

loan and to pay one. It will not save money to abolish direct loans, it will cost money.

Second, the plan apparently says they are going to take profits from the bank, I think I heard the number \$4.7 billion, from the banks and the guaranty agencies. I find this remarkable for two reasons. First, for the last 10 years every time someone has proposed taking money from the banks in the student loan program by reducing the rate of interest that they are paying, the banks come tripping up to Capitol Hill and say, "We will not stay in the program anymore if you take profit away from us. It will no longer become profitable." Frankly, it has been the very same Republican defenders of the banks on this issue who are now proposing taking profits away from the interest rate that the banks earn.

The question I would raise, Mr. Speaker, is were they wrong in 1990 and 1992, or are they wrong now? Because for two decades the banks have said if you take anything away from their subsidy in this program, they will leave the program. They will not make any more loans. I find it miraculous that now all of a sudden that argument has changed. It has not changed, and some of the banks will in fact leave the program.

Where do you think the guaranty agencies are going to get part of this \$4.7 billion? Mr. Speaker, here is where. When an American student applies for a student loan, he or she usually pays 5 percent of their loan principle as a guarantee fee. That fee will go up, inevitably, under this.

Let me say this. The plan apparently proposes that we will end the deferment of payments after graduation. Here is what that means in English. It means the day after you graduate, Mr. Speaker, the day after a student graduates he or she will have to start to pay their loan back before they get a job, whether or not they get a job. If you want a surefire recipe to increase defaults that the taxpayers are liable for, that is the way to do it. This is a plan that hurts students. In the future I will be happy to outline specific ways to save even more money. This is not the way to go.

SALMON REHABILITATION IN THE COLUMBIA RIVER

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, we have a critical issue in the West, the salmon rehabilitation in the Columbia River. A model has been developed, a computer model called the FLUSH Model. It has been developed and accepted for this rehabilitation plan. Because public policy is based on this model and public policy will be spent on this, using this model to rehabilitate the Columbia River, I requested the details on which

the FLUSH Model is based. I have been trying to get the details, the assumptions, and all of the information upon which it was based.

We are about to begin spending \$200 million to \$300 million of public money on salmon rehabilitation, but information on the FLUSH Model is not forthcoming. At a hearing before the Committee on Resources, I asked Rollie Schmitt, Director of the National Marine Fisheries Service, about this, if he could get this information for me. He agreed that the Committee on Resources must have this information, but despite his good faith efforts, and that is Rollie Schmitt, Director of the National Marine Fisheries Service, despite his good faith efforts, despite my repeated requests to several entities, including the Washington and Oregon Departments of Fisheries and others, the Committee on Resources still does not have any details on the FLUSH Model. I think that is unacceptable.

Instead, my request and the other requests have been met with delays and excuses, silly arguments that the model may not be usable, or it might be misunderstood. We obviously have a problem, and that problem must be solved.

This is the problem: Sound science and peer review must be part of the recovery process. Let me repeat that. Sound science and peer review must be part of the recovery process, especially a process that costs hundreds of millions of dollars of public money. Public confidence is being undermined by the appearance that this information is being hidden from review. That is unacceptable.

I still do not have a copy of this model. I believe that the Committee on Resources of the Congress needs and, in fact, must have this information for peer review before the expenditure of public dollars. I brought this up before the Committee on Resources today, and the chairman said if we do not get this in the near future we will seek a committee subpoena for this information.

I just bring this to the attention of the Congress because this is something that must be handled in the short run, and we must get this information upon which public policy and expenditure of public funds is based.

DEVELOPMENTS AND PROGRESS OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE 104TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues tonight join me from the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight to discuss many of the developments and progress of the 104th Congress in this first session. With me

I have tonight the gentleman from Minnesota, GIL GUTKNECHT, the gentleman from New Jersey, BILL MARTINI, and the gentleman from Washington State, RANDY TATE, each of whom has been a leader in their own right, not only in the freshman class but in their own committee.

Just recently, this past weekend in the Eighth District of New Jersey, the gentleman from New Jersey, BILL MARTINI, who has been at the forefront of reform in the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, held a hearing in his district along with five other colleagues, including the gentleman from Washington, Mr. TATE, and if he can tell us tonight, I would ask the gentleman from New Jersey what was the orientation for the hearing he held in his district, what was the purpose, and what was accomplished, so we can look to improvements and legislation and other reforms as Congress moves to further agenda items.

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I thank him for allowing me this opportunity to share with the Members the mission this hearing was designated to do.

First I have a little background about the field hearing itself. The field hearing that we in the Eighth Congressional District in New Jersey were honored to have and to bring to people in our district was a field hearing of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, chaired by our good chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, BILL CLINGER. This committee had been designated by the Speaker of the House to conduct a series of national field hearings on the topic of the 21st century Federal Government. Obviously, it is a broad topic, but the real purpose of having the hearing was to go out into the field, to get out of the Beltway, and to listen to the people as to how they envision a 21st century Federal Government.

We had, and I am pleased to say, several of my colleagues from the House here join me on the panel, along with the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER]. We had the distinguished gentleman from Washington, RANDY TATE, who was there, along with several other panelists. We also had the benefit of listening to testimony from a number of people, including the great Governor of our State, Governor Whitman, as well as other officials, bipartisan in nature, I might add, as well as people from the private sector, all of whom already have embarked on the road that we here in Washington have been embarking on in the last 8 months, the road to try to make the respective institutions, of which they have jurisdiction over, more efficient and still provide