

Shockingly, 90 percent of new teachers, the majority of whom one might assume have grown up with computers—particularly during their years of higher education—do not feel prepared to use or effectively teach technology skills in their classrooms. Just as a dictionary may not be used as a resource by someone who is unable to read, computers in our classrooms are only useful when teachers are able to understand how they work and confidently apply this know-how in the classroom. The Higher Education Act recognizes this problem and provides for programs designed to implement the integration of technology into teaching and learning. I'm pleased to have helped initiate this policy in legislation which I've co-sponsored this session.

I specifically voice my opposition to the Riggs amendment which attempts to eliminate affirmative action. This amendment overreaches and would bar any legal initiative to achieve diversity in our higher education institutions, its wrong and ought to be defeated. The bottom line is that Americans must have education and training they can afford, for the jobs and futures they merit and it must embrace the diversity of our US populace. Without educational opportunities, America's children face a future of lower employment, lower productivity, lower aspirations, and ultimately, a lower standard of living. This is certainly no way to prepare for a new Century. The federal government, prompted by Congress, can and will make a difference in meeting the challenge of change. By supporting higher education, we are investing in people, our nation's most valuable natural resource.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, Congress should reject HR 6, the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 because it furthers the federal stranglehold over higher education. Instead of furthering federal control over education, Congress should focus on allowing Americans to devote more of their resources to higher education by dramatically reducing their taxes. There are numerous proposals to do this before this Congress. For example, the Higher Education Affordability and Availability Act (HR 2847), of which I am an original cosponsor, allows taxpayers to deposit up to \$5,000 per year in a pre-paid tuition plan without having to pay tax on the interest earned, thus enabling more Americans to afford college. This is just one of the many fine proposals to reduce the tax burden on Americans so they can afford a higher education for themselves and/or their children. Other good ideas which I have supported are the PASS A+ accounts for higher education included in last year's budget, and the administration's HOPE scholarship proposal, of which I was amongst the few members of the majority to champion. 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 tax dollars to spend as bureaucrats see fit.

Federal control inevitably accompanies federal funding because politicians cannot exist imposing their preferred solutions for perceived "problems" on institutions dependent upon 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 numerous provisions in HR 6. Clearly, federal funding is being used as an excuse to tighten the federal noose around both higher and elementary education.

Federal spending, and thus federal control, are dramatically increased by HR 6. The entire bill has been scored as costing approximately \$101 billion dollars over the next five years; an increase of over 10 billion from the levels a Democrat Congress Congress authorize for Higher Education programs in 1991!. Of course, actual spending for these programs may be greater, especially if the country experiences an economic downturn which increases the demand for federally-subsidized student loans.

Mr. Chairman, one particular objectionable feature of the Higher Education Amendments is that this act creates a number of new federal programs, some of which were added to the bill late at night when few members were present to object.

The most objectionable program is "teacher training." The Federal Government has no constitutional authority to dictate, or "encourage," states and localities to adopt certain methods of education. Yet, this Congress is preparing to authorize the federal government to bribe states, with monies the federal government should never have taken from the people in the first place, to adopt teacher training methods favored by a select group of DC-based congressmen and staffers.

As HR 6 was being drafted and marked-up, some Committee members did attempt to protect the interests of the taxpayers by refusing to support authorizing this program unless the spending was offset by cuts in other programs. Unfortunately, some members who might have otherwise opposed this program supported it at the Committee mark-up because of the offset.

While having an offset for the teacher training program is superior to authorizing a new program, at least from an accounting perspective, supporting this program remains unacceptable for two reasons. First of all, just because the program is funded this year by reduced expenditures is no guarantee the same formula will be followed in future years. In fact, given the trend toward ever-higher expenditures in federal education programs, it is likely that the teacher training program will receive new funds over and above any offset contained in its authorizing legislation.

Second, and more importantly, the 10th amendment does not prohibit federal control of education without an offset, it prohibits all programs that centralize education regardless of how they are funded. Savings from defunded education programs should be used for education tax cuts and credits, not poured into new, unconstitutional programs.

Another unconstitutional interference in higher education within HR 6 is the provision creating new features mandates on institutes of higher education regarding the reporting of criminal incidents to the general public. Once again, the federal government is using its funding of higher education to impose unconstitutional mandates on colleges and universities.

Officials of the Texas-New Mexico Association of College and University Police Departments have raised concerns about some of the new requirements in this bill. Two provisions the association finds particularly objec-

tionable are those mandating that campuses report incidents of arson and report students referred to disciplinary action on drug and alcohol charges. These officials are concerned these expanded requirements will lead to the reporting of minor offenses, such as lighting a fire in a trash can or a 19-year-old student caught in his room with a six-pack of beer as campus crimes, thus, distorting the true picture of the criminal activity level occurring as campus.

The association also objects to the requirement that campus make police and security logs available to the general public within two business days as this may not allow for an intelligent interpretation of the impact of the availability of the information and may compromise an investigation, cause the destruction of evidence, or the flight of an accomplice. Furthermore, reporting the general location, date, and time for a crime may identify victims against their will in cases of sexual assault, drug arrests, and burglary investigations. The informed views of those who deal with campus crime on a daily basis should be given their constitutional due rather than dictating to them the speculations of those who sit in Washington and presume to mandate a uniform reporting system for campus crimes.

Another offensive provision of the campus crime reporting section of the bill that has raised concerns in the higher education community is the mandate that any campus disciplinary proceeding alleging criminal misconduct shall be open. This provision may discourage victims, particularly women who have been sexually assaulted, from seeking redress through a campus disciplinary procedure for fear they will be put "on display." For example, in a recent case, a student in Miami University in Ohio explained that she chose to seek redress over a claim of sexual assault " * * through the university, rather than the county prosecutor's office, so that she could avoid the publicity and personal discomfort of a prosecution * * * " Assaulting the privacy rights of victimized students by taking away the option of a campus disciplinary proceeding is not only an unconstitutional mandate but immoral.

This bill also contains a section authorizing special funding for programs in areas of so-called "national need" as designated by the Secretary of Education. This is little more than central planning, based on the fallacy that omnipotent "experts" can easily determine the correct allocation of education resources. However, basic economics teaches that a bureaucrat in Washington cannot determine "areas of national need." The only way to know this is through the interaction of students, colleges, employers, and consumers operating in a free-market, where individuals can decide what higher education is deserving of expending additional resources as indicated by employer workplace demand.

Mr. Chairman, the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 expand the unconstitutional role of the federal government in education by increasing federal control over higher education, as well as creating a new teacher training program. This bill represents more of the same, old "Washington knows best" philosophy that has so damaged American education over the past century. Congress should therefore reject this bill and instead join me in working to defund all unconstitutional programs and free Americans from the destructive tax

and monetary policies of the past few decades, thus making higher education more readily available and more affordable for millions of Americans.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 6 which reauthorizes the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Like the G.I. bill which provided a college opportunity to the returning WWII vets, the Higher Education Act has done more to expand post-secondary education than any other factor in our educational system or in society. The decision by the Congress in 1965 to make a college education a national priority has contributed to the economic success of our nation. Literally millions of students have been able to attain a college degree because of the federal grant and student loan programs authorized by the Higher Education Act. Most importantly these programs are targeted to disadvantaged students who would have no alternative means of paying for a college education.

H.R. 6 continues the goal of expanding educational opportunity for all students, it lowers the cost of borrowing under the student loan program, expands early intervention efforts and includes provisions to address the special needs of women students.

The cornerstone of the Higher Education Act is the Pell Grant program which provides up to \$3,000 to help low-income students pay for college. The bill continues the commitment to the Pell Grant program by raising the authorized level of the maximum Pell Grant award from \$3,000 in the school year 1998–99 to \$5,100 by the year 2002.

The agreement reached on the student loan interest rate assures that the cost of borrowing student loans will be greatly reduced for students. The new interest rate will be around 5.83% in 1998 for a student in school and a rate of around 7.43% for a student in repayment. The agreement also assures that financial institutions will continue to participate in the student loan program so that students will have access to student loans through a variety of lenders.

Early intervention is also a key component of this legislation. We all know the benefits of existing programs such as TRIO, which assists at-risk high school students in achieving the academic tools necessary to attend college and providing support services such as tutoring and mentoring once they are in college to assure that they will stay in school.

H.R. 6 includes a strong commitment to the TRIO program by increasing the authorization to \$800 million. Currently TRIO programs are funded at \$530 million. We now have a goal to fund this program at its full \$800 million authorization level, so that we can expand programs to reach those areas that do not have the benefit of TRIO.

We also added an important component to our early intervention efforts in the adoption of the High Hopes program, a Clinton Administration initiative which will fund a variety of early intervention efforts in middle schools in low income areas. This program will help close the gap between college enrollment among higher income families and low income families.

H.R. 6 also includes provisions designed specifically to address the needs of women students. The bill increases the allowance for child care expenses in a student's cost of attendance from \$750 to \$1,500. This provision

recognizes the high cost of child care and the impact it has on the overall resources a parent has to attend school.

In another effort to assist students with young children, the bill authorizes \$30 million for a new program to establish child care centers on college campuses. Also, I understand the Chairman of the Committee has agreed to include in his manager's amendment a grants for campus crime prevention. Unfortunately, women on college campuses are victims of violent crimes all too often. It is the responsibility of the institution to assist in making college safe for women. This grant program will assist in that effort.

Of particular concern to the University of Hawaii is the International Education programs in Title VI of this bill. I am pleased we were able to work out a compromise on the issue of including both the International Education and Graduate Education programs in the same Title. The International Programs appear in a separate Part to make clear that there is no intention of consolidation of these programs. International education plays an increasingly important role in our society and we must prepare our students to work in a global society.

Though I am in support of this bill, there are provisions that cause grave concern—specifically the elimination of the Patricia Roberts Harris Fellowship which is designed to give women and minorities with significant financial need opportunities in graduate education, particularly in the fields of study that women and minorities have traditionally been under represented such as the engineering and sciences.

Although the committee intends this program to be consolidated in the Graduate Assistance Areas of National Need or GAANN program, I note that the GAANN program as amended by this bill has no component which assists women and minorities in fields in which they are under represented. The GAANN program if focused on provided assistance to those individuals who pursue fields of study in which there is a national need for more students. It has no focus on women or minority students. This is something I hope we can work out in conference.

Mr. Chairman, this bill moves us forward in expanding educational opportunities for our students. There has been much effort to make this a bi-partisan bill that everyone can be proud of. I urge my colleagues to support the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, H.R. 6, and the tremendous help this bill will provide to our nation's higher education system. The students of today will be the leaders of tomorrow, and we owe it to them to provide the best possible opportunities for furthering their education beyond high school. In the global economy of today, our children will need more and better skills to compete with their counterparts from around the world. Congress can significantly help this effort by providing low-cost loans, more scholarship opportunities, and programs that encourage partnerships among all levels of government and educational institutions.

There are a few provisions in H.R. 6 I would like to mention specifically that relate to the third district of Oregon which I represent. First is the Urban Community Service Grant program. Under this program, funds are made

available to institutions to help link the assets of institutions such as Portland State University, attended by many of my constituents, to the needs of urban communities. This program is the only one in the Department of Education that speaks directly to urban institutions and has made a real difference for those institutions throughout the country.

PSU's project is community-based and focuses on urban ecosystems. It serves more than 1,000 schoolchildren and demonstrates that learning the basics about mathematics, science, and social studies can involve "real work" experiences through community service learning. In this project, curriculum topics arise from real issues identified by people in the community. As a result, students perceive their classroom experiences as relevant and are more motivated to participate in educational activities.

Some examples of the work students performed include:

Building and monitoring bird boxes for the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife;

Discussing Portland's infamous combined sewage overflow problem with residents and disconnection of downspouts to help alleviate the problem; and

Planting and maintaining a butterfly and bird garden.

Parents, the business community, local government, and nonprofit organizations are involved in and contribute to the program's success. Volunteers work with students in an urban ecosystems environment to apply the fundamentals of science and math to projects that make a difference to the community. This program is unique because it addresses middle school children—those who are at an age when they will either succeed or fail in school—and their families.

Second, I strongly support the Federal Financial aid provisions in the bill. I am pleased the bill "fixes" the independent student eligibility for Pell Grant issue. Last year's revisions to the tax code made one thing clear—access to higher education is key to the nation's ability to maintain economic competitiveness. Even more needs to be done to encourage those without financial resources to attend college. As Oregon's primary urban university, Portland State University serves many students who are independent or who have little or no family resources for a college education. At PSU, Federal financial aid means access. About 8,000 of our students receive financial aid, that's more than half of the student population. Clearly, more financial aid will mean more students will attend college.

I also support the bill's position on lowering the interest rate on Student loans. PSU students are increasing their indebtedness to get a college degree. Since 1986–87, student borrowing at PSU has increased from \$7.7 million to \$43.9 million. This is due to a number of factors—the cost of education has risen, funding for grants has not kept pace with inflation, and loans are now available primarily to middle and upper income students. Although loans are made available to families who don't have savings or other resources for higher education, soaring amounts of debt are still placed on our students. The high level of indebtedness now associated with attending college is of concern to both myself and my constituents.

I also support continued funding of the State student Incentive Grants (SSIG) program. This

program is important because it provides needed financial aid dollars to low- and working class students and it leverages state funds. While the Federal SSIG funds have declined, the Federal match is needed to help states maintain their commitment to providing state aid for students. At a time when states are facing tight budgets, the Federal match has prevented cuts in the states' share of financial aid. It has often made the difference to state legislatures around the country looking for ways to trim budgets.

However, I am concerned about any provision added to the bill which would have the federal government interfere with the ability of colleges and universities to choose students as they see fit, regardless of their racial or ethnic heritage. The Congress should take every precaution to not interfere into policies of this nature. Admissions policies that take into account racial, ethnic and gender actors have widely been recognized as constitutional by the Supreme Court, and should not be subject to further Congressional meddling. I am hopeful this bill is passed without such harmful provisions.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will go a long way towards addressing many students' needs in their pursuit of a college degree. It is the least we can do to prepare our children for the demands they will face in the real world. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6, and hope for the bill's speedy passage by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GILCHREST) having assumed the chair, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6) to extend the authorization of programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 411, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 4, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

YEAS—414

Abercrombie	Doggett	Kaptur
Ackerman	Dooley	Kasich
Aderholt	Doolittle	Kelly
Allen	Dreier	Kennedy (MA)
Andrews	Duncan	Kennedy (RI)
Archer	Dunn	Kennelly
Army	Edwards	Kildee
Bachus	Ehlers	Kilpatrick
Baesler	Ehrlich	Kim
Baker	Emerson	Kind (WI)
Baldacci	Engel	King (NY)
Ballenger	English	Kingston
Barcia	Ensign	Klecza
Barr	Eshoo	Klink
Barrett (NE)	Etheridge	Klug
Barrett (WI)	Evans	Knollenberg
Bartlett	Everett	Kolbe
Barton	Ewing	Kucinich
Bass	Farr	LaFalce
Becerra	Fattah	LaHood
Bentsen	Fawell	Lampson
Bereuter	Fazio	Lantos
Berman	Filner	Largent
Berry	Foley	Latham
Bilbray	Forbes	LaTourette
Bilirakis	Ford	Lazio
Bishop	Fossella	Leach
Blagojevich	Fowler	Lee
Biley	Fox	Levin
Blumenauer	Frank (MA)	Lewis (GA)
Blunt	Franks (NJ)	Lewis (KY)
Boehert	Frelinghuysen	Linder
Boehner	Frost	Lipinski
Bonilla	Furse	Livingston
Bonior	Galleghy	LoBiondo
Bono	Ganske	Lofgren
Borski	Gejdenson	Lowey
Boswell	Gekas	Lucas
Boucher	Gephardt	Luther
Boyd	Gibbons	Maloney (CT)
Brady	Gilchrest	Maloney (NY)
Brown (CA)	Gillmor	Manton
Brown (FL)	Gilman	Manzullo
Brown (OH)	Goode	Markey
Bryant	Goodlatte	Martinez
Bunning	Goodling	Mascara
Burr	Gordon	Matsui
Burton	Goss	McCarthy (MO)
Buyer	Graham	McCarthy (NY)
Callahan	Granger	McCollum
Calvert	Green	McCrery
Camp	Greenwood	McDade
Canady	Gutierrez	McDermott
Cannon	Gutknecht	McGovern
Capps	Hall (OH)	McHale
Cardin	Hall (TX)	McHugh
Castle	Hamilton	McInnis
Chabot	Hansen	McIntosh
Chambliss	Harman	McIntyre
Chenoweth	Hastert	McKeon
Clay	Hastings (WA)	McKinney
Clayton	Hayworth	Meehan
Clement	Hefley	Meek (FL)
Clyburn	Hefner	Meeks (NY)
Coble	Herger	Menendez
Coburn	Hill	Metcalfe
Collins	Hilleary	Mica
Combest	Hilliard	Millender-
Condit	Hinchee	McDonald
Conyers	Hinojosa	Miller (CA)
Cook	Hobson	Miller (FL)
Cooksey	Hoekstra	Minge
Costello	Holden	Mink
Cox	Hooley	Moakley
Coyne	Horn	Mollohan
Cramer	Hostettler	Moran (KS)
Crapo	Houghton	Moran (VA)
Cubin	Hoyer	Morella
Cummings	Hulshof	Murtha
Cunningham	Hunter	Myrick
Danner	Hutchinson	Nadler
Davis (FL)	Hyde	Neal
Davis (IL)	Inglis	Nethercutt
Davis (VA)	Istook	Ney
Deal	Jackson (IL)	Northup
DeFazio	Jackson-Lee	Norwood
DeGette	(TX)	Nussle
Delahunt	Jefferson	Oberstar
DeLauro	Jenkins	Obey
DeLay	John	Olver
Deutsch	Johnson (CT)	Ortiz
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (WI)	Owens
Dickey	Johnson, E. B.	Oxley
Dicks	Johnson, Sam	Packard
Dingell	Jones	Pallone
Dixon	Kanjorski	Pappas

Parker	Salmon	Talent
Pascrell	Sanchez	Tanner
Pastor	Sanders	Tauscher
Paxon	Sandlin	Tauzin
Payne	Sanford	Taylor (MS)
Pease	Sawyer	Taylor (NC)
Pelosi	Saxton	Thomas
Peterson (MN)	Scarborough	Thompson
Peterson (PA)	Schumer	Thornberry
Petri	Scott	Thune
Pickering	Sensenbrenner	Thurman
Pickett	Serrano	Tiahrt
Pitts	Sessions	Tierney
Pombo	Shadegg	Torres
Pomeroy	Shaw	Towns
Porter	Shays	Traficant
Portman	Sherman	Turner
Poshard	Shimkus	Upton
Price (NC)	Sisisky	Velazquez
Pryce (OH)	Skeen	Vento
Quinn	Skelton	Visclosky
Rahall	Slaughter	Walsh
Ramstad	Smith (MI)	Wamp
Rangel	Smith (NJ)	Waters
Redmond	Smith (OR)	Watkins
Regula	Smith (TX)	Watt (NC)
Reyes	Smith, Adam	Watts (OK)
Riggs	Smith, Linda	Waxman
Riley	Snowbarger	Weldon (FL)
Rivers	Snyder	Weldon (PA)
Rodriguez	Solomon	Weller
Roemer	Souder	Wexler
Rogan	Spence	Weygand
Rogers	Spratt	White
Rohrabacher	Stabenow	Whitfield
Ros-Lehtinen	Stark	Wicker
Rothman	Stearns	Wise
Roukema	Stenholm	Wolf
Roybal-Allard	Stokes	Woolsey
Royce	Strickland	Wynn
Rush	Stump	Young (AK)
Ryun	Stupak	Young (FL)
Sabo	Sununu	

NAYS—4

Campbell	Paul
Crane	Schaffer, Bob

NOT VOTING—14

Bateman	Hastings (FL)	Schaefer, Dan
Carson	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Christensen	McNulty	Skaggs
Doyle	Neumann	Yates
Gonzalez	Radanovich	

□ 2255

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 6, HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1998

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 6, the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections and conforming changes to the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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 and include extraneous material on H.R. 6.

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