

- Technology is the engine of economic growth.
- Scientific knowledge is the key to the future.
- Responsible government advances science and technology.

The Congress and the American people can find evidence of the Administration's dedication to responsible government support for science and technology in our defense and economic policies as well as our management of the science and technology enterprise. We have decreased the Federal deficit, helped to create millions of new jobs, and improved the tax treatment of small businesses and of investments in research and development. Hemispheric and global trade agreements as well as relaxation of outdated export controls have opened huge export markets to America's high-tech industries. My *National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement* (February 1995) depends on farsighted and efficient science and technology investments. Our foreign policy and security interests are also supported by mutually beneficial international cooperation in science and technology.

We have consistently endorsed technology policies to increase prosperity and enhance environmental quality. In *Technology for America's Economic Growth* (February 1993) and *Technology for a Sustainable Future* (July 1994) this Administration conveyed to the American people our plans for public/private partnerships to improve the business environment, enhance access to quality education and training, support development of information infrastructure, ensure continued excellence in health care, and strengthen America's global competitiveness.

Streamlined government based on strong partnerships—within the government, with the private sector, and among nations—is a hallmark of the Clinton/Gore Administration. The "virtual department" I created by establishing the National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) has cut bureaucratic red tape and produced a historic first: an integrated research and development budget that focuses on national goals. The NSTC has also produced large savings by enabling agencies to coordinate their efforts, divide tasks, and share resources.

My Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) provides critical links to industry and academia. Their oversight of NSTC activities, such as development of strategies for the management and disposition of fissile materials, promises to improve the Federal effort. So, too, do the forums and workshops that have drawn in thousands of experts and stakeholders to help develop priorities in areas as diverse as fundamental science; environmental technology; and health, safety; and food research.

I am also very proud of the steps we have taken to improve international cooperation in science and technology. Through the Gore-Chernomyrdin Com-

mission we have used science and technology cooperation to ease the Russians' transition to democracy and a market economy. We have received valuable new technology and cultivated a crucial partner in global affairs through Russian participation in the international space station. We have used the Megasciences Forum of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and other international forums to explore ways to share the increasing costs of cutting-edge research while maintaining our position of world leadership. Bilateral science and technology cooperation with other nations, including advanced industrial economies such as Japan, and big, emerging markets such as the People's Republic of China, serve us well in the global economy—giving us access to new ideas and new technologies while creating new opportunities for business.

Economists have estimated that the social rate of return on investments in research and development averages about 50 percent, or about double the average private rate of return. Clearly a solid Federal investment program is justified even in the leanest times. It is especially important for the Federal Government to maintain its investments in science and technology when the pressures of the international competition are leading businesses to focus on shorter term payoffs at the expense of more basic, longer term, and riskier research and development.

In *Science in the National Interest* (August 1994), the Vice President and I reaffirmed our longstanding commitment to world leadership in science, mathematics, and engineering. Scientific discoveries inspire and enrich us. Equally important, science and mathematics education provides all Americans with the knowledge and skills they need to prepare for and adapt to the high-technology jobs of the future and to exercise the responsibilities of citizenship.

This Administration has articulated clear goals and established priorities for Federal spending, and our economic policies have improved the climate for private investment as well. We intend to work closely with the Congress to ensure the well-being of our children and grandchildren. These investments will prepare us for the challenges of the 21st century.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 29, 1995.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE BOB FRANKS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable BOB FRANKS, a Member of Congress from the State of New Jersey:

SEVENTH DISTRICT, NEW JERSEY,

March 21, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that I have been served with a subpoena issued by the Municipal Court for Manville, New Jersey.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is not consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

BOB FRANKS,
Member of Congress.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each:

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

[Mr. HOEKSTRA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

TERM LIMITS

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, what was the final vote there? Do any of my colleagues know? 227 to 204? So our brilliant Speakers prediction was right on the nose almost. We got way in the high 80's on the Republican side of the aisle and let me see, let me do a little arithmetic, 205 Democrats in this Chamber, the oldest party in America, Andy Jackson, great tradition, and, yeah, they did not give us enough here to get through.

OK. Do we not already have term limits by way of elections? Well, obviously not when 90 percent of all the incumbents in the House and Senate who wanted their seats back got it. Forty-two people did not even have an opponent. I guarantee you that number will not be that high on November the 5, 1996. Particularly if this great oldest party in America puts up Clinton, we are not going to have 42 unchallenged seats. The goal of the Grand Old Party is to have no unchallenged seat in the United States of America comes 1996 election year.

Number two, is it hypocritical for anyone to advocate term limits who have already served longer than that?

Now, they were throwing around a lot of false figures here. I have announced that I am in my last term. Nobody gave me credit for that all during the debate. I served 6 years, had my seat chopped in four parts because they could not find a candidate, including Gregory Peck's son, to whip me twice, the most expensive race in the history of the House. I raised over \$2 million, he raised over \$1.5 million in 1980, then, bingo, they cut my seat up.

I said to President Reagan, "What do you think I should do?" He said, "Bob, there is a Democrat liberal down there in Orange County and don't you guys call that Reagan country. Why don't you go down there and knock him off." So I did and I said I would only stay for 12 years because one of the most arrogant things I heard here all night is that in each district in America, and some compliments went back and forth, each district has found the greatest statesman or stateswoman that that district was ever going to produce in American history.

Well, I can tell you something, in every district in America there is a woman, there is a man, there is a retired military person, there is a sharp young man or woman just out of college that would like to serve for 6, 12 years, get it over with and then go in the private sector and create jobs and carry that government experience with them the rest of their life.

Has it ever occurred to anybody that since Jeremiah Dent left the House there is not a single admiral or general over in the other body and only SONNY MONTGOMERY in this House, and then people complimented all the World War II people in this House. I have watched Watergate babies, pro-Sandinista, pro-Hanoi demonstrators try to knock off all our World War II people in this majority party and take their chairmanships away from them. So where was the respect factor for World War II veterans there?

Then it was inherent on both sides of the aisle, arguing against term limits that somehow or other the process is not broken. If this process is not broken, how do we get into bloody \$5 trillion worth of debt this coming September? Every man, woman and child, every newborn baby on September 20 of this year and every man or woman about to meet their maker owes \$20,000. Just how did that happen, if this process is so wonderful?

And we are the greatest assemblage of statesmen and women that this Nation has ever seen. No, I loved it when our dynamic Speaker said this will be H.R. 1 next year.

□ 2145

Look, folks, here is the countdown watch. I may market these later in the year if I can get it through the Committee on Ethics. Here is the countdown watch. I do not like that backward running watch. I am an analog guy. I want it to go the right way, clockwise. Here is the countdown. Here is Clinton taking a little tumble there

and it says 587 days to the election day. My wife has one that is 76 days longer. Her watch counts down to the inauguration, January 20, 1997, 587 days. And if the American people give us the White House to sink it up for the first time since I was too young to vote, and we have the House and the Senate and the White House, as Eisenhower had in January of 1953 when I got sworn in that same week into the Air Force, you are going to see amazing things happen in this country. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], one of our finest Congressmen, was saying in the cloakroom after the vote, imagine, imagine, he said, if we get the White House, and hold the House and Senate, what we can do for this great country of ours. Faith, family and freedom. That should be the focus of this House, and that freedom means liberty from big, oppressive taxing-taxing, spending-spending government. \$5 trillion, term limits, maybe in the next Congress. God bless you, Madam Speaker. Thank you for those 5 minutes.

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

[Mr. MFUME addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. KINGSTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

STUDENT LOAN PROGRAMS IN JEOPARDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Speaker, I would like to discuss something of grave concern to me, because although I do not have a child who is of college age yet, in about 6 years I will, and in about 18 years, God willing, I will also have another child that will be preparing to go to college.

Today I would like to address the whole issue of what is happening in this Congress, and to me what is happening and what will happen perhaps next week is the devastation of the opportunity of young people to become professionals and become productive members of our society.

The Republican Contract With America calls for cuts. It calls for tax cuts that will go to those privileged few in our society that are very wealthy. And it calls for cuts, cuts to programs that help seniors, cuts to programs that help children, and cuts to people who are preparing to go on to college.

Whether you are 5 years of age or whether you are 22 years of age, it does

not matter; the Contract With America is bad news for you. Last week we passed in this House welfare proposals that were contained within the Contract With America. Unfortunately, what this proposal did was cut school lunch programs, it cut child care, it cut aid to disabled students, all for the purpose of trying not just as we were told to try to reform welfare, but also to provide billions of dollars to pay for these tax cuts that we will see next week on the floor of this House for discussion, which will ultimately go mostly as I said before to the privileged few.

Within the next weeks we will also see something that will be of interest not to just to those that are 5 years of age, not just to those who have children 5 years of age, but to those who wish to go on to college, and that is, of course, what we see written, for example, in U.S. News and World Report where they say that "Every major Federal college aid program is considered a target in one form or another by the new Republican majority in Congress."

What does that mean? Financial aid for middle-class students today is in jeopardy. In fact, it is not only in jeopardy, it may become a thing of the past. Why? The Contract With America calls for the Congress to pay for these tax cuts. And one of the ways they plan to do that, as we understand so far from the majority, is they plan to eliminate four major student aid programs. The first is subsidized Stafford student loans; the second is work study programs; the third is supplemental education opportunity grants for very low income and disadvantaged students; and fourth is a Perkins loan program, which also provides loans to low- and middle-income students. These four programs constitute about 75 percent of all the student aid that we see given out in this Nation.

Why are the Republicans in this Contract on America doing this? As I said before, they have to pay for their tax cuts, which amount to about \$200 billion over 5 years, and I believe over \$800 billion over 10 years. Somewhere they need to find the money, and they are doing it going after not just the kids and school lunch, but we now see college students will have to pay the price.

What we find is that on November 8 people said they wanted to vote for change, but what we are finding is people are beginning to realize this is not the kind of change that they wish to have. When you talk to people, they say that along with things like Social Security, we wish to preserve programs that help people become professionals, to become productive citizens. We do not wish to deny them the opportunity to become full-fledged members of our society.

These cuts to student aid programs will be devastating. Millions of individuals may very well see their economic futures go down the drain. This in turn,