

to 3,468,000 metric tons in 1998, and they have been sold at dumped prices substantially below the cost to produce them. This has caused serious injury to the American steel industry and the loss of thousands of steel-worker jobs.

The suspension agreement will authorize Russia to continue to dump steel in America, which will continue to cause serious injury to our industry. The tons of unfairly traded steel that the Administration is going to allow Russia, at 750,000 metric tons per year, will still allow Russia to be the largest single supplier to the U.S. market. The pricing level given to the Russians of \$255 per metric ton will both allow continued dumping and allow inefficient Russian producers to undercut and damage efficient U.S. producers.

We have consistently requested the Administration to permit our laws to be enforced as Congress intended, but by entering this Agreement our rights have been taken away from us.

We regret this development and will work to convince the Administration that the proposed agreement is not in the best interest of the nation or our industry. We are also requesting Congress to have a prompt hearing about this matter. If the Administration proceeds with this agreement, we will take appropriate legal action.

Comprehensive steel agreement with Russia

We also oppose the comprehensive steel agreement negotiated with the Russians. We would support such an agreement only if it is a part of a global solution to the serious injury being caused by unfairly traded steel. Any agreement with Russia must be a part of an Administration initiated and supported \$201 action on all steel products which will result in global quantitative restrictions, minimum prices, an adequate enforcement mechanism, and a moratorium on further shipments until the inventory of dumped steel has been cleared.

While all the details of the Russian agreement are not available, we are disappointed that they will be permitted to ship at a rate well above the 1996 precrisis level.

We do have concern over the serious economic problems facing Russia, but to the extent the United States provides financial and other aid, surely we should do this in behalf of the United States from the Federal Treasury and not by sacrificing the jobs and property of a specific private industry sector such as our modern and world class American steel industry.

We will continue to work closely with the Administration and the Congress to stop the serious injury being caused to our industry and to restore fair trade in steel.

For Media Contact: Bethlehem Steel Corporation, Bette Kovach (610) 694-6308; U.S. Steel Group, USX Corporation, Tom Ferrall (412) 433-6899; Ispat/Inland Inc., John Nielsen (219) 399-6631; LTV Steel Company, Mark Tomasz (216) 622-4635; National Steel Corporation, Clarence Ehlers (219) 273-7327; Independent Steel Workers Union, Mark Glyptis (304) 748-8080; Weirton Steel, Greg Warren (304) 797-2828; Gulf States Steel, Inc., John Duncan (256) 543-6100; Ipsco Steel, Inc., Anne Parker (306) 924-7390; and Gallatin Steel, Ed Puisis (606) 567-3103.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

INTRODUCTION OF THE RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND OPPORTUNITIES ACT OF 1999

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

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce that I will introduce legislation to address a problem that is hurting much of rural America, a stagnant economy and the declining number of job opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, if we read the newspapers inside the Beltway, we will think that all Americans are experiencing the best economic times of their lives. While our economy is indeed strong, we have to realize that there is a significant number of Americans, rural Americans, who are struggling economically because the job base in their hometown is drying up.

According to a study by the Aspen Institute, many of our rural economies are suffering because of declining sales in their natural resources market and intense international competition in the manufacturing sector.

Just like many industries across the Nation, businesses in our small towns are being forced to downsize operations while demanding more from fewer employees. The growth in metropolitan areas is quickly absorbing displaced workers there, but workers in smaller, remote communities are at a great disadvantage because economic development is virtually stagnant. In fact, a growing number of rural workers are forced to commute long distances or actually relocate their families in order to find work in these metropolitan areas.

In the region around my home district, the Eighth District of North Carolina, the Charlotte area has more jobs than workers. Each day more than 100,000 commuters, 25 percent of the area's work force, leave their local economy to go to work in Charlotte. Obviously, this trend hurts our rural communities, and it adds to the many problems our metropolitan areas suffer with traffic congestion and excessive growth.

In the Charlotte area, the unemployment rate is a meager 2.3 percent. Just two counties to the east, however, Anson County has an unemployment rate of 8 percent, Scotland County 8 percent, and Richmond County over 8 percent. We can either address this problem, or we can sit idly by while it gets worse.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing the Rural Economic Development and Opportunities Act of 1999. What I am proposing is not a complex package of government programs and

new spending. Instead, I am advocating that we adopt a commonsense proposal that will level the playing field for our rural communities by offering a basic tax credit for a new or existing rural business when it creates a job for rural workers.

It is that simple. No mountains of paperwork to fill out, no layer upon layer of government bureaucracy to work through. Local governments and development authorities will have all the flexibility they need to develop a local or regional strategy. In fact, this is not a giveaway program that will allow rural communities to relax. That is a basic tax credit that gives our rural communities a better opportunity to increase local economic development and job opportunities.

When we measure our nation's economic health, we have to look just as closely at Main Street as we do at Wall Street. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to offer the Rural Economic Development and Opportunities Act of 1999. I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in supporting this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. WOLF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

INCREASED FUNDS FOR PELL GRANTS IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about a critical national issue, one that affects our national security, our future economic prosperity, and the position of the United States as a world leader. I speak, of course, about the education of our children and their ability to afford a college education.

Since the late 1970s, Federal grant assistance to students pursuing their education after high school has declined dramatically. One of the most significant measures of this decline is what has happened to the value of the Federal Pell Grant.

The Pell Grant program is the largest need-related Federal grant program for students pursuing a higher education. It is considered the foundation program for Federal student aid. It helps students from families of modest

income who would not otherwise be financially able to handle the costs of a college education or special career or technical training program.

Created in 1972, the Pell Grant originally provided significant financial support to students. In the 1976-1977 school year, the maximum Pell Grant award covered 35 percent of the average annual cost of attending a 4-year private institution, and 72 percent of the average cost of a 4-year public institution.

Today, Mr. Speaker, in spite of President Clinton's efforts over the past 3 years to boost the purchasing power of the Pell Grant, and the President deserves much credit for these efforts, but in spite of all of this, the maximum Pell Grant now pays for only one-third of the average cost of a public 4-year college, and barely one-seventh of the cost of a private college.

This sad state of affairs came about from cutbacks in Federal funding during a period of escalating college costs and tuition increases among most of the Nation's public and private colleges. I firmly believe that higher education institutions must rein in the cost of college tuition, but I am equally as firm in my belief that the Federal Government must and has to restore the value of the Federal Pell grant.

That is why I am proud to join with my colleagues, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) to introduce H.R. 959, the Affordable Education through Pell Grants Act of 1999.

This bill does one thing and one thing only: It raises the maximum Pell Grant award level to \$6,500 for the academic year 2000 to 2001. This simple action would restore the value of the Pell Grant as originally conceived. It is twice the amount of the maximum Pell Grant award proposed by President Clinton, and it is the level of funding where the Pell Grant is meant to be.

By raising the maximum award level to \$6,500, we restore the purchasing power of every Pell Grant awarded to financially needy students, and we increase the eligibility pool for Pell Grants. This has an important impact on middle-income families who face the financial burden of having more than one child in college at the same time.

Over the past 2 years, I have met many students from the Third Congressional District of Massachusetts who would not have gone to college, who would not have gone to the college of their choice, without the Federal Pell Grant program.

Bethany English, who has now graduated from Assumption College in Worcester, Massachusetts, has stood alongside me on presentations on the importance of Pell Grants. Jamie Hoag, from a working class family in Fall River, Massachusetts, was able to graduate from Holy Cross College in Worcester because he received a Pell Grant. It is for these young people, and all the students like them, that I urge my colleagues to restore the value of the Pell Grant.

I know many of my colleagues will say that we are asking for too much, that this is too expensive a proposition. Indeed, it will require about \$11 billion more than what is currently in the President's budget for Pell Grants.

But I would say to my colleagues that education must be the Nation's number one priority. The future of our economy rests on the higher education of our children, the future of our national security rests on the higher education of our children, and the future of our communities rests on the higher education of our children, all of our children.

If we can find money in the budget to build Star Wars, then we can find the money to make stars out of our children, and to make sure that everyone with the ability to go to college can afford to go to college. If we can give billion dollar corporations special tax breaks, then we can certainly make sure that every student who has the ability to go to college gets a financial break to pay for college. If we can spend billions of dollars each year to design new nuclear weapons and new ways to make nuclear war, then we can find the money we need to increase the funding for Pell Grants.

I say to my colleagues, this is an issue of national priorities and of national interest. I urge my colleagues to join the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) and I and cosponsor H.R. 959, and restore the power of the Pell Grant program.

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

(Mr. SHIMKUS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IN SUPPORT OF AN INCREASE IN THE FEDERAL PELL GRANT PROGRAM

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we are a rich and powerful Nation in the midst of strong economic growth. As we approach the 21st century, we must ask ourselves, what is our next greatest challenge? How will we target our investments to become stronger as a Nation and as a people?

I have always said, and I will continue to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is no greater challenge and nothing that is more important than the education of our next generation. We do not have a person to waste. Every student in this Nation who wants to go to college, no matter how rich or poor, should have the opportunity to go. Education is a great equalizer. A good education can shine the light of hope and opportunity in every corner of our Nation,

no matter how poor, how hopeless, or how downtrodden.

For nearly 30 years Pell Grants have been the key that have unlocked the American dream. For millions of American students who had the talent, had the desire, but lacked the funds, the Pell Grant made the difference between college and a dead end job.

In the last decade, the cost for college has increased at rates of 5 to 8 percent, outpacing inflation and putting a college education further out of reach for those who can least afford it. Until recently, the size of the maximum Pell Grant stayed the same.

Two years ago, many of my colleagues and I, along with the President, fought for and won the largest increase in the Pell Grant in 20 years. That brought the maximum Pell Grant up from \$2,700 to \$3,000.

Mr. Speaker, we can even do better. Today's Pell Grant provides only 35 percent of the average cost of a 4-year State college. Too few families today can afford to write a check for \$10,000 to cover tuition for State schools, and for so many families, private education is out of the question.

Mr. Speaker, I remember growing up in rural Alabama in the forties and fifties. My family could never have afforded the college tuition at Harvard, Yale, or even the University of Georgia. For so many of us, college was a distant dream, a pipe dream. Without the help of financial aid or work study, we could never have afforded to go to college.

We have come a long way in opening the doors of college for all Americans, but we can do better. We can do more. For this reason, I am joining my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) in sponsoring legislation that will raise the maximum authorized Pell Grant to a level that reflects the rising cost of college.

I ask all of my colleagues to join me and my colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), in making education a priority, and to ensure that in the days of economic prosperity, no one but no one is left out or left behind.

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

(Mr. GUTKNECHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1345

CONGRESS MUST DOUBLE PELL GRANT FUNDING

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join with the gentleman