

restore funding for student financial aid.

THE AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT IS GOOD LEGISLATION

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, on November 8, this Congress heard a message pretty loud and clear, that it is time to eliminate and streamline the bureaucracy, to pass a budget for the first time in 28 years where we live within our means, and to cut foreign aid.

On May 15, the Committee on International Relations passed the American Overseas Interests Act legislation to meet that commitment. In fact, this legislation represents six major changes from business as usual. It reduces unnecessary bureaucracy by folding three independent agencies into the State Department. Their functions and budgets will be reduced and folded into the State Department, which will take over their responsibilities.

This legislation will eliminate several low-priority programs, and reduce U.S. funding for a dozen international agencies. The bill also follows through on our commitment to cut foreign aid. In fact, over the next 7 years this legislation will cut foreign aid by \$21 billion as part of our commitment to live within our means.

Legislation will also punish our adversaries and focus on vital U.S. interests. This is good legislation, Mr. Speaker. The American Overseas Interests Act keeps our commitment to eliminate and streamline the bureaucracy, to cut foreign aid, and to pass a balanced budget.

CONGRESS MUST PROVIDE OVERSIGHT OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, since Oklahoma City, many politicians are choosing their words very carefully, many times afraid to say what they really feel. The truth is, Mr. Speaker, many Americans are fed up with the Government. They are sick and tired, to be exact. They are beginning to question the news stories and the Government spin.

Most Americans did not believe all the stories about the assassination of JFK. Many Americans do not believe the Government's account of Waco. Many Americans do not believe what happened in Ruby Ridge with the Weaver family. Many Americans still have questions about the Government's side of PanAmerican 103.

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, Congress had better take its head out of the sand, because Congress has allowed

agencies like ATF and the IRS to rip off the American people. They know it and they do feel abandoned. If the Congress does not provide the oversight that is necessary, the American people will.

We cannot justify nor condone violence, do not get me wrong. However, Congress has allowed these agencies to go without oversight, and the American people are fed up. Take a look at it and read the tea leaves.

REMOVING IN-SCHOOL INTEREST SUBSIDY ON STUDENT LOANS SEEN AS FAIR AND NECESSARY

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, removing the in-school interest subsidy on student loans is one of the tough choices that must be made in order to balance the budget.

With a national debt that exceeds \$4.7 trillion, it is hard to justify saving a subsidy for students who can expect to earn 71 percent more over their lifetime than someone who just goes to high school.

It is simply not fair to ask working Americans—who are struggling to make ends meet—to pay the interest payments on the student loans of future doctors and lawyers.

Removing the in-school interest subsidy will not limit access to Government-backed student loans. Eligible students will still be able to borrow money to help pay for their education. And, no student will be asked to pay for their loans while they are in school. We are simply asking that they pay the full cost of the loan—after they graduate.

Finally, we must keep in mind that college students will substantially benefit from a balanced budget. Balancing the budget will lower interest rates on student loans, result in more high-wage jobs, and allow students to keep more of their salaries once they begin working.

Mr. Speaker, removing the in-school interest subsidy is both fair and necessary. And, it is time to start telling the truth about this proposal.

THE PUBLIC AND THE HOUSE DESERVE AN OUTSIDE COUNSEL TO INVESTIGATE ALLEGATIONS AGAINST SPEAKER GINGRICH

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post reports that apparently in the consideration of the ethics case against the Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], that the committee has arrived at a deadlock on whether or not to turn the case over to an outside independent counsel to study the facts and render a

finding to the committee. Apparently the five Republican Members of the committee, according to the Washington Post, voted against doing that.

When they did that, they broke a 15-year bipartisan tradition in this House of taking the tough ethics cases that have unfortunately, from time to time, been referred to the committee, and turning them over to an outside counsel, so we can get a full rendering of all of the facts and all of the issues before the Ethics Committee in an impartial fashion. That has been done on a bipartisan basis since 1979.

Now we find, in the case involving the Speaker, that that apparently will not be the case. The chairman and others will not vote. I think it is important to understand that the Republican Members of the Congress have an ongoing relationship with the Speaker of the House. They have contributed to his campaign, he has contributed to theirs. They have campaigned for him, he has campaigned for them. They have been the recipients of moneys that have been commingled and intermingled.

These charges are serious. The public deserves better. The House of Representatives deserves better. We deserve an outside counsel.

□ 1220

THE NEW MAJORITY

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I will lay aside my prepared remarks this morning to answer my good friend the gentleman from California.

It never ceases to amaze me how the guardians of the old order who were here as part of an incredible corrupt regime during the former majority are so willing to hop on the Speaker and his positive agenda for change.

With all due respect to my friends on the other side of the aisle, why do you not join with us to put your shoulder to the wheel and govern this Nation? We have the majority. Get over it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

JUSTICE DELAYED IS JUSTICE DENIED

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, Americans across this great land know the old concept, the concept of the old order that ought to be the concept of the new order as well, "Justice delayed is justice denied."

We know full well that justice is being denied and delayed again and again. We were told that it was inappropriate to consider the charges against the Speaker until the contract was passed. And then when the contract was passed, we were told it was

inappropriate to do it until after the congressional recess. Now we are told, well, maybe after Memorial Day. Justice is being delayed and justice is being denied because some people are unwilling to make the hard choices, the hard choices that demand that an independent counsel act without political bias to evaluate these charges, to decide whether they have merit.

Anyone, be they old or new, ought to support that very old concept of impartial justice. Looking at these charges, seeing that they are resolved only through an independent counsel will that be done and we need that action immediately.

FOREIGN AID

(Mrs. WALDHOLTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State Warren Christopher said in January of this year, "The current structure of the foreign affairs agencies developed in a world much different from today's. It must change to meet the demands of the next century." He was right. And that is exactly what we are beginning today.

Today we begin the debate on the American Overseas Interests Act which will streamline the maze of foreign aid bureaucracies, reduce foreign aid spending and help set new priorities. It is also an important part of the Republican commitment to balance the budget in a way that makes sense.

Under our plan, three foreign aid bureaucracies and dozens of programs are eliminated and reformed, and we save \$21 billion over the next 7 years while continuing to meet our commitments to our friends and allies.

As every aspect of the budget comes under scrutiny, foreign aid, however well-intentioned, cannot be excluded. We need to reexamine how and why every dollar is spent, setting new priorities for a new world. I look forward to a debate that can only improve our foreign aid programs.

OUTSIDE COUNSEL NEEDED IN SPEAKER'S ETHICS CASE

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disappointed that the House Ethics Committee has refused to hire an outside counsel to investigate the five ethics charges against the Speaker. Without an outside counsel, the ethics charges will have to be investigated by House Members. That means we will have politicians investigating politicians.

Being a former law enforcement officer, I believe, and I have always voted, that professional law enforcement officials should do investigations of other Members of this House, not politicians. Five dark clouds of doubt hang over this Chamber. Let us have a special

outside counsel to investigate the ethics charges hanging over the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we need an outside counsel to do a professional investigation, not politicians. Let us remove the five dark clouds of doubt and appoint a special outside counsel now.

FOREIGN AID AUTHORIZATION BILL

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

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, today the House will take up consideration of this country's foreign aid authorization bill in which we establish our foreign policy priorities.

Last year as I campaigned throughout Georgia's Eighth District, I heard from folks who are very concerned about the amount of money we spend overseas while we have so many problems here at home, and I share that concern.

Mr. Speaker, for those residents of central and south Georgia and for all citizens of this country, the new majority has shown its commitment to taking a fresh look at everything the Government does. Foreign aid is no exception. This bill today moves us in the right direction and will cut \$1 billion from foreign aid spending in the upcoming budget.

We must not lose sight, however, of the very real and numerous threats around the world to the freedoms we enjoy. As a member of the Committee on National Security, I have seen those threats. True, the cold war is over but the world has not magically become a safe place.

For the first time in many years, this foreign aid bill today represents a measured attempt to prioritize our influence and interests abroad. The United States is truly the leader of the world and our foreign aid policy must reflect that role by supporting our friends and deterring our foes. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

OUTSIDE COUNSEL NEEDED IN SPEAKER'S ETHICS CASE

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

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, last week on this floor I was told by the Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH, that as a freshman I should learn the rules. This weekend I have been studying and what I have studied has discouraged me a lot.

What I have found is that, according to the Washington Post, all five Republican members of the Ethics Committee broke with 15 years of bipartisan tradition and voted unanimously to block an independent outside counsel to investigate the charges that have been leveled against Speaker GINGRICH.

We need to go back to the way the Democrats did it. Under Democratic

leadership, the Ethics Committee has appointed an outside counsel to investigate every major ethics case since 1979. I urge the Ethics Committee to do the same in this case. What is to be hidden? What is to be gained? If there is nothing there, let an outside counsel clear the air.

TRIBUTE TO LES ASPIN

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, America lost a real public servant this last weekend in the death of Les Aspin.

Les Aspin was a young man. He was only 56 years old. He served 22 years of those 56 years here in the Congress. He was also our Secretary of Defense.

He was a summa cum laude at Yale, he attended Oxford, and MIT, so not only did he have a great deal of political savvy but he was also very much academically gifted. From his first close race against a person by the name of LaFollette, a magic name in Wisconsin, to the time he left to become Secretary of Defense, Les Aspin never lost a single political race.

I remember the first time I was here on the floor with an amendment, Les Aspin helped me get the amendment passed. In an age when the Pentagon got everything it wanted, there was one person who started to holler, "No, halt," and that was Les Aspin. "Let's take a closer look," he would say, "at defense spending."

Mr. Speaker, we in this House have not only lost a good friend but we have also lost a true public servant. Not only has America lost a good public servant and we in Congress, but also Marquette University, because Marquette is where he started teaching and Marquette is where he worked when he passed away.

It is only appropriate that Marquette will be the place on Friday where we will say our last good-bye to Les Aspin. America truly has lost a wonderful public servant.

TIME FOR AN OUTSIDE COUNSEL IN SPEAKER'S ETHICS CASE

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, why is the Ethics Committee making the special exception in the case of Speaker NEWT GINGRICH?

In every single high-profile ethics case since 1979, both the Democrats and the Republicans on the committee have voted to appoint an outside counsel. But last Sunday, according to the Washington Post, all five Republican members of the Ethics Committee broke with 15 years of bipartisan tradition and voted to make a special exception for NEWT GINGRICH and block an outside counsel.