

is tomfoolery. It dodges the essential point that most defense spending from 1947 to 1992 was devoted to dealing with the Soviet Union and its allies, a threat that no longer exists.

Politicians should also recognize that Pentagon spending is a significant force only in communities with large defense manufacturers or military bases. Pentagon spending is not the flywheel of prosperity in a \$7 trillion national economy.

Certainly, the United States cannot be complacent about its security. Iraq remains a threat to American interests in the Persian Gulf region. North Korea, strained by famine and heavily armed, could seek relief by renewing hostilities on the Korean Peninsula. China aims to be a military power in the decades ahead. Terrorism is a constant danger, and the need to send American troops abroad in peacekeeping roles is likely to grow. But no current or near-term peril comes anywhere close to the former Soviet threat.

The Pentagon is examining military requirements as part of its Quadrennial Defense Review, but do not expect much creative thinking from this exercise. The generals should be redesigning the American military to meet the threats of a new era, an exercise that might well slash budgets and discard the principle that America be able to fight two regional wars simultaneously.

That principle has justified an Army of 495,000 active-duty troops and a Navy with 12 aircraft carriers, just one less than the cold-war fleet. Scaling back to a more realistic one-war doctrine, plus sufficient air power to pin down an enemy elsewhere, would save \$10 billion to \$20 billion a year, even with more spending on stealth aircraft. Closing and consolidating bases and other support operations would produce additional savings.

Instead of looking seriously at these options, the generals are trying to determine how little they can cut within the Administration's five-year budget plan for the Pentagon. Under that plan, the budget would grow steadily, reaching \$278 billion in 2002. It includes a whopping 40 percent increase in spending for new weapons.

It would be interesting to see where planning would lead if it were not governed by the Clinton Administration's escalating Pentagon budgets and the military's exaggerated threat assessments. It is not unreasonable to believe that American security can be adequately protected for considerably less than \$240 billion a year.

INTRODUCTION OF THE COST OF HIGHER EDUCATION REVIEW ACT OF 1997

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1997

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Cost of Higher Education Review Act of 1997. Representative MCKEON and a bipartisan group of Members of this body have introduced this bill because we all share a common goal—we want college to be affordable for students and families across the country.

The current crisis in college affordability has been documented in various newsstories, as well as by the General Accounting Office in its report titled, "Tuition Increasing Faster Than Household Income and Public Colleges' Costs." Among the facts and figures contained

in the report is the simple reminder that paying for a college education is one of the most costly investments facing American families today.

Certainly, students and parents are well aware of this simple fact. At the field hearings held by the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, Training, and Life-Long Learning chaired by Representative MCKEON, one consistent theme from students and parents is the reality that paying for college is a huge financial burden, and for some, it is simply out of reach.

Recent reports indicate that colleges have begun moderating their tuition increases and I am encouraged that the current rate of increase in tuition and fees is a vast improvement over prior years. I am also encouraged by the individual efforts of some college presidents who are restructuring their campuses in order to become more efficient and less costly, and sharing resources in order to control costs. But I think more can be done. Annual tuition increases of 5 to 6 percent continue to exceed the CPI rate of inflation and I think students, families, and taxpayers deserve to see a greater effort on the part of colleges to reduce those tuition increases.

The Commission established by this bill will review the cost controlling practices currently employed on some college campuses, as well as the underlying factors which impact tuition prices. Their analysis and recommendations for actions on the part of colleges, the administration, and the Congress will be vital to our goal of keeping college affordable for all Americans.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join in support of this legislation.

CITIZENSHIP USA

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1997

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, the Immigration and Naturalization Service [INS] has tested me time and again. Today, my patience has run out. My district in southern California has one of the largest concentrations of illegal aliens. INS claims to be working to remedy this problem. They are failing miserably.

This morning, I learned that the Citizenship USA Program, which is run by the INS, has failed to properly screen nearly 180,000 aliens. These aliens were hastily naturalized without adequate background checks. Many more submitted the fingerprints of another person to avoid triggering a hit by the FBI. How many criminals has the INS allowed to become U.S. citizens? How many criminal aliens are lurking in our neighborhoods and preying on our children?

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I helped introduce legislation drafted by my colleague ELTON GALLEGLY. This bill would expand a pilot program currently operating in Anaheim and Ventura County, CA, which requires a 24-hour presence of INS agents at local jails in 100 counties with the highest concentration of illegal aliens.

Currently, our local law enforcement officials do not have the power to deport these criminal illegal aliens. This bill will place the proper authorities in the hands of our communities in

order to send these criminal illegal aliens back over the border for good. In addition, because those who committed crimes are more likely to break the law again, this bill will pick up those who slipped through the cracks of the Citizenship USA Program. It is my hope that the INS will now correct the wrongs they have committed against law-abiding U.S. citizens. The INS must take appropriate action to deport those who are found to have submitted falsified documents to gain U.S. citizenship. It is the right thing to do for the safety of our children and the security of our neighborhoods. We must rid our streets of these criminal aliens.

INTRODUCTION OF THE COST OF HIGHER EDUCATION REVIEW ACT OF 1997

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1997

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Cost of Higher Education Review Act of 1997.

In today's technology and information based economy, getting a high quality postsecondary education is more important than ever. For many Americans, it is the key to the American dream. As Chairman of the Subcommittee with jurisdiction over Federal higher education policy, I am responsible for the programs which provide Federal help in getting this education. However, my interest in higher education goes well beyond the role I play as Chairman. I am a parent and a grandparent. I know students who are pursuing or will pursue a postsecondary education. I have constituents, students and parents, who are worried about their ability to afford a college education.

Historically, the cost of getting a postsecondary education has increased at a rate slightly above the cost of living. However, a recent GAO report tells us that over the last 15 years the price of attending a 4-year public college has increased 234 percent, while the median household income has risen by only 82 percent, and the CPI only 74 percent. A recent survey of college freshmen found that concern over college affordability is at a 30-year high. Parents and students across the country are understandably worried about the rising cost of a college education. In order to control the cost of obtaining a college education, parents, students, and policy makers must work together with colleges and universities to slow tuition inflation, or for many Americans, college will become unaffordable.

This is not to say that there are not affordable schools. There are still some affordable schools and there are college presidents who are committed to keeping costs low. There are schools that are trying very innovative things to reduce tuition prices.

However, the trend in college pricing is truly alarming. This trend is especially alarming in that it only seems to apply to higher education. There are many endeavors and many businesses that must keep pace with changing technologies and Federal regulations. However, in order to stay affordable to their customers and stay competitive in the market, they manage to hold cost increases to a reasonable level.

The legislation I am introducing today will establish a commission on the cost of higher