

adopted in the House, speaking of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 which we passed this evening. This will reverse the current trend where it has been more difficult for many students to get into college because of financial reasons, and this is because college will be more affordable under our new amendments. It will simplify the student aid system and improve academic quality. In doing so, our bill enhances the freedom of Americans to live the American dream, rewards Americans who are willing to take responsibility for themselves in the future and restores accountability to the Nation's higher education programs.

Higher education amendments make college more affordable by rescuing the student loan program and, in turn, providing students with the lowest interest rate in 17 years. Specifically, this provision ensures that private banks stay in the student loan program. Without it the student loan program would eventually collapse and college students would be left without the borrowing power which they need to finance their education.

The higher ed bill makes college more affordable for students from disadvantaged backgrounds. It expands the Pell grant program which provides higher education vouchers for needy students and improves campus-based aid programs like the supplemental education opportunity grants, work-study and the Perkins loans, and strengthens international and graduate education.

Mr. Speaker, it also brings much needed reforms to the TRIO program to help disadvantaged children prepare for college while still in their teens. Specifically the bill increases the maximum allowable Pell grant for students from the current 3,000 to \$4,500 per student for academic year 1999, and the grants gradually increase to 5,300 in the year 2003 to 2004.

Furthermore, the bill acknowledges sacrifices rendered by making college more affordable for those who serve in the U.S. Armed forces. Specifically it exempts veterans' benefits from being counted against students when they apply for financial aid.

This legislation holds colleges and universities accountable for tuition increases. Under the bill, colleges and universities are required to develop clear standards for reporting college costs and prices for both undergraduate and graduate education.

It also simplifies the student aid system. The Higher Education Amendments of 1998, which we just voted upon, offers students a way out by making the student aid process more user-friendly, incorporating sales management principles into student aid programs, and cutting red tape and bureaucracy.

One of the most important parts of this bill, Mr. Speaker, was the Foley amendment which requires that crime statistics be available to those who apply to colleges. I have in my own dis-

trict a heroine, Connie Cleary, who has been working for many years to make sure that colleges report such security information. Her daughter was tragically murdered on a college campus. She and her husband have dedicated their lives to making sure that every college parent and student knows exactly what the security situation is at each university, so that together we can make our campuses safer and to make sure that individuals who attend schools have every piece of knowledge they should know about the campus in making an informed choice.

This bill is a positive bill. I believe it is going to help more students attend college and be able to financially afford to achieve their dream and then go on to get the job which best suits the academic challenges they have met.

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

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

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

(Mrs. CLAYTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 2320

FAULTY PROCEDURES OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT

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

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I know the hour is late. It is a pleasure to follow my good friend from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the former chairman of the House Operations Committee, now the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight of the House of Representatives.

On the same issue that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) recently addressed the House on, I would just like to spell out some of my thoughts in regards to the exercise of the authority of the committee and the chairing of the committee, particularly in the last several months.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives, in passing the resolution directing the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight to examine the election practices in the presidential and congressional elections of 1996, invested in the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight a very unusual power and instruction. I dare say, although this was a political issue from the standpoint it involved political campaigns and supposedly both parties that were engaged in the campaign

of 1996, my observations were that both on the majority and the minority side, originally there was some expression of intent to do a serious, credible investigation and examination; not a persecution or a politically motivated investigation, but something that would give insight to the Members of this House and to the American people of a very serious problem, and that problem is the prostitution of the American political system and campaigns, which is fast overwhelming this Nation as experienced in 1996.

As we met to organize and to identify our mission, it seemed that very early on many of us on the minority side of the committee were fast realizing that there was an extraordinary power, the power of subpoena that was going to be vested in the Chairman without the need for clearing a subpoena through the ranking member or to going to the full committee that would normally have some input in the exercise of the issuance of a subpoena. I thought that was strange, and to my own mind and to others I remarked at the time that as a result of this unusual power being vested in the chairman, he would become the most powerful American citizen in the United States. No other individual in the United States could, by merely signing a subpoena, command the presence, the records, the examination of all of the personal papers of any American citizen.

We cautioned the chairman that it may be wise to carry on prior practices, both of the Committee of Oversight and Investigation, and the experiences of the Watergate committee, the Thompson committee in the Senate, and that was that when an individual is going to be issued a subpoena, it should come to the full committee to be disclosed, or at least to the ranking member so that a discussion can be had; and when agreement was reached, the subpoena would issue. If there was disagreement, it would come to the full committee and the full committee would cast a vote with the majority of the committee controlling the outcome as to whether the subpoena should issue.

Instead of doing that, the chairman received, without limitation, by vote of the majority of the committee, that he in his own right, without consultation and without consent from the committee, and without contest by the rest of the committee, could issue at will subpoenas to many citizens in the country.

Mr. Speaker, I think nearly 1,000 such subpoenas were issued. Some of them were so grossly and improperly issued that because the surname of the individual who was named in the subpoena was of Chinese American origin, there was a professor at the University of Georgetown that had his bank records seized, even though he had nothing to do with the campaign and was, in fact, an entirely different person. We called that very strongly to