

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.

Mr. Speaker, today we are considering H. Con. Res. 88, which sets forth specific priorities for higher education funding and proposes that we refrain from creating new education programs until we adequately fund these priorities.

The top funding priority for higher education is the Pell Grant Program, and the goal is to increase the maximum award to students from low-income families to \$3,525. This amount represents an increase of \$400 to the maximum Pell grant award and would be the largest increase since the inception of the program in 1972.

The resolution also recognizes the importance of providing increased funding for the existing campus-based student aid programs. These need-based programs provide financial aid administrators at colleges across the country with considerable flexibility in the packaging of financial aid awards that best meet the needs of their students.

The Pell Grant Program is one of the largest voucher programs in the country, and it is considered the foundation program for all Federal student aid. Students eligible for a Pell grant can use that money to attend one of almost 6,000 postsecondary institutions in the country.

The Pell Grant Program was created in 1972, and the goal of the program was simple. Congress wanted to assist students from low-income families who would not otherwise be financially able to attend a postsecondary institution.

In the first year of the program, 176,000 students received Pell grant awards. Funding Pell grants at the level set forth in the resolution would make more than 4 million students eligible for Pell grants next year, including an additional 21,000 students in my home State of California.

Ninety percent of the students who will receive a Pell grant come from families with incomes under \$30,000, and 54 percent of those students come from families with incomes under \$10,000. This is a program that simply continues to serve the vital purpose for which it was originally created.

This is not the first time that we have stated our support for making the Pell Grant Program the top funding priority for higher education. On June 26, 1997, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and I sent a letter to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) that began by saying, we greatly appreciate support for increased funding for the Pell Grant Program, and we believe it should be the top funding priority of all higher education programs.

I continue to believe that the Pell Grant Program should be the top higher education funding priority. I also think a \$400 increase to the maximum award is a very reasonable request.

For more than 7 years, the Pell grant maximum fluctuated between \$2,300

and \$2,400. However, after years of stagnant funding levels, the Committee on Appropriations has shown overwhelming support for the program during the past 3 years by increasing funding for the Pell Grant Program by more than \$2.7 billion. Had the administration not cut \$250 million from last year's appropriation level for the Pell Grant Program in order to fund its other priorities, we would be well on our way to our goal of a maximum award of \$3,525.

In addition to the Pell Grant Program, this resolution supports increased funding for the campus-based student aid programs. While Pell grants open the door to postsecondary education for many students from low-income families, it is the campus-based programs that provide these same students some degree of choice in selecting a postsecondary institution.

After years of double-digit increases in the cost of a college education, the maximum Pell grant no longer covers a large percentage of the cost of attendance at most public 4-year institutions in the country. However, a Pell grant, coupled with awards from the campus-based program, goes a long way in reducing the amount a student needs to borrow in student loans in order to pay the bills for tuition and room and board.

In closing, I want to address some of the objections I have heard with respect to this resolution. We all know the budget caps are tight, and the Committee on Appropriations will have a difficult time in making funding decisions, but that simply supports getting our priorities on record.

I have copies of testimony submitted to the subcommittee of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) from various higher education organizations, and each one identifies certain funding priorities important to the particular organization. However, there are two consistent messages. The first is strong support for a \$400 increase to the maximum Pell grant. The second is strong support for funding proven education programs, rather than creating new ones that take money away from the existing programs.

Finally, do not misread this resolution. It does not say only fund Pell in the campus-based programs. It does not say that we should cut the class size teacher program. Unlike the President's budget that cuts several existing programs, including the Pell appropriation, impact aid, the Title VI block grant and others, this resolution does not propose cuts to existing programs.

□ 1515

This resolution simply establishes funding priorities for higher education. We have many higher education programs that have been in existence a long time and serve students well, such as the TRIO programs, Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need, Institutional Aid programs under Title III, and many others. We reauthorized

these programs last year, and we support their continued funding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the following associations and organizations that have given their support for this resolution, including the American Association of Community Colleges, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the United States Student Association, the Career College Association, the American Council on Education, the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, the U.S. Public Interest Research Group, the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, the Coalition of Higher Education Organizations, the Association of American Universities, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, and finally, the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution and the higher education funding priorities it establishes for the Congress and the President.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise reluctantly today in opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 88.

I want to be very clear that I do support the priority for Pell Grant and campus-based student aid programs. However, specifically, I oppose the last 12 words of this resolution, which I believe are not only unnecessary to the intent of the resolution, but have the potential to tie the hands of Congress in our ability to help the children of this country.

Were we not considering this resolution under a suspension of the rules, I would have offered an amendment to strike those 12 words, as I did during the committee markup, which would allow, if we did strike those 12 words, it would allow myself and I daresay all of my colleagues on this side of the aisle to lend wholehearted support to this resolution. Members may get support from some of the Members on our side because those Members would not want to be on record as seeming to vote against Pell Grants, but they would not get their unconditional support.

I would stress that my colleagues and I are not opposed to establishing the Pell Grant and campus-based student aid programs as a funding priority. On the contrary, over the past years we have always supported Pell Grants and the increase in Pell Grants and campus-based student aid programs.

As a matter of fact, on the other side of the aisle, until recently they did not. But we, as a matter of fact, are delighted to see that our colleagues on that side are taking so much of an interest in these programs that have provided millions of low-income students with an opportunity to pursue higher education.

On this side of the aisle, we have always believed that providing an opportunity to less fortunate people of our country is a paramount responsibility of the government. The Pell Grant program has provided millions of low-income students with the opportunity to pursue their higher education dreams and goals.

Moreover, I firmly believe that my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), the sponsor of this resolution, is sincere in his desire to expand opportunity to millions of other struggling students. I sincerely regret that I cannot join him in supporting this resolution.

As I stated, my concern surrounding the resolution are the last 12 words, which call for the funding of Pell Grants and campus-based aid programs, and I quote, "prior to authorizing or appropriating funds for any new education initiative."

Earlier, my colleague said that it does not cut other programs, but it does prevent other programs from being funded. Although I understand and agree with my colleague and his desire to fund existing programs that work before we create and fund new programs, I am concerned that the language in this resolution is ambiguous and may tie our hands and our ability to help the children of our country.

The problem, as I see it, is that House Concurrent Resolution 88 fails to define the term "new education initiative," and leaves open the question of how it might affect the future work of this Congress.

For instance, is the class size reduction initiative, which, although currently authorized for only 1 year, is in full swing in many of the States, is that a new program? Is the Reading Excellence Act which was just passed last year a new program?

Also created last year was Gear Up, a program that, like Pell and the campus-based aid programs, would allow millions of low-income students to attend college. Will it be considered a new program?

If in the course of reauthorizing ESEA we decide to consolidate several existing professional development programs into a larger, more effective professional development initiative, will it be considered a new program and therefore go unfunded?

If we develop a program to address school violence like that which took place in Littleton, Colorado, will it be considered a new program and be denied funding?

To avoid these pitfalls, during committee mark-up I mentioned that the Senate is currently considering a similar resolution which has bipartisan support, and I offered that as a substitute to this resolution.

Like House Concurrent Resolution 88, the resolution currently being considered by the Senate acknowledges the importance of Pell and campus-based student aid programs, and urges the Congress and the President to

make them a funding priority. However, the Senate resolution refrains from bolstering students' aid at the possible expense of other programs. Senate Concurrent Resolution 828 is identical to this resolution except that it does not contain those last 12 words.

The language in the Senate resolution would have allowed us to recognize Pell and campus-based aid as educational priorities without denying the importance of existing programs or the potential importance of programs that may come out of the reauthorization of ESEA.

I regret that I did not have the opportunity to offer that amendment here today. I regret that, as a result of that, I will not be able to support this resolution.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to express strong support for the House Concurrent Resolution 88 urging both the President and Congress to increase Pell Grants for low-income students, and I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), the sponsor of this measure, for bringing it to the floor at this time.

Because the Pell Grant is basis for all Federal student aid, and the amount of aid needed to cover the ever-rising cost of higher education is increasing, it is imperative we make students' scholarship aid a high priority.

In the ever-increasing global market, our Nation must make sure that it maintains its leading role. Therefore, now more than ever we must guarantee that our students are well-prepared to compete against their counterparts from all over the world. Education is the only way that we can ensure a strong future for America's children, and increasing Pell Grant awards is one way we can begin to achieve that goal.

Accordingly, I urge our colleagues to fully support this measure.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of both of these resolutions. Unfortunately, I was detained and was not able to come over and speak on behalf of the full funding for IDEA.

But first let me say, on the Pell Grants, I strongly support increasing the Pell Grant program. As outlined by a couple of the speakers already, clearly as the cost of college continues to accelerate, we find that we are covering a much smaller percentage of that with the existing Pell Grants than we had previously. Previously we cov-

ered about 72 percent of the average costs. Now we are in the position of covering about 34 percent of that.

As a result of that, many young students from low-income families who have worked very hard in high school to get the grades in order to do the work required and to be accepted to college find out that economics now stand in the way of them achieving that education.

We should not allow that to happen, because we obviously have an economy that needs the contributions of all of these young people to our economic system. For that reason, I join the bipartisan support for the increase in the Pell Grant.

I am concerned, as the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) pointed out, exactly the meaning of those words at the end of the legislation, because we know that there is a great deal of concern that this would take precedence over the class size reduction money, since that in fact is not an authorized program and needs authorization. And if it were to take place after the passage of this resolution, would that knock it out of the box?

We know that class size reduction, as we just found out last week with the Tennessee study, is starting to have some important positive impacts on young people, when coupled with qualified teachers. So I think the concern is quite proper that the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) has raised about that. But since I think we will get a second shot at that in our authorizations, I am prepared to support the full funding.

On the question of the IDEA funding, I am deeply concerned about the suggestion that to be for full funding of education for individuals with disabilities, that therefore somehow we have to cut other worthy programs in the education field, because we know that it sets up a false choice between programs like Head Start or America Reads, all of which work to help kids become school-ready, to help them become ready to read and to participate in schools.

While fully supporting the idea of full funding for IDEA, I wish that the Republicans had not tried to set it up so they could chase away Democratic sponsors of this legislation by suggesting that it has to be done by cutting these other programs.

When we look at the Republican budget that cuts about \$1.2 billion below a freeze compared to 1999 in the education field, if we were to fully fund this, we would be talking about a 40 percent cut below the President's education request to fully fund IDEA.

It is interesting to note that the Committee on the Budget, when full funding of IDEA was offered, they voted in lockstep against it, and again in the Committee on Rules would not allow that amendment to be put into consideration, where we could have provided offsets or what have you within the budget resolution.

So I am not sure that this resolution is exactly as it should be, but the fact is we should support the continued increase in appropriations of IDEA funds.

Finally, let me say that time and again it is suggested that somehow the Federal Government is shirking its responsibility when it does not provide all of the funding for IDEA. When we passed that legislation, Republicans and Democrats said that the goal was to provide some 40 percent of the excess costs of providing education for individuals with disabilities.

It continues to remain a goal. It is a goal that we have made great advancements on in the last couple of years. We ought to continue to go after it. But it is not a question of an unfunded Federal mandate. The fact is that this is there because of the United States Constitution.

If we were to repeal IDEA, every State and local education authority would still have the obligation under the Constitution of the United States to educate these children in a free and appropriate education. They could end up picking up 100 percent of the cost.

The Federal Government is trying to do the best it can to help districts with the cost of these educations, but the belief somehow is that this is our duty alone, and in fact the legislation passed last year would allow, unfortunately, schools to withdraw support for IDEA if we hit a Federal threshold, so the same schools who are saying they do not have enough money find out they can in fact withdraw support for this effort.

I think the intent of these resolutions is good and is proper, and both of these programs need increases in funding. The Pell Grant needs an increase in the maximum grant. But I am concerned about some of the nuances that are suggested in these resolutions.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his support of the resolution. For the record, the President's budget for the year 2000 for education is \$65.28 billion. Our budget for the year is \$66.35 billion, \$1.1 billion more than the President's.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), chairman of the full committee.

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

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

There was a time when Pell Grants covered 75 percent of a college education. We are now down to about 36 percent. The good news is, however, we did get a \$2.7 billion increase in the last 3 years, so we have billions of dollars available in student aid from the Federal Government to State governments and institutions of higher education, and children from high-income families continue to enroll in college

at almost twice the rate of children from low-income families.

For many of the students from low-income families, the cost of college is the overwhelming factor in their decision to forego a college education. In 1997 we supported the enactment of tax credits related to post-secondary education for middle- and upper-income families. At the same time, we voiced strong concern about the need to continue making substantial commitments to the Pell Grant program in order to assist those students from low-income families who would not receive any benefits from the new tax credit.

I mention that because I want to mention now the most unbelievable thing that I think I have heard in my entire time in the Congress. Prior to our mark-up of this resolution in committee last week, a Department of Education official told the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services of the Committee on Appropriations that a \$400 increase to the Pell maximum would not help low-income students all that much, since they would lose their tuition tax breaks.

I want to repeat that, because I know everybody listening will be smart enough, I will not even have to explain how ridiculous it is.

□ 1530

But what he said was that a \$400 increase to the Pell maximum would not help low-income students all that much since they would lose their tuition tax breaks.

I can only assume that the administration has forgotten the debate over tax credits and the testimony of college officials and students who all agree that up-front cash assistance such as the Pell Grant program is the most effective form of aid for increasing access to college.

Now, I would also remind that gentleman, and he should not need to be reminded, retroactive tax credits are great for those who have enough money to enroll in college in the first place. But I am sure if he would just look at his statistics, he would discover that 54 percent of the families receiving Pell Grants have incomes under \$10,000. What tax credits are they waiting for? What tax credits are they expected to get? Of course, they do not get any. How silly the man could ever make a statement of that nature.

The resolution also expresses support for campus-based student aid programs.

These need-based programs help students pay the bills that are not covered by a \$3,000 Pell Grant.

The campus-based student aid programs require institutions to provide matching funds in order to receive funds from the Federal government. The \$1.5 billion devoted to the campus-based programs last year leveraged almost \$400 million in additional aid to college students across the country.

The Higher Education Amendments of 1998 enacted last fall, streamlined the operation of

all these programs in order to make them more effective. More importantly, the formula under which funds are distributed was modified. Under the new formula, any new money provided for the campus-based programs goes to institutions of higher education that serve large populations of students from low-income families who are most in need of financial assistance.

These are fundamentally sound programs that have served our nation's college students well for the past three decades and we should consider them a higher education funding priority.

This resolution does not propose cutting any programs. It does not say that we should not fund other education programs that work. It does not pit one program against another. It simply says that our highest priorities for higher education funding should be the Pell Grant Program and the campus-based aid programs, which have a proven record of success.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), a really strong advocate of education.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) for yielding me this time. I rise to support the intent of the legislation, not particularly the accomplishment of the legislation.

Certainly, the "whereas" clauses in this Pell Grant concurrent resolution are very, very strong and language that I agree with, particularly the fact that in the language we talk about being concerned that the impact and the help of the Pell Grant has been sliced in half from the 1970s.

We have gone from providing through a Pell Grant about 76 percent of the cost of education; in the 1990s now, the impact of the Pell grant is about 36 percent of the cost of a 4-year public college. That is slashing in half the impact and the help of the Pell Grant, and we need to do something about that.

I sat on an airline just this past week with a young gentleman from Indiana who was trying to select between Cornell in New York and DePaul in Indiana. The entire rationale for his decision was going to be resting on one part of the economics of a decision between Cornell and DePaul, and that was the financial aid: what Pell Grant, Stafford loan, work study programs could be put together.

So families and students are very concerned about education. But what we need to do, Mr. Speaker, as we show our concern about the declining impact and help of the Pell Grant, is to come up with a piece of legislation, a bill that funds it.

This is a concurrent resolution. It is not signed by the President. It is not an appropriation bill that takes a penny out of the Treasury. It simply conveys the intent of Congress that we would like to see some more money put toward Pell Grant. I think everybody on our side would like to do that. I am sure everybody on the Republican side would like to do that.

But what we need are not unfunded mandates, not unfunded resolutions, but bipartisan solutions to this problem.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) for his support of our intent.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BARRETT), a member of the committee.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 88. This resolution proposes our funding priority should first include programs that work, and Pell Grants do work. We are talking about a program of more than a 25-year track record of success. Pell Grants have offered millions of students the opportunity to pursue a higher education. While opening that door, they help narrow the gap between the rich and the poor and help alleviate the debt burden from young people just starting out in their careers.

Students awarded Pell Grants are among the neediest, and probably would not have attended college without this financial assistance. For example, in the 1995-1996 school year, 54 percent of Pell Grant recipients came from families with incomes of less than \$10,000.

We all know that students from middle and high-income families are more likely to attend college, and one reason is that those parents can at least help finance the costs. Students from low-income families do not have that safety net, and Pell Grants help fill that void. At the current level, a Pell Grant on average only covers 36 percent of the cost of college, compared to 77 percent in the 1970s.

The Federal Government also helps students with loans, and thousands of both low and middle-income students finish college each year with loans to pay off. In fact, the average student graduates with more than \$9,000 in debt. But low-income students, who have had to finance nearly everything, can face particularly steep debt.

This problem is amplified when considering that often these students choose lower paying but very important jobs like teaching or social work. In these situations, students may be faced with years and years of debt payments. We can lower that hurdle to higher education by not only continuing our strong support for the Pell Grant program, but by also increasing the minimum Pell Grant level.

The current maximum for Pell Grants is \$3,125. This resolution suggests a modest \$400 increase. The resolution also proposes increasing, within the context of our balanced budget agreement, other aid programs that serve low-income students. Those programs include work study, Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants, and Perkins Loans. Pell Grants, these programs work, and they could be put to much broader use if the funding is

increased, and we should aim toward that goal before jumping into new untested education initiatives.

This resolution does not say that we should not fund other higher education programs, and it does not pit one group of students against another. It simply says that the Pell Grant program has worked well, and that by making Pell Grants a priority, we are indeed making education a priority and strengthening our commitment to helping low-income students achieve their potential.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 88.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the beautiful State of Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

(Mrs. MINK of Hawaii asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, we have heard previous to this debate a long dissertation about the Federal obligation to fund IDEA. While there is disagreement in terms of how that responsibility has fallen upon the Federal Government, most of us agree that funding for IDEA should be increased.

Now we are discussing another concurrent resolution which has to do with Pell Grants. This I believe is a time when the majority must listen to what they were saying when they debated IDEA.

The authorization language which comes from this august committee calls for a basic funding of Pell Grants. That ought to be interpreted as an obligation which this Congress and this Federal Government is according based upon very severe eligibility standards. Much as we do Medicare, we have eligibility standards and then we decide how much funding that individual should get for Medicare, for hospitalization, for doctor's care, and so forth.

It seems to me that if we are really true to what we are saying on this floor with regard to the importance of funding low-income students, giving them the best opportunity to have a higher education, this Congress ought to fund the complete amount that we authorize for Pell Grants. That is the only way we are going to meet our fundamental responsibility. Let us not talk about just \$400 beyond what was authorized or appropriated last year. We ought to go for the entire amount.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which I ask all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to cosponsor with me, and that is to make the Pell Grant program an entitlement. Young people ought to know with great assurance that if they meet the criteria for a Pell Grant to go on to higher education, that this Congress is willing to fund it.

So I have created a program which makes it a responsibility for this Congress, for this Federal Government, to treat this program as an entitlement. Every young person ought to have that right to continue on to higher education

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of increasing funding for Pell Grants.

There is nothing better we can do for this nation than to improve education, and ensure that all children in all communities across this nation have access to higher education.

Pell Grants were created to provide this access for low-income families. The Pell Grant Program was created in 1972 to assist students from low-income families in obtaining a postsecondary education by meeting at least 75% of a student's cost of attendance. Unfortunately, Congress is not living up to its promise.

In real dollars, the appropriated maximum individual grant, adjusted for inflation, has decreased 4.7% between 1980 and 1998. Considering the exorbitant increases in college costs, the Pell Grant has covered less and less of a student's cost of attendance. In just the last 10 years, total costs at public colleges have increased by 23% and at private colleges by 36%. According to the General Accounting Office, this means that over the last 15 years, tuition at a public 4-year college or university has nearly doubled as a percentage of median household income. All students suffer as a result of these increases; however students from low-income families suffer the most.

The resolution before us calls for an increase of \$400 in the maximum Pell Grant awarded to students from low-income families.

Although it is important to raise the maximum Pell Grant awarded, it does not go far enough. We need to guarantee that eligible students are entitled to the maximum amount under the Pell Grant Program. Today, I have introduced legislation that does just that.

My bill will create a contractual obligation on the United States to reimburse institutions that award Pell Grants to its eligible students in the full amount they are entitled to. Simply put, my bill guarantees that an eligible student will receive the maximum award amount she is entitled to. By guaranteeing that eligible students will receive the maximum amount, this bill will make it easier for students from low-income families to get a higher education.

I urge my colleagues to do more than support this resolution, which merely requests a \$400 increase in the maximum award allowed. I urge my colleagues to support my legislation which guarantees that eligible students are entitled to the maximum amount authorized under the Pell Grant Program.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), subcommittee chair of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, American students I think are confused about the President's student aid priorities.

On Election Day in 1996 they heard the President proclaim, and I will quote, "I am proud that we have got the biggest increase in Pell Grants in 20 years, but we must do more. I want to open the doors of college to all Americans; and if you give me 4 more years, that is exactly what I intend to do."

That was in Lexington, Kentucky. He said the same thing in Cleveland, Santa Barbara, Green Bay, New Orleans, St. Louis, and the Democratic Convention in Chicago.

Many students also heard this ad, run by the President's campaign, and I will quote, "As a Latino and a student, I know the value of education." The ad read in Spanish. "Under President Clinton, Pell Grants and scholarships were increased. President Clinton wants us to have more opportunities to improve our quality of life. That is why, on November 5, I am going to vote for President Clinton."

Well, Mr. Speaker, on November 5, that is exactly what a lot of students did. But now the President is singing a different tune. The President is proposing cutting Pell Grant funding by 3 percent; he proposes cutting Perkins Loans by eliminating an adjustment for inflation; and he proposes cutting student loans by \$2 billion in favor of a program that makes the Department of Education the country's largest bank, a loan program that is 30 percent more expensive than the private sector program, and that is the program that most universities say that they do not want.

Mr. Speaker, students are confused about the President's student aid priorities, so let us be crystal clear about ours. This resolution sends a clear message that we are serious about funding programs that have been proven to work.

I went to college myself on a program that is now known as the Perkins Loan, and I can tell my colleagues firsthand that these programs do work. But if my colleagues no longer believe that these programs should be our highest priority, then vote "no" on this resolution. But do not blame students for being confused about where we stand on these student aid priorities.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am shocked, but pleasantly shocked, pleasantly shocked to hear the other side of the aisle finally stepping up to the plate and saying that rather than shut down the Department of Education, they understand that there is a Federal commitment to do something to raise the level and to raise the bar.

I was listening to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) speak about making Pell Grants an entitlement, and I thought maybe we would need some armed guards over here to stop all of our friends and colleagues from the other side rushing over and signing onto that legislation as cosponsors. But I trust that really will not be a problem.

In fact, I asked some members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce who have been there for quite some time to search back in their historical perspective to see if there ever was an occasion when the current majority proposed more money for Pell Grants, to raise the authorization for Pell Grants, that the Democrats were not first in line to be there and do that. They could remember none.

In fact, I searched for the one bill that has been filed that would, in fact, raise the authorization for Pell Grants to make them worth what they used to be worth when this program was originally adopted, and that is H.R. 959. There were 62 sponsors and cosponsors on that bill, not one Member of the majority party.

So here we are today talking about a resolution. It is Teacher Appreciation Week. All things education are apparently on schedule for all of us. But when the dollar has to stop and the buck has to stop here, Mr. Speaker, let us see how many people on the other side are willing to actually come forward with the money by raising the appropriation level and by raising the authorization level to make Pell Grants really what they should be worth.

Again, I think we are faced here with a potential in this language for pitting program against program. The other side says that is not the case, and we hope it is so. And we are probably all going to vote for this because we want the strong message to continue as we have continuously put it forward, that we need to pay for Pell Grants because that is the best way to fund higher education. We need to raise funds for work study programs. We need to make the interest rates as low as possible for anybody that does have to take a loan.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have to stop making resolutions and feel-good pieces of legislation, move on to bills and acts that actually put our money where our mouth is, and make things happen. We stand ready to do that.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), a member of the committee.

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

I have a personal interest in this. The previous speaker wondered why Republicans are supporting this bill, and I can certainly tell him why this Republican is.

□ 1545

When I wanted to go to college, my parents, who were low-income, regrettably told me that they simply did not have the money to support me. They would do what they could, but it was not much, and I would have to earn my own way.

I was not sure I would go to college but, fortunately, I was able to get summer employment in high school and save up enough money for the first year, and so I went off to college. I worked my way through, every cent, every inch of the way. I worked over 25 hours a week during the school year. I worked over 60 hours a week during the summers in order to put myself through college.

I am not saying this to brag, but I simply point out that students cannot

do that today, even if they worked 40 hours a week. The costs have gone up too much. I paid \$188 a semester for tuition. Today, it is many, many times that.

I am very intimately aware of the concerns and the problems that students have, and I have a special acquaintance with these problems because after going to college I went to graduate school, got a doctorate, and I taught at the University of California for some time and at Calvin College. So I have had experience in both the public and the private sector.

Higher education is expensive, and I am very thankful that the Federal Government has established student loan programs and Pell grants which allows every student today to achieve a college education. We have fallen behind in the amount of money available, particularly for lower income students.

I strongly support this resolution, and I ask this House to support it so that our students, no matter what the income level of the family, are able to go to colleges and universities, achieve a higher education and thereby improve their earning potential throughout their lives, as well as their appreciation of life and all that comes with education.

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of both resolutions we are considering today, both which urge this Congress and the President to fully fund IDEA and the Pell grant Programs before funding any new program.

As a supporter of both these programs, I understand that IDEA provides an education for many American children who would otherwise be denied an education, and the Pell grant has enabled millions of Americans, including my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), to attend college. However, Mr. Speaker, these nonbinding resolutions will not make a dent, really, even with all the flowery and wonderful rhetoric we have heard from both sides today. For we are merely expressing our wishes, merely talking about the problem, but not acting.

I can assure my colleagues that if Democrats were in control of this Chamber, not only would we be talking today, we would be preparing to act. In fact, if we were serious about education, we would probably think about funding the class size reduction program of the President and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

As the chairman of the full committee and the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) both know, in Tennessee, where I am from, a study was just completed to show that small classes in grades K through 3 continue to outperform students in larger classes right through high school graduation.

I know my dear friend, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BARRETT), knows and strongly believes, as I do, that we should support programs that work. This program works.

In addition, our schools are in dire need of modernization. It has been shown that this Federal Government can contribute money to build new prisons and build new roads and build new highways. We have to find the capacity and the courage to build new schools.

Let us stop being the suspension bill and resolution Congress. I say to the other side, let us go to work and do the job the American people pay us \$136,500 a year to do. Resolutions, expressing our wishes will not do it. It is time to act. This Congress has failed that test, and we are failing American children in the process.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER), one of our great Members.

(Mr. GARY MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues who is most impacted by the shrinking power of Pell grants: community colleges, junior colleges and the students they serve.

In California, our community college system has 106 campuses, 71 districts and serves 1.5 million students. That is the largest system in the country, dedicated to serving students with incomes below those students who attend our large University of California and California State University systems. They are the ones on the margin who are most impacted by any fee increase or any loss in buying power from the Pell grant.

The Pell grant was created to serve as the foundation of need-based student aid, and it is the single most important program for low-income students served by community colleges.

More and more students are benefiting from Pell grants. In 1973, 176,000 students received Pell grants. Under this resolution, almost 4 million students will receive a Pell grant next year.

Unfortunately, its purchase power has declined by 25 percent over the past 20 years. The President's last budget actually cut current appropriation levels by \$250 million in order to fund his new education programs. The most disturbing part is that if the President did not propose cutting the actual appropriations, we would already be funding a \$3,325 grant.

Maybe it is the nature of politics to loudly speak in favor of a program when it is new but then take money from it when it is not so new anymore to get credit for creating a new program.

All this resolution does is say that we will appropriately fund the programs that work, instead of taking money from them to create new pro-

grams. This resolution does not propose cutting any other program. Unlike the President's budget, we do not propose to cut the Pell grant Program appropriation, Impact Aid, Title VI block grants, or the other programs that are clearly not priorities of the President.

It does not say we should not fund other education programs that do work. It does not aim to pit one group against another. It simply says our highest priority for higher education funding should be the Pell Grant and Campus-Based Aid Programs, which have a proven success record.

If my colleagues do not believe that the Pell grant and Campus-Based Aid Programs work and should be our highest priority, then I urge them to vote "no" on this resolution. But I would urge my colleagues to support this program. It supports those low-income students who mostly need our help.

I urge my colleagues to: support existing programs before rushing to fund a new fad; support those lower income students who benefit from the Pell Grant Program, and support community colleges and colleges in your communities.

I urge my colleagues to support this common sense resolution.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I just want to say we are not worried about pitting Pell grants and Campus-Based Student Aid against other programs that have long been in existence and have long proven themselves to be worthy of funding. That is not the question. The question is, are we going to tie our hands so that if there is an innovative new program, in order to deal with school violence, such as the school violence that happened in Littleton, Colorado, are we then going to tie our hands and say we cannot fund a program, no matter how great it may look or how much good we feel it can do because we have tied ourselves to this resolution?

Now, I say that, but I am not really that concerned about it, because this is a resolution that carries no impact in law. In fact, I think I will vote for S.28, if it will ever get over here, but it will not get over here.

I will support Pell grants. My decision to not vote for this bill does not mean I do not support Pell grants. What it does mean is that I do not believe in the idea of cutting ourselves from any program that might have a tremendous impact on some aspect of education just because we say that we are feeling that Pell grants should be of the highest priority. We can say that without doing this.

So I will continue to not support this resolution. As I say, I will not vote against it, but I will not vote for it. I will reserve my right to be in strong support of Pell grants through other methods. And I will especially wait for the authorizing bill, in which I will vote, if that authorizing bill increases Pell grants.

This is not an authorizing bill, and it does not carry any weight in law.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF).

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor our Nation's teachers. I would like to thank them for their dedication and inspiration.

I was a public school teacher for 30 years, so I understand the importance of a good education and the foundation it builds for our youth. American students, parents and teachers must maintain the highest level of quality in education.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

A lot of the debate today, Mr. Speaker, has focused on Pell grants, but I also want to point out this does cover the Campus-Based Aid Programs which provide institutions with Federal support for grants, loans, and work-study programs. These require matching funds from the schools. It gives the schools greater flexibility to keep those in school that have the greatest need. And with requiring the matching funds, it is a multiplier and brings more money to the table to help those students that need it the most.

There has also been some talk about the fact that this is a resolution and does not really carry the weight of law. It does state and it does show how we have performed the last 5 years. Since we have had the majority, we have increased Pell grants every year. It indicates our high priority for the Pell grants and campus-based programs and the fact that we continue to want them to be the highest priority of higher education.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of significant increased funding for Pell Grants and Campus-Based Aid programs.

Coming from south Texas, I know the dire need for Pell Grants. By providing resources for our students, we create real opportunity for them to attain higher education.

The Pell Grant program is the largest need-based Federal grant program for students pursuing higher education. I know that in San Antonio, this program is the foundation for student aid. Pell Grants help our students from families of modest income who could not otherwise afford a college education.

I support the resolution but would like to express my strong reservations about the wording. This resolution is another example of how Republicans are purporting to be education friendly when they are not. Just like a wolf in sheep's clothing there is a face behind this resolution.

The language in this resolution essentially says that any new programs we come up with would have to take a backseat to Pell Grant increases.

To make demands on what programs should take precedence at this time, is unrealistic and removed from the approach we should be taking on the funding of our education programs. For example, what if a new program is introduced later on this year that will seriously address the needs of our youth and the issue of violence? Does this program automatically get a back seat simply because it is a "new" program under this resolution?

Yes, we should fund Pell Grants but we should also look at the bigger picture and realize that there may be other "new" programs that have been introduced that will be equally as important and help with the early development of our students in the K-12 grades.

Higher education is a priority and what better way than through increases in Pell Grants. However, we should also make sure that we are doing what we can to strength the foundation of our elementary and secondary education system.

If our Republican colleagues are serious about the Pell Grant program I encourage them to support H.R. 959, the Affordable Education through Pell Grants Act. The legislation will raise the maximum Pell Grant award level to \$6,500 for the academic year 2000 to 2001, bringing it to funding where the Pell Grant is meant to be.

If Republicans want to put their money where their mouth is, I would ask that they also support H.R. 959.

Education is our number one priority. The future of our economy, and our communities rests our ability to increase access to higher education but to also ensure our students can get from point A to point B.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, it's a great revelation to see that our colleagues on your side of the aisle have come to realize the importance of increased support for student aid programs which assist low income students. I am especially pleased that, after numerous efforts to slash funding for education programs, Republicans now see the light. My hope is that they will continue moving in that direction and realize that increased funding for education across the board is essential to increase educational opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, I support a substantial increase for Pell funding. In fact, in the last Congress I introduced legislation to make Pell Grant funding mandatory spending, just like the loan programs.

However, I am concerned that the way H. Con. Res. 88 is written, could be interpreted to pit one group of education programs against another. If adopted and adhered to by the appropriators, it would rob Peter to pay Paul.

The record of House Democrats' support for increased aid to needy college students is clear. House Democrats have been in the forefront in advocating increased funding for student aid programs without short-changing or reducing spending for other programs. Since 1996, Democrats, in conjunction with the President, have been responsible for adding nearly \$8 billion more for education than was in bills supported by House Republicans. With respect to Pell Grants, since 1996 the President requested, and House Democrats supported, an increase of \$3.4 billion, while House Republicans advocated 62% less.

Today, we are being asked to vote for a resolution that would aid freshmen at the expense of first graders. We believe that is an unwise, inappropriate choice.

During the committee markup my colleagues and I offered amendments to H. Con. Res. 88 designed to increase Pell Grants without jeopardizing other worthy programs. The language we offered was the same language adopted in the Senate on a bipartisan basis. The Senate resolution calls for increased Pell Grants, without pitting one education program against another. Unfortunately, we are not successful in these efforts.

We should go on record for increasing our overall investment in education, instead of robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to explain why I oppose H. Con. Res. 88, which expresses the sense of the Congress that funding for the Pell Grant Program should be increased by \$400 per grant and calls on Congress to increase funding for other existing education programs prior to authorizing or appropriating funds for new programs. While I certainly do oppose creating any new federal education programs, I also oppose increasing funds for any programs, regardless of whether or not the spending is within the constraints of the so-called balanced budget agreement. Mr. Speaker, instead of increasing unconstitutional federal spending, Congress should empower the American people to devote more of their own resources to higher education by cutting their taxes. Cutting taxes, not increasing federal spending, should be Congress' highest priority.

By taxing all Americans in order to provide limited aid to a few, federal higher education programs provide the federal government with considerable power to allocate access to higher education. Government aid also destroys any incentives for recipients of the aid to consider price when choosing a college. The result is a destruction of the price control mechanism inherent in the market, leading to ever-rising tuition. This makes higher education less affordable for millions of middle-class Americans who are ineligible for Pell Grants!

Federal funding of higher education also leads to federal control of many aspects of higher education. Federal control inevitably accompanies federal funding because politicians cannot resist imposing their preferred solutions for perceived "problems" on institutions beholden to taxpayer dollars. The prophetic soundness of those who spoke out against the creation of federal higher education programs in the 1960s because they would lead to federal control of higher education is demonstrated by examining today's higher educational system. College and universities are so fearful of losing federal aid they allow their policies on everything from composition of the student body to campus crime to be dictated by the Federal Government. Clearly, federal funding is being abused as an excuse to tighten the federal noose around both higher and elementary education.

Instead of increasing federal expenditures, Mr. Speaker, this Congress should respond to the American people's demand for increased support of higher education by working to pass bills giving Americans tax relief. For example, Congress should pass H.R. 1188, a bill I am cosponsoring which provides a tax deduction of up to \$20,000 for the payment of college tuition. I am also cosponsoring several pieces of legislation to enhance the tax benefit for education savings accounts and pre-paid tuition plans to make it easier for parents to

save for their children's education. Although the various plans I have supported differ in detail, they all share one crucial element. Each allows individuals the freedom to spend their own money on higher education rather than forcing taxpayers to rely on Washington to return to them some percentage of their own tax dollars to spend as bureaucrats see fit.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to reject H. Con. Res. 88 and any other attempt to increase spending on federal programs. Instead, my colleagues should join me in working to put the American people in control of higher education by cutting taxes and thus allowing them to use more of their resources for higher education.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, today, I come before the House to ask, "have the Republicans done a U-turn?"

Their education record includes: opposing education funding increases; passing a year 2000 budget \$2.9 billion short of the President's education proposal; and advocating for the abolishment of the Department of Education.

Again, I ask, "is this resolution a Republican U-turn?"

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there has been no U-turn. The Republican course is straight and does not lead to a true endorsement of education.

I support Pell Grant increases. However, without language to state otherwise, I am left to surmise that this resolution may endanger initiatives to reduce class size, hire more teachers, and modernize schools.

Let's set a better course and invest at every level of our children's education—preschool through postsecondary.

Let's stand up for all worthwhile education initiatives!

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 88.

The question was taken.

Mr. McKEON. 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. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 88.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE IN SUPPORT OF AMERICA'S TEACHERS

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 157) expressing the