

you ask people if we spend too much on foreign affairs, in one recent poll, 79 percent said yes. The second question was, how much do you think we should be spending, and they consistently said about 5 percent, and indeed we are spending 1 percent.

There will be honest debates as to whether we are giving too much support for one country or another, but the fact of the matter is it is cheaper to support nations in peace than it is to buy more bombers and missiles, and I believe that we are on the right track.

CHANGE IN STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

(Mr. POMEROY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I think it is dead wrong to turn our back on our Nation's students by eliminating the in-school interest deferral on student loans. The student loan program is not for children from wealthy families. It is for those who qualify, namely those from middle- and low-income backgrounds.

Watching Members of Congress my age who I know back when they were students took advantage of these programs now vote to repeal them to give tax breaks to their rich friends makes me sick. I think it is dead wrong for those who took advantage of programs now to vote to essentially pull up the ladder and deprive those who follow of the same opportunities that they had.

This hit to student loans comes at a time when the importance of education has never been greater, but the cost unfortunately has never been higher. We should not get to a point where our college campuses bear a sign, "Only the wealthy need apply." But unfortunately the Republican plan financing tax breaks by eliminating student loan interest deferral brings us much closer to that sorry state.

MORE ON THE STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I spent some time in the district talking to and working with students who simply wanted an opportunity to be educated.

I rise this morning to read a letter just received from Eric Lee Nickell, a Houston constituent of mine and a student at the University of Houston.

He writes:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LEE: I am a university student who is obtaining an education with the aid of subsidized student loans. I am afraid that this may not be possible for much longer, judging from what I have heard of the rescission bills currently working their way through both Houses. My hope and the

hope of many thousands of students is that you will consider the potential leaders and scientists and doctors this country will lose if they cannot obtain an education. Please vote against any cut to student aid. Our future depends on you.

Mr. Speaker, considering the fact that Republicans plan to eliminate 18.7 billion dollars' worth of student loan interest deferral will end up costing students about \$5,000 apiece, I want to promise Eric that you will have my support. I will fight against the loss of student loans. Finally, I think Eric's letter speaks for itself.

□ 1240

GOP SACRIFICES FAMILIES FOR THE WEALTHY

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, Republicans are asking working families to sacrifice in order to pay for their tax giveaway to the wealthy. The GOP cut in student loans will result in the largest increase in college costs in history for working families—families like the Baxters of West Haven, CT.

The Baxter children, Heather, Joe, Heidi, Scott, and Donnie come from a single parent family. Their mother, Gail, has already worked to put one daughter through college, and, next fall, her four remaining children will all be attending college. And, yes, Gail and her children rely on student loans to help pay tuition.

The Republican plan to cut student loans by \$18.6 billion will increase the cost of a college education by an average of \$5,000 per student. For the Baxters, that is an increase of \$20,000. The Republican budget asks the Baxters to pay \$20,000 more, so the richest 1 percent of Americans can pay \$20,000 less. That is wrong.

AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT IS MIXED BAG

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the American Overseas Interests Act legislation that we will be debating today is a mixed bag at best. In some respects the bill represents a retreat from America's role of promoting democracy in those lands that were formerly part of the Soviet Union.

The bill authorizes \$145 million less than the administration's fiscal year 1996 request and \$76 million less than the 1995 level. We need to draw a distinction between Russia and the other Soviet Republics. After spending billions guarding against Moscow's aggressive expansionism during the cold war, I believe it is still an important American interest to continue promoting the transition to democracy in the

former captive nations of the Soviet Union.

Also I do want to express praise for one provision of the bill included by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], known as the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act. That act would withhold U.S. aid to nations which are blocking congressionally approved humanitarian assistance to other countries. It requires all of U.S. aid recipients to allow unencumbered delivery of humanitarian assistance.

The Republic of Turkey has imposed a blockade on the neighboring Republic of Armenia, preventing delivery of food, medicine and other humanitarian relief supplies from reaching Armenia. Much of this aid originates in the United States.

This Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act would prevent countries like Turkey from receiving aid if they prevent this aid from getting through.

ETHICS COMMITTEE STONEMALLING

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, here we go again, I am shocked and dismayed that by a straight party line vote the House Ethics Committee failed to appoint an independent counsel in the case of our Speaker, NEWT GINGRICH. It is obvious to me the majority members of our Ethics Committee have made the decision to stonewall this case. Why? Well, Mr. Speaker, could it be because the chairwoman of the committee nominated Mr. GINGRICH to be Speaker and also contributed to his campaign?

Could it be that two majority members of the committee are involved in GOPAC either as a contributor or a recipient? Could it be that one majority member is a potential witness in one of the cases against the Speaker involving influence peddling?

I remind my colleagues that Speaker GINGRICH himself said an independent counsel is required for any investigation into the position of the Speaker. I quote "this investigation has to meet an higher standard of public accountability." The clouds are darkening over our Capitol and can only be lifted with the appointment of an independent counsel. The stonewalling must stop now, Mr. Speaker.

PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule.

The Committee on Agriculture; the Committee on Banking and Financial Services; the Committee on Commerce;

the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities; the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight; the Committee on House Oversight; the Committee on the Judiciary; the Committee on National Security; the Committee on Resources; the Committee on Small Business; and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. VOLKMER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority for consulting with the minority on this request, and the minority agrees with the request.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT OF 1995

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 155 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 155

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1561) to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States; to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1996 and 1997; to responsibly reduce the authorizations of appropriations for United States foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2(l)(6) of rule XI or section 302(f), 303(a), 308(a), or 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule for an initial period of ten hours. After such initial period, amendments shall be debatable only as provided in clause 6 of rule XXIII or in section 2 of this resolution. Consideration for amendment may not continue beyond 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, May 25, 1995. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on International Relations now printed in the bill modified by deleting section 2210. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as modified shall be considered as read. Points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as modified for failure to comply

with clause 5(a) of rule XXI or section 302(f), 303(a), or 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. Other than pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate and amendments en bloc described in section 2 of this resolution, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as modified shall be in order unless printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as modified. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time for the chairman of the Committee on International Relations or a designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII or germane modifications of any such amendment. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read (except that modifications shall be reported), shall not be subject to amendment or to a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole and shall be debatable for ten minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations or their designees. For the purpose of inclusion in such amendments en bloc, an amendment printed in the form of a motion to strike may be modified to the form of a germane perfecting amendment to the text originally proposed to be stricken. The original proponent of an amendment included in such amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the Congressional Record immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the House this rule for the consideration of H.R. 1561, the American Overseas Interests Act of 1995. Although this rule is somewhat complicated, it is a modified open rule that provides Members the widest possible latitude in directing the debate and offering amendments, while bringing consideration of this bill to closure at the end of this legislative week.

First, the nuts and bolts: This rule provides for 2 hours of general debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee

on International Relations and makes in order the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. The rule provides that the committee amendment shall be considered as read and it allows for an open amendment process to last 10 hours, including voting time.

Because of the complexity of the subject, the rule requires that amendments be preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that the Committee on International Relations, and all Members of the House, may have sufficient time to review them. To facilitate maximum efficiency in the use of the amendment time, the rule allows the chairman of the International Relations Committee, or his designee, to offer amendments en bloc consisting of preprinted amendments and subject to 10 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled. Once the 10-hour period has concluded, additional amendments that have been preprinted may be considered with 10 minutes of debate time, equally divided, until 2:30 on Thursday afternoon. At that time certain, the amendment process will be concluded and the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as have been adopted.

The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage. The rule does allow for one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Because of the reach and complexity of this bill, the rule includes a series of important waivers that Members should be aware of.

First, the rule waives the 3-day availability requirement for committee reports. The committee did file its report on Friday evening, which makes today the second legislative day that it was available. Although we generally do not like to provide this waiver, the Rules Committee felt that, given the rush of legislative business expected after the Memorial Day recess, it is necessary to conclude consideration of H.R. 1561 this week. Because we wanted to allow as much amendment time as possible within that constraint, this waiver is needed so we can get started today.

The rule also waives clause 5(a) of rule XXI, prohibiting appropriations on a legislative bill—a waiver that applies to technical language in 15 sections of this bill. The International Relations Committee has provided a list of the specific sections affected by this waiver, most of which deal with the transfer and reallocation of funds.

Finally, the rule provides several Budget Act waivers, all of which have been cleared by the Budget Committee. These waivers apply to sections 302(f), 303(a), 308(a), and 402(a) of the Budget Act.

Respectively, these waivers pertain to consideration of legislation providing new entitlement authority in excess of a committee's allocation, consideration of budgetary legislation prior to adoption of the budget resolution, the requirement of a CBO cost estimate in the committee report on legislation containing new entitlement