

We must renew that pledge. We must mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor so that, if we are called upon to defend America, we will stand ready.

I am proud to say last week this House took an important step and passed the military appropriations bill that will provide the funding necessary for those young men and women who are today called upon to be the front line of defense of our freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following letter for the RECORD:

Sacrifice. It's a word we all know. Our Founding Fathers understood the need for sacrifice—they concluded the declaration of independence with the words: "We mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." I, myself, grew up with the notion that sacrifice was part of the American experience. I can recall my grandmother, Lillian Slyle, telling me stories of her experiences in world war I. She was an army nurse during the war, and she told me countless tales of the hardships of that terrible conflict, marching across Europe with General Pershing. She was profoundly affected by these experiences. And so was I. All of us have made some sacrifices in our lives. We make sacrifices for our family, for our close friends, even for our neighbors and co-workers. Members in the armed forces make many sacrifices great and small, and over one million Americans have given their lives, the ultimate sacrifice, while serving to defend our country. Many of us here today can remember the long, lonely hours of sacrifice that service in the army, navy, air force, or marine corps requires—standing watch on the bridge of a warship through the night, patrolling alone in a dark forest, or working into the night on an aircraft in preparation for the next flight. Some of those sacrifices go unseen, but never unrecognized by those who depend on them. Americans across the country gather each year on this day to honor such sacrifices, and remember the contributions of American servicemen. Throughout history, members of the armed forces have risked their lives not merely for their family or their co-workers, but for a cause represented by the American flag and the liberty to succeed or fail which it embodies. Some Americans are too young to remember, others have too quickly forgotten. How important, therefore, that we honor our veterans, that we learn from them, and that we teach others about history, about war, about sacrifice. We are still reminded about the great World Wars, about Korea, Vietnam, and more recent conflicts. We should not, however, allow the memory, the lessons, and the sacrifices of our tragic wars to fade. Proud veterans of those wars are among us today. Their presence bears witness to sacrifice. Battlefields and cemeteries remind us of the terrible sacrifices and loss of life in war. Many of us remember all too directly the experience of war. The United States asked the sacrifice of our citizens, a sacrifice that was necessary to fight Nazism in Europe, Japan, and Asia, it was a sacrifice offered in the cause of freedom. To protect our God-given liberties for both this country, and for our fellow men and women abroad. Americans today would do well to remember that throughout history the freedom that we now enjoy was created and maintained by blood and iron, and many tears. The lives and dreams of thousands of men and women who fought for democratic ideals were sacrificed because those men and women believed that these ideals were worth fighting for and dying for. It is fitting that today we honor those men and women who made that

sacrifice. It is the duty of our generation to preserve the freedom that earlier generations fought to secure. Unhappily, many now call for America to disarm. I, however, am reminded of what George Washington said over 200 years ago: "To be prepared for war is on of the most effectual means of preserving peace." The cost of freedom is eternal vigilance. Conflicts rage around the globe. Dictators with pernicious designs are at this moment committed to building their military power. Let us think twice about downsizing our military forces too quickly in the wake of the end of the Cold War—those before us here today understand all too well that there is no substitute for military preparedness. And they know that military preparedness does not come cheap, does not come without sacrifice. Remembering what memorial day is for, and what gives it meaning is how each of us remembers the great sacrifices which have made possible the blessings we share as Americans today. But when we consider those blessings, we must remember that men and women do not give their lives in the field of battle so that their loved ones who they leave behind live in a society that no longer respects their freedoms. The courageous veterans that are here with us today understand exactly how precious those freedoms are. You understand what is meant by civic duty, and the responsibilities of citizenship in a world desperate for heroes. I wish to salute you and honor you for that sacrifice. Your courage is an inspiration to me and to my generation, because courage in the face of danger and in the face of an uncertain future is going to be the key difference between what makes this country great and what could lead to failure as we struggle with the difficulties that we have today in our communities. To all of you who are veterans, I am deeply honored to recognize your sacrifices in the cause of freedom. Our country thanks you for your patriotism. We will not forget. And when we are called upon to defend liberty, we will rise to the challenge in the noble American tradition of our forbears. And on behalf of my generation, let me renew the pledge of Jefferson, Madison, Hamilton, and John Jay: "We stand ready, if our nation, and the freedoms we stand for, are attacked—we will make the sacrifice to preserve our cherished liberty for our children. This we pledge: our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor. May God bless you, and may God bless the United States of America!"

FINANCIAL AID

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight after listening with great interest to the colloquy which took place between and among my friends, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON] and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE], with respect to the issue of financial aid for people wanting to go to college or to pursue higher education in the country.

First let me say as a matter of record that I know and I accept that the intentions, particularly of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON], are entirely positive in promoting higher education. It has been

their record. It has been their personal commitment, and I am very honored to serve with them on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities. Having said that, I think that the plan that is being put forward is a serious assault on the ability of Americans, particularly middle-class Americans, to go to college or to pursue a higher education.

First let me say that the first time that we heard about this plan was tonight. As a member of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, I would expect that there would be more opportunities for both Republicans and Democrats to learn about the plan, debate its merits, and propose alternatives.

I am, finally, glad to hear something from the majority as to how it plans to reduce higher education spending by \$10 billion over the next 5 years, but I think that the proper way to do this would be to have hearings and a debate within the committee, not do it this way.

Having said that, it is my understanding that there are three ways that the committee is considering proposing to meet this \$10 billion target. Numbers, Mr. Speaker, fly around here freely. And if our constituents are listening to us, numbers like \$10 billion and 5-year appropriations and all of this is very, very confusing.

I would like to attempt to cut through that and talk about my understanding as to what the majority is, in fact, proposing and how it would affect students of all ages trying to get a higher education in the country. First of all, they propose the abolition of the direct loan program and claim that it will save \$1.2 billion. There is only one way that the abolition of the direct loan program saves money, and that is if you cook the books. With all due respect, that is what the Congressional Budget Office is doing with the direct loan program. It simply makes no sense whatsoever to argue that the taxpayers will spend less money by borrowing it at 5 percent than they will paying a bank to lend it at 8 percent. You do not have to go very far in school to figure that out.

In the next couple of days we will be revealing specific evidence which shows that the Congressional Budget Office for partisan political reasons has chosen to distort this issue and to distort the real economic impact of direct lending. It does not save money to abolish direct lending. It costs money. What it does is to take a program that is working successfully on college campuses across this country and turn it back to the maze of banks and guarantee agencies, and, Mr. Speaker, our constituents understand this.

□ 2130

They bounce from bank to guaranty agency to financial aid office and back all over again. You sometimes need a degree in educational administration to figure out how to apply for a student

loan and to pay one. It will not save money to abolish direct loans, it will cost money.

Second, the plan apparently says they are going to take profits from the bank, I think I heard the number \$4.7 billion, from the banks and the guaranty agencies. I find this remarkable for two reasons. First, for the last 10 years every time someone has proposed taking money from the banks in the student loan program by reducing the rate of interest that they are paying, the banks come tripping up to Capitol Hill and say, "We will not stay in the program anymore if you take profit away from us. It will no longer become profitable." Frankly, it has been the very same Republican defenders of the banks on this issue who are now proposing taking profits away from the interest rate that the banks earn.

The question I would raise, Mr. Speaker, is were they wrong in 1990 and 1992, or are they wrong now? Because for two decades the banks have said if you take anything away from their subsidy in this program, they will leave the program. They will not make any more loans. I find it miraculous that now all of a sudden that argument has changed. It has not changed, and some of the banks will in fact leave the program.

Where do you think the guaranty agencies are going to get part of this \$4.7 billion? Mr. Speaker, here is where. When an American student applies for a student loan, he or she usually pays 5 percent of their loan principle as a guarantee fee. That fee will go up, inevitably, under this.

Let me say this. The plan apparently proposes that we will end the deferment of payments after graduation. Here is what that means in English. It means the day after you graduate, Mr. Speaker, the day after a student graduates he or she will have to start to pay their loan back before they get a job, whether or not they get a job. If you want a surefire recipe to increase defaults that the taxpayers are liable for, that is the way to do it. This is a plan that hurts students. In the future I will be happy to outline specific ways to save even more money. This is not the way to go.

SALMON REHABILITATION IN THE COLUMBIA RIVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, we have a critical issue in the West, the salmon rehabilitation in the Columbia River. A model has been developed, a computer model called the FLUSH Model. It has been developed and accepted for this rehabilitation plan. Because public policy is based on this model and public policy will be spent on this, using this model to rehabilitate the Columbia River, I requested the details on which

the FLUSH Model is based. I have been trying to get the details, the assumptions, and all of the information upon which it was based.

We are about to begin spending \$200 million to \$300 million of public money on salmon rehabilitation, but information on the FLUSH Model is not forthcoming. At a hearing before the Committee on Resources, I asked Rollie Schmitt, Director of the National Marine Fisheries Service, about this, if he could get this information for me. He agreed that the Committee on Resources must have this information, but despite his good faith efforts, and that is Rollie Schmitt, Director of the National Marine Fisheries Service, despite his good faith efforts, despite my repeated requests to several entities, including the Washington and Oregon Departments of Fisheries and others, the Committee on Resources still does not have any details on the FLUSH Model. I think that is unacceptable.

Instead, my request and the other requests have been met with delays and excuses, silly arguments that the model may not be usable, or it might be misunderstood. We obviously have a problem, and that problem must be solved.

This is the problem: Sound science and peer review must be part of the recovery process. Let me repeat that. Sound science and peer review must be part of the recovery process, especially a process that costs hundreds of millions of dollars of public money. Public confidence is being undermined by the appearance that this information is being hidden from review. That is unacceptable.

I still do not have a copy of this model. I believe that the Committee on Resources of the Congress needs and, in fact, must have this information for peer review before the expenditure of public dollars. I brought this up before the Committee on Resources today, and the chairman said if we do not get this in the near future we will seek a committee subpoena for this information.

I just bring this to the attention of the Congress because this is something that must be handled in the short run, and we must get this information upon which public policy and expenditure of public funds is based.

DEVELOPMENTS AND PROGRESS OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE 104TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues tonight join me from the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight to discuss many of the developments and progress of the 104th Congress in this first session. With me

I have tonight the gentleman from Minnesota, GIL GUTKNECHT, the gentleman from New Jersey, BILL MARTINI, and the gentleman from Washington State, RANDY TATE, each of whom has been a leader in their own right, not only in the freshman class but in their own committee.

Just recently, this past weekend in the Eighth District of New Jersey, the gentleman from New Jersey, BILL MARTINI, who has been at the forefront of reform in the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, held a hearing in his district along with five other colleagues, including the gentleman from Washington, Mr. TATE, and if he can tell us tonight, I would ask the gentleman from New Jersey what was the orientation for the hearing he held in his district, what was the purpose, and what was accomplished, so we can look to improvements and legislation and other reforms as Congress moves to further agenda items.

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I thank him for allowing me this opportunity to share with the Members the mission this hearing was designated to do.

First I have a little background about the field hearing itself. The field hearing that we in the Eighth Congressional District in New Jersey were honored to have and to bring to people in our district was a field hearing of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, chaired by our good chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, BILL CLINGER. This committee had been designated by the Speaker of the House to conduct a series of national field hearings on the topic of the 21st century Federal Government. Obviously, it is a broad topic, but the real purpose of having the hearing was to go out into the field, to get out of the Beltway, and to listen to the people as to how they envision a 21st century Federal Government.

We had, and I am pleased to say, several of my colleagues from the House here join me on the panel, along with the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER]. We had the distinguished gentleman from Washington, RANDY TATE, who was there, along with several other panelists. We also had the benefit of listening to testimony from a number of people, including the great Governor of our State, Governor Whitman, as well as other officials, bipartisan in nature, I might add, as well as people from the private sector, all of whom already have embarked on the road that we here in Washington have been embarking on in the last 8 months, the road to try to make the respective institutions, of which they have jurisdiction over, more efficient and still provide