

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 strengthen 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