

with a national sales tax that rewards hard work and allows these young people to make their dreams come true.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Tori for writing me. I believe we are on the way to giving her a more secure future.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Without objection, and pursuant to section 2(b) of Public Law 98-183, and upon the recommendation of the minority leader, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following member to the Commission on Civil Rights on the part of the House, effective May 4, 1999, to fill the existing vacancy thereon:

Mr. Christopher F. Edley, Jr., Cambridge, Massachusetts.

There was no objection.

REAPPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS TO NATIONAL SKILL STANDARDS BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to section 503(b)(3) of the National Skill Standards Act of 1994, (20 U.S.C. 5933) and upon the recommendation of the minority leader, the Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment of the following members to the National Skill Standards Board on the part of the House for a 4-year term:

Ms. Carolyn Warner, Phoenix, Arizona; and

Mr. George Bliss, Washington, D.C.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

If a recorded vote is ordered on House Concurrent Resolution 84, relating to the Disabilities Education Act; House Concurrent Resolution 88, relating to the Pell Grant Program; or House Resolution 157, relating to teacher appreciation, those votes will be taken after debate has concluded on those motions.

If a recorded vote is ordered on any remaining motion, those votes will be postponed until tomorrow.

URGING CONGRESS AND PRESIDENT TO FULLY FUND INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) urging the Congress and the President to fully fund the Federal Government's obligation under the Individuals With

Disabilities Education Act, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 84

Whereas all children deserve a quality education, including children with disabilities;

Whereas Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 334 F. Supp. 1247 (E. Dist. Pa. 1971), and Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia, 348 F. Supp. 866 (Dist. D. C. 1972), found that children with disabilities are guaranteed an equal opportunity to an education under the 14th amendment to the Constitution;

Whereas the Congress responded to these court decisions by passing the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (enacted as Public Law 94-142), now known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.), to ensure a free, appropriate public education for children with disabilities;

Whereas the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act provides that the Federal, State, and local governments are to share in the expense of educating children with disabilities and commits the Federal Government to pay up to 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure for children with disabilities;

Whereas the Federal Government has provided only 9, 11, and 12 percent of the maximum State grant allocation for educating children with disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in the last 3 years, respectively;

Whereas the national average cost of educating a special education student (\$13,323) is more than twice the national average per pupil cost (\$6,140);

Whereas research indicates that children who are effectively taught, including effective instruction aimed at acquiring literacy skills, and who receive positive early interventions demonstrate academic progress, and are significantly less likely to be referred to special education;

Whereas the high cost of educating children with disabilities and the Federal Government's failure to fully meet its obligation under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act stretches limited State and local education funds, creating difficulty in providing a quality education to all students, including children with disabilities;

Whereas, if the appropriation for part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1411 et seq.) exceeds \$4,924,672,200 for a fiscal year, the State funding formula will shift from one based solely on the number of children with disabilities in the State to one based on 85 percent of the children ages 3 to 21 living in the State and 15 percent based on children living in poverty in the State, enabling States to undertake good practices for addressing the learning needs of more children in the regular education classroom and reduce over identification of children who may not need to be referred to special education;

Whereas the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act has been successful in achieving significant increases in the number of children with disabilities who receive a free, appropriate public education;

Whereas the current level of Federal funding to States and localities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act is contrary to the goal of ensuring that children with disabilities receive a quality education; and

Whereas the Federal Government has failed to appropriate 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure per child with a disability as required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

to assist States and localities to educate children with disabilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That—

(1) the Congress and the President—

(A) should, working within the constraints of the balanced budget agreement, give programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.) the highest priority among Federal elementary and secondary education programs by meeting the commitment to fund the maximum State grant allocation for educating children with disabilities under such Act prior to authorizing or appropriating funds for any new education initiative; and

(B) should meet the commitment described in subparagraph (A) while retaining the commitment to fund existing Federal education programs that increase student achievement; and

(2) if a local educational agency chooses to utilize the authority under section 613(a)(2)(C)(i) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to treat as local funds up to 20 percent of the amount of funds the agency receives under part B of such Act that exceeds the amount it received under that part for the previous fiscal year, then the agency should use those local funds to provide additional funding for any Federal, State, or local education program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. GOODLING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, this is an old topic for me, 25 years, speaking on the same subject, trying to encourage the Congress to put their money where their mouth was 24 years ago, when school districts were promised that if they participated in the Federal Individuals With Disabilities Education Act they would receive 40 percent of the excess cost in order to fund special education programs to educate a child with a disability, which may be two, three, five, ten, twenty times greater than to educate a non-disabled student.

Obviously, that was not done. We got up to 6 percent. In the last 3 years, fortunately, we have been able to get huge increases, which gets us all the way up to 12 percent. And, hopefully, by the end of this year, it will be 15 percent, and we still have a long way to go.

What does it mean when we do not fund what we promised? It means that the local school districts must raise millions of dollars in order to fund a mandate that came from the Federal level, a mandate if they decided to participate.

I realize that no matter how much money we put up, we can never fully fund even our 40 percent unless we deal with the number of people who are placed in special education programs, many of which only have a reading problem and, therefore, really should not be there.

I hope that some of the early childhood programs that we have put into effect on the Federal level will help eliminate those who get into special ed simply because of those reading problems.

So, again, I am here today asking, as I have asked every year for 25 years, for Congress and the President to put their money where their mouth was before we talk about funding new programs.

Center cities particularly stand to get all sorts of money to deal with pupil-teacher ratio, to deal with maintenance of their buildings. All we have to do is get that 40 percent of excess costs back to those local school districts and then they can help all students. That is what this is all about, helping all students, not pitting one against another.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring House Concurrent Resolution 84 to the Floor. This Concurrent Resolution urges full funding of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) before creating and funding any new education initiatives. The co-sponsors and I believe that the Federal government cannot continue to ignore the commitment it made over 24 years ago to children with disabilities.

At the time IDEA was first enacted, Congress committed that the Federal government would provide States and local school districts with 40% of the average per pupil expenditure to assist with the excess costs of educating students with disabilities. Where are we on that commitment? We are at 12% and it is this high only because Republicans have insisted and fought for increased Federal funds for IDEA. Since Republicans took over control of Congress in 1995, funding for IDEA has risen over 85%.

Failing to live up to our IDEA funding commitment fails our students, parents, schools, and communities.

Where do we stand on IDEA spending right now? Here's what we know about the President's thoughts on IDEA funding. Under his budget request, President Clinton wants to cut spending for students with disabilities from \$702 per child in FY 1999 to \$688 per child in FY 2000. We also know Secretary of Education Riley's top priorities. According to an article in the Washington Post of April 20, 1999, increasing funding for IDEA does not make the top three priorities of the Department.

The Committee on Education and the Workforce stated its funding priority quite clearly. In a bipartisan vote of 38-4, the Committee approved this resolution to give IDEA programs the highest priority among Federal elementary and secondary education programs.

What will giving IDEA the highest priority in Federal funding for K-12 education programs do for students and schools? It will allow schools to increase and improve services for all students, including students with disabilities.

Meeting the Federal IDEA funding commitment benefits every student by allowing the local school to fund the services needed by all students—everyone wins. Once the Federal government begins to pay its fair share under IDEA, local schools will no longer be forced to redirect local funds to cover the unpaid Federal share. Local funds will be freed up, allowing local schools to hire and train high-quality

teachers, reduce class size, build and renovate classrooms, and invest in technology.

Every student will benefit, regardless of whether the student receives services under Title I, limited English proficiency programs, or IDEA.

We must fully fund IDEA before Washington creates new education programs. We do not need to spend our limited education resources on new, unproven Federal programs. Let's first live up to the promises we made over 24 years ago and fund a program that we know works.

House Concurrent Resolution 84 urges Congress to fully fund IDEA while maintaining its commitment to existing Federal education programs. We do not want to take funds from the Federal education programs currently serving students. However, year in and year out under both Democrat and Republican control, Congress must set priorities and we believe that funding the federal commitment to IDEA must come before funding new untested programs.

We can both ensure that children with disabilities receive a free and appropriate public education and ensure that all children have the best education possible if we just provide fair Federal funding for special education.

I urge everyone to support this important concurrent Resolution. Congress must fulfill its commitment to assist States and localities with educating children with disabilities.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say at the beginning of my remarks that I am going to support this resolution.

However, the resolution that is before the House today is not as simple as it may seem. Unfortunately, this resolution tends to place the needs of disabled children and nondisabled children in conflict rather than to seek to recognize our commitment to all children.

Full funding for the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act is a goal which is vitally important to the education of the disabled children of our Nation and one that I have been committed to since I arrived in Congress 23 years ago. We need to provide 40 percent of the excess cost of educating a child with a disability, and this should be done and this should be one of our top priorities for Federal education funding.

In fact, as my chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) knows, I have joined him and many other of my colleagues in demanding additional funding for special education so we can meet this goal now rather than later.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) has been a real and long time leader for full funding of IDEA. I can recall several years ago, when we both served on the Committee on the Budget, the courage he took to be the one Member over there who joined me in trying to secure more funding for this program.

Supporting the needs of disabled children and providing them with a chance to become productive, participating

members of society is extremely important, and there has been no greater champion than myself in this issue.

In fact, many years before the passage of 94-142, I, as one of its principal authors, helped enact Michigan's special education law. My commitment and experience in this issue has spanned three decades of my career in public service, and I understand and support the need to fully fund IDEA.

However, in our desire to provide full funding for IDEA, we should not do so at the expense of other Federal education programs or pit the needs of disabled children against those of non-disabled children. The resolution which we are considering today tends to do that, accentuate the politics of division rather than recognizing what has become a bipartisan goal, the full funding of IDEA.

The issue of IDEA funding is not a Democratic or Republican concern. There has been strong bipartisan support for substantial increases in funding for IDEA in recent appropriations bills, and I strongly believe this will continue.

In the past 3 years we have provided sizable increases for both IDEA and other Federal education initiatives, recognizing the need to build a total Federal commitment to education. IDEA alone has received over \$1.5 billion in additional funding since 1996. The growth and funding for all Federal education programs that have a positive effect on student achievement should be the goal we set our sights on regardless of party or parochial interest.

It is my hope that we commit ourselves to the spirit of cooperation on the issue of educational funding.

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to draw the attention of my colleagues to this headline. It says they are going to cut 60 non-tenured positions in my hometown, in my hometown paper.

The reason for that is that we are going to have to increase classroom size and reduce our gifted and talented programs because we cannot access dollars from any of the other Federal education programs. Specifically, we cannot access the dollars from the President's new initiative for new teachers and smaller classes. And that is a problem with our existing school funding programs.

So what we can do? What we can do is fully fund special education, living up to the commitment that Congress has made. What happens if we do that? First of all, it is going to take the pressure off of local taxpayers in my home State, property taxpayers. But, more important than that, it will provide more funding for the general fund budget for education.

By underfunding special education, we are forcing schools to go take money from their general education account and put it into their special education account.

□ 1430

By fully funding special education, we will reverse that process. It will address the area of greatest uncertainty and the area of greatest cost to most of our school districts. I would urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, like so many of all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I am hearing constantly from parents and educators at home about the importance of meeting the Federal commitment to fund the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA. Parents of children with special needs are absolutely frantic about their children's access to public education. They often feel like the schools are giving them the runaround, but schools are equally as worried about having the resources to do the job that they need to do. And the parents of students without special needs are more than fearful because they believe that special needs students are taking precious resources away from their children.

This cannot continue. Congress must step up to our responsibility, and we should do it this year while the economy is good and we have a surplus. If we cannot do it now, we never will.

But we should not be pitting one education program against another as this particular resolution does. When we do that, we pit students against students, parents against schools, and we pit schools against each other.

However, there is a way that we can in this Congress meet the Federal commitment to fund IDEA. We can do this while continuing our support for other important education programs. We can do this by using some of the funds that have been set aside under the Republicans' balanced budget agreement for tax cuts to fund IDEA.

The balanced budget agreement sets aside \$778 billion for a 10-year tax cut. We would only need \$11 billion additional in funds to fully fund IDEA this year.

When this resolution was marked up in the committee, I offered an amendment that urged Congress to fund IDEA before funding tax cuts. It lost on a partisan vote. 100 percent of the Democrats voted for it; 100 percent of the Republicans voted against it.

While I realize that no amendment can be considered on the floor this afternoon, I do want to point out that we can fully fund IDEA and we can do it without taking away from other education programs. Once again, I urge my colleagues to put education for our

children with disabilities before tax cuts. Work with me. We can fully fund IDEA without taking funds from other important education programs.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, as I go around my district in southwest Missouri and ask school administrators or teachers what is their biggest problem with the Federal Government, I always get the same answer, IDEA. And so now I ask what is their second biggest problem with the Federal Government, and I get a variety of answers, but there is no question their biggest challenge is in the way IDEA is funded, the way IDEA is administered, the way that the rules and regulations are set up.

We cannot do anything today about the administration and the rules and regulations. That needs to be in another, bigger debate later. It needs to happen. But we can do something about the funding.

In 1974, when this program was conceptualized and put into law, Congress said they would pay 40 percent of the cost. Twenty years later, we were paying 6 percent of the cost. In the last 4 years, we have been able to double that, to 12 percent, so we are headed in the right direction. But we need to keep our word.

This is about the Federal Government, not just conceptualizing some new obligation but paying their share and keeping their commitment to make those programs work.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) a member of the committee.

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for yielding me this time.

I want to, first of all, preface my comments by indicating to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) that I intend to vote for this resolution. I believe that there has been a sufficient gap between what the Federal Government has promised with respect to funding individuals with disabilities and what we have actually paid for.

When I am in town meetings in my home State of Indiana, IDEA problems come up over and over and over again. Concerned parents, very upset about getting their children a sufficient and fair education, getting their children opportunities to learn in the classroom and having the Federal Government come through with the funding. So I will support the Goodling resolution.

There has also been a three-part series on the difficulties in special education done by the Washington Post here in Washington, D.C. I would ask at the appropriate time unanimous consent for these articles to be entered into the RECORD to show that we need to do more in special education.

But I do have two concerns about this resolution. One is that we do not pay for this resolution by taking money away from other good education programs, that we need to fund Head Start, that we need to fund Pell grants, that we need to make sure that we are not taking money away from education. And this should come from the Republican 10 percent across-the-board tax cut that everybody knows is not going to be out there, anyway.

And, secondly, I just end on the note of, there was a battle cry in 1988 of "Where's the Beef?" Where is the substance? This is a resolution. This does not mean anything yet. Let us get a bill. Where is the bill? Let us go forward with a bill that funds IDEA for our children and for our parents.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting sometimes that we do not read the legislation since it says, "should meet the commitment described in subparagraph (A) while retaining the commitment to fund existing Federal education programs."

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I also rise in support of H. Con. Res. 84, the Individuals with Disabilities Act.

Let me tell Members that the meat is there now. The bottom line is that we are obligated by statute to pay 40 percent of the education of those with disabilities in this country. We have unfortunately in this Congress over the years not gotten anywhere near that level. In fact, we are probably about 11 percent right now with about a \$14 billion deficit that we have to make up.

Some people have gotten up and they have said, and I can understand it and I do not disagree with this, that we cannot do this at the expense of other programs. I will tell my colleagues that we will not do it at the expense of other programs. I am talking about Federal programs.

But if we paid that money into the local governments, into the local school districts, then they would be able to free up the money which they presently have to build schools, to hire more teachers and to help with all of the other programs, because they are funding the deficit which we created by mandating that they do this. We have an obligation to educate everybody in America if we possibly can. This legislation would do it. We should pass it.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. RIVERS).

(Ms. RIVERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, Clement Atlee once said, "Democracy means government by discussion, but it is only effective if you can stop people from talking." I agree.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop talking about special education funding. It is time to do something.

In 1972, the Federal Government did the right thing by enacting a national guarantee for education for special needs children. Before this action, far too many handicapped children never saw the inside of a schoolhouse.

As someone who served on a local board of education for nearly a decade, I know the positive impact of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. But as someone who struggled to pass local school district budgets, I also know that the Federal Government has never come close to funding at the promised level of 40 percent. In fact, it has been mentioned before, we barely reached 12 percent. In fact, the National Association of State Boards of Education point out that underfunding since the day the bill was passed totals \$146 billion that was promised to local public schools over the last 22 years that was never delivered upon.

Schools need real help, not rhetorical soothing, real help. This proposal, the one we have before us, will not do anything. It is a sense of Congress, an opinion without the force of law. A sense of Congress will not pay teachers' salaries. It will not buy textbooks. It will not put school buses on the street. In short, it will not address any of the very real financial pressures facing America's schools every day.

This has been an issue for me from the beginning of my time in Congress. I have introduced bills and amendments to fully fund IDEA to the promised 40 percent. It is highly ironic to me that those proposals have repeatedly been voted down or tabled, in some cases, by Members who are today promoting what is no more than a reaffirmation of the 1972 promise.

Someone mentioned earlier, where is the real bill? Here is the real bill. I will soon be introducing this bill to fund IDEA at the promised 40 percent. I would invite every Member who has taken to the floor today to talk about the importance of meeting this obligation to actually act and become a cosponsor. I would invite all Members who recognize the value of IDEA and the value of keeping promises to join me in cosponsoring this bill.

This is real action, not soothing rhetoric, real action. Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop talking about special education.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of this measure. I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, in his efforts to obtain full funding for individuals with disabilities.

In adopting this measure back in 1975, IDEA, Congress required the Fed-

eral, State and local governments to share the cost of educating children with disabilities. When enacted, the Federal Government was to assume 40 percent of the national average per pupil. It was never done. We need to fund this properly. We are only funding it for 11 percent this year. It is time we acted. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. Speaker. I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 84 and I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Chairman of the Education and Workforce Committee, Mr. GOODLING and his efforts to obtain full funding for the individuals With Disabilities Act (IDEA).

In adopting IDEA in 1975, Congress required the Federal, State and local governments to share the cost of educating children with disabilities. When enacted, the Federal Government was to assume 40 percent of the national average per pupil expense for such children.

While Congress has authorized this amount since 1982, the appropriation has never come close to the stated goal of 40 percent. Last year, it reached the highest level ever at 12 percent and now the President has requested that the program be cut to 11 percent for fiscal year 2000.

The result has been an enormous unfunded mandate on State and local school systems to absorb the cost of educating students with disabilities. In doing so, local school districts must divert funding away from other students and education activities. This has had the unfortunate effect of draining school budgets, decreasing the quality of education and unfairly burdening the taxpayers. Local school districts are spending as much as 20 percent of their budgets to fund IDEA.

Since 1995, educational funding levels have jumped 85 percent and have demonstrated Congress' commitment to help States and local school districts provide public education to children with disabilities. It is now time for this Congress to make good on its promise to fully fund IDEA at 40 percent. We can no longer let the States try to make up the difference between the funds they have been promised and the funds that they actually receive.

In my district, the schools are definitely feeling the negative effects of the lack of IDEA funding. East Ramapo School District in Rockland County should receive \$2.04 million for IDEA but according to 1995 figures, they only saw \$398,000. That is a difference of \$1.6 million. Similarly, the Middletown City School District in Orange County was expecting \$1.6 million but actually only saw \$316,000. A difference of \$1.3 million.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Congress to show that they are truly committed to our Nation's children's education. By fully funding IDEA, Congress will simultaneously ease the burden on local school budgets while ensuring that students with disabilities receive the same quality of education as their nondisabled counterparts.

Once the Federal Government begins to pay its fair share, local funds will be available for school districts to hire more teachers, reduce class size, invest in technology and even lower local property taxes for our constituents.

I proudly stand here today in support of H. Con. Res. 84 and I hope that this Congress will keep its word and fully fund the Individuals With Disability Act.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY), a member of the committee.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me this time.

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and other members of the committee for bringing forth legislation which will in fact put more Federal funding and more emphasis on education. The presentation of this resolution marks an acknowledgment that all aspects of government, Federal, State and local, must step up to the plate and support education.

What is particularly notable is that the majority, which in the past has not been willing to do that, which has in fact been stepping back and saying that the Federal Government should get out of education, now is stepping forward and agreeing with us that, in fact, we all must participate.

The Constitution is what obligates people to fund IDEA. There is not a Federal legislative mandate. The Constitution told States that they have the obligation to fund this program, and the Federal Government stepped forward and made an offer to assist, and we said we would do it to the extent that we could, hopefully up to 40 percent.

We are moving toward that goal. This resolution entitles us to move even more so forward. But in no way should we be pitting one education program against another. We still need more teachers and smaller classrooms. We need more technology. And we need more teacher development. We need to make sure that we do this.

I thank the chairman for accepting the language into this bill that says that local communities that have funds freed up by virtue of additional Federal funding must keep that money in educational programs so that in fact Federal, State and local governments all participate in smaller classrooms, more teachers, teacher development, technology and all the needs of education.

□ 1445

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I can only say it was awful lonely for 20 years in the minority trying to get some funding for IDEA.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON), another subcommittee chair.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker I would like to join my colleagues in support of H. Con. Res. 84 which calls on the President and Congress to fulfill our obligation to our Nation's neediest children, those with disabilities.

In my home State of California, the cost of educating an estimated 600,000 children with disabilities is a staggering \$3.4 billion, but the Federal Government contributes only \$400 million,

which translates to only 11.7 percent of the total cost. I believe before we look at creating new programs with new Washington mandates we need to ensure that the Federal Government lives up to the promises it made to the students, parents and schools over 2 decades ago.

Mr. Speaker, I am not the only one who thinks so. I recently met with all of the superintendents in my district. Each and every one of them stated that we must increase funding for IDEA before we create a new Federal program. If the President would first fund a special education mandate, our States and local school districts would have the funds to do the things the President proposes.

This Congress will continue to work to provide fair Federal funding for special education so in the end we can improve education for all our children, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), another subcommittee chair.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, in our markup we heard from the Democrats that this bill, if enacted, would rob Peter to pay Paul. A more accurate way for the Democrats to look at this resolution is from the perspective of paying what we promised Paul before we begin to give new money and make other promises to Peter. We simply cannot neglect the fact that we promised to help pay for the education of these special-needs children and put scarce funds into other programs that do not have the same mandate.

It is also important to note that if the Federal Government had begun funding IDEA appropriately, schools would have more State and local money freed up to handle local school demands like teacher/pupil ratios and school construction.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ), a member of the committee.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, I was listening to the debate, and I had not really planned to speak on this, but I think we lose touch with reality here.

Now the reality is that the responsibility for educating these children is really not the Federal Government's; it is the local school district's responsibility.

The reason that the Federal Government got into it at all was because there was a court case brought that proved that the local people were not educating those children with disabilities because it was so much more expensive to do so.

Now I understand that. So when the Federal Government got into it, they made a commitment that they would fund 40 percent of that extra cost of educating these children with disabilities. I do not like to call it disabilities; I think it is more challenges to them. It is disabilities in our mind, Mr. Speaker.

But the fact is that when we did, we made that commitment, and, like a lot of people here, I have felt badly that we have never lived up to that commitment. But we never lived up to the commitment of full funding Head Start or full funding a lot of other programs that are doing equally responsible jobs.

But remember this, that the responsibility for educating children lies at the local level. Our colleagues on the other side constantly remind us of that, that that responsibility lies there so the decisions should be made there. So how about the decisions to funding the cost of educating these children? They did not want to make that decision, so we made it for them. We said that they will educate those children.

Then I think magnanimously we offered to fund 40 percent of it. Now all of a sudden that becomes a burden to us. Not that I disagree with the fact that we ought to live up to that commitment because we made it; because we do not want to be people who go back on promises as elected officials and leaders of the communities.

So, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the idea, and I will vote for the resolution, but I am really disturbed by the constant reference to the fact that somehow or another this is the Federal government's responsibility. It is a responsibility the government has accepted for itself, but originally it was not. It was local.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Correcting the facts, yes, the court said all will be educated. However the Federal Government said: Do it our way and we will give you 40 percent of excess costs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS).

(Mr. BASS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution before us today which is essentially the same as one which I introduced last year which passed by voice vote, and I certainly hope we have a recorded vote on this resolution this time, and I would like to say that I support it for four reasons:

Number one, it is plain good education policy to provide full funding for special education.

Secondly, it is meeting the worst unfunded federal mandate that this government currently has, 10 percent of a 40 percent obligation. Bearing in mind that it is up from 5 percent 4 years ago, still 10 percent is not acceptable.

Thirdly, it is an issue of local control, local control of education, letting local school boards make decisions for themselves whether they are going to have new teachers, build new classrooms or spend the money on other areas. The Federal Government should make this a top priority.

Lastly, this is an issue that is extremely important for disabled individ-

uals, for families, for school boards, for administrators.

If my colleagues want to do something for education in 1999, support this resolution, and then move forward and fully fund special education.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACC).

(Mr. BALDACC asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALDACC. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member and the chairman for bringing this resolution to the floor.

I am a strong supporter of the Individuals with Disability Education Act or IDEA. I strongly agree that every child deserves the opportunity to benefit from a public education. We must do all that we can to ensure that every child reaches his or her fullest potential, but we also must recognize the tremendous cost of this endeavor.

In fact, the cost of educating a disabled student is on average more than twice the cost of educating a non-disabled student. If our schools are truly to serve all students, the Federal Government must increase its commitment to IDEA funding.

When it was first passed, Congress committed to spending 40 percent of the cost. However, the Federal Government has consistently fallen far short of this goal. As a result, special education costs continue to rise, and we fall further behind. Currently we fund less than 12 percent of the cost, leaving State and local governments to pick up the rest.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution demonstrates Congress' commitment to stand behind our promise. It shows that we recognize the impact that special education costs are having on our State and local budgets and that we are committed to providing leadership and resources for our schools and their students.

Let me give my colleagues just one example of a city in Maine. Lewiston schools currently receive about \$233,000 in special education funding. If we were meeting our 40 percent commitment currently, Lewiston schools would be receiving nearly \$1.2 million, a difference of \$1 million. Imagine the impact that freeing up \$1 million for other educational needs could have on the education of all of Lewiston's young people, and then multiply that across every school and every district in the State of Maine, in every school district in the country.

As I traveled throughout my district, this is probably the concern I hear most frequently:

School budgets are rising and taking property tax rates with them.

I am often told that schools have to cut art and music programs, eliminate field trips and cancel extracurricula. I know that this situation is the same throughout the country.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I thank him for his leadership on IDEA and for his help to our States and the children that they are trying to educate.

Mr. Speaker I have spoken with our Governor, Christie Todd Whitman, in New Jersey about what fully funding IDEA would mean to my State.

In New Jersey alone there are over 210,000 students in special education programs. According to our Governor, if the Federal Government paid its full 40 percent share last year, the State would have received an additional \$300 million to pay for these children's education.

Our States are paying too great of an amount of our government's legal obligation to IDEA with money that otherwise could be spent to hire additional teachers, expand or maintain school facilities, pay for athletics or extracurricular activities. Mr. Speaker, until we pay our existing mandates, we should not consider paying for any new and expensive programs, any new entitlements.

I support this resolution, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I want to thank him and the committee for their support and for their work toward the fulfillment of a commitment that has been made by the Federal Government to fully fund special education made many years ago. It was a beautiful civil rights law saying every child ought to have access to education, and yet that beautiful law has been consistently underfunded ever since.

Mr. Speaker, that puts pressure on local taxes, that puts pressure on local control of education. It puts pressure on local control, it puts pressure on other education programs, general education programs, talented and gifted programs, and it puts cross pressure in a way that is totally unintended for the very people that we are trying to help.

For Iowa alone it would mean \$80 million of additional funds for the kids, for the programs that make sure that Iowa's children are available and ready to learn, ready to meet the commitments of a continuing and growing economic demands for those kids, Mr. Speaker.

Let us not have new programs, Mr. Speaker. Let us fulfill our commitment to the existing programs first.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, what we have before us today is really a get well card, and it is a very nice get well card.

If I have a friend who is ill, I will send my friend a get well card, and that is very important. It expresses my sentiment and my hope for him. But what my friend really needs, besides

that get well card, is the Blue Cross card to pay the bills, and that is why the Committee on the Budget and Committee on Appropriations could do a much better job. Mr. Speaker, we will solicit our colleagues' support over there to get money for that Blue Cross card, send a get well card which is nice, but it does not do enough.

So I am going to vote for this because it is an encouraging, hopeful get well card. But upon receipt of that we must do more, and I would hope that each and every one of my colleagues over there would encourage the Committee on the Budget, encourage the Committee on Appropriations and indeed encourage the Committee on Ways and Means to do its job.

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

Mr. KILDEE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Michigan aware that the Committee on the Budget put an extra billion dollars in the House proposal for special education this year to fund IDEA? I do not know if the gentleman voted for that, but that was an important priority from the Committee on the Budget. We did hear that. We were not trying to send just a get well card. We wanted to try and fully fund those programs, and we did not get a lot of support from the gentleman's side. That concerns us.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from Iowa: I served on the Committee on the Budget very well. I know how the Committee on the Budget relates to the Committee on Appropriations. I referred to three committees. The real legislative committees here are the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Ways and Means, and they hold in their hands really the hope for any of these programs. If the Committee on Ways and Means cuts revenue, that makes it more difficult for us to fund these programs. Unless the Committee on Appropriations acts, these funds will not be appropriated.

So they are the ones who really control that Blue Cross card we are debating.

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

Mr. KILDEE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Michigan in trying to answer the inquiry from the gentleman from Iowa is also saying that we have a billion dollars in our budget and we are really concerned about these physically challenged kids and their families, where is the bill? Where is the beef? Where is the money?

Now we are going to vote on this side for this resolution, but where is the bill, the statutory authority, to follow through on what they said in their budget to provide funds for these families and these children?

□ 1500

We are going to get a Pell grant resolution, which I intend to vote for. We

will do a resolution maybe on our teachers, which I intend to vote for, but I would hope that the Republican majority would come forward with a bill that we can debate that is fairly paid for and not just a resolution that does not have any money in it.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I will say where the beef is. The beef is where we put it the last 3 years while we were in the majority. \$800 million one year, \$600 million the next year, another \$500 million the next year for a total of almost \$2 billion over 3 years, not where it was for 20 years prior to that when I sat in the minority where we got zero, zero, zero and the majority was overwhelming at that particular time.

So we are putting the beef there. We know where the beef is, and we are getting it there, and we are getting it out to the children who can eat that beef.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FORBES).

(Mr. FORBES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 84; and I would reiterate what the chairman has just said. Under the Democrats, we did not get any increases in this program, a valuable program that is working. It is working in this country. And I appreciate the leadership of the chairman in the last 25 years trying to raise the consciousness of this Congress to adequately fund this program.

We are asking our States to come up with better standards for our students, and they are doing that. In my own State of New York, they have raised the standards, which were already high standards.

Where are they getting the money? Where are they going to get the money? In New York State alone, we are \$581 million short of this Federal mandate. This Federal mandate is asking my school districts to come up with the extra money. And who pays? The property taxpayer.

This is a Federal mandate. It should be fully funded at the 40 percent that Congress dictated over 25 years ago. In my own Longwood School District on Long Island, New York, in Middle Island they get \$484,000 when they should be getting \$2.4 million; \$1.9 million short. I urge support.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

(Mr. WELDON of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as an original cosponsor of H. Con. Res. 84 which would make fully funding special education one of the highest priorities in the Federal elementary and secondary education funding. It is imperative that we meet the objective of paying the 40 percent of the average per pupil expenses associated with educating children with disabilities.

I encourage all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to not only support this resolution but as well to vote for the funding when we do the appropriations bills.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING).

In 1975, IDEA, which mandated every child, regardless of disability, would be given a free public education, Congress promised to fund up to 40 percent of the cost. Mr. Speaker, Congress and the President have not kept their part of the bargain. Today we fund 12 percent of the cost to educate children. Twelve percent is not 40 percent. Twelve percent is not enough.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who would say that increased IDEA funding will come at the expense of other high-priority programs, but if we in Congress fulfill our promise by picking up the slack, these other educational priorities will be funded on the local level, where they belong. Illinois alone would receive four times more than the \$103 million we received last year.

I urge Members to support the resolution on behalf all of our Nation's children.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The beauty of this resolution is, there are several, as a matter of fact. First of all, the resolution says that we do not take money from existing programs to fund this program. We heard a lot about how we will take money from existing programs to fund this. Well, if one reads the resolution, it does not do that.

Secondly, the resolution does not say fund immediately. What it says is, continue the drive that we have had the last 3 years. Forget the 20 years prior to that, where nothing was done, but continue the drive that we have had going the last 3 years, getting two billion over the last 3 years.

Then the beauty also is we do not pit one child against another child. As a matter of fact, by trying to get this money for special ed, we make sure that we take away that battle that is going on out there at the present time because the local districts have to use their money in order to fund special ed. They must take it away from other students. So we are giving an opportunity to help all students.

Yes, we are sending a get-well card, the same get-well card we sent last year; and that get-well card got us a half a billion dollars. The same get-well card we sent the year before, that get-well card got us \$600 million. I am hoping that this get-well card, when the appropriators read it, will also get us another billion.

I would say that is a pretty good investment in a get-well card. I wish I could get some other get-well cards going out there that could get those

kinds of returns that our get-well cards have gotten us in the last several years.

I want to make sure that everybody understands, yes, it was the Court who determined all children deserved an equal and a quality education. It was the Federal Government then who came along, as they generally do, and said, do it our way, do it our way, and we will give you 40 percent of that excess cost.

How attractive that is. Forty percent, that is better than trying to go it alone, but they should have known better. They should have known that that 40 percent was just a gimmick. It was not anything else.

Now, in the last 3 years we have changed all of that, and we are going to continue to change all of that because we are going to step up to the plate as we have the last 3 years and put our money where our mouth was and help all children by helping local districts fund special education.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to express my opposition to H. Con. Res. 84, the resolution calling for full-funding of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA). My opposition to this act should in no way be interpreted as opposition to increased spending on education. However, the way to accomplish this worthy goal is to allow parents greater control over education resources by cutting taxes, thus allowing parents to devote more of their resources to educating their children in such a manner as they see fit. Massive tax cuts for the American family, not increased spending on federal programs should be this Congress' top priority.

The drafters of this bill claim that increasing federal spending on IDEA will allow local school districts to spend more money on other educational priorities. However, because an increase in federal funding will come from the same taxpayers who currently fund the IDEA mandate at the state and local level, increasing federal IDEA funding will not necessarily result in a net increase of education funds available for other programs. In fact, the only way to combine full federal funding of IDEA with an increase in expenditures on other programs by state and localities is through massive tax increases at the federal, state, and/or local level!

This bill further assures that control over the education dollar will remain centered in Washington by calling for Congress to "meet the commitment to fund existing Federal education programs." Thus, this bill not only calls on Congress to increase funding for IDEA, it also calls on Congress to not cut funds for any program favored by Congress. The practical effect of this bill is to place yet another obstacle in the road of fulfilling Congress' constitutional mandate to put control of education back into the hands of the people.

Rather than increasing federal spending, Congress should focus on returning control over education to the American people by enacting the Family Education Freedom Act (H.R. 935), which provides parents with a \$3,000 per child tax credit to pay for K-12 education expenses. Passage of this act would especially benefit parents whose children have learning disabilities as those parents have the greatest need to devote a large

portion of their income toward their child's education.

The Family Education Freedom Act will allow parents to develop an individualized education plan that will meet the needs of their own child. Each child is a unique person and we must seriously consider whether disabled children's special needs can be best met by parents, working with local educators, free from interference from Washington or federal educators. After all, an increase in expenditures cannot make a Washington bureaucrat know or love a child as much as that child's parent.

It is time for Congress to restore control over education to the American people. The only way to accomplish this goal is to defund education programs that allow federal bureaucrats to control America's schools. Therefore, I call on my colleagues to reject H. Con. Res. 84 and instead join my efforts to pass the Family Education Freedom Act. If Congress gets Washington off the backs and out of the pocketbooks of parents, American children will be better off.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution urging Congress, and the President, to fully fund the Federal Government's obligation under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

In 1975 the Federal Government committed to provide 40 percent funding aid for the mandate to educate those students with disabilities. As most of my colleagues know, federal funding for IDEA has never risen above 12 percent.

On average, local school districts currently spend 20 percent of their budgets on special education services. Once the Federal government begins to pay its fair share, local funds will be freed up, allowing local schools to hire and train additional high-quality teachers, reduce class size, build and renovate classrooms and invest in technology.

In my district, the Duval County School District receives about \$7 million. If IDEA were fully funded, this school district would receive over \$37 million, an increase of over \$30 million.

It is time for us to send a clear message that the Federal government must honor our commitments to help our state and local school districts educate children with disabilities.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

When special education legislation was first enacted in 1975, the federal government, recognizing the extraordinary costs of inclusion, pledged to provide state and local education agencies with forty percent of the excess costs associated with educating students with disabilities.

Sadly, the federal government has not come close to meeting this obligation, with annual appropriations never exceeding twelve percent of excess costs.

The chronic underpayment of this federal mandate has left state and local governments with a burden of more than \$146 billion in lost funding over the past twenty-two years—a staggering shortfall that has forced education agencies to shift resources out of lower-priority, but important necessities such as building maintenance and upkeep.

Special education departments end up eating large portions of local and state school budgets, which creates a competitive relationship between regular and special education, as they vie for the same scarce funds. This situation is not the fault of school districts, but a direct result of Congress's inadequate funding of IDEA.

Special education has received a billion dollar increase over the past two years. Yet even with this substantial increase, funding is still substantially below Congress's 40 percent promise. This means that states and districts will continue to be unfairly burdened by these excess costs.

Congress is simply being unfair to our local school districts by not living up to our end of this bargain and we are taking needed resources away from regular education.

I hope the Congress will live up to its obligation, and fully fund IDEA. If we do not, all students across this country will suffer.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 84 calls for increased funding for IDEA at the expense of initiatives like the Clinton/Clay Class Size Reduction Act. While I support increased funding for IDEA, we should not be robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Achieving the goal of 100,000 new teachers will ensure that every child receives personal attention, gets a solid foundation for further learning, and is prepared to read by the end of the third grade.

I am disappointed that the Republicans have continued their attempt to torpedo this critical program. On the Ed-Flex bill, Republicans tried to raid class size funds for other programs. We should never pit one program against another—we should support overall increases in education spending.

I believe that reducing class sizes with well-qualified teachers is the single most significant action we can take to enhance student achievement.

We should increase funding for IDEA, but not at the expense of class size reduction.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution to fully fund the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

IDEA ensures that all children with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education. Prior to IDEA, 2 million children were excluded from receiving their right to a public education. Another 2.5 million children received an inadequate education.

IDEA has served as a civil rights initiative for our Nation's children for more than 22 years.

Fully funding this educational program is important to the millions of learning disabled students in our districts across the country. It is important to our communities that benefit from the achievement level of all these students.

IDEA is another example of how government support of an educational program provides the foundation for states and local educational agencies to work together. Funding this initiative for the sake of our children is important for the future success of our schools and communities.

In addition to fully funding IDEA, Congress should also better fund other educational programs that are seriously underfunded. For example, consider Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSI's).

We have charged these institutions with ensuring the academic success of the Hispanic students that are at their institutions. Similar to

IDEA, these institutions cannot fulfill their duty to the students and the community at large without adequate funding.

The funding of IDEA is critical along with the funding of all our education programs that aim to serve every child that has the right to fair, and equitable access to a quality education.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight one of the most important issues for our nation: educating our young people. Everyone agrees that a good education is critical for the future success of our children, and yet are not providing the financial resources that make this possible. This is especially true for the education of children with disabilities.

School districts are struggling with how to provide the best education possible for all children within often very tightly constrained budgets. I applaud their efforts. In many cases, however, school districts can not reduce class sizes, build needed schools, or hire new teachers while still providing the services so important to students with disabilities. In my home state of California, over 600,000 students receive special education and related services in public schools at a reported cost of \$3.4 billion. Without federal assistance, local school districts are forced to use their general funds to the detriment of other programs.

This is not to say that the IDEA hasn't been successful. It has. By providing children with disabilities with the same educational opportunities as their abled peers, we now have a system supporting happier and more productive adults. According to the Department of Education, disabled young people are three times more likely today to attend college than prior to 1975 and twice as many of today's twenty-year olds with disabilities are working. But we must do more to make sure there are more success stories than setbacks.

I applaud my friends on the other side of the aisle for bringing to the floor House Concurrent Resolution 84, which urges the Congress and the President to fully fund the federal Government's obligation under IDEA. This must be more than just words in a Resolution though. I call upon this Congress, this year, to fulfill its pledge for full funding of IDEA. It is time that the federal government make good on its obligation to the school districts and our children across the country.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 84, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 84.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

URGING CONGRESS AND PRESIDENT TO INCREASE FUNDING FOR PELL GRANTS

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 88) urging the Congress and the President to increase funding for the Pell Grant Program and existing Campus-Based Aid Programs.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 88

Whereas the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program, now known as the Pell Grant Program in honor of Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island, was first authorized in the 1972 amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965;

Whereas the Pell Grant Program has become the largest need-based Federal higher education scholarship program and is considered the foundation for all Federal student aid;

Whereas the purpose of the program is to assist students from low income families who would not otherwise be financially able to attend a postsecondary institution by providing grants to students to be used to pay the costs of attending the postsecondary institution of their choice;

Whereas in the late 1970's, the Pell Grant covered seventy-five percent of the average cost of attending a public four-year college; by the late 1990's, it only covered thirty-six percent of the cost of attending a public four-year college;

Whereas families across the country are concerned about the rising cost of a college education, and for children from low income families, the cost of college continues to be an overwhelming factor in their decision to forego a college education;

Whereas children from high income families are almost twice as likely to enroll in college as children from low income families;

Whereas higher education promotes economic opportunity for individuals and economic competitiveness for our Nation;

Whereas the Pell Grant and Campus-Based Aid Programs target aid to low income students as effectively as any programs administered by the Federal government; and

Whereas student borrowing to finance a postsecondary education has increased to an average indebtedness of \$9,700, and therefore increased grant aid is more important than ever: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress and the President, should, working within the constraints of the balanced budget agreement, make student scholarship aid the highest priority for higher education funding by increasing the maximum Pell Grant awarded to low income students by \$400 and increasing other existing campus-based aid programs that serve low-income students prior to authorizing or appropriating funds for any new education initiative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON).

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.