

simulation system for such things as electronic training systems for commercial trucking companies. Illusion Inc., a small contractor in Westlake Village, is now taking "virtual reality" technology, developed for designing aircraft and military training exercises, into such diverse venues as museums and movie special effects. In each of the past three years, Illusion Inc. has doubled its revenues and expects to expand to 50 employees by 1997, up from its current 20. "The future for companies like ours," said Peter Beale, Illusion Inc.'s chairman, "is to combine the creative vision of Hollywood with the engineering vision of the defense industry."

Such new uses for military technology and talents could also prove critical in providing the Southland economy with an important new source of high-wage jobs that lessen its current dependence on the volatile film industry or the always uncertain course of foreign trade. As Southern California begins to harvest the overlooked fruits of its rich defense industry heritage, it may enjoy the broad, diversified economic recovery that many thought could never happen here again.

ENDING STUDENT SUBSIDIES

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1996

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a copy of an article that was written by Ross Booher and Kevin W. Jones entitled, "Ending Student Subsidies". One young man is currently attending the University of Tennessee Law School, and the other is just entering. Both Ross and Kevin are not only excellent students, but they are citizens who I am certain will contribute greatly to our society and its future.

I request that a copy of this article, "Ending Student Subsidies" be placed in the RECORD at this point, so I can call it to the attention of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD.

[From the Chronicle of Higher Education, Nov. 24, 1995]

ENDING STUDENT SUBSIDIES

(By Ross I. Booher and Kevin W. Jones)

Although college lobbyists apparently have persuaded Congress to abandon plans to eliminate the federal interest subsidy on guaranteed student loans this year, lawmakers are likely to scrutinize the program again in the future as they search for ways to cut wasteful government spending. We urge them to do so. Even though we are students who currently enjoy the benefits of this taxpayer largess, we believe that the interest subsidy should be dropped. American taxpayers spend almost \$2.5-billion a year for interest on guaranteed loans while the borrowers are students and for six months after they graduate. The borrowers never repay any of this interest.

We believe that this subsidy amounts to a taxpayer-financed gift to people who neither need it nor deserve it. Eliminating the subsidy would not make student loans or a college education less available, because the loans themselves still could be obtained. Further, the maximum amount that could be borrowed would remain the same; students would not pay any interest while they were in school; and they would continue to have a six-month grace period after graduation before the began repayment. The only change

we suggest is that once students begin repayment, they pay all the interest that has accrued. The interest should be added to the student's debt, not to the national debt.

We believe that students, and everyone else, would be better served by a stronger economy. We are willing to "sacrifice," not out of altruism, but because we and everyone else will benefit from a national economy not bogged down by federal debt. According to the U.S. Treasury Department's latest estimates, the federal government is nearly \$5-trillion in debt. Unless we cut all but the most-essential spending the interest on the national debt alone will soon consume almost all federal tax revenue. This scenario augurs ill for the schooled and unschooled alike? All federally financed programs would be endangered.

Many who oppose ending the subsidy fear that, without it, students from lower- and even middle-income backgrounds will be unable to afford higher education. This fear is unfounded. Students who are willing to borrow money to pay for college still would be able to do so, but, as the people who benefit from the loan (and the education), they simply would have more to repay after graduation. Isn't it reasonable for the recipient of education to have to pay for it, particularly when the financial rewards of college continue to far outweigh the costs?

The U.S. Department of Education calculates that eliminating the federal interest subsidy would increase the loan repayment of an undergraduate student who chooses to borrow the maximum amount available during his or her undergraduate year by about \$69 per month during the standard 10-year repayment period. Even this, the highest possible increase, would easily fit into the budget of most college graduates—who, according to the most recent census data available, earn \$1,039 per month more than the average high-school graduate. The vast majority of undergraduates, however, borrow far less than the maximum loan amount, and thus the increases in their payments would be smaller.

What about more-expensive graduate and professional degrees, such as those in medicine and law? Will students be able to afford them without the interest subsidy? Again, the answer is yes. The Department of Education calculates that eliminating the interest subsidy would increase the payments of the average student who receives Ph.D., and who chooses to borrow the maximum amount available, by about \$382 per month during the standard 10-year repayment period. This is a great deal of money, but, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, the average Ph.D. recipient earns \$3,853 per month and the average recipient of a professional degree earns \$4,961 per month. The comparable figures for people with a bachelor's degree and people with a high-school diploma are \$2,116 and \$1,077, respectively.

Looking at the big picture, those who borrow the maximum amount of \$138,500 to obtain a doctoral degree enable themselves to earn an average of \$1.4-million more during their lifetime than the average high-school graduate. Recipients of a professional degree in fields such as law and medicine earn, on average, a staggering \$2.2-million more than the average high-school graduate.

Organizations lobbying to preserve the interest subsidy, such as the American Medical Student Association and the Student Osteopathic Medical Association, point out that, in the years immediately following graduation, many people who earn a graduate or professional degree earn very little relative to the amount of debt they have incurred. According to the A.M.S.A., medical doctors can earn an average of about \$2,500 per month during residency training. The

A.M.S.A. currently argues that it is difficult to make payments on a \$100,000-plus student loan with such a salary.

For this very reason, the government provides the option of temporarily or permanently making payments on a 30-year repayment schedule. This method dramatically lowers monthly payments, by spreading them out over a longer period. When borrowers complete their postgraduate training and begin to realize the financial rewards of their education investment, they may choose to return to the standard 10-year repayment schedule, thus lowering the total interest they will pay. We believe that this option makes eliminating the subsidy relatively painless, even for those whose earnings are not very high immediately after they receive their advanced degree.

Some supporters of the interest subsidy point out that not all jobs requiring a college education pay the Census Bureau's "average salary." Wouldn't losing the interest subsidy hurt students who choose to incur student-loan debts and then enter occupations that pay very little? Again, provisions already are in place to address that concern. First, most students now begin repaying their loans six months after they graduate, but longer deferments are granted for a variety of reasons—including unemployment, a return to full- or half-time student status, acceptance of an academic fellowship, and economic hardship. Further, if graduate serve in a public-service position (for instance, as a nurse, public-school teacher, member of the armed forces, or peace Corps or Vista volunteer), their loans may be partially or completely paid by taxpayers—who receive obvious benefits from the graduates' service.

What about students who borrow because they want to attend an expensive private college or university, but then decide to enter a low-paying field not included in the public-service category above? Such students may find that, in a world of limited resources, they cannot always have everything they want: They may have to choose between pursuing a low-paying career and attending an expensive college.

Of course, they may decide that they want to do both badly enough to be willing to take out student loans and accept a 30-year repayment schedule and a lower standard of living. If that is their choice, it should be their responsibility to cope with the consequences, not that of the American taxpayer.

MOLLIE BEATTIE WILDERNESS AREA ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1996

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, on June 27, 1996, we lost Mollie Beattie, a friend and an ally, to a battle with brain cancer. Head of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service [USFWS], Mollie worked diligently to preserve our ecosystem and protect it for the future of our Nation. As the first woman to head the USFWS, she worked wonders shrinking budgets while still expanding the Federal refuge system.

A philosophy major at Marymount College in Tarrytown, N.Y. Mollie later found herself involved in an Outward Bound course, through which she rediscovered her love for nature, which led her to a career as an environmental official. Her philosophy on the environment

changed the way that the USFWS worked, by providing for the ecosystem as a whole instead of dividing the country into parts.

In particular, Mollie was instrumental in helping me create legislation to authorize the purchase of Shadmoor in Montauk, Long Island. When acquired, this land will be preserved as a national wildlife refuge. Thanks to her help and dedication, this legislation is now law and we are one step closer to the preservation of Shadmoor.

The entire Nation may not realize the extent to which Mrs. Beattie has touched our lives, but those who knew her personally and knew what she worked for will miss her dedication and her spirit. May she rest in peace.

JESSE OWENS' LEGACY STANDS: A SPECIAL SALUTE TO OLYMPIC COMPETITORS

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1996

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, the games of the 1996 summer Olympics began. The city of Atlanta is hosting the biggest Olympics ever with more than 10,000 athletes from 197 countries gathered for the centennial games. This includes an Olympic-record 4,000 women athletes who are competing in Atlanta. The 16 days of Olympic competition promises to be exciting from start to finish.

I am proud that the 1996 Olympics include outstanding athletes from the great State of Ohio. Our State is represented in many of the Olympic events, including gymnastics, swimming, track and field, diving, archery, and team handball, just to name a few. I take pride in saluting these outstanding athletes as they strive for victory in the Olympic arena. I also salute the Olympic team coaches and assistant coaches who were selected from the State of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, as the Olympic games get underway, many articles are being written about previous Olympic champions. I read with interest an article which appeared in the July 15, 1996, edition of USA Today. In that article it is reported that the sports staff was asked to vote on the greatest moments in Olympic history. They were unanimous in selecting Jesse Owens' 1936 performance as the one that best signifies the Olympic spirit.

We are reminded that 60 years ago, the world watched as Jesse Owens became the first person in the history of the Olympics to capture four gold medals. In accomplishing this feat, Jesse Owens, the son of a sharecropper and grandson of a slave, shattered Adolf Hitler's hopes for Aryan supremacy in the games. Owens also captured the hearts of the world with his stunning performance and remarkable grace.

Jesse Owens died in 1980 at the age of 66. Throughout his life, he continued to exhibit the type of spirit that made him an Olympic hero and American legend. Jesse Owens is perhaps the greatest athlete who ever lived. I am proud that this Olympic hero was reared and attended school in my congressional district. I am also proud to be the author of legislation which awarded Congress' highest honor, the Congressional Gold Medal, to Jesse Owens posthumously.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share the USA Today article which is entitled, "Owens' Legacy Stands," with my colleagues and others throughout the Nation. I applaud the athletes who are gathered in Atlanta for the summer games. It is my hope that they will be inspired by Jesse Owens and his achievements. As we celebrate the centennial Olympics, we pay tribute to the memory of this great American.

[From USA Today, July 15, 1996]

OWENS' LEGACY STANDS

HIS SUPREME STATEMENT STILL INSPIRES IN '96

(By Gary Mihoces)

Adolf Hitler planned a 400,000-seat stadium in Germany to host the Olympics for all time, according to his chief architect. At the 1936 Berlin Games, he settled for a 110,000-seat stadium to showcase his belief in Aryan supremacy.

But Jesse Owens made his statement at those '36 Games with four gold medals in the sprints and long jump, a track and field feat matched only by Carl Lewis during the boycotted 1984 Games.

With 16 days of Olympic competition about to begin in Atlanta, USA TODAY staffers selected 16 moments best signifying the Olympic spirit.

Owens' performance was rated the ultimate. His legacy—not Hitler's giant stadium—looms over every Olympics.

"I don't think I've been anywhere (that) anybody who is a sports fan has not heard of Jesse Owens," says Harrison Dillard, who was inspired by Owens to become an Olympic track champion himself in 1948 and 1952. "It's not only what he did, but the circumstances under which he did it, right there in front of Hitler."

Owens, son of an Alabama sharecropper and grandson of a slave, represented the USA when blacks were barred from major sports at home. He competed in a Berlin where Hitler's brand of racial superiority was official policy.

Hitler already had stripped Jews of citizenship, but anti-Jewish signs were taken down during the Games. Nazi newspapers downplayed their references to the "black auxiliaries" of the U.S. team.

Owens had been a sensation at Ohio State, where in a 1935 meet he broke three world records and tied another.

"He was only 23. He was very focused on why he was there, to do the best he could in his events," says Owens' daughter, Marlene Rankin. "I don't think he was very conscious of what was happening politically."

One popular story was that Hitler snubbed Owens by refusing to shake his hand. According to the book *The Nazi Olympics* by Richard Mandell, the International Olympic Committee sent word to Hitler after the first day's competition that "he should congratulate all or none" of the medalists and that Hitler chose the latter.

So when Owens won the 100 on the second day, he wasn't greeted by Hitler, "nor was any other winner on that or any of the following days," Mandell writes.

Owens later said, "It was all right with me. I didn't go to Berlin to shake hands with him anyway."

But Owens was among 10 black members of the U.S. track and field team who combined for 13 medals.

That "highly annoyed" Hitler, former Nazi architect Albert Speer wrote in his memoir *Inside the Third Reich*. Speer said Hitler decided black athletes "must be excluded from future games."

Speer also designed the giant stadium Hitler had planned for Nuremberg to host the Games for "all time to come."

Owens' second gold came in the long jump. But he fouled on his first two qualifying

jumps and had one more. German jumper Luz Long reportedly suggested Owens place a towel behind the takeoff board to use as his starting point to avoid fouling.

That story has been refuted by many, but Owens easily made his third qualifying jump and won the final with an Olympic-record jump of 26 feet, 5¼ inches. Long hurried to congratulate Owens and they left the field arm in arm, Mandell writes. Long was later killed in the war.

On Aug. 5, Owens won the 200 meters in an Olympic-record 20.7 seconds. He expected that to be the end of his competition, but he and Ralph Metcalfe were added to the four-by-100-meter relay team to replace Marty Glickman and Sam Stoller.

Glickman and Stoller were Jewish. There were reports they were bumped off the relay team because U.S. officials bowed to pressures from the Nazis. There were other claims that it was simply a matter of ensuring the victory.

Owens was lead runner on the relay team, which set a world record.

Just after his Olympic victories, Owens ran afoul of the Amateur Athletic Union. When he declined to continue in a European tour the AAU had arranged to offset Olympic expenses, he was suspended from U.S. amateur competition.

In the years after the Olympics, his ventures ranged from running exhibition races against horses to a failed dry cleaning business. However, he later found a niche as a public speaker and goodwill ambassador until his death in 1980 at age 66 of lung cancer.

Rankin is executive director of the Chicago-based Jesse Owens Foundation, which has several scholarship programs.

"He always believed that the youth of any country is its greatest resource," she says.

Dillard says Owens later worked at a recreation center in Cleveland. "He had a rough time, particularly early on," says Dillard. "The endorsements were not there, and high-profile companies were not using African-Americans."

Commercial use of Owens' name or likeness now is controlled by CMG Worldwide of Indianapolis, under agreement with Owens' heirs.

But Rankin says Owens never despaired that he wasn't born in an era of more lucrative rewards.

"Money didn't mean an awful lot to him," she says. "He liked what it would buy . . . But he was not extravagant. He loved the sport, the discipline of training and the challenge to do it better. Not better than someone else, just best for yourself. And his best just happened to be better than most."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1996

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I was away from the House on an official leave of absence on July 17 attending a memorial service at which I was a speaker. While I was out, I missed seven rollcall votes. Because I have each year since coming to Congress published and provided my constituents my entire voting record, I want the record to show that had I been in the House and voting on July 17, I would have cast the following votes:

"No" on rollcall 320, Hoyer amendment to H.R. 3756, fiscal year 1997 Treasury, Postal Service, General Government appropriations.