

provide timely and reliable intelligence to its policymakers and military commanders, and we commend the new chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST], and the ranking member, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS], for their cooperation and excellent work in developing this year's intelligence budget.

Despite the demise of the Soviet Union, the world remains an unpredictable and dangerous place; we have only to pick up our morning newspapers or listen to a newscast to be aware of that. There is a need for effective intelligence, especially in light of the worldwide reduction of U.S. military spending and personnel.

The intelligence community should continue to be encouraged to review their operations, discarding those that are no longer necessary and strengthening those that remain important. We except that we shall hear arguments over whether the intelligence community had been adequately realigned to deal with new international realities. The appropriate missions of an intelligence agency will always be a controversial and most appropriate subject in a nation founded on democratic principles.

The debate on these issues will continue, and we appreciate the majority's recognition of the importance of the discussions of those controversial issues by providing for this modified open rule.

In closing, I again congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST], the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS], ranking minority member, for bringing this bill to the floor today and their excellent work in general in leading this important committee.

Mr. Speaker, to repeat, we support this rule. We urge its adoption, so that we may proceed first thing tomorrow with consideration of the intelligence authorization bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his personally kind remarks and I assure him he has won my admiration, and the admiration of all colleagues, for his steady hand at the helm of oversight and intelligence for so many years.

And it is my honor to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST], the distinguished chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], my friend and very able colleague on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILEN-SON], the continuing very able and former member and chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for their support of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, we think it is a good rule. We think it is one which will give

us the opportunity to have full and open debate, and yet protect any classified material problems that we might have in open debate on the floor of the House. I would certainly commend it to my colleagues and urge its passage and thank the committee very much for its assistance in crafting a rule that was so strongly supported by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

#### CONSEQUENCES OF THE REPUBLICAN'S FUNDING CUTS ON EDUCATION

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight because I think it is imperative that the American public in general and the people of New Jersey specifically, understand the details and consequences of the Republican's plan to slash funding for Federal student assistance programs. Indeed, while I support efforts to balance the Federal budget, I believe attempting to do so by restricting the average citizen's access to institutions of higher education is unequivocally a step in the wrong direction.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am perplexed at the logic behind the cuts the Republicans have already approved. Like so many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I benefited from student assistance programs when I was in college. But unlike my Republican colleagues, I think it is grossly unfair for my generation to call for an end to student assistance programs after we used them to get to where we are today.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to use Rutgers University as an example of the negative impact of the Republican proposals. As a former student of Rutgers Law School who now represents the main campus of Rutgers University in Congress, I am deeply troubled about the impact these cuts will have on the 6,500 plus low-income and middle-class New Jersey students who used them to secure a Rutgers education.

As part of the 1996 Education appropriations bill, Republicans have eliminated all capital contributions for Perkins loans, which are designed to specifically assist low-income students and received \$158 million in fiscal year 1995. If finalized, such a cut would have a dramatic impact on the more than 3,100 low-income Rutgers students who are provided with nearly \$5 million in Perkins loans this year.

The bill also attacks Pell grants, limiting the maximum award to \$2,400 and

eliminating assistance to students who qualify for grants of less than \$600. This cut would prevent some 7,000 students at Rutgers, and some 360,000 of their cohorts at universities across the Nation, from receiving Federal education assistance.

The Republican assault on education, moreover, is hardly contained entirely within the fiscal year 1996 appropriations bill. Looming on the horizon is an attack on the interest subsidy on Federal direct subsidized Stafford loans as part of the reconciliation bill. One scenario is a complete elimination of the interest subsidy for graduate students. But with a targeted student loan reduction of a staggering \$10.2 billion over 7 years, it seems likely the Republicans will not reach their goal without raiding undergraduate Stafford loans as well.

Elimination of this Federal subsidy could increase the average undergraduate student's indebtedness by as much as 20 or even 30 percent. For those who wish to go on to graduate schools, the increase could be as much as 40 percent with monthly payments on a 10-year plan rising to a whopping \$753 per graduate student.

With the Department of Education projecting that 89 percent of the jobs being created in the United States will require post-secondary training, the Republican inclusion of student assistance programs in the fiscal year 1996 budget belies their claim that the legislation is what's best for the American economy. Attempting to foster economic growth by limiting the very means which serves as its engine is, pure and simple, bad public policy.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government recently began experimenting with a direct university loan program instead of the traditional bank loan subsidized with Federal dollars.

In addition to the upcoming dissection of Federal interest subsidies, there is also likely to be a Republican attempt to terminate the direct loan program where the university is substituted for a bank lender. This approach to dispersing student loans not only saves the taxpayers billions of dollars, but cuts through redtape at a much more rapid pace than the old bank system, thereby allowing schools to process more applications in a shorter time period. In its first year of implementation at Rutgers, the direct loan program enabled the schools' financial aid office to process loans for 15,295 students with term bills being credited to their accounts immediately by the week those term bills were due. The year before the implementation of direct funding, the schools' financial aid office processed only 3,283 loans during the same period.

This expedited process made excess funds available earlier for over 12,000 Rutgers students, and thousands on campuses across the country, facilitating their ability to buy books, pay rent, and keep on top of other school related expenses.

Thus, as the issues I outlined illustrate, the Republican attack on education moves higher education closer to being yet another Republican designed luxury for the wealthy. I think I speak for all of us when I say that our presence here tonight should be mistaken for nothing less than our determination to prevent access to higher education from moving out of the realm of Government priorities and into the realm of privileges for the few.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who benefited from student loan programs, those of us who were able to get an education, undergraduate, graduate, or professional school, realize how important it is to have these Government programs. It is very unfair for those of us who are now in Congress to be advocating these student loan programs or grant assistance programs should be terminated or cut back, particularly at a time when this country faces such competition from abroad and we know that higher education is a very valuable tool for those who want to go out and be successful and get a job in this very competitive world.

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

[Mr. HORN 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 Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR 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.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### THE FUTURE OF AMERICAN EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I am really very proud to join with several of my colleagues tonight to engage in a discussion, in a dialogue, about an

issue that really is near and dear to the hearts of, I think just about all Americans, and that is the whole issue of education and the education of children and what the future of this country is all about.

□ 2015

I am the daughter of immigrant parents who, quite frankly, could only dare to dream that someday their daughter would sit in the House of Representatives. My father came to this country as an immigrant, and my mom worked in a dress shop in the old sweatshops, if you will, for most of her life in order to provide me the opportunity to be able to go to school.

I can remember going to that dress shop to meet her every day after school, and I would complain because, as all kids, I wanted to be outside. I did not want to be in a noisy place, and it was dirty. I remember those women, though. I remember them with their backs bent over their sewing machines just trying to pump out the dresses as quickly as they could so that they could provide for their family.

My mother would say to me when I would complain, "Take the opportunity for an education so you don't have to do this." Now, that is my mother's story, which is multiplied thousand and thousands of times around this country and this body that we all serve in here.

The fact is that that is what the American dream is about. It is being able to provide your kids with the future and have them have opportunities that you may not have had or to have the same opportunities.

What we are looking at in the House and what myself and my colleagues want to talk about a little bit tonight is, as this House of Representatives embarks on a process over the next few weeks, we are going to urge people to really pay very careful attention to the Republican proposals that are, in fact, going to slash education funding, slash that opportunity that so many of us were given to be able to go to school, to get an education, to expand our horizon, and they are going to slash that education funding by making incredibly devastating cuts in Federal student aid, education and training programs and the total elimination of the very cost-effective direct lending program. These are very shortsighted cuts. They are going to shut that door. It is going to close the educational opportunities for working families in this country.

So many of us have this opportunity through the use of student loans. These cuts not only jeopardize our Nation's economic competitiveness but they destroy the hopes and the dreams of working families who struggle to build a better future for their families, for their kids, and, quite frankly, what is most disturbing about the cuts in education is that they are going to finance, I mean, this is the worst of all possible reasons, to make cuts in such

a vital part of what our lives are all about, they are going to cut these education programs in order to finance a tax cut, a tax break for this country's wealthiest individuals, folks who have the opportunity.

This is the United States of America. Part of that American dream is to do well, to be able to have the wherewithal to have the good life. That we all understand. But folks at that upper end of the spectrum have the wherewithal to send their kids to school; they can do it, and they do not need help that working, middle-class families do in order to be able to make sure that their kids can get those interest-deferred student loans.

The whole budget debate is about priorities, about the deep cuts in education programs. These cuts, I will tell you, speak volumes about misplaced priorities; more than priorities, misplaced values.

We are trying to once again instill values in people in this country and in our youngsters to understand the value of education and of respect and of working hard and responsibility. Those are all the values that people like my colleagues have been taught, that I have been taught, that we often lament that maybe are not there in today's society.

But if we are going to look at what kinds of things we are doing here and where we place our values, how can we not place our values on education and making sure that our kids' futures are secure? So that the cuts speak volumes about misplaced values and priorities of the Gingrich revolution.

Let me just tell you about Connecticut. The Republican cuts translate into a loss of approximately \$325 billion in education and training funds over the next 10 years. Cuts in student aid and specifically reductions or the elimination of the in-school interest subsidy could mean 43,000 students from Connecticut would pay more for a college education, and by eliminating the interest-deferred Stafford loans, Republicans will add \$5,200 to the cost of an education for the average college student in Connecticut.

I have got to say \$5,200 may not be very much to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], but I will tell you that it is a heck of a lot of money, and it is plenty to the 15,000 working families that rely on this subsidy in my district.

According to the Department of Education, my district alone, the Third Congressional District in Connecticut, will lose \$9 billion in student support provided through the in-school interest subsidy.

That increase will devastate families like the Baxter family of West Haven, CT, a family that is struggling to put their children through college. This is the Baxter family right here in this photograph. I met Gail Baxter this spring at a student loan forum that I organized, and Gail told me that she was very, very worried about what cuts