

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,

of course, will threaten the economic future of our own country. Getting rid of these four student aid programs will cost about \$20 billion over the next 5 years for middle-income families.

Now, let us look at it this way. It is not just the cost, it is a tax. Because these are middle-income families that otherwise would have been able to help their children go on to college. But because they are being taxed in higher fees, less money for student loans, they will now be paying the cost of these tax cuts that will be going mostly to the privileged few in their Contract With America.

This is the worst time, by the way, to be cutting back on student aid. Tuition is rising rapidly throughout the country. Without any assistance, the cost of attending college will go up even more. Some will be forced to forgo school altogether.

In California, tuition rates have skyrocketed. The goal of California's master plan of giving every young person the chance to go to college, whether it is community college, State university or the University of California campuses, is evaporating rapidly. Those students who represent the first generation of college students in their family just might come home without a degree, a devastating blow for parents, students and siblings alike.

I can give an example: I myself am the first in my family to get an education. My parents were immigrants. I would not have been able to go, but I took advantage of work study and student aid and student loans.

I hope we will understand this is not the way to go, and we will not support the Contract With America's attempt to go after our college students.

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

[Mr. SHAYS 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 New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

JULIA BAILEY IS MISSISSIPPI WINNER IN VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues the winning entry from Mississippi in the VFW's annual Voice of Democracy contest. It was submitted by Julia Bailey of West Point, MS.

Julia is a senior at West Point High School and the daughter of Eugene and Elizabeth

Bailey. I had the chance to meet and visit with this outstanding young lady when she came to Washington recently. Her patriotic essay is one of the best I have read and commend it to all my colleagues.

"MY VISION FOR AMERICA"

The people who fought for the American Revolution had a vision of a country they governed themselves. The South had a vision of keeping their slaves. The North had a vision of defeating the South. Abraham Lincoln had a vision of forming a Union again, and the slaves had a vision of being free. History is a picture show of many groups with many visions. I am following in a long line of history because I, too, have a vision.

Everyday I go to school, and, to me, it is a small scale America. In our school we have black people, white people, people with learning disabilities, and straight A students. We have as many visions as we do groups of people, but all the students and faculty come together five days a week for one purpose, whether it is conscious or buried under all their other concerns. We come to school to educate and to be educated because we all have a vision of success. My vision for America is that, like the school, we will recognize that we, too, have a common goal to work towards—unity.

The civil rights movement was perhaps a time when many people combined dreams to form one vision. Sit-ins, boycotts, and marches were all a part of a people's fight for justice. The civil rights movement was special because it included everyone. The object of the movement was unity. A person did not have to be black to fight for civil rights but simply a person with an eye for justice and a belief that it was time for the truth to be acted upon that all people are created equal, not "separate but equal," equal.

We tend to focus on the qualities that we can see are equal—like our color or our financial status—rather than the qualities that we cannot see. In my vision our new focus will be on equality of mind and spirit, of opinions and beliefs, equality, not agreement, unity of spirit, not race. Spirit has no color; it has no age, it is not divided into categories.

I had the privilege of standing on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D.C. The Washington Monument pierced the air, and the green glow of the Capitol filtered from behind it. I felt powerful, humble, and thankful. Not only are those monuments reflected in the water they rise above, they are reflected in me.

I realize that even though the states are not always united, and that corruption threatens our freedom, in the capital of my country I can stand and ponder and pray for as long as I want without being threatened or dragged away or embarrassed. We have a starting point for equality. We are all free. The answer for a truly united nation is not at the top of the Washington Monument or clutched by Lady Freedom on the tip of the Capitol. It is as low and as humble as we make it in our hearts. Those monuments are not representing a country about to fall, but a country with the potential to rise, not in concrete, in power, or money, but in unity and goodness. My vision for our nation to be united through spirit begins in the seedbed of real freedom—our hearts.

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

[Mr. DAVIS 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 New York [Mrs. MALONEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. MALONEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

KEEP LONG ISLAND SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION OFFICE OPEN

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

Mr. FORBES. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the hundreds of thousands of small businessmen and women and the potential hundreds of thousands of small businessmen and women on Long Island. Earlier this week the Clinton Administration announced that they were going to streamline and consolidate departments at the Small Business Administration, something that I on the face of it applaud, and I commend the administrator, Phil Lader of the Small Business Administration, for his leadership in that endeavor.

Unfortunately, included in this measure to downsize the agency is the closing of a very valuable office, the Small Business Administration's Long Island office in Melville. I am most supportive of the efforts to consolidate. As a former head of the Small Business Administration in New York, we led a pilot program to do just that. I strongly urge, however, that the Clinton Administration reconsider closing the Long Island office.

Long Island is in a unique situation. For most of the century, Long Island's economy has been dependent on a healthy defense industry. However, in recent years, draconian cuts to the defense budget have left the Long Island economy reeling, and today we are searching for an alternative. Forced to diversify, Long Island now more than ever looks to the small business sector as its major source of jobs, revenue, and income. Small businesses on Long Island look to the local Small Business Administration office for valuable help and counsel. The closing of the Long Island office would be devastating to an economy so dependent on a viable small business sector.

Madam Speaker, the administration's plan to close the Long Island office would negatively impact, as I have said, over 82,000 small businesses in Nassau and Suffolk County. This is an area larger in population than some 20 States. While the economy in most of the Nation has rebounded of late, the Long Island economy continues to lag. Long Island has endured extensive cuts in defense spending and the loss of the SBA office on Long Island would be another blow to an economy already struggling to right itself.

For the months ahead, Congress will have some very difficult decisions to make about the budget and the future