

adopted in the House, speaking of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 which we passed this evening. This will reverse the current trend where it has been more difficult for many students to get into college because of financial reasons, and this is because college will be more affordable under our new amendments. It will simplify the student aid system and improve academic quality. In doing so, our bill enhances the freedom of Americans to live the American dream, rewards Americans who are willing to take responsibility for themselves in the future and restores accountability to the Nation's higher education programs.

Higher education amendments make college more affordable by rescuing the student loan program and, in turn, providing students with the lowest interest rate in 17 years. Specifically, this provision ensures that private banks stay in the student loan program. Without it the student loan program would eventually collapse and college students would be left without the borrowing power which they need to finance their education.

The higher ed bill makes college more affordable for students from disadvantaged backgrounds. It expands the Pell grant program which provides higher education vouchers for needy students and improves campus-based aid programs like the supplemental education opportunity grants, work-study and the Perkins loans, and strengthens international and graduate education.

Mr. Speaker, it also brings much needed reforms to the TRIO program to help disadvantaged children prepare for college while still in their teens. Specifically the bill increases the maximum allowable Pell grant for students from the current 3,000 to \$4,500 per student for academic year 1999, and the grants gradually increase to 5,300 in the year 2003 to 2004.

Furthermore, the bill acknowledges sacrifices rendered by making college more affordable for those who serve in the U.S. Armed forces. Specifically it exempts veterans' benefits from being counted against students when they apply for financial aid.

This legislation holds colleges and universities accountable for tuition increases. Under the bill, colleges and universities are required to develop clear standards for reporting college costs and prices for both undergraduate and graduate education.

It also simplifies the student aid system. The Higher Education Amendments of 1998, which we just voted upon, offers students a way out by making the student aid process more user-friendly, incorporating sales management principles into student aid programs, and cutting red tape and bureaucracy.

One of the most important parts of this bill, Mr. Speaker, was the Foley amendment which requires that crime statistics be available to those who apply to colleges. I have in my own dis-

trict a heroine, Connie Cleary, who has been working for many years to make sure that colleges report such security information. Her daughter was tragically murdered on a college campus. She and her husband have dedicated their lives to making sure that every college parent and student knows exactly what the security situation is at each university, so that together we can make our campuses safer and to make sure that individuals who attend schools have every piece of knowledge they should know about the campus in making an informed choice.

This bill is a positive bill. I believe it is going to help more students attend college and be able to financially afford to achieve their dream and then go on to get the job which best suits the academic challenges they have met.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HINCHEY 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 North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. CLAYTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 2320

FAULTY PROCEDURES OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I know the hour is late. It is a pleasure to follow my good friend from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the former chairman of the House Operations Committee, now the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight of the House of Representatives.

On the same issue that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) recently addressed the House on, I would just like to spell out some of my thoughts in regards to the exercise of the authority of the committee and the chairing of the committee, particularly in the last several months.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives, in passing the resolution directing the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight to examine the election practices in the presidential and congressional elections of 1996, invested in the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight a very unusual power and instruction. I dare say, although this was a political issue from the standpoint it involved political campaigns and supposedly both parties that were engaged in the campaign

of 1996, my observations were that both on the majority and the minority side, originally there was some expression of intent to do a serious, credible investigation and examination; not a persecution or a politically motivated investigation, but something that would give insight to the Members of this House and to the American people of a very serious problem, and that problem is the prostitution of the American political system and campaigns, which is fast overwhelming this Nation as experienced in 1996.

As we met to organize and to identify our mission, it seemed that very early on many of us on the minority side of the committee were fast realizing that there was an extraordinary power, the power of subpoena that was going to be vested in the Chairman without the need for clearing a subpoena through the ranking member or to going to the full committee that would normally have some input in the exercise of the issuance of a subpoena. I thought that was strange, and to my own mind and to others I remarked at the time that as a result of this unusual power being vested in the chairman, he would become the most powerful American citizen in the United States. No other individual in the United States could, by merely signing a subpoena, command the presence, the records, the examination of all of the personal papers of any American citizen.

We cautioned the chairman that it may be wise to carry on prior practices, both of the Committee of Oversight and Investigation, and the experiences of the Watergate committee, the Thompson committee in the Senate, and that was that when an individual is going to be issued a subpoena, it should come to the full committee to be disclosed, or at least to the ranking member so that a discussion can be had; and when agreement was reached, the subpoena would issue. If there was disagreement, it would come to the full committee and the full committee would cast a vote with the majority of the committee controlling the outcome as to whether the subpoena should issue.

Instead of doing that, the chairman received, without limitation, by vote of the majority of the committee, that he in his own right, without consultation and without consent from the committee, and without contest by the rest of the committee, could issue at will subpoenas to many citizens in the country.

Mr. Speaker, I think nearly 1,000 such subpoenas were issued. Some of them were so grossly and improperly issued that because the surname of the individual who was named in the subpoena was of Chinese American origin, there was a professor at the University of Georgetown that had his bank records seized, even though he had nothing to do with the campaign and was, in fact, an entirely different person. We called that very strongly to

the attention of the chairman and he dismissed that.

About 5 months ago, we had a vote to immunize six witnesses before the committee. At that time we were assured that they would offer testimony that was necessary to the committee. In fact, that immunization of those witnesses allowed an individual to escape prosecution by getting immunity from that committee

ROLE OF PAKISTAN IN THE TRANSFER AND PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND DELIVERY SYSTEMS

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 want to stress my concern this evening over the continued role of Pakistan in the transfer and proliferation of nuclear weapons and delivery systems.

Last month, the U.S. State Department determined that sanctions should be imposed on Pakistan pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, and this decision comes in the wake of a determination that entities in Pakistan and North Korea have engaged in missile technology proliferation activities.

According to the notice published in the Federal Register on May 4 of this year, Khan Research Laboratories in Pakistan and the North Korean Mining Development Trading Corporation are subject to sanctions, including denial of export licenses, a ban on U.S. Government contracts with these entities, and a ban on importation to the U.S. of products produced by these two entities. The sanctions are in effect for 2 years.

Now, although these sanctions seem relatively modest, I still want to applaud the Clinton administration for imposing the sanctions on these companies. I hope that enforcement efforts against these and other firms involved in the proliferation of missile technology will remain strong.

As if this recent disclosure, though, about Pakistani nuclear missile technology with North Korea was not shocking enough, there are reports this week that the International Atomic Energy Agency, or the IAEA, is investigating whether a leading Pakistani scientist offered Iraq plans for nuclear weapons. The information, first reported in Newsweek Magazine, has been confirmed by the IAEA. According to the report, in October of 1990, prior to the Persian Gulf War, but after the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, while our troops were massing in Saudi Arabia under Operation Desert Shield, a memorandum from Iraqi's intelligence service to its nuclear weapons directorate mentioned that Abdul Qadeer Khan, the Pakistani scientist, offered help to Iraq to "manufacture a nuclear weapon." The document was among those turned over by Iraq after the 1995 defection of Saddam Hussein's son-in-

law, Lieutenant General Hussein Kamel, who ran Iraq's secret weapons program.

The Pakistani Government has denied the report and the IAEA has not yet made any determination, but this report is part of a very troubling pattern involving Pakistan in efforts to obtain nuclear weapons and delivery systems or to share this technology with unstable regimes.

Recently, Pakistan tested a new missile known as the Ghauri, a missile with a range of 950 miles, sufficient to pose significant security threats to India and to launch a new round in the south Asian arms race. I am pleased that the recently elected Government of India has demonstrated considerable restraint in light of this threatening new development.

While I welcome the sanctions against North Korea, I remain very concerned that China is also known to have transferred nuclear technology to Pakistan. Our administration has certified that it will allow transfers of nuclear technology to China, a move I continue to strongly oppose.

Mr. Speaker, for years many of our top diplomatic and national security officials have advocated a policy of appeasement of Pakistan, citing that country's strategic location. But I think the time has long since passed for us to reassess our relationship with Pakistan. The two developments I cite today are only the latest developments. North Korea, the last bastion of Stalinism, is also one of the most potentially dangerous nations on Earth and the U.S. has been trying to pursue policies to lessen the threat of nuclear proliferation from North Korea, but now we see that Pakistan is cooperating with North Korea on missile technology.

Mr. Speaker, we do not need to be reminded of American concerns over Saddam's regime in Iraq. Now credible reports have surfaced suggesting the possibility of nuclear cooperation between Iraq and a top Pakistani scientist. Concerns about Pakistani nuclear weapons proliferation efforts have been a concern for U.S. policymakers for more than a decade. In 1985 the Congress amended the Foreign Assistance Act to prohibit all U.S. aid to Pakistan if the President failed to certify that Pakistan did not have nuclear explosive devices.

□ 2330

This is known as the Pressler amendment. And it was invoked in 1990 by President Bush when it became impossible to make such a certification. The law has been in force since, but we have seen ongoing efforts to weaken the Pressler amendment, including a provision in the fiscal year 1998 Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill that carves out certain exemptions to the law.

Several years ago, \$370 million worth of U.S. conventional weapons to Pakistan, which had been tied up in the

pipeline since the Pressler amendment was invoked, was shipped to Pakistan. There is also the specter of U.S. F-16s, the delivery of which were also held up by the Pressler amendment, being delivered to Pakistan.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I want to say that Pakistan has continued to take actions that destabilize the region and the world. Providing and obtaining weapons and nuclear technology from authoritarian, often unstable regimes, is a pattern of Pakistani policy that is unacceptable to U.S. interests and the goal of stability in Asia.

Pakistan is a country that faces severe development problems and really they should not be involved in this continued proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Its people would be much better served if their leaders focused on growing the economy, promoting trade and investment and fostering democracy. U.S. policy needs to be much stronger in terms of discouraging the continued trend toward destabilization and weapons proliferation that the Pakistani government continues to engage in.

ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE BURTON COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BARRETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the hour is late. There has been much fanfare this week in Washington over the Burton committee, and the actions that were taken by the chairman of that committee. I just want to reflect on those actions and reflect on that committee which I have served on for the last 5½ years.

My first two years, I served under the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), who is here with us tonight and who has spoken about this issue earlier. For two years Mr. CLINGER headed the committee and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) has headed this committee for the last year and a half.

Earlier this week and late last week there was much criticism of the 19 Democrats on that committee who had voted against immunity. I was one of those Democrats and I am 100 percent comfortable with my vote. There are many times when it is difficult when legislators have to think about whether they are doing the right thing or the wrong thing, and believe it or not, legislators sometimes actually think about this and they are concerned about whether they are doing the right thing or the wrong thing.

I am very confident that what we did on that committee was the right thing to do. And I just want to take a minute to explain the concerns that I and other Members of that committee have had.

First, I have to go back a year and a half when the committee was formed and started this investigation. We argued that there were problems, and that there are problems, but those