

active acceptance, not necessarily with resignation. This is not a coercive process.”

I agree with President Bush that “it takes a special kind of depravity to exploit and hurt the most vulnerable members of society. Human traffickers rob children of their innocence; they expose them to the worst of life before they have seen much of life. Traffickers tear families apart. They treat their victims as nothing more than goods and commodities for sale to the highest bidder.”

It is inconceivable that an organization like SANGRAM could have received funding from the American taxpayer had USAID put in place an adequate management system to carry out Public Law 108-25.

On December 13, 2005, a large briefing team from the State Department and USAID met with staff from my subcommittee in order to demonstrate ownership of the problem and lay out corrective measures being taken. To my dismay and astonishment, the briefers were not prepared to discuss and exhibited little knowledge of the pass-through entity known as Avert that USAID has established and which served as the mechanism whereby NGOs in India were monitored and financed with American tax dollars.

Subcommittee staff knew more than the State Department USAID briefing team about this matter, thanks to Google searches on the Web for critical documents that had not been provided to the subcommittee by the administration.

At that meeting, USAID was requested by the subcommittee staff to establish an electronic registry for grantees and subgrantees to facilitate oversight by USAID Washington as well as by Congress and ensure compliance with the Federal law. That request has not been honored.

In the months since that December 13 appeal was made for an electronic registry, the subcommittee request has inspired two pieces of legislation: First in the other body, and the second we are debating here today. This scandal of financing pro-prostitution groups by USAID was highlighted by the authors in both Chambers as illustrating the need for this legislation.

On April 7, I asked USAID in writing to provide legal advice to make certain that all USAID grantees and subgrantees would be captured by H.R. 5060. That request, too, has not been honored.

I, for one, am out of patience having to wait months for agencies to reluctantly produce documents to shed light on how questionable projects are funded.

I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 5060 and begin the process of bringing sunshine on the processes of unelected bureaucrats doling out grants to questionable organizations.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I again thank Mr. WAXMAN and his staff and Mr.

DAVIS for being here, and all of the staff on the Government Reform Committee on the minority side, Anna Luitin, Christopher Davis, Robin Appleberry, and Brian Cohen for their contributions to this legislation as well. We thank you for working with us.

I would just add that I would urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 5060, as amended.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5060 requires the Office of Management and Budget to create a web-based database of Federal grants.

I want to thank Majority Whip BLUNT and Chairman DAVIS for working with us to make changes to the bill as originally drafted. Based on these revisions, I am supporting the bill.

As modified, H.R. 5060 will create a robust, fully searchable database of all Federal grants that is free for members of the public to use. The database will contain a significant amount of information about each grant awarded—including details about the grantee, the process under which the grant was awarded, as well as the purpose and requirements of the grant.

Currently, there is an existing grants data system that is available to Members of Congress. The database that will be created under H.R. 5060 is an improvement over this existing system in two key ways: it will include more information and it will be available to the public, not just Members of Congress. As a result, this database will serve as a useful tool for individuals and organizations hoping to understand how the Federal Government distributes funds.

There is also an urgent need to improve the existing database of Federal contracts. Earlier this week, I released a report finding that the “shadow government” of private companies working under Federal contract has exploded in size over the past 5 years. Far more taxpayer dollars now go to contracts than to grants.

I had hoped that we would be able to add language improving the current contracts database, the Federal Procurement Data System, to this bill. The FPDS can be hard to use and is not fully accurate. Although it contains a significant amount of information about Federal contracts, it is not easily or freely searchable by members of the public. It must be fixed in order to provide the public with the ability to truly understand the role of contracts in the Federal Government.

We were not able to reach agreement on language to add a contracts database to this legislation. But Chairman DAVIS has pledged to work with me to address this issue in separate legislation.

Again, I want to thank the Majority Whip and the Chairman for working with us to amend H.R. 5060, and look forward to continuing this collaboration as we address the problems with the existing database of Federal contracts.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5060, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof)

the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECOND HIGHER EDUCATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2006

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5603) to temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5603

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Second Higher Education Extension Act of 2006”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS.

Section 2(a) of the Higher Education Extension Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-81; 20 U.S.C. 1001 note) is amended by striking “June 30, 2006” and inserting “September 30, 2006”.

SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act, or in the Higher Education Extension Act of 2005 as amended by this Act, shall be construed to limit or otherwise alter the authorizations of appropriations for, or the durations of, programs contained in the amendments made by the Higher Education Reconciliation Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-171) to the provisions of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Taxpayer-Teacher Protection Act of 2004.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5603.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5603, the Second Higher Education Extension Act of 2006. This bill will provide a clean extension of the Higher Education Act for 3 months. This bill enjoys bipartisan support and is co-sponsored by the chairman and ranking members of the full Education Committee and the Higher Education Subcommittee.

On March 30, 2006, the House of Representatives completed its work and passed the College Access and Opportunity Act to fully reauthorize the Higher Education Act. We strengthened Pell Grants, improved the Perkins Loan program, and expanded access for millions of American students.

However, the Senate has not yet acted to reauthorize the Higher Education Act. The Senate should soon act to pass the reauthorization bill so we

can have these important higher education reforms signed into law during this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this is a clean extension that will allow the important programs of the Higher Education Act to continue past their current June 30, 2006, expiration date until September 30, 2006. Programs like Pell Grants and Perkins Loans are the passports out of poverty for millions of American students. We must not break our commitment to higher education.

□ 1100

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 5603.

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 rise today to support H.R. 5603, a 3-month extension of the Higher Education Act. I have enjoyed working with the new chairman of the subcommittee Mr. KELLER on this bill.

This bill, in essence, temporarily extends the last portions of the Higher Education Act not reauthorized in the reconciliation package.

During the 1998 reauthorization, I had the opportunity to work closely with Chairman McKEON, now chairman of the full committee, in crafting a bipartisan bill. Our reauthorization attempts this Congress have been a little more rocky than in 1998. Most of the hard-hitting changes to the Higher Education Act and student aid have already been passed in reconciliation, which I opposed. That action forever removed nearly \$12 billion from student aid programs and missed an opportunity to reinvest in students who are already struggling to pay for college.

In response, along with Representative MILLER, I recently introduced a bill called the Reverse the Raid on Student Aid Act, H.R. 5150. This bill would have cut interest rates in half for students and parents taking out subsidized loans, the borrowers most in need. This bill would save the average borrower already saddled with \$17,500 in debt \$6,600 over the life of their loan.

The consideration and passage of the Reverse the Raid on Student Aid Act is a critical investment in our global competitiveness and would offer real relief to students and families in need.

Let's set the record straight on Pell. Today we will hear about Republican support of Pell Grants. Yes, overall, spending on Pell Grants is on the rise, but Pell Grants are semientitlement programs, which means that if eligible students apply for Federal financial aid, they automatically get a Pell Grant. The increased spending they referred to is not because we are doing more to help individual students struggling to pay for college; this is because more students qualify, and more students are going to college. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we have more poor students that need our help.

In reality, the individual Pell Grant has seen no meaningful increase in the

last 5 years. In fact, Pell Grants today are worth \$900 less in inflation-adjusted terms than they were in the 1975-1976 school year.

Until the appropriators restore the actual buying power of the Pell Grant to the \$5,100 level promised by our President 6 years ago, we have not done anything meaningful in helping the students and families struggling to pay for college.

As we worked towards reauthorizing the remainder of the higher education through H.R. 609 in March, I had hoped we could change the tone of debate and act in the interest of the students that the Higher Education Act was intended to help. Unfortunately, in the end, my concerns in the bill still far outweighed any benefit. The bill that was considered was not something I considered comfortable to support, and, for that reason, opposed it.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman KELLER and Chairman McKEON for offering H.R. 5603, the 3-month extension of the Higher Education Act. And because we still have time to work on this, and hopefully things can change, we can achieve some repair work, repair of the reconciliation act. I will support this and have cosponsored the bill.

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

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California, the chairman of the full Education and Workforce Committee, Mr. McKEON.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the subcommittee chairman for his works on bringing this bill to the floor, and thank Mr. KILDEE for his work in supporting the bill.

It is important that we extend this act and give the Senate time to act on the bill, so I would encourage all of our colleagues to support the bill to help our young people get the education they need to realize the American dream.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5603, the Second Higher Education Extension Act of 2006. I thank the Chairman of the 21st Century Competitiveness Subcommittee, Mr. KELLER, for his work on this bill, as well as his consistent efforts on behalf of our Nation's college students and their families.

Discretionary programs under the Higher Education Act will expire on June 30, 2006, and this legislation before us simply extends the programs for an additional three months.

Earlier this year, when the Deficit Reduction Act was signed into law, we authorized the Act's mandatory spending programs. In the process, we reduced lender subsidies; increased loan limits for students; simplified the financial aid process; and provided additional resources for needy students studying math, science, and critical foreign languages in college. And we managed to achieve all that while also making certain that student aid programs operate more efficiently, saving U.S. taxpayers billions of dollars.

In March, the House backed H.R. 609, the College Access & Opportunity Act, which would reauthorize the remaining programs

under the Higher Education Act. This bill would strengthen the Pell Grant program, empower parents and students through "sunshine" and transparency in college costs and accreditation, improve college access programs, and much more. I am hopeful that our friends on the other side of the Capitol will act on these reforms soon so these extensions will become a thing of the past.

In the meantime, however, Congress again must act to extend the Higher Education Act, which we have done previously on several occasions and with bipartisan support. The Second Higher Education Extension Act will ensure that vital Federal college access and student aid programs continue to serve those students who depend upon them. At the same time, the bill also gives our Senate colleagues additional time to complete a renewal of the Higher Education Act.

Mr. Speaker, we are facing new realities in an increasingly competitive global economy. U.S. workers of today are no longer just competing with one another for jobs, but also against counterparts across the globe. One avenue we have for tackling today's new climate is through education in general, but more significantly through higher education. That's why the Federal investment in the Higher Education Act is so vital. Our Nation has millions of low and middle income students aspiring to go to college. They not only deserve an opportunity to educate themselves, but we personally depend on their having that opportunity.

I encourage my colleagues to support the bill before us today and continue to work toward a fundamental reform package so that we can better serve American students pursuing the dream of a college education.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, almost 3 months to the day, I stood here in support of the third extension to the Higher Education Act with the hope that it would be the last short-term measure we needed to pass before we finally produced an improved bipartisan and long overdue reauthorization bill that reflects the best interest of America's college students.

I now rise in support of H.R. 5603 with a different hope, that the pending version of the Higher Education Act that the House passed in late March does not advance in the Senate, and that during the next session of Congress, under a new majority, we start over by making this legislation truly about increasing access and affordability.

On July 1, student borrowers will be burdened with a higher interest rate on their loans as a result of the administration's fiscal irresponsibility. Student loan interest rates are based on the 91-day T-bill, which is directly tied to the status of our economy. Based on today's current T-bill, interest rates for student borrowers who do not consolidate by July 1 will jump from 5.3 percent to 7.14 percent, which is a 34 percent increase in the rate.

Record-breaking budget deficits, tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans, and an economic policy flawed by fiscal

irresponsibility have resulted in higher interest rates and our Nation's students having to pay for the mistakes of this administration and this Congress.

Last year the House leadership chose to cut student loans to the tune of \$12 billion through the Deficit Reduction Act. With those cuts in the budget reconciliation bill, and now with higher interest rates on student loans, we are sending a message to America's students and their families that they are no longer among this Nation's top priorities.

As high school graduates and their proud parents calculate how they can squeeze college costs into their budget, they are discovering that it is an uphill climb for most families, made tougher by new higher interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I support this extension that we are considering here today, but I do not support the direction and actions of this Congress as it relates to higher education. We must do more to ensure that every qualified student has the chance to go to college.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the last couple of weeks and months have been times of mixed emotions for a lot of American families. Many people got the thick envelope in the mail that told them they were accepted to the school they really want to get into. And then it became time to figure out how to pay for it.

Now, a few families were fortunate enough, very few families were fortunate enough, they have enough income to meet the tuition payment. Others immediately went down to the bank and made a home equity loan application to figure out a way to borrow enough money to send their son or daughter to school. Others weren't so fortunate and had to decide some other course, maybe including not going to school at all. And then others who are themselves already parents who are raising children and working full time just can't figure out a way to do it without putting themselves so far in debt that it makes no sense to get an education.

This bill is a missed opportunity to address that problem. There were significant savings generated in the student loan programs that were thrown away by the reconciliation bill, the budget-cutting bill passed by this Congress late in 2005. Money that could have been used to raise loan limits, eliminate origination fees, expand programs where people can pay back their loan as a function of their income, money that could have been used to increase Pell Grants was instead put into the economic priorities of this majority: tax cuts for the very wealthy, subsidies for corporate America and misadventures around the world. So here we are feebly extending existing terms

of this bill, while millions of American families struggle with the very real problem of how to pay for a higher education.

This is a missed opportunity. It calls for a radical change in the country's priorities away from tax breaks for the wealthy, away from welfare for corporate America, away from misadventures around the world, toward educating and investing in the people of this country. Those changes in priorities are coming.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5603.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4755

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as cosponsor from the bill, H.R. 4755.

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

There was no objection.

SENIOR INDEPENDENCE ACT OF 2006

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5293) to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2007 through 2011, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5293

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the “Senior Independence Act of 2006”.

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

Sec. 3. Establishment of Administration on Aging.

Sec. 4. Functions of the Assistant Secretary.

Sec. 5. Federal agency consultation.

Sec. 6. Administration.

Sec. 7. Evaluation.

Sec. 8. Reports.

Sec. 9. Contractual, commercial and private pay relationships; appropriate use of Act funds.

Sec. 10. Nutrition education.

Sec. 11. Pension counseling and information programs.

Sec. 12. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 13. Purpose; administration.

Sec. 14. Authorization of appropriations; uses of funds.

Sec. 15. Organization.

Sec. 16. Area plans.

Sec. 17. State plans.

Sec. 18. Payments.

Sec. 19. Nutrition services incentive program.

Sec. 20. Consumer contributions.

Sec. 21. Supportive services and senior centers program.

Sec. 22. Nutrition service.

Sec. 23. Congregate nutrition program.

Sec. 24. Home delivered nutrition services.

Sec. 25. Criteria.

Sec. 26. Nutrition.

Sec. 27. Evaluation of nutrition projects.

Sec. 28. Improving indoor air quality to buildings where seniors congregate.

Sec. 29. Caregiver support program definitions.

Sec. 30. Caregiver support program.

Sec. 31. Activities of national significance.

Sec. 32. Title IV grant programs.

Sec. 33. Career preparation for the field of aging.

Sec. 34. Health care service demonstration projects in rural areas.

Sec. 35. Demonstration projects for multigenerational activities.

Sec. 36. Native American programs.

Sec. 37. Multidisciplinary centers.

Sec. 38. Responsibilities of Assistant Secretary.

Sec. 39. Community service employment-based training for older Americans.

Sec. 40. Native Americans caregiver support program.

Sec. 41. Vulnerable elder rights protection activities.

Sec. 42. Native American organization provisions.

Sec. 43. Elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation prevention.

Sec. 44. Technical amendments.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Section 102 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3002) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (10) to read as follows:

“(10) The terms ‘assistive device’, ‘assistive technology’, and ‘assistive technology service’ have the meanings given such terms in section 3 of the Assistive Technology Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 3002).”

(2) by amending paragraph (12)(D) to read as follows:

“(D) evidence-based health promotion programs, including programs related to the prevention and mitigation of the effects of chronic disease (including osteoporosis, hypertension, obesity, diabetes, and cardiovascular disease), alcohol and substance abuse reduction, smoking cessation, weight loss and control, stress management, falls prevention, physical activity, and improved nutrition through the consumption of a healthful diet and multivitamin-mineral supplementation;”

(3) in paragraph (29)(E)—

(A) in clause (i) by striking “and” at the end,

(B) in clause (ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and” , and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) older individuals at risk for institutional placement.”

(4) by amending paragraph (24) to read as follows:

“(24) The term ‘exploitation’ means the fraudulent or otherwise illegal, unauthorized, or improper act or process of an individual that uses the resources of an older individual for monetary or personal benefit, profit, or gain, or that results in depriving an older individual of rightful access to, or use of, benefits, resources, belongings, or assets.”

(5) by amending paragraph (34) to read as follows:

“(34) The term ‘neglect’ means—

“(A) the failure of a caregiver or fiduciary to provide goods or services that are necessary to maintain the health or safety of an elder; or

“(B) self neglect.”