

DEMOCRATS WILL NOT PROTECT AMERICA

(Mrs. MILLER of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, yesterday congressional Democrats outlined their agenda to better secure America. I must say I was a bit surprised by what they had to say. Even though America has not been attacked on our soil since September 11, 2001, even though the vast majority of the leadership of the al Qaeda has been killed or captured, even though we have toppled two dictatorships and brought freedom to 50 million people in Iraq and Afghanistan, even though funding has been dramatically increased to aid first responders, the Democrats are trying to peddle the idea that President Bush has failed to secure our Nation.

Even though it was the Democrats who gloated that they “killed the PATRIOT Act.” Even though it was the Democrats under the Clinton administration who gutted our intelligence operations. Even though it was leading Democrats who voted against giving our troops the funding and support they need to win the war on terror. Even though it was the Democrats who advocated a defeat and retreat strategy for Iraq.

I hope the American people will take a good look at the Democrats’ plan and who is offering it, because they will see once again that it is the Republican Party that is the one that will fight to the ends of the Earth to protect America.

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE REMINDER

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate pharmacists, social workers and other caregivers who are working to help American seniors realize they have only 6 weeks to take advantage of an opportunity to save hundreds of dollars in the coming year.

Although over 27 million Americans have registered for the Medicare prescription drug program, additional seniors throughout our Nation are still eligible to sign up for this positive plan. I am glad that independent reports indicate that those who have registered say the total cost of all of their drugs is often less than the amount they were paying for just one prescription benefit in the past. Additionally, seniors who have consulted Medicare experts and insurance counselors are usually quite happy with their coverage.

As the May 15 registration deadlines draws near, I encourage American seniors to take advantage of this opportunity to significantly decrease their

drug expenses. Simply call 1-800-MEDICARE.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 609, COLLEGE ACCESS AND OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2005

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 742 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 742

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 609) to amend and extend the Higher Education Act of 1965. No further general debate shall be in order. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no further amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

House Resolution 742 provides for a structured rule and continued debate on several additional amendments to H.R. 609, the College Access and Opportunity Act of 2005.

This second rule for H.R. 609 allows for the consideration of the Democratic substitute bill offered by the ranking Democratic member of the Education and Workforce Committee, Mr. MILLER of California, and allows for 30 minutes of debate on that measure alone so the House will be able to debate and discuss the substitute’s vision of whether

it is appropriate to support the creation of at least eight new Federal education spending programs which are contained in that language.

Mr. Speaker, it seems like only yesterday we were discussing this bill. And with apologies for using baseball analogies; but it is spring training season and for a Cubs fan, hope looms always eternal. But to quote the great philosopher and relief pitcher for the Kansas City Royals, Dan Quisenberry: “I have seen the future. It is just like today, only longer.”

When we are talking today about how we help kids to fulfill their dreams of a college education, I think he is going to prove not only visionary but prophetic. What we talk about today I think will be the future, just longer.

This rule today allows eight important additional amendments to be brought forth, and they will be debated on the floor.

I think it is significant of the 117 amendments that were filed on this bill for the Rules Committee, 15 were made in order yesterday, another eight today. Half of yesterday’s and half of today’s will be either Democrat or bipartisan amendments.

□ 1030

This does not even begin to count the number of issues which were already worked out between the minority and the Education and Workforce staff and chairman in the base text of the bill over the past several months, or those items for Democratic Members which were included in the manager’s amendment which was passed by a voice vote yesterday.

I also want to statistically note that 44 of the amendments that were filed were in violation of our germaneness rule, including mandatory spending on new programs or invoking jurisdiction of other committees, including Judiciary and Ways and Means.

Twenty-five of the amendments were filed past the Rules Committee deadline.

Members are always advised to be sure of the procedure and the time deadlines for submitting amendments, and once again, we said yesterday, having the additional time before part two would give Members a chance to work out with the Parliamentarian’s Office the details of their particular amendments.

Eight amendments were withdrawn. Three were duplicative. Four were taken care of in the manager’s amendment from yesterday.

The underlying bill, H.R. 609, still strikes a very good balance between reauthorizing important and existing higher education assistance programs, while steering clear of social engineering mandates and massive new spending programs. At the same time, it returns the emphasis to the original intent of the 1965 Higher Education Assistance Act, to give students a hand up in helping them to earn their own higher education.

Once again, the goal of this bill is still simply to help more kids achieve their dream of a college education and not to try and funnel the money that can be used for them into other kinds of projects and programs. This is still a good bill and, more importantly, a fair rule, and it allows the minority to offer its comprehensive vision of the future with regard to these issues in the Miller substitute.

In conclusion, I ask that all Members support and to vote in favor of this rule so that we can complete our work on this important legislation and move closer to ensuring that more individuals and students than ever wanting a college education can indeed receive the help they need to do that.

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

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

(Ms. MATSUI asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding me this time as we continue into part two.

Today, we are considering a second rule to make in order amendments to the Republican majority's version of the higher education reauthorization. I had hoped we would have had the opportunity to continue a meaningful debate about how to best assist families and students across this Nation trying to pursue the college dream because a college education plays such a critical part in our lives.

As children, we all play at grown-up roles, dreaming of what we may be when we grow up, a teacher, an astronaut, a doctor, a scientist, an underwater adventurer or perhaps even a Member of Congress. Well, an education is what turns those dreams into reality, and with the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, we could have had an opportunity to play a role in encouraging these children's futures.

But to do that, we need to be looking at a reauthorization that reinforces our Nation's longstanding commitment to providing educational opportunities for all Americans, but alas, at the start of this year, my colleagues across the aisle pushed through the budget reconciliation package that cuts student loan programs by \$12 billion, the single largest cut to the Nation's Federal student aid programs ever.

Middle-income families are hard-pressed to keep up with rising tuition costs. Due to record high financial barriers, high school graduates who are fully prepared to attend a 4-year college are unable to do so.

While college tuition has continued to rise far faster than the cost of living, the maximum Pell Grant level has remained virtually constant, thus forcing many qualified students to postpone or cancel their dreams of a college degree or to incur significant debt in the form of loans.

Clearly, this bill has room for improvement. We could be debating a

number of thoughtful amendments that would help substantially increase our investment in student loan programs, recruit teachers and develop a high-skilled workforce. However, fewer than one in five amendments was made in order.

Take, for example, the amendment offered by Representative INSLEE to recruit Head Start teachers. I remember visiting the Nedra Court and Whispering Pines Head Start program in my district. The 60 students at each site definitely kept those teachers busy. This is a challenging job for which the \$20,000 salary really is not much of an incentive.

Yet, last year, the House passed H.R. 2123, the School Readiness Act, to reauthorize the Head Start program. Contained in that legislation was an unfunded mandate requiring Head Start teachers to obtain a bachelor's degree.

Representative INSLEE offered a straightforward amendment to increase student loan forgiveness programs to \$17,500, which is the same level allowed for other targeted forgiveness programs for high-need professions. However, we will not be allowed to debate this amendment because the Republican majority are limiting the democratic process.

And those \$12 billion in cuts from the Deficit Reduction Act, Representative EMANUEL had an amendment that would restore the \$12 billion to student aid programs cut in the Deficit Reduction Act. I think I hear about the negative impacts of these student aid cuts at least every other day, whether I am home in Sacramento or here in Washington, D.C. I find it hard to believe every other Member is not hearing this as well. But that amendment was not made in order.

Nor was the bipartisan Student Aid Reward amendment. At no additional cost to taxpayers, the STAR amendment would generate more than \$12 billion in additional college scholarship aid.

Representatives HOLT and KIND also crafted an exceptional amendment to promote students to study and enter into careers focused on math, science, engineering and technology. At a time of increasing concern about America's competitiveness in the world, these are fields we must promote to develop an engaged workforce.

I recently toured the UC Davis Center for Biophotonics in my district. This center explores how light and lasers can be applied to medical procedures, making for less invasive treatments and better diagnoses of cancer. The center has dozens of math and science graduate students assisting with research alongside the Nation's leading biophotonics experts.

Unfortunately, today we are sending a mixed message to students: We need you to pursue math and sciences, but we will not ensure that you can afford the education to enter these fields.

Today, the economic, social and civic importance of a college education has

never been more important. Yet, college enrollment rates in the United States are stagnant. As more and more baby boomers begin to retire, we will be facing a crisis in the employment market if we cannot develop a highly skilled and trained workforce. This must be a national priority, but apparently not for this Congress.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for the time.

I had concerns about this bill as well. As Republicans, we are not in favor of increasing government but decreasing the amount of restrictions that additional bureaucracy creates, and I saw part of this that created additional bureaucracy by allowing States to start accrediting.

But before I say anything else, there has been a great deal of misinformation about what the Deficit Reduction Act did. Having two children in college right now myself and another about to start next year, I have been particularly sensitive about this issue. I have had bankers and other educators saying, we understood you cut \$12 billion in the Deficit Reduction Act for money that was available for students, and that is not right.

What occurred was there was a reduction by about \$12 billion of subsidies that were going to banks for making the student loans, but the fact is there was around \$9.5 billion increased in the amount available for student loans and grants and funding. So we increased, not decreased, by about \$9.5 billion the amount available for students.

So it was a good thing, and we recognize the importance of education, and we are trying to help them. So that addresses that comment from my colleague.

But with regard to the bill, I have grave concerns about it, especially to allow the States to start accrediting. Governments have done enough damage to education in K-12 over the last 30 years. I was very concerned about that, but I appreciate Chairman MCKEON working with me, and I appreciate his staff working with us.

They have agreed to support an amendment which strikes out the provision that allows States to apply to the Federal Government which creates more Federal Government, to allow them to start accrediting, and that provision, under my amendment, will be struck. There will be no additional State agencies accrediting universities and colleges, and I am hopeful that that will be passed with the chairman's support of that.

Also, we share a very strong concern about the increases in college tuition and fees. They have dramatically gone up over the last 30 years. In fact, I was asking, when I went to law school, if it was still \$500 a semester for tuition, and they said, yeah, that much an hour

now, but anyway, over a 30-year time, things have just gone up dramatically.

In balancing the difficulty of not increasing government, which naturally requires an increasing cost to universities but at the same time requiring some accountability, I think the chairman's bill, if my two provisions are passed, that this is a good bill because it balances those things.

The task force that is created in the top five most abusive colleges in raising tuition over a 3-year period and costs of the college, they will have to set up their own task force to figure out why their institution has gotten so abusive in its costs. So it will be its own people looking at its own institution. It will not set up more bureaucracy. It will not set up more government, and this will push and provide pressure on institutions and have some accountability, even though it is by people in their own community, as the bill sets out, as amended, if my amendment is allowed to pass.

So I applaud the bill if my amendment, those two provisions, pass. I think it will be helpful in controlling costs without increasing bureaucracies in government, and I appreciate very much Mr. BISHOP and the chairman and his staff in working with us on this.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and in strong opposition to H.R. 609, the underlying bill.

As a matter of fact, I had hoped when we started the process that we were going to see a bipartisan effort because all of us talk about how great and how important education is, and I do not think that there is a single person in this House who would not agree with that. But oftentimes I am afraid that our conversations are different than our actions.

When I look at this restrictive rule, it prevents us from discussing and debating at least 100 amendments, 100 ideas, perhaps even 100 programs at different ways to look at and try to improve access to college education for thousands and thousands of individuals in our country who will be left out and left behind, with no, or virtually no, hope of ever reaching mainstream society because they would not have had the chance.

Yet, philosophically, when we think of education, I was thinking of something that Abraham Lincoln was supposed to have said at one time, and that is, that education makes a man easy to lead but difficult to drive, easy to govern but impossible to enslave.

So we should have been trying to provide the highest level of opportunity for every individual in our country to grasp for that great opportunity.

□ 1045

I had two amendments that I consider to be very minor, meager amend-

ments that I had hoped to have made in order. One of them would have restored Pell Grants to thousands of individuals who are currently incarcerated with little skill, little training, and little possibility without the additional education. And yet that amendment, and we are the most incarcerated Nation on the face of the Earth, with more than 2 million people languishing in jails and prisons, knowing full well that most of them will return within a short period of time if they do not acquire some of this great opportunity that we call education, that amendment, unfortunately, was shot down.

The second one would have provided a modest sum of money, only \$25 million, for predominantly black student-serving institutions that are serving a low-income population, most of them being the first in their family to have a chance to go to college. The schools they attend do not qualify as part of the historically black college and university network, and yet they will not be allowed to get the little additional resources.

I do want to thank Mr. PICKERING for his sponsorship of this amendment. Hopefully, if it didn't make it this round, of course we will be back and hopefully, eventually, it will happen.

I did have one amendment, and I am grateful to the majority for including that idea in the manager's amendment, to have the Secretary of Education take a hard look at why there is such a heavy disparity between African American males, for example, who are attending colleges and universities and other parts of the American population.

When we look at the bill in every way that we can, and I know that I have heard my colleagues come to the floor and say that this is not a raid on student aid; that this is expanding opportunity; that this is making education more affordable, I know that they believe what they are saying. I just can't figure out which playbook they are reading from when you take a government that takes away money and gives back tax dollars to the wealthy.

Education is so vitally important that we do ourselves and we do this Nation a disservice when we prevent any individual from having an opportunity to acquire it.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, it is with great disappointment today that I rise to voice my opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. Higher education has become more important than ever in ensuring America's economic prosperity, national security, and health. A quality college degree is the cornerstone of the American Dream, opening the doors of opportunity and professional fulfillment.

For decades, the Federal Government has been a partner with States and col-

leges in creating opportunity and access to college, especially for middle- and lower-income students. But today, just 2 months after the Republicans voted to raid Federal student aid by \$12 billion, a vote which passed by only two votes, Republicans once again are pushing through a higher education bill that does not help American families pay for college. Why? Well, it is because the Republican Party is apparently more interested in tax cuts for corporations and for oil companies.

Traditionally, the Higher Education Act has enjoyed widespread bipartisan support. But today, instead of meaningful debate about the future of our students and our country, a debate that would provide accountability and access and opportunity, we find that debate has been blocked by the Republican majority.

The Higher Education Act should be about creating access to vocational training and college for millions of America's students and adults who find themselves having to get reeducated in this tough economy. The reauthorization law should serve as an opportunity to improve the current law and make college more accessible.

Unfortunately, the underlying bill does nothing to make college more affordable, and in fact it raids student aid. And it does this at a time when tuition is rising faster than the rate of inflation; at a time when financial aid for America's families is not keeping up with the rising cost of a college education; and at a time when this Congress will be voting for tax giveaways for the Nation's wealthiest. In other words, as a former teacher, I give this higher education bill a failing grade. And it gets a failing grade because it misses the opportunity to promote students' abilities to afford college and to make America more economically secure.

This dramatic rise in tuition that I spoke about earlier over the past decade can only be explained by our lack of participating and making college more affordable at a Federal level, but also many of our States also get a failing grade for their participation in making higher education affordable for all students. When we put the dream of a college education out of reach for Americans, America suffers. When we put the dream of being able to afford a college education out of reach for Americans, our students suffer.

In the Rules Committee, I offered an amendment, along with Mr. TIERNEY, that would have presented a real solution to the college affordability issue, offering an achievable goal for the Federal Government to work in partnership with States to have accountability, to provide the opportunity for the American Dream for millions more families. Unfortunately, this opportunity was missed when our amendment was ruled out of order. We would have ensured that students and colleges in my district and districts all over this country would have invested

in a competitive fashion in order to make our students and our country more able to compete in the future.

Why has Congress backed away from their future? Well, the answer is simple. Congress backed away because they wanted to take \$12 billion that could have been put back into the higher education bill. They raided that \$12 billion and gave it to corporations.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, later today this House will have an opportunity to reverse one of the more egregious things that we have done, or those who voted for it have done, against the interest of America's economy, of America's institutions of higher education, for the students who are attending them, and the families that are supporting them. And that was when earlier this year in the budget reconciliation bill, this Congress, under Republican leadership, cut \$12 billion out of the student aid accounts and foisted a higher cost onto students and their families at the exact time when the increased cost of college education is outstripping the ability of those families to afford that education.

We are starting to see an increasing number of young people who are fully qualified, who would fully benefit from a college education who are now deciding maybe they can't do it because they can't afford it. The exact purpose of the Federal Government's involvement in helping to finance higher education for America's students is to make sure that no qualified student is turned away from that opportunity because of cost.

So today, in our substitute, we will have the opportunity to make a down payment on reversing those costs for those families and those students most in need. And what we will do is we will cut the new interest rate that is going to go into place in July at 6.8 percent on these loans. We would reduce that to 3.4 percent, and this would be a down payment for 1 year. We obviously hope that the Congress would follow on and continue that effort so that these students can afford that education.

It is just incredible what was done in that budget reconciliation. Over 70 percent of the net savings that comes from excessive fees that we identify, and excessive interest rates that are charged to families and to students, rather than return what are identified as excessive rates to those families so they can help pay for their college education, we took those, the Congress took those, the Republicans took those and gave them in tax cuts to the wealthiest people in the country.

So these people will continue to pay excessive interest rates, but they will not get it returned to them. It will go

to pay for the tax cuts. They want to say it is for deficit reduction. It wasn't for deficit reduction. It was to pay for the tax cuts, either the tax cuts for the oil companies or the tax cuts for the wealthiest people in this country.

So it is very important that all Members give very serious consideration to this substitute. It will be offered by myself and Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BOBBY SCOTT, DANNY DAVIS, and Mr. GRIJALVA as a way of doing this. It also provides for establishing a new predominantly black-serving institutions program to boost college preparation rates among low-income black students, and it also provides for increasing the tribal college minimum grants. It stabilizes tribal college construction to ensure that the funds for construction under the Higher Education Act are guaranteed.

It takes a number of the provisions that are in the underlying bill that help Hispanic teaching institutions and gets rid of the single-lender rule so that people can have an option about where they go to refinance and renegotiate their college loans.

But it is a very important substitute. It is, in fact, a down payment on behalf of American students, on behalf of America's families, and on behalf of America's economy. It is about economic and national security because it ensures that young Americans with a lot of talent will not be shut out of college because of the increased cost imposed upon them by the Republicans' actions earlier this year in the Budget Reconciliation Act.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER), the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. KELLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The Higher Education Act that will be reauthorized today by this House is a good bill because it strengthens the Pell Grant program, it expands Perkins loans, and it increases access to college for millions of people.

Now, we have just heard from the other side that they have a substitute that is better, called Reverse the Raid on Financial Aid. Now, let's just take a look at whether this is an actual true statement, whether the Republican Party has been raiding financial aid.

I have here a chart that shows the history of Pell Grants for the past 20 years. And of course Pell Grants are the heart of this higher education reauthorization bill. Shown here in yellow are the Pell Grant funding levels when the Democrats were in control of the Congress. Shown here in red are when Republicans have been in control in Congress.

Looking at this over the past 20 years, does it really look like Republicans have raided financial aid? Are you kidding me? You can easily see from these figures that under a Republican Congress financial aid has increased dramatically.

□ 1100

In fact, if you look at the last 3 years when Democrats were the majority in Congress, you see something pretty interesting. You see, in 1992, they had funded Pell Grants at \$2,400, and then they got a Democrat President in the White House, Bill Clinton. And with a Democrat President and a Democrat House of Representatives, what happened next? They cut Pell Grants 3 years in a row.

And then they come before us today with this partisan slogan and election-year double talk saying we have raided financial aid. Don't believe the hype. Not one student in America will receive less financial aid under this bill, not one.

They say, well, tell you what, instead of the 6.8 percent that all of the Democrats agreed to back in 2002 as part of a bipartisan compromise that fixes the interest rate, let's now for the first time in the interest of election year politics say we will give students a 3.4 percent interest rate which will cost \$2.7 billion for 1 year. How do they pay for it? They don't tell us. They don't have any way to pay for it. Why not just say zero percent? That sounds even better, but it is irresponsible, and it breaks an agreement they made that was bipartisan and was in compliance with what student groups said.

Now, let me show how we have fared with the Pell Grant program since President Bush has been in office. Actually, I need another chart, if I can have it. While they are pulling that chart, I will just tell Members what it is.

In the year 2000, when I was elected and President Bush was elected, we funded Pell Grants at \$7.6 billion. This past year, we funded Pell Grants at \$13 billion, a 71 percent increase in Pell Grant funding. Yet what slogan do we hear from the other side? Reverse the raid on financial aid. It is crazy.

The next figure, I will show, if my chart were here, that, in 2000, the maximum award was worth \$3,300 per student. This year, it is \$4,050, and under this bill, we provide an additional \$1,000 taking up to \$5,050 for those high achieving, low-income students.

Finally, since 2000, we have seen a 36 percent increase in the number of students able to get Pell Grants. In 2000, we had 3.9 million students. This year, we have 5.3 million students. So not only have we dramatically increased the funding for Pell Grants, we have been able to do it despite the dramatic increase in the number of students.

For Members to appreciate how big a jump this is to go from \$3,300 to \$4,050, let me explain it. Every \$100 that we increase the maximum Pell Grant award costs us \$420 million. We have made the most historic and largest increases in the history of the Pell Grant program; and the other side has nothing to say except "reverse the raid on financial aid."

Mr. Speaker, this is a darn good bill. It increases funding for Pell Grants. It

expands the Perkins Student Loan Program, and it is going to help millions of students go to college who otherwise would not have the opportunity. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this fair rule and vote "yes" on this excellent bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are here this morning to continue debate on a bill that forms the backbone of the opportunities our Nation's students may have at our Nation's colleges and universities. We must get it right which is precisely why this House must reject the rule before us.

As I reminded my colleagues yesterday, the House reauthorized the Higher Education Act in 1992 and in 1998 in a very different way than we have seen in the 109th Congress. Historically, any amendment to the Higher Education Act that was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ahead of time could be offered on the floor.

The broad consideration those rules provided yielded reauthorization measures with broad support in the House. Each of those years, the rules, the bills and the conference reports passed either by voice vote or by overwhelming margins.

So my colleagues will forgive me when I place the historical record on reauthorization next to this year's bill and ask: What happened?

Instead of a bipartisan bill, we see the Higher Education Act torn in two by the majority, solely so some of its provisions could be used to cut more than \$12 billion from student aid partially to finance the majority's tax cuts. Instead of careful floor consideration of several different policy approaches, we saw 118 amendments submitted to the Committee on Rules but only 23 amendments were made in order.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a list of all of the amendments to H.R. 609 submitted to the Committee on Rules but not made in order under either of the two rules.

Andrews (NJ)—No. 97—(Late) Requires institutes of higher education to request emergency contact information on enrollment forms.

Andrews (NJ)—No. 98—(Late) Allows students, whose parents refuse to provide financial information on FAFSA forms, to receive unsubsidized loans.

Andrews (NJ)—No. 99—(Late) Provides right of action for students to sue IREs for violations of privacy rights.

Andrews (NJ)—No. 100—(Late) Provides that federal aid be given without regard to university aid, which could then be given on top.

Andrews (NJ)—No. 101—(Late) Requires personal computers that are disposed of by IHEs be fully scrubbed of all personal information.

Andrews (NJ)/Price (GA)—No. 105—(Late) Requires IHEs to distribute materials on meningitis to new students along with the other general disclosures they are required to provide.

Andrews (NJ)—No. 106—(Late) Protects the award levels of institutions that report at least at 75% of their students come from

families with incomes that are within 150% of the poverty line.

Andrews (NJ)/Price (GA)—No. 117—(Late) Requires IHEs to distribute materials on meningitis to new students along with the other general disclosures they are required to provide.

Berman (CA)/Bono (CA)/Goodlatte (VA)/Hoyer (MD)—No. 61—Requires colleges and universities to report whether they are taking steps to prevent illegal downloading of copyrighted material on their campus information technology systems.

Bishop (UT)—No. 32—(Withdrawn) Ensures that state and local education officials, as well as private schools and parents of home schooled students, retain control over secondary school curriculum for purposes of eligibility under the new Academic Competitiveness Pell Grants program. Potential control over this curriculum was improperly given in-part to the Secretary of Education by the portion of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 which created this program.

Bishop (NY)—No. 34—Increases oversight on the administration of the ability to benefit test.

Bishop (NY)—No. 36—Blocks any Department of Education funds from being used to recall Perkins loan funds.

Bishop (NY)—No. 37—Extends the Tuition Deduction for Higher Education through 12/31/2011.

Cole (OK)/Payne (NJ)—No. 2—(Withdrawn) Strikes Section 402(c) from the bill to eliminate the 10 percent set aside for novice TRIO applicants.

Davis (IL)/Owens (NY)/Pickering (MS)—No. 80—Includes predominantly black institutions into existing higher education efforts to strengthen the ability of minority-serving institutions to attract, retain, and graduate low-income students.

Davis (IL)—No. 81—Re-extends Pell eligibility to individuals in prison in an effort to increase successful transitions into the community and reduce recidivism.

Davis (IL)—No. 82—(Withdrawn) Revises the study on minority graduation rates that was included in H.R. 609 as reported by Committee to be consistent with recommendations made by the Department of Education and the National Center for Education Statistics.

Davis (CA)—No. 14—Prevents contributions made by military service members to the Montgomery GI Bill (MGJB) program from causing any reductions to a veteran student's eligibility for federal student financial aid.

Emanuel (IL)—No. 16—Provides grants to states and local education agencies seeking to create teacher preparation activities. In order to qualify, agencies must have a written agreement with a local college or university where the teaching residents will enroll and complete a Masters Degree in teaching; teaching residents will spend no less than 10 months in a classroom with an experienced mentor teacher; and teaching residents must sign a written agreement with the local education agency agreeing to teach in that district for a minimum of five years.

Emanuel (IL)—No. 17—Instructs the Secretary of Education to reduce the number of questions on the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) form by 50 percent within 5 years.

Emanuel (IL)—No. 18—Simplifies the application process for the neediest students with automatic qualification for the maximum aid awards through federal means tested programs (such as Free and Reduced Price School lunches). Raises the automatic zero income threshold to \$25,000 (from \$20,000) and adjusts the threshold annually according to the Consumer Price Index. Also eliminates certain nontaxable income data elements from the FAFSA form.

Emanuel (IL)—No. 19—Restores the \$12 billion to student aid programs that the Deficit Reduction Act cut.

Engell (NY)—No. 88—(Late) Expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that, in an effort to raise awareness about sexual assault, all colleges and universities should provide a training course to incoming students to educate them on sexual assault.

Etheridge (NC)—No. 47—Adds Fayetteville State University to the list of schools eligible for funding under Title III B of HEA.

Fattah (PA)—No. 107—(Late) Establishes a new and distinct Dual Enrollment Section as an addendum to the current GEAR UP program. This section is essentially an additional programmatic element that would specifically target resources and services towards the promotion of dual enrollment among low income students participating in GEAR UP programs throughout the country. The language was drafted in a manner that adds a new section to GEAR UP, and attaches a separate appropriation for this section, \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2007 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the succeeding five years. In short, dual/concurrent enrollment is defined as the practice by which high school students may enroll in college courses while still enrolled in high school. Students receive college credits but are not required to apply for admission to the college in order to participate.

Fattah (PA)—No. 108—(Late) Adjusts the minimum scholarship amount in which grantees are required by law to distribute in accordance with the requirements of the program from the maximum Federal Pell Grant to the minimum Federal Pell grant awarded.

Fattah (PA)—No. 109—(Late) Creates legislative action to take precedence over current agency regulations which prevent new funds appropriated under new authorizing legislation to be used to provide services under old authorizing legislation. With this amendment, funds will be permitted for use with current GEAR UP students who have not yet graduated from high school.

Gingrey (GA)—No. 104—(Withdrawn) Ensures economically eligible students enrolled in a full-time, university level, academically gifted program, but are of traditional high school age, qualify for Pell Grants. Students affected by the amendment are full time university students who reside on campus as a requirement of the gifted program. The students do not attend high school courses, nor will they return to a high school classroom as a student.

Grijalva (AZ)—No. 58—Offers loan forgiveness for teachers who work in schools located on Native American reservations or in Indian Country who complete five years of service.

Grijalva (AZ)—No. 59—Offers loan forgiveness for educators working at high poverty (Title I eligible) and large free-and-reduced lunch population Border Schools within the 100 mile region of the US-Mexico border who complete 5 years of service. Seeks to reduce the burden of student debt for Americans who dedicate their careers to service in areas of national need along the border.

Grijalva (AZ)—No. 60—Offers loan forgiveness for teachers who work in rural schools located in low-income communities who complete five years of service.

Holt (NJ)/Bishop (NY)—No. 33—Rebates students who lost Pell Grant eligibility due to changes in the state tax tables, and replaces the tax tables with the highest income protection allowance.

Holt (NJ)—No. 50—Authorizes \$15 million in grants to institutions of higher education to establish programs that encourage students to develop foreign language proficiency as well as science and technological knowledge. Eligible institutions will develop

programs in which students take courses in science, math and technology taught in a foreign language. Funds will also support immersion programs for students to take science and math courses in a non-English speaking country.

Holt (NJ)—No. 51—Creates the opportunity for school systems to complete a Needs Assessment in science, mathematics, and foreign languages to guide teacher professional development and classroom improvement. The Needs Assessment will include as many education stakeholders as possible, including teachers, administrators, parents, school boards, businesses, institutions of higher education, professional associations, and others as determined by the community. The purpose of the Needs Assessment is to properly direct funds and energy to necessary and ambitious teacher professional development and classroom improvement.

Holt (NJ)—No. 52—Creates year-round professional development for mathematics, science, vocational education, and technical course teachers inspired by reports like the NAS' "Rising Above the Gathering Storm" and the Glenn Commission's "Before Its Too Late". The process begins with a two week summer institute at an institution of higher education targeted to improve content knowledge of, grade level teaching of, and the use of technology in the disciplines in which they teach. The professional development continues with meetings to discuss new scientific, industrial, and academic research and how to incorporate it into classroom practice. Additionally, an online community is created to further foster a collaborative learning community amongst teachers that exceeds the limits of a once a month gathering.

Hooley (OR)—No. 46—Creates a Technology Education State Stimulus Scholarship Program, that will allow the Secretary of Education to award grants to States to provide supplementary scholarships to students for study at the postsecondary level in science, math, engineering, or a related field.

Inslie (WA)—No. 25—Seeks to retain Head Start and Early Head Start teachers by increasing the level of discretionary loan forgiveness from \$5,000 to \$17,500 (the level for math and science teachers). Seeks to address the unfunded mandate passed in School Readiness Act (H.R. 2123) requiring 50 percent of Head Start and Early Head Start teachers to obtain a bachelor's degree in early education by 2011.

Inslie (WA)/Wu (OR)—No. 26—Instructs the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance (ACSFA) to assess the increasing cost of college textbooks and the effect on access to higher education, and to recommend strategies for reducing the costs. Currently, ACSFA operates within the Department of Education to advise and counsel Congress and the secretary of education on student financial policy, focusing only on financial aid. Allows the ACSFA to consider total costs, including textbooks, that may affect overall costs and access to postsecondary education.

Israel (NY)—No. 66—Requires the Department of Education to study and report on methods of encouraging centers of higher education, and their students, to study topics and regions important to our nation's national security, such as Islamic studies and China studies.

Israel (NY)—No. 67—Directs the Secretary of Education to match, on a 1:1 basis, any funding set aside by National Security Education Trust Fund (NSETF) for the National Security Education Program, thereby doubling the funding of this program.

Israel (NY)—No. 68—Directs the Secretary of Education to make grants to eligible members of the Armed Services to pay tuition

and other authorized fees to an educational institution in which the service member is enrolled. The funds made available for these grants shall match, on a 1:1 basis, funding set aside by the Secretaries of the military departments.

Israel (NY)—No. 20—(Withdrawn) Requires the Department of Education to study and report on methods of encouraging centers of higher education, and their students, to study topics and regions important to our nation's national security, such as Islamic studies and China studies.

Jackson-Lee (TX)—No. 73—Expresses the Sense of Congress encouraging publishers, professors, and universities to ensure accessibility of braille textbooks for blind or vision-impaired students.

Jackson-Lee (TX)—No. 74—Commissions a study of students in higher education with learning disabilities.

Jackson-Lee (TX)—No. 55—Increases the maximum Pell grant from \$6,000 to \$7,350.

Jefferson (LA)—No. 38—Seeks to provide an additional semester of Pell Grant eligibility to college students who (1) attended school in an "area affected by the Gulf hurricane disaster"; (2) were dependents whose parents lived and were employed in the area; or (3) whose education was interrupted by the disaster. Also directs the Secretary of Education to increase the annual loan limits by \$3,500 for affected students; eligible students may elect to apply the loan increase to either the 2005-2006 or 2006-2007 school years.

Jefferson (LA)—No. 110—(Late) Establishes a low-cost relief loan program to make available low-cost, long-term, guaranteed loans to eligible institutions of higher education for expenses relating to the losses incurred during and after the gulf coast hurricane disasters including: construction and rehabilitation, faculty salaries and benefits and to supplement the institution's operations. The loan should be repayable over 50 years and the Secretary will determine the loan amount.

Johnson, Eddie Bernice (TX)—No. 64—Expands anti-discrimination measures to preclude institutions of higher education from using Federal financial assistance to perform any study or fulfill any contract that prohibits persons of a particular color, ethnicity, religion, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation or national origin from performing that study or executing that contract. Institutions are not prevented from conducting objective studies pertaining to discrimination or including the subject of discrimination in its curriculum.

Johnson, Eddie Bernice (TX)—No. 65—Expands Pell grant eligibility to children who lost a parent or guardian as a result of the conflicts in Iraq or Afghanistan. These children will be eligible for the maximum amount of Pell grant assistance.

Johnson, Eddie Bernice (TX)—No. 62—Changes eligibility standards for Academic Competitiveness Grants by requiring recipients to also be Pell recipients, as opposed to the current requirement of Pell eligible. Academic Competitiveness Grants are not to exceed that of a student's Pell grant, with first year awards adjusted from \$750 to \$1,000, and second year awards adjusted from \$1,300 to \$1,050. Academic Competitiveness Grant recipients will be given top priority for SMART Grants.

Johnson, Eddie Bernice (TX)—No. 63—Expands Pell grant eligibility to children who lost a parent or guardian as a result of Hurricanes Katrina or Rita. These children would be eligible for the maximum amount of Pell grant assistance.

Kind (WI)/Van Hollen (MD)—No. 30—Reinstates the eligibility of undergraduates in Section 602(b), Foreign Language Area Studies (FLAS) fellowships, for advanced level

training in foreign language, world area, and other international studies. It also clarifies that undergraduates may use the fellowships while studying abroad.

Kind (WI)/Holt (NJ)—No. 31—Provides institutions of higher education with grants to institute creative and innovative ways of encouraging students to study and enter into careers focused on math, science, engineering, and technology.

Lantos (CA)—No. 24—Makes a technical correction to the Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN) program to clarify Congressional intent that a Masters Degree level institution or program is eligible to be the lead recipient of a grant under the GAANN program.

Lee (CA)—No. 15—Makes school counselors, school social workers and school psychologists eligible for student loan forgiveness program and identifies them as an "in need" profession in our elementary and secondary schools.

Lewis (KY)—No. 49—(Withdrawn) Strikes a provision from the legislation to allow states to become accreditors of independent colleges and universities. Regional accrediting entities now assure that colleges and universities are meeting standards. Prohibits state intervention into private and independent colleges and universities.

McCarthy (NY)—No. 21—Requires teacher preparation programs to publicly report on the number and type of teachers they are preparing.

McCarthy (NY)/Andrews (NJ)—No. 22—Includes nursing schools in Section 102, "Institutions Outside the United States".

McCarthy (NY)—No. 23—Creates a pilot program to increase the number of graduate educated nurse faculty to meet the future need for qualified nurses.

McCollum (MN)—No. 75—Requires colleges that participate in Federal financial aid programs to disclose information to students and the Department of Education about the college's compliance with U.S. regulations that prohibit bonuses to admissions counselors for their recruitment efforts.

McCollum (MN)—No. 96—(Late) Strikes Section 204 and related sections. This amendment strikes the Teacher Incentive Fund provisions and requires the Secretary of Education to direct any funds appropriated for the Teacher Incentive Fund to financial assistance to higher education institutions located in areas affected by Hurricanes Rita and Katrina.

Millender-McDonald (CA)—No. 4—Makes mentoring a component of the community services programs under work-study. The program can be coordinated between the eligible institution and the public and private organizations and entities that will participate in providing mentoring for children in foster care (such as faith-based organizations, foster care/adoption agencies, children's groups, State Departments of Social Services, public school systems).

Millender-McDonald (CA)—No. 3—Directs the Secretary of Education to advocate for and support the addition of foster-care mentoring programs as part of the independent study requirements if such independent study requirements are required for graduation in the following areas of Education, Sociology, and Psychology at 4-year or 2-year institutions. The duration of the program would be as outlined by academic requirements for graduation.

Millender-McDonald (CA)—No. 6—Clarifies the due process owed to educational institutions throughout the accreditation process. The amendment would: (1) provide express Congressional definition of minimum due process for educational institutions; and (2) require key accreditation decision making to be made in public and after an opportunity for public comment.

Miller (NC)/Bishop (NY)—No. 89—(Late) Establishes a pre-competitive innovation investment grant program that will assist colleges and universities in establishing precompetitive technology transfer centers.

Miller (CA)/McCarthy (NY)—No. 91—(Late) Offers up-front tuition assistance to undergraduates committed to a teaching career, and seeks to establish teachers infields like math and science. Establishes grants with which local districts can provide competitive salaries to their best teachers in the most high-need areas.

Norton (DC)—No. 93—(Late) Amends title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to include the University of the District of Columbia as an eligible institution in Section 326 to receive funding for its qualified graduate programs.

Norton (DC)—No. 95—(Late) Amends Section 496 to clarify the current statutory due process requirements, require cited institutions to receive notice of the deficiencies and be provided the opportunity to respond, grant cited institutions the right to assistance of counsel, and change the final appeals procedure to provide an alternative dispute resolution component.

Petri (WI)/Miller (CA)—No. 27—Inserts at the end of part G of title IV of the bill, the provisions of HR 1425, the Student Aid Reward Program.

Ryan (OH)—No. 8—Requires the Education Secretary to award grants of not more than \$25,000 each on a competitive basis to not more than 20 institutions of higher education to enable those schools to determine the feasibility of operating a course material rental program on their campuses. The feasibility studies would determine the effectiveness and cost of a program which expands the services of bookstores to provide the option for students to rent course materials in order to achieve savings for students.

Ryan (OH)—No. 7—Requires institutions of higher education to waive academic progress requirements for interruptions of study caused by active military service.

Sanchez, Loretta (CA)—No. 111—(Late) Adds language so that paragraph 4 of section 513 enables students receiving financial assistance to receive some sufficient to cover elevated costs of living that exist in some regions.

Sanchez, Loretta (CA)—No. 112—(Late) Adds language so that SECTION 131(b)(1) will require the website to provide, along with other data elements of importance, information which will be useful to minority student populations. For example, by including Hispanic Serving Institutions as a search criterion in the website's college search, students will be able to target the universities which may provide scholarships or areas of study of their preference.

Sanchez, Loretta (CA)—No. 113—(Late) Adds language so that SECTION 131(b)(3)(B) reads as follows: "includes clear and uniform information determined to be relevant to prospective students, enrolled students, and families; in both English and Spanish". This amendment will require all the information in the website to be presented in both English and Spanish.

Sanchez, Loretta (CA)—No. 114—(Late) Adds a new paragraph so that the new SECTION 131(c)(2) requires the schools in the website to present a list of scholarships they offer. This will help students who are eligible for specific scholarships to identify institutions who offer that specific type of scholarship.

Sanchez, Loretta (CA)—No. 115—(Late) Adds language so that SECTION 131(d) will require the information under this section to be in both English and Spanish.

Sanchez, Loretta (CA)—No. 116—(Late) Adds language so that SECTION 401A(a)(1)

will oblige recipients of federal student aid to receive some instruction in financial literacy and responsibility to better manage their financial aid.

Scott (GA)/Drake (VA)/Weiner (NY)—No. 69—Establishes a student loan repayment program within the Department of Education for borrowers who agree to remain employed, for at least three years, as public attorneys who are: (1) State or local criminal prosecutors; or (2) State, Local, or Federal public defenders in criminal cases. The repayment under this program will be limited to \$6000 per calendar year and \$40,000 total.

Scott (VA)—No. 83—Requires degree granting institutions to collect hate crimes data using the same crime categories that the FBI is required to use under the Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1991.

Strickland (OH)—No. 70—Requires that the maximum authorized Pell grant award increases every year by a percentage equal to the percent increase in the cost of higher education, according to the Price Indexes for Personal Consumption Expenditures by Type of Product of the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the Department of Commerce.

Strickland (OH)—No. 71—Defines and sets minimum standards for "educational organizations" eligible for teacher education partnership grants under Title II of the bill.

Strickland (OH)—No. 53—Expands the loan forgiveness program for FFEL and DL borrowers to all teachers working in low-income schools who became first-time borrowers on or after October 1, 1990.

Stupak (MI)—No. 78—Provides Federal student loan relief to borrowers who go into school administration in low-income school districts. Applies to any borrower who has been employed as a full-time school superintendent, principal, or other administrator for five consecutive complete school years in a school district in a low-income area.

Tierney (MA)/Kind (WI)—No. 76—Prohibits the campus-based aid funding formula changes from taking place until the Secretary of Education certifies that sufficient funding has been appropriated so that no school loses money.

Tierney (MA)/McCollum (MN)—No. 40—Provides incentives to make tuition affordable. Provides that any institution of higher education that keeps its net tuition price increase below the Higher Education Price Index receives a 25 percent increase to the Pell Grant award of its Pell Grant recipients and any institution that guarantees net tuition price increases below the Higher Education Price Index for five years receives a 10 percent increase to the Pell Grant award of its Pell Grant recipients. Institutions that raise net tuition price by more than the Higher Education Price Index shall submit a report explaining the causes of such an increase and detailing a plan for preventing such increases in the future.

Tierney (MA)/McCollum (MN)—No. 41—Commissions the National Research Council to conduct a national study to determine the viability of developing and implementing standards in environmental, health, and safety areas to provide for differential regulation of industrial laboratories and facilities, on the one hand, and research and teaching laboratories on the other. The National Research Council shall make specific recommendations for statutory and regulatory changes that are needed to develop such a differential approach.

Tierney (MA)/McCollum (MN)—No. 42—Creates an articulation agreement demonstration program, monitored by the Department of Education, to encourage institutions of higher education to enter into articulation agreements or consortia groups, as a means to lower tuition prices to students.

Tierney (MA)/McCollum (MN)—No. 43—Renews states' commitment to affordable college education by ensuring that they maintain their own level of college financing. Gives students and families access to accurate information about the cost of college and steps individual schools are taking to offer affordable rates of tuition.

Tierney (MA)—No. 44—Commissions a study by the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance to examine the adequacy of current financial aid programs and the extent to which every qualified eligible student receives a sufficient comprehensive financial aid package from all sources, including aid from Federal financial aid programs under this title, state financial aid programs, institutional financial aid programs, and privately-funded grant aid programs.

Tierney (MA)/McCollum (MN)—No. 45—Commissions a GAO Study on college costs and the relationship between state, Federal and institutional support for higher education and college costs.

Waters (CA)—No. 118—(LATE) Seeks to condition the eligibility of private, post-secondary institutions as "institutions of higher education" for purpose of funding under the Act on the obtaining of at least 10 percent of its total funding from sources other than Title IV.

Waters (CA)—No. 56—Extends eligibility for Centers of Excellence program funds to states in which a major disaster has occurred under Section 402 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act for a period of two years following the date of Presidential declaration.

Wu (OR)/Simmons (CT)—No. 9—Allows student loan borrowers to refinance their student loans. Upon reconsolidation, the borrower would get a variable rate with a cap of 6.8 percent.

Wu (OR)/McGovern (MA)—No. 10—Increases the Pell Grant award to \$8,000 through the use of mandatory funds over a period of 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle, why doesn't Mr. INSLEE deserve a floor vote on his proposal on Head Start teacher loan forgiveness? Why prevent public discussion of Mr. MCGOVERN's and Mr. WU's proposal that we increase Pell Grant awards? Or the amendment from Mr. MILLER and Mr. PETRI that would provide \$12 billion in student aid without costing the taxpayers a dime?

Clearly, their ideas would have at least made it to the floor for the debate in 1992 and 1998. So have these Members simply shown up to the wrong section of Congress, or does the majority feel that these amendments might be sound policy and pass?

Members on both sides of the aisle decry the lack of bipartisanship in the House every day, but what are we doing to really embrace bipartisanship? We should be able to agree that every Member of this body deserves time to offer his or her suggestions on something as fundamental as our Nation's education policy. Sadly, that is not the case this morning.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to reject the second rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

As we have seen today, Dan Quisenberry was right: The future is much like the past, only longer.

Yesterday the debate on the underlying bill provided ample discussion, and we realize that the underlying bill is one that has the one goal, the most important goal, to expand the number of kids who have the opportunity of fulfilling their college dream, with a special emphasis on new students coming into the system and those who accelerate their study programs in some particular way.

If I can speak for the chairman of the committee, I believe at that point that part of the discussion was done in a very bipartisan manner in the committee.

Mr. MILLER, the ranking member, will give a comprehensive alternative program and have 30 minutes of debate, and he can include anything he wishes to include in that. We are offering plenty of debate on this particular bill.

I would like to say something simply about the rule itself and the process of the rule. If we extend the logic of some who are saying everything should be an open rule, realizing we have four times the number that are in the Senate, we move ourselves into a structural system where we start to emulate the Senate process which should strike fear in the hearts of Members just on that concent.

Prior to the War of 1812, we had always had committee work done in the House. It was Speaker Clay who instituted standing committees and formulated a structural policy that the House has used since that time to try to use committees in a different way than our sister body on the other side of this Capitol to try to put a greater emphasis on committees so that Members would become specialists in areas. They would have expertise. In committee, you can have expert testimony in the hearing to assist, and in the committee with expertise in that area, Members could sit down and work through bills before they actually came to the House.

There was for this particular bill 79 amendments discussed in the committee, half as many of those amendments in the subcommittee on this particular bill with endless discussion. It was a thoroughly vetted and discussed bill. I would add, of the 117 amendments that then came to the Committee on Rules for further discussion here on the floor, 68 of those were from members of the committee who already supposedly discussed that. Multiple amendments were either withdrawn, were duplicative, or had jurisdictional problems. And more important, many of those amendments presented in the Rules Committee had been discussed and defeated in the committee of jurisdiction.

As I look at some of the amendments that were proposed: No. 97 was defeated on a rollcall vote; No. 98 was withdrawn in committee; No. 100 defeated on a voice vote; No. 101 was defeated in

a rollcall vote; No. 80 was defeated on rollcall vote; No. 27 defeated on a rollcall vote; No. 83 defeated on a voice vote; No. 43 defeated on a rollcall vote; and No. 45 was actually incorporated into the bill. Amendment No. 9 was defeated twice, once in the subcommittee and once in the committee and then, once again, presented on the floor.

What the Rules Committee is trying to do is cull through the process in the committees where this discussion should take place with people who have expertise and people who have developed competence in that particular area, not replicating the entire thing on the floor, which is why if you look at the rules for both yesterday and today, they are both rules which reward bipartisanship for indeed half of the amendments made in order were either Democrat or bipartisan amendments at that particular time.

One of the greatest managers of all time, Casey Stengel, once talking about who I still think is the best second baseman in the history of the Yankees' organization, Bobby Richardson, said he was amazed because the guy doesn't drink, he doesn't smoke, he doesn't stay out late, and he still can't hit .250. That is a wonderful non sequitur. Not staying out late, not drinking, not smoking makes you healthy and perhaps play longer but it has nothing to do with the ability of hitting a curve ball.

Oftentimes when we come here with amendments on the floor, we bypass the concept of the bill with some amendments or processes that I think are non sequitur.

Talking about the various kinds of teachers in various disciplines that we can enhance is good, is worthwhile and wonderful, but this bill is about how kids can have better access to a college education.

Talking about increasing the potential of lender profits is great for the lenders, but this bill is about how you expand the number of kids who can get a college education.

Having an amendment that deals with National Resource Council to have an environmental health and safety study is a wonderful concept and a worthwhile goal, but it is not the purpose and the function of this bill.

I hope as we go through this process we recognize what the Rules Committee tried to do is focus in on what the purpose of this bill is. The purpose of this bill is to try to help more kids get a college education. In that regard, I think this rule moves us in that direction and the underlying bill supports that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 188, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—224

Aderholt	Gibbons	Nunes
Akin	Gillmor	Nussle
Alexander	Gingrey	Osborne
Bachus	Gohmert	Otter
Baker	Goode	Paul
Barrett (SC)	Goodlatte	Pearce
Bartlett (MD)	Granger	Pence
Barton (TX)	Graves	Peterson (PA)
Bass	Green (WI)	Petri
Beauprez	Gutknecht	Pickering
Biggart	Hall	Pitts
Bilirakis	Harris	Platts
Bishop (UT)	Hart	Poe
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Pombo
Blunt	Hayes	Porter
Boehlert	Hayworth	Price (GA)
Boehner	Hefley	Pryce (OH)
Bonilla	Hensarling	Putnam
Bonner	Herger	Radanovich
Bono	Hobson	Ramstad
Boozman	Hoekstra	Regula
Boustany	Hostettler	Rehberg
Bradley (NH)	Hulshof	Reichert
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Renzi
Brown (SC)	Hyde	Reynolds
Brown-Waite,	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (AL)
Ginny	Istook	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Jenkins	Rogers (MI)
Burton (IN)	Jindal	Rohrabacher
Buyer	Johnson (CT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Johnson (IL)	Royce
Camp (MI)	Johnson, Sam	Ryan (WI)
Campbell (CA)	Jones (NC)	Ryun (KS)
Cannon	Keller	Saxton
Cantor	Kelly	Schmidt
Capito	Kennedy (MN)	Schwarz (MI)
Carter	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Castle	King (NY)	Sessions
Chabot	Kingston	Shadegg
Chocola	Kirk	Shaw
Coble	Klaine	Shays
Cole (OK)	Knollenberg	Sherwood
Conaway	Kolbe	Shimkus
Crenshaw	Kuhl (NY)	Shuster
Cubin	LaHood	Simmons
Culberson	Latham	Simpson
Davis (KY)	LaTourette	Smith (NJ)
Davis, Jo Ann	Leach	Smith (TX)
Davis, Tom	Lewis (CA)	Sodrel
Deal (GA)	Lewis (KY)	Souder
DeLay	Linder	Stearns
Dent	LoBiondo	Sullivan
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lucas	Tancredo
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lungren, Daniel	Taylor (NC)
Doolittle	E.	Terry
Drake	Mack	Thomas
Dreier	Manzullo	Thornberry
Duncan	Marchant	Tiahrt
Ehlers	McCaul (TX)	Tiberi
Emerson	McCotter	Turner
English (PA)	McCrery	Upton
Everett	McHenry	Walden (OR)
Feeney	McHugh	Walsh
Ferguson	McKeon	Wamp
Fitzpatrick (PA)	McMorris	Weldon (FL)
Flake	Mica	Weldon (PA)
Foley	Miller (MI)	Weller
Forbes	Miller, Gary	Westmoreland
Fortenberry	Moran (KS)	Wicker
Fossella	Murphy	Wilson (NM)
Fox	Musgrave	Wilson (SC)
Franks (AZ)	Myrick	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Neugebauer	Young (AK)
Gallegly	Ney	Young (FL)
Garrett (NJ)	Northup	
Gerlach	Norwood	

NAYS—188

Abercrombie	Allen	Baca
Ackerman	Andrews	Baird

Baldwin	Gutierrez	Oberstar
Barrow	Harman	Obey
Bean	Hastings (FL)	Oliver
Becerra	Herseth	Ortiz
Berkley	Higgins	Pallone
Berman	Hinchee	Pascarell
Berry	Hinojosa	Pastor
Bishop (GA)	Holden	Payne
Bishop (NY)	Holt	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Honda	Peterson (MN)
Boren	Hookey	Pomeroy
Boswell	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Boucher	Inslee	Rahall
Boyd	Israel	Reyes
Brady (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Ross
Brown (OH)	Jefferson	Rothman
Brown, Corrine	Johnson, E. B.	Royal-Allard
Butterfield	Jones (OH)	Rush
Capps	Kanjorski	Ryan (OH)
Capuano	Kaptur	Sabo
Cardin	Kennedy (RI)	Salazar
Carnahan	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda T.
Carson	Kilpatrick (MI)	T.
Case	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Chandler	Kucinich	Sanders
Cleaver	Langevin	Schiff
Clyburn	Lantos	Schwartz (PA)
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Scott (GA)
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Costa	Lee	Serrano
Costello	Levin	Sherman
Cramer	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Crowley	Lipinski	Slaughter
Cuellar	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Lowey	Snyder
Davis (AL)	Lynch	Solis
Davis (CA)	Maloney	Spratt
Davis (IL)	Markey	Stark
Davis (TN)	Matheson	Strickland
DeFazio	Matsui	Stupak
DeGette	McCarthy	Tanner
Delahunt	McCollum (MN)	Tauscher
DeLauro	McDermott	Taylor (MS)
Dicks	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	McIntyre	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	McNulty	Tierney
Doyle	Meehan	Towns
Edwards	Meek (FL)	Udall (CO)
Emanuel	Melancon	Udall (NM)
Engel	Michaud	Van Hollen
Eshoo	Millender-	Velázquez
Etheridge	McDonald	Visclosky
Farr	Miller (NC)	Wasserman
Fattah	Miller, George	Schultz
Filner	Mollohan	Watt
Ford	Moore (KS)	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Moore (WI)	Weiner
Gonzalez	Moran (VA)	Wexler
Gordon	Murtha	Woolsey
Green, Al	Nadler	Wu
Green, Gene	Napolitano	Wynn
Grijalva	Neal (MA)	

NOT VOTING—20

Cardoza	Marshall	Schakowsky
Clay	McKinney	Sweeney
Davis (FL)	Meeks (NY)	Waters
Evans	Miller (FL)	Watson
Gilchrest	Owens	Whitfield
Issa	Oxley	
Jackson-Lee	Rangel	
(TX)	Ruppersberger	

□ 1144

Messrs. STUPAK, BUTTERFIELD, DOGGETT, and CUELLAR changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1145

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—PRIVILEGED RESOLUTION REQUIRING ETHICS INVESTIGATION OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS BRIBED BY REPUBLICAN LOBBYIST JACK ABRAMOFF

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule IX, I rise in regard to a question

of the privileges of the House, and I offer a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas, it has been two years since credible reports of misconduct by Mr. Jack Abramoff and Members of Congress began appearing regularly in the public record, including reports closely linking Republican Members of Congress with the documented misconduct of Mr. Abramoff;

Whereas, in the first session of the 109th Congress, for the first time in the history of the House of Representatives, the rules of procedure of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct were changed on a partisan basis, the Chairman of the Committee and two of his Republican Colleagues were dismissed from the Committee, the newly appointed Chairman of the Committee improperly and unilaterally fired non-partisan staff, and the Chairman attempted to appoint supervisory staff without a vote of the Committee in direct contravention of the intent of the bi-partisan procedures adopted in 1997;

Whereas, because of these actions, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct conducted no investigative activities in the first session of the 109th Congress and has not yet conducted such activities;

Whereas, the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs and the Senate Committee on Finance have both undertaken investigations of Mr. Jack Abramoff's activities, yet no House Committee has begun any such investigation;

Whereas, on March 29th, 2006, Mr. Jack Abramoff was sentenced to 5 years and 10 months in prison after pleading guilty to conspiracy and wire fraud;

Whereas, a Justice Department press release reported that Mr. Jack Abramoff “corruptly provid[ed] things of value to public officials . . . including, but not limited to, a lavish trip to Scotland to play golf on worldfamous courses, tickets to sporting events and other entertainment, regular meals at Abramoff's upscale restaurant, and campaign contributions for [a] Representative, his political action committee, his campaign committee, and other political committees on behalf of [that] Representative.” (Department of Justice press release, January 3, 2006);

Whereas, Mr. Jack Abramoff's plea agreement states that he and his colleagues “provided things of value to public officials in exchange for a series of official acts and influence . . . including agreements to support and pass legislation (and) agreements to place statements in the Congressional Record.” (Abramoff Plea Agreement);

Whereas, on November 5, 2005, in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, a former Congressional staff member and business partner of Mr. Jack Abramoff pled guilty to conspiracy to violate Federal laws and admitted that, beginning in January, 2000, he offered and provided things of value to public officials, including Members of Congress and staff, in exchange for a series of official acts;

Resolved, That the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall immediately initiate an investigation of the misconduct by Members of Congress and their staff implicated in the scandals associated with Mr. Jack Abramoff's criminal activity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution constitutes a question of the privileges of the House.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move to table the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 216, noes 193, answered “present” 7, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

AYES—216

Aderholt	Garrett (NJ)	Norwood
Akin	Gibbons	Nunes
Alexander	Gillmor	Nussle
Bachus	Gingrey	Osborne
Baker	Gohmert	Otter
Barrett (SC)	Goode	Pearce
Bartlett (MD)	Goodlatte	Pence
Barton (TX)	Granger	Peterson (PA)
Bass	Graves	Petri
Beauprez	Gutknecht	Pickering
Biggart	Hall	Pitts
Bilirakis	Harris	Poe
Bishop (UT)	Hart	Pombo
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Porter
Blunt	Hayes	Price (GA)
Boehlert	Hayworth	Pryce (OH)
Boehner	Hefley	Putnam
Bonilla	Hensarling	Radanovich
Bonner	Herger	Ramstad
Bono	Hobson	Regula
Boozman	Hoekstra	Rehberg
Boustany	Hostettler	Reichert
Bradley (NH)	Hulshof	Renzi
Brown (SC)	Hunter	Reynolds
Brown-Waite,	Hyde	Rogers (AL)
Ginny	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Istook	Rogers (MI)
Burton (IN)	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Buyer	Jindal	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Johnson (CT)	Royce
Camp (MI)	Johnson (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Campbell (CA)	Johnson, Sam	Ryun (KS)
Cannon	Keller	Saxton
Cantor	Kelly	Schmidt
Capito	Kennedy (MN)	Schwarz (MI)
Carter	King (IA)	Schwenbrenner
Castle	King (NY)	Sessions
Chabot	Kingston	Shadegg
Choccola	Kirk	Shaw
Coble	Kline	Sherwood
Cole (OK)	Knollenberg	Shimkus
Conaway	Kolbe	Shuster
Crenshaw	Kuhl (NY)	Simmons
Cubin	LaHood	Simpson
Culberson	Latham	Smith (NJ)
Davis (KY)	LaTourette	Smith (TX)
Davis, Jo Ann	Lewis (CA)	Sodrel
Davis, Tom	Lewis (KY)	Sodrel
Deal (GA)	Linder	Stearns
DeLay	LoBiondo	Sullivan
Dent	Lucas	Tancredi
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lungren, Daniel	Taylor (NC)
Diaz-Balart, M.	E.	Terry
Doolittle	Mack	Thomas
Drake	Manzullo	Thornberry
Dreier	Marchant	Tiahrt
Duncan	McCauley (TX)	Tiberi
Ehlers	McCotter	Turner
Emerson	McCrery	Upton
English (PA)	McHenry	Walden (OR)
Everett	McHugh	Walsh
Feeney	McKeon	Wamp
Ferguson	McMorris	Weldon (FL)
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Mica	Weldon (PA)
Flake	Miller (MI)	Weller
Foley	Miller, Gary	Westmoreland
Forbes	Moran (KS)	Whitfield
Fortenberry	Murphy	Wicker
Fossella	Musgrave	Wilson (NM)
Fox	Myrick	Wilson (SC)
Franks (AZ)	Neugebauer	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Ney	Young (AK)
Gallely	Northup	Young (FL)

NOES—193

Abercrombie	Baca	Bean
Ackerman	Baird	Becerra
Allen	Baldwin	Berkley
Andrews	Barrow	Berman