

So at the height of the cold war, the two major superpowers of the world decided to agree not to conduct any more nuclear tests in the atmosphere because of the dangers of nuclear contamination of the food cycle to Americans, Russians—and incidently, to other human beings who live in various regions of the world.

Incidently, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if my colleagues are aware of the fact that despite our earnest efforts to advise President de Gaulle of France of the dangers of conducting nuclear explosions in the atmosphere—the French went right ahead and exploded 12 nuclear bombs in the atmosphere in the South Pacific.

And is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the thousands of Polynesian Tahitians who were exposed to nuclear contamination in the sixties and throughout the seventies—many are coming forward with stories of retarded and deformed children coming from the same parents, who historically have never experienced such traumatic problems in their lives.

It is any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the French Government either simply threw such records away or just doesn't care about the health of its own citizens—some 200,000 French citizens who live 14,000 miles from Paris and the first to be exposed to nuclear contamination when this atoll breaks open, that is, the Moruroa Atoll in French Polynesia.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not much of an artist, but I want to share with my colleagues the potential horrors of Moruroa Atoll. When this atoll leaks radioactive materials, I fear very much that the health and safety of the peoples of the Pacific will be seriously at risk.

Mr. Speaker, again I say to the French Government—shame on you for bringing the horrors of nuclear contamination to the peoples of the Pacific.

---

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

[Mr. BURTON of Indiana 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 Texas [Mr. BRYANT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

---

#### SPREAD OF MISINFORMATION DISSERVICE TO AMERICA

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I am sure if we could get the 1996 election behind us, the misinformation that is being spread constantly would cease. What a disservice to this institution and to the other body, and to the administration and to the American people to continue this kind of misinformation day after day after day.

Recently some of my colleagues have taken to the House floor to portray their view of the Republican efforts to balance the budget in 7 years. Watching them, I found myself back in school reading Homer and Plato, Socrates, and all of those wonderful Greek myths that we all enjoyed as children. It is an appropriate reference to these works of fiction, as my colleagues would have the American people and certainly our friends in the press, swoon over the myths they portray. I would like to look at a couple of those myths tonight that I am very closely connected to.

Myth No. 1, Republicans are cutting student loans. Even the President today in his message used that misinformation. Now, the fact is that student loans will increase by nearly 50 percent, nearly 50 percent over the next 7 years from \$25 billion to \$36 billion in the year 2002. This chart shows that. Each year during that time an increase, an increase, an increase, the whole way up the line throughout the entire period. Yet, you would be led to believe that the opposite would happen.

More loans will be made available next year than ever before, rising from 6.6 million loans in 1995 to 7.1 million in 1996.

For all students, the Federal interest subsidies on student loans remains intact, and there are 75 percent of the American people that have some problems with that, but nevertheless, that is the way it will remain, including during the 6-month grace period following graduation. For all parents, the interest rate on student loans remains the same.

The Balanced Budget Act of 1995 does not include higher education cuts. There are no changes affecting student eligibility for Federal student loans; there are no changes affecting the amount of funds available for student loans; there are no changes affecting the interest rates, interest subsidies, or fees charged to the students or the parents. There are no special fees imposed on any schools.

The next myth, students will pay more for their loans under the Republican plan to balance the budget. The fact is that the Republican balanced budget will result in significantly lowered loan payments, because Alan Greenspan and others tell us that if we get to that point, interest rates will drop at least 2 percent. Now, that is at least an \$8 savings for every student out there with an average loan when they consider repayment.

The next myth: Republicans are making extreme cuts in student loans while the President wants to save these programs. The fact is that the Presi-

dent's own budget director, Alice Rivlin, issued a memo recommending the elimination of the in-school interest subsidy for student loans as a method to balance the budget. We did not follow her advice. We found ways to do this without affecting students.

By capping the President's direct loan program at 10 percent, the Congressional Budget Office has found that we will save \$1 billion over 7 years, again without harming students.

Myth: Republicans will force hard choices on parents and families. Listen to what one of my colleagues said on the floor of this House.

□ 1915

They will, "in some cases have to make the very difficult choice of which child will be favored with a college education and which will be told, well, you have to fend for yourself in the job market without that education."

Mr. Speaker, I find these scare tactics to be very irresponsible. Simply put, these are scare tactics based on incorrect information. It might be better that those parents would tell their children that there are hundreds of thousands of college graduates out there today either with no job or in a job way beyond their education, and at the same time there are hundreds of thousands of technical jobs out there begging for somebody to be trained in order to take those jobs, not a 4-year college education.

I want to repeat the facts. Republicans are increasing student loan volumes and balancing the budget. There are no cuts. Zero cuts. No eligible student will be turned away from the student loan program. Anyone who claims otherwise is simply misrepresenting the facts. No student or parent will pay more for their loan under this Balanced Budget Act of 1995.

Again, I hope we can get correct information out to the public, and not play politics and use scare tactics while doing that.

---

IN HONOR OF GEN. MAX THURMAN

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a friend and one of this country's great patriots, Gen. Maxwell R. Thurman. He died December 1 at Walter Reed Army Medical Center in Washington after a long battle with leukemia.

He was called a visionary and an innovator for the work he did to help save the All-Volunteer Army after the Vietnam war. In the early 1980's, we were not getting qualified young people into our Armed Forces. More than 50 percent of recruits at that time were reading on the eighth grade level. General Thurman saw the problem and went to work to solve it. He created the recruiting slogan still used by the U.S. Army: "Be all you can be," as well as a program that stressed how recruits could learn a skill and realize their fullest potential.

It succeeded in bringing more motivated and higher educated young men and women into the military.

General Thurman was one of the earliest supporters of the Montgomery GI bill when many at the Pentagon and the White House opposed it. He saw immediately that it would help in recruiting and retaining topnotch young people, and history has proved us right on the value of the program.

He was also very proud of the fact that he commanded the U.S. invasion of Panama that ousted Gen. Manuel Noriega in 1989. It was the first major combat operation performed at night by American forces, a move which reduced U.S. casualties and helped set an example for future night-fighting tactics used in the Persian Gulf war.

I knew Max Thurman, and worked with him, for more than 20 years. I know firsthand how committed he was to the military life and to the country he loved so much. He was truly one of our best and brightest. We will miss our old friend.

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

[Mr. MCKEON 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 Missouri [Mr. CLAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. CLAY 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 Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### TEENAGE PREGNANCY

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, our parents and grandparents have taught us that prevention is better than cure.

Unintended teenage pregnancies illustrate this dilemma.

Contrary to popular thinking, more than 9 out of 10 teenage pregnancies—96 percent—are unintended.

Every year, more than 1 million American teenage girls become pregnant—and, the vast majority of them do not intend this result.

If we had in place a more effective and comprehensive prevention program, in both the private and public sectors, greater than 90 percent of the teenage girls who have babies may not get pregnant in the first place.

If those girls did not get pregnant, we could save millions, perhaps billions, of

medicaid and other federal dollars. This is an important observation during our budget legislation.

The delivery of a baby and postnatal care to a pregnant teenager—who cannot afford the pregnancy—costs the Government now about \$8,400 each time.

Over the years, teenage pregnancies cost continues to rise, through other entitlement programs and other costs associated with these pregnancies that were not intended and were not prepared for properly. A range of prevention activities would cost far, far less than that amount.

The savings that could be experienced through a more effective prevention program could help avoid some of the cuts we are now postured to make. More important, effective prevention would save the teenagers productive life until that person is ready to become a parent. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you have heard that popular commercial that states, "Pay me now or pay me later."

On teenage pregnancies, it is better to pay now than to pay later.

There are effective programs, with proven track records, that reach about half of the girls who need help. With more effort, we can reach most or all of these girls. The proportion of sexually active adolescent women over age 15 increased substantially from the seventies to almost 50 percent in the early eighties.

Although data for the first half of the 1980's suggested a leveling off to 44 percent, the data for 1988 was more than 50 percent and indicates a resumption of the increase rate.

Available data for adolescent men over age 17 also shows a substantial increase in the proportion sexually active—up from 66 percent in the late seventies to almost 80 percent in the late eighties.

And, by 1992, the adolescent birth rate was more than 60 births per 1,000 adolescents over age 15. Out-of-wedlock childbearing has increased steadily and markedly among adolescents.

The birth rate for unmarried adolescents over age 15 increased from more than 22 births per 1,000 in 1970 to almost 45 births per 1,000 in 1992.

Moreover, in 1970, 30 percent of births to adolescents over age 15 were out of wedlock as compared to 70 percent in 1991.

The United States has one of the highest teenage pregnancy rates of any western industrialized nation.

These are unintended and preventable pregnancies—so why are we standing idly by?

I issue a challenge to all my colleagues. We must do more than legislate, legislate, legislate. We must reach out with a caring hand to our youth and their families. We must try to stop these unintended pregnancies. Prevention is the key. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

#### REPUBLICANS ROLL BACK ENVIRONMENTAL GAINS

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in very strong opposition to Speaker GINGRICH's and the Congressional majority's attack on clean water, clean air, and our national parks.

No one who has followed the legislative activities of this Chamber over the last several months can deny that there has been—and continues to be—a concerted effort underway to roll back a host of laws that protect our natural resources and the environmental health and safety of the American people.

Already this body has voted to gut the Clean Water Act, to cut hundreds of millions of dollars from grants to local communities that help keep drinking water safe and beaches swimmable, to allow oil and gas drilling in the pristine wilderness of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge—America's last frontier, to cut the Environmental Protection Agency's budget by 33%, including a 50% cut in enforcement activities and a 19% cut in the program that cleans up hazardous waste sites, to slash funding for land acquisition for national parks and wildlife refuges by 40%, to cut major wetlands habitat conservation programs by 24%, and terminate altogether the EPA's role in protecting wetlands, to accelerate timber sales and logging road construction in our national forests, including the Tongass, a vast temperate rain forest in southeastern Alaska, to cut by one-third the recovery program for the grey wolf in Yellowstone National Park, to repeal a key component of the California Desert Protection Act, to cut climate and global change research by 41%, and to terminate recovery research programs on whales and other marine mammals.

Thankfully, an attempt to sell off our national parks was defeated. But the list goes on and on.

This summer, the Republican majority voted in favor of seventeen special interest loopholes that would restrict the EPA from enforcing programs important to public health, such as controls on airborne emissions of benzene, dioxin, and other cancer-causing pollutants from oil refineries, cement kilns, and paper plants.

When the American people found out about these outrageous provisions, it did not take long for some Members to do an about-face. Most of those special interest riders have been removed. However, we are still faced with a bill that imposes deep cuts in the EPA.

Mr. Speaker, the American people want to know what is next on the Republicans' environmental chopping block. Well, the Endangered Species Act, for one, is on life-support in critical condition. Apparently some feel that because the bald eagle is no longer