Tomasch (216) 622–4635; National Steel Corporation, Clarence Ehlers (219) 273–7327; Independent Steel Workers Union, Mark Glyptis (304) 748–8080; Weirton Steel, Greg Warren (304) 797–2828; Gulf States Steel, Inc., John Duncan (256) 543–6100; Ipsco Steel, Inc., Anne Parker (306) 924–7390; and Gallatin Steel, Ed Puisis (606) 567–3103.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

INTRODUCTION OF THE RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND OPPORTUNITIES ACT OF 1999

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing the Rural Economic Development and Opportunities Act of 1999. What I am proposing is not a complex package of government programs and new spending. Instead, I am advocating that we adopt a commonsense proposal that will level the playing field for our rural communities by offering a basic tax credit for a new or existing rural business when it creates a job for rural workers.

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

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

INCREASED FUNDS FOR PELL GRANTS IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST

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

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

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

The Pell Grant program is the largest need-related Federal grant program for students pursuing a higher education. It is considered the foundation program for Federal student aid. It helps students from families of modest income who would not otherwise be financially able to handle the costs of a college education or special career or technical training program.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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