

But that action by the President needs to be followed by Congressional action. We need to increase the overall LIHEAP funding for fiscal 2001. Remember, two-thirds of LIHEAP households have incomes of less than \$8,000 per year and even with the assistance, the average LIHEAP family spends over 18 percent of its income on home energy costs, compared with 6.7 percent for all households.

So, in a time of higher fuel prices we need to act to make sure our low-income senior citizens and children need not be forced to be cold or to choose between heating and eating.

But beyond that, there is a broader question to consider—how can we avoid these energy crises in the future?

What should not be focused just on the short-term issue of oil prices. We also need to be addressing the core problem: our continued excessive dependence on petroleum.

We need to be actively and strongly promoting alternative energy and increasing our energy efficiency. We need to do it for the environment—and also because it promotes our national security and strengthens our economy.

By promoting these alternatives, we're making one of our most valuable investments in America's future. These investments can stimulate the private sector, and jobs, reduce our reliance on imported oil, and improve our air and water quality.

So I urge adoption of this motion, for increased support for LIHEAP, and I urge all of us to work together to strengthen our national commitment to clean energy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

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

Ms. DELAURO. 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 305, nays 18, not voting 109, as follows:

[Roll No. 572]

YEAS—305

Abercrombie	Biggart	Camp
Aderholt	Bilirakis	Canady
Allen	Bliley	Capps
Armey	Blumenauer	Capuano
Bachus	Blunt	Cardin
Baird	Boehlert	Carson
Baker	Boehner	Castle
Baldacci	Bonilla	Chabot
Baldwin	Bonior	Chambliss
Ballenger	Bono	Chenoweth-Hage
Barcia	Borski	Clayton
Barrett (NE)	Boswell	Clement
Barrett (WI)	Boyd	Coburn
Bartlett	Brady (PA)	Collins
Bass	Brady (TX)	Combest
Bereuter	Burr	Condit
Berkley	Burton	Conyers
Berman	Buyer	Cook
Berry	Callahan	Cooksey

Costello	Jenkins	Rahall
Coyne	John	Ramstad
Cramer	Johnson (CT)	Rangel
Cubin	Johnson, E.B.	Regula
Cummings	Jones (OH)	Reyes
Cunningham	Kelly	Reynolds
Davis (FL)	Kildee	Riley
Davis (VA)	Kilpatrick	Rivers
DeFazio	Kingston	Rodriguez
DeGette	Klecza	Roemer
DeLauro	Knollenberg	Rogan
DeLay	Kucinich	Rogers
DeMint	LaHood	Rothman
Deutsch	Lampson	Roybal-Allard
Dicks	Larson	Ryan (WI)
Dingell	Latham	Ryun (KS)
Dixon	Leach	Sabo
Doggett	Lee	Sanchez
Dooley	Levin	Sanders
Doyle	Lewis (CA)	Sandlin
Dreier	Lewis (GA)	Saxton
Ehrlich	Lewis (KY)	Scarborough
Emerson	LoBiondo	Schaffer
Engel	Lofgren	Schakowsky
English	Lowey	Scott
Eshoo	Lucas (KY)	Serrano
Etheridge	Lucas (OK)	Shadegg
Evans	Luther	Sherman
Everett	Maloney (NY)	Sherwood
Ewing	Manzullo	Shows
Farr	Markey	Sisisky
Fattah	Mascara	Skeen
Filner	Matsui	Skelton
Fletcher	McCarthy (NY)	Slaughter
Foley	McCrery	Smith (NJ)
Forbes	McDermott	Smith (TX)
Ford	McGovern	Smith (WA)
Frelinghuysen	McKinney	Snyder
Galleghy	McNulty	Souder
Ganske	Meehan	Spence
Gekas	Meeks (NY)	Stabenow
Gibbons	Menendez	Stearns
Gilchrest	Mica	Stenholm
Gilman	Millender-	Strickland
Gonzalez	McDonald	Stump
Goode	Miller, Gary	Sununu
Goodlatte	Miller, George	Sweeney
Goodling	Minge	Tanner
Goss	Mink	Tauscher
Graham	Moakley	Tauzin
Granger	Moore	Terry
Green (WI)	Moran (KS)	Thomas
Greenwood	Moran (VA)	Thompson (CA)
Gutierrez	Murtha	Thornberry
Gutknecht	Myrick	Thune
Hall (OH)	Nadler	Thurman
Hall (TX)	Napolitano	Tiahrt
Hansen	Nethercutt	Tierney
Hastings (WA)	Ney	Towns
Hayes	Northup	Trafficant
Hayworth	Norwood	Turner
Herger	Nussle	Udall (CO)
Hill (IN)	Oberstar	Udall (NM)
Hill (MT)	Obey	Upton
Hilleary	Olver	Velazquez
Hinchee	Ortiz	Vitter
Hinojosa	Ose	Walden
Hobson	Oxley	Walsh
Hoeffel	Packard	Wamp
Hoekstra	Pallone	Waters
Holden	Pastor	Waxman
Holt	Payne	Weiner
Hooley	Pease	Weldon (PA)
Horn	Pelosi	Wexler
Hoyer	Peterson (MN)	Whitfield
Hunter	Petri	Wicker
Hutchinson	Phelps	Wilson
Inslee	Pitts	Wolf
Isakson	Pombo	Woolsey
Istook	Pomeroy	Wu
Jackson (IL)	Portman	Young (AK)
Jackson-Lee	Price (NC)	Young (FL)
(TX)	Pryce (OH)	
Jefferson	Quinn	

NAYS—18

Archer	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Cannon	Largent	Salmon
Coble	Linder	Sanford
Deal	Miller (FL)	Simpson
Doolittle	Paul	Smith (MI)
Hostettler	Rohrabacher	Toomey

NOT VOTING—109

Ackerman	Becerra	Boucher
Andrews	Bentsen	Brown (FL)
Baca	Bilbray	Brown (OH)
Barr	Bishop	Bryant
Barton	Blagojevich	Calvert

Campbell	Kanjorski	Pickett
Clay	Kaptur	Porter
Clyburn	Kasich	Radanovich
Cox	Kennedy	Ros-Lehtinen
Crane	Kind (WI)	Roukema
Crowley	King (NY)	Rush
Danner	Klink	Sawyer
Davis (IL)	Kolbe	Sensenbrenner
Delahunt	Kuykendall	Sessions
Diaz-Balart	LaFalce	Shaw
Dickey	Lantos	Shays
Duncan	LaTourette	Shimkus
Dunn	Lazio	Shuster
Edwards	Lipinski	Spratt
Ehlers	Maloney (CT)	Stark
Fossella	Martinez	Stupak
Fowler	McCarthy (MO)	Talent
Frank (MA)	McCollum	Tancredo
Franks (NJ)	McHugh	Taylor (MS)
Frost	McInnis	Taylor (NC)
Gejdenson	McIntosh	Thompson (MS)
Gephardt	McIntyre	Visclosky
Gillmor	McKeon	Watkins
Gordon	Meek (FL)	Watt (NC)
Green (TX)	Metcalf	Watts (OK)
Hastings (FL)	Mollohan	Weldon (FL)
Hefley	Morella	Weller
Hilliard	Neal	Weygand
Houghton	Owens	Wise
Hulshof	Pascrell	Wynn
Hyde	Peterson (PA)	
Jones (NC)	Pickering	

1228

Mr. GILCHREST and Mrs. JONES of Ohio changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4577, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer the motion to instruct that I presented yesterday pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. LOWEY moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 4577, be instructed to insist on disagreeing with provisions in the Senate amendment which denies the President's request for dedicated resources to reduce class sizes in the early grades and for local school construction and, instead, broadly expands the Title VI Education Block Grant with limited accountability in the use of funds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

1230

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is truly unfortunate that we even have to debate the importance of these issues. Members from the other side of the aisle say that education is their number one priority.

Then why has it been necessary for Members from this side of the aisle to fight to preserve our investment in class size reduction and finally begin our investment in local school construction?

It has been 4 years since I conducted a survey of New York City schools and found that one in every four schools held classes in hallways, gymnasiums, bathrooms and janitors' closets. Two-thirds of these schools had substandard building features, such as roofs, walls and floors. I repeat, this was 4 years ago; and despite the outpouring of support from both sides of the aisle, Congress has not provided even one cent to alleviate overcrowding, and improve the physical condition of our schools. In fact, 2 days ago, when we considered the tax bill, we had the opportunity to include the bipartisan Rangel-Johnson school modernization bond proposal, and we did not.

We in our local communities have an obligation to all children. We make the decisions locally and pay the taxes locally, but we as a Nation have an important role as well: to use Federal resources to encourage excellent programs, to jump start local investment, and to support national priorities.

That is why I firmly believe that Congress must join with the President to support school modernization and smaller class sizes. We know that smaller class sizes means better learning for students and less disciplinary problems for teachers. By continuing our efforts to hire more teachers in the critical early grades, we can offer 2.9 million more children the benefits of more personal instruction and will see the results in their academic performance.

We need to fix the shameful state of too many American schools. School enrollment is skyrocketing. We will need at least 2,400 new public schools by the year 2003 to accommodate rising enrollments and to relieve overcrowding. Our modernization needs are no less pressing. High-speed modems and the wiring to support them is no longer a luxury; yet we still have Pokemon-generation kids in classrooms straight out of Charles Dickens with their asbestos-filled ceilings and coal stoves. It would be laughable, I say to my colleagues, if it was not so disgraceful.

In fact, the National Education Association estimates that the unmet school modernization needs in American schools total over \$300 billion; and that is on top of what school districts and States are already spending. This problem is just too big for local and State officials to handle alone.

Simply stated, we need dedicated programs to help local schools reduce class size and modernize their buildings. These are national problems that demand a national response. The Federal Government has a responsibility, I say to my colleagues, to ensure that public education is more than a promise, and our students cannot learn when they are stacked on top of each

other and the walls are literally crumbling around them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this motion.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning, I would say that we are not going to support this motion to instruct as we did the last one. Even considering the fact that we supported the last one, there was more political rhetoric that came from the other side than in most campaign meetings. So I suspect that is going to be the same this time because we are not going to support this motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, there are major differences between the political parties. One of the big major differences is that one party believes that all of the power should be centralized in Washington, that whoever works in the bureaucracy here is smarter than anybody else in the country. That is not our party, Mr. Speaker. Not yours and not mine. That is their party.

We believe that States and local communities and the people in those States and local communities have a right to make decisions for themselves. That is one of the major differences between the two parties.

Now, when the Constitution was first written, and we have all applauded the Framers of the Constitution so many times, they originally created a Constitution that created a very powerful central government. They gave all of the power of the government to the Federal Government. But then they realized they had made a mistake and they created what? The first 10 amendments to the Constitution, the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights that protected the people's rights as individuals, that protected the rights of the States as individual States of a union, and what we are trying to do is to maintain what the Framers intended with the Bill of Rights, and that is to protect the rights of the people in our communities to make decisions for themselves, except in those cases where the Federal Government is the only agency that is able to deal with things such as national defense, such as Social Security, such as Medicare, things of this nature.

Education has become a large issue; and believe me, we support education. In fact, in this legislation that we are debating here and negotiating, my colleagues will find that we have provided more money in that bill than the President of the United States asked for.

The major difference between us, and other speakers will go into this in more detail, but the major difference is who decides how the money is spent. Their side thinks that Washington should decide it all for people in my community, people in his community, people in others' communities; and we disagree with that. We believe that the needs

are different in different parts of the country. We understand that there are some school districts where they need more schools and construction is important. We also understand that there are some places in the country where they need more teachers, or they need more special education, or they need more technology, some computers, some laboratories. We understand that the needs are different. They are not all alike in every community in this Nation. Our approach is to give those communities the opportunity to make the decisions on what they will do with the money that we will provide through the block grant.

Mr. Speaker, for years and years in this country of ours, people opposed Federal aid to education, and the reason that I heard from my constituents and many of my colleagues heard from their constituents, is that they were not opposed to the Federal Government being interested in education, but they did not want the Federal strings that came from Washington. They did not want the strings that came with Federal aid. They preferred to go it on their own, which they do 95 percent of the time anyway, with local and State funds.

However, now we are talking about more involvement on the part of the Federal Government from the standpoint of centralized education from their side than from the standpoint of a block grant as far as we are concerned. We think we are on the right side, and that is the position that we have taken; and that is the position we are going to stand by, and that is the position we are going to support today by opposing this motion to instruct.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 60 seconds to respond to the gentleman from Florida, my good friend, the chairman of the committee, to make it very clear that our position is that this Congress builds highways, bridges, and responds to emergencies.

When I began with this issue in 1996, we had a \$112 billion emergency. It is now a \$300 billion emergency. We believe that we can assist local governments by lowering their property taxes and responding to these emergencies, and then support the Rangel-Johnson bipartisan bill that will also help local governments, because they make the decisions, we help with the financing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), my good colleague and my friend on the committee.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her leadership in championing this issue over the years, the issue of school construction.

Anyone who is a parent or anyone who has been a child, so that includes all of us, is familiar with the expression, the children are listening. Indeed, the children do listen. They hear us telling them that education is key to

their personal fulfillment and their success in life, that they must apply themselves in school so that they can succeed; and yet we send these same children a different message when we send them to schools that are dilapidated, that are not even capable of being wired for the future and are very, very un conducive to study.

What do children think if we say this is a value, it is very important that you get a good education and by the way, we are placing a very low value on it when it comes to the place in which we want you to study. We spend money, the taxpayers' money here on research that we all herald as important, and that research tells us that children do better in smaller classes and indeed, that they do better in smaller schools, Mr. Speaker.

The distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) has documented the need very clearly, a growing need, more than doubled since 1996 for these improvements, these modernizations, or these replacements of these schools. How can the Republican majority ignore the scientific basis, which we fund and support and praise, about children needing smaller classes and doing much better in those circumstances, by not insisting that the funds that we put aside for school construction and modernization, for smaller classes, not be used for that purpose?

So I commend the gentlewoman for her motion, and I urge my colleagues to support it, because, Mr. Speaker, the children are listening. Let us not send them a confused message.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support Representative LOWEY'S Motion to Instruct the Labor-HHS Appropriations Conferees to support the Democratic initiative on school construction. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership has continually refused to support vital funding to help local communities reduce class size at public schools.

America's schools are teaching more students than ever before and generally, our schools work for most students. However, we can improve our public schools by focusing our efforts on underperforming schools and low-income areas with ongoing problems. We can overcome this significant problem—the infrastructure and facilities at our schools require modernization and investment.

WHAT IS THE NEED?

Today, school enrollments are higher than ever, with a record 53.2 million children enrolled in our schools. By 2008, another million students will be in America's schools.

By 2003, to meet rising student enrollments, America will need another 2,400 new schools.

The average American public school is 42 years old. After 40 years, school buildings begin to deteriorate rapidly and repair costs soon exceed the costs to construct new schools.

According to the GAO report "School Facilities: The Condition of America's Schools", one-third of all schools need extensive repairs or replacement.

WHAT WOULD IT COST TO ADDRESS THESE CONDITIONS?

According to a 1996 GAO report, it would cost \$112 billion to repair our schools. Accord-

ing to a 2000 National Education Association report, it would cost \$322 billion to repair our schools.

WOULD IT HELP?

Smaller class sizes are important because studies demonstrate that reduced class size leads to more individual attention and increased accountability.

We know that this investment in school construction would benefit our schools, our teachers, and most importantly our children. I have heard personal stories about: teachers teaching in converted bathrooms; students eating lunch in shifts starting at 9:45 due to overcrowding; leaky roofs and exposed lead paint leading to health and safety hazards.

These conditions are intolerable, Mr. Speaker. I rise to support the Motion to Instruct and urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Motion.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we will attempt to stay within our time limits that we were assigned.

I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), who is not only an educator in his own right, but is chairman of the committee responsible for authorizing educational issues.

(Mr. GOODLING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, this is a very curious motion to instruct. In fact, it is the most curious motion to instruct I have seen in 26 years.

Why? Well, first of all, it was originally drafted and submitted to this body on September 19. That is right, September 19, 5 weeks ago. At that time we had not begun the negotiations with the White House or our friends in the minority party on what the final appropriations agreement would include or not include. At this point, to instruct the House and Senate conferees in the Labor-HHS-Education appropriation bills on issues that have already been thoroughly discussed and tentatively agreed to, and in other instances totally agreed to, just does not make sense.

Mr. Speaker, this motion is irrelevant given the status of our negotiations; and as such, I oppose the gentlewoman's motion, as should anyone who is working in good faith to successfully conclude work on the bill.

I want to thank Members of both parties and the White House representatives for working tirelessly the last 9 days, including last Saturday and Sunday, day and night, to fashion an agreement in which Members from both parties can take pride. It is my hope that when our work is complete, we will continue funding to assist schools in their efforts to reduce class size with qualified teachers.

As I tried to point out to the President when he came up with this idea, which was political more than anything else, 100,000 teachers for 15,000 school districts and 1 million classrooms; and I said, if we do not have quality people to put in there, it will not matter. I do not care how we reduce the teacher-student ratio. And

guess what? The first 30 percent that were hired, the first 30 percent that were hired under this new program were not qualified.

1245

Where did they go? They went to the same school districts that already had 30 percent, 40 percent, and 50 percent of unqualified teachers already where they needed the very best teachers.

Again, I tried to point out unless we put the horse before the cart, that is what is going to happen.

Last year we negotiated it, and I think it came out well, because what we said last year was that 25 percent of the money could be used to improve the quality of the teachers they presently have. Now, does not that make sense? Why would I hire someone who is not qualified, rather than train someone who is already in the system who shows great potential?

We said 25 percent of the money can be used for that purpose, but we said if we have 10 percent or more of unqualified teachers, and at the time we were negotiating I was using a city not too far from Pennsylvania, where they had 50 percent unqualified teachers, we said you can use 100 percent of your money to improve the teachers that you presently have. That was agreed upon. That makes sense.

I am pleased to say that we have been able to reach that same agreement this particular year, and all schools with a high priority of teachers that are not qualified will have the flexibility to use that 100 percent to improve the existing teachers.

Now, it has taken the administration to realize the fallacy of reducing class size by ignoring teacher quality all of this time. I am so pleased, as I told the negotiators as soon as we started, I am so glad that here for the last year and a half down Pennsylvania Avenue the word is quality, quality, quality, quality, because people on the committee, of which I chair, the Committee on Education and the Workforce are tired of hearing that word, too, I am sure.

That is the most important part about class-size reduction, having a quality teacher, the most important element as to whether a child succeeds or not is that classroom teacher next to the parent.

We have made some progress on the issue of school construction. As I said, we have met for 9 straight days and nights. I made it clear to the administration that State and local flexibility must be a component of Federal funding for classroom modernization and renovation. It is important to see a significant portion of the funding available for other pressing needs.

Again, who knows better? We or the local district? I believe it is the local district. Again, I go back and point out that had we stepped up to the plate with the 40 percent that we said would come with special ed, 40 percent of the per pupil cost throughout this country that we would send, Los Angeles alone

would have received more than \$90 million extra every year.

Multiple that by 25, that sounds like a good bit of maintenance money to me to prevent schools from crumbling. New York City would have gotten \$160 million extra every year. But we never meet those needs, we just say we will go on and create something new, some other mandate, and forget about what it was we promised to these very people.

What happened? They had to use their money. They had to use State money, and they had to use local money to meet our mandate. So they could not do the kinds of things they needed to do in school maintenance. The primary responsibility for construction, certainly, remains at the local level.

Mr. Speaker, I point out again that this motion to instruct conferees at this particular time is irrelevant and it certainly is not constructive when we had the kind of negotiations that are going on at the present time that I hope will be completed in the very near future.

Let the conferees do their job. They are making real headway.

Let me point out one other thing. I think it is very important. Education technology, they have already indicated they will provide \$2 million more than the President asked for.

Education for the disadvantaged they have said, you will get \$50 million more than the President asked for.

Impact aid, you will get \$258 million more than the President asked for.

Special ed, you will get \$1 billion more than the President asked for.

Education for homeless children, you will get \$2.3 million more than the President asked for.

Rehabilitation services, you will get \$20 million more than the President asked for.

Vocational and adult education, you will get \$5 million more than the President asked for.

Student financial aid, you will get \$300 million more than the President asked for.

Historically black colleges, you will get \$60 million more than the President asked for.

The Hispanic-serving institutions, you get \$6 million more than the President asked for.

TRIO, so important in higher ed, you will get \$35 million more than the President asked for.

Higher Ed, you will get \$20 million more than the President asked for.

Department of Education, \$600 million.

In a bipartisan fashion, I believe they have done a good job, and I believe they are continuing to do that. I certainly do not believe my colleagues should interfere at this particular time and try to instruct conferees, who in a bipartisan fashion with the help of the White House are doing a pretty fine job in bringing this to a final positive goal that both sides will be very pleased with.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Members are reminded that the use of personal electronic communication devices are prohibited on the Floor of the House. Members are to disable wireless telephones before entering the Chamber.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), my friend, who has served so well in education, that I would hope that the leadership would fund the teacher quality initiative, because I know of our mutual interest in training our teachers.

I would like to acknowledge to the group that the President's reduction in class-size initiative has reduced the average size of a class by five, which has made a real difference in teaching young people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), my good friend.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, what kind of message do we send our children when their community and when this Nation boasts new, elegant shopping malls and new expensive sports stadiums while our kids are forced to learn in overcrowded, crumbling schools?

I support the Lowey motion to instruct because we cannot expect our children to get a first-rate education in second-rate and third-rate school buildings.

Mr. Speaker, a recent GAO study found that 60 percent of our Nation's schools need at least one major repair or they need replacement. It is time to show our children that their school is equally as important as a new mall or a new stadium. It is time to show our children that they are important.

We must vote for the Lowey motion. It is a vote that makes our children, 25 percent of our population but 100 percent of our future, our highest priority.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY), a distinguished leader in education, a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my colleague, for bringing this issue.

I live on Long Island, and everybody thinks everyone on Long Island is rich. Let me tell my colleagues all of my schools are over 50 years old. A lot of my schools have boilers that are over 100 years old. What does that have to do with it?

We are sending a message to our children that we do not care about them to modernize our schools. I bring it as a health care issue. I have high rates of asthma among my young children be-

cause of the conditions of our schools. We here in Congress have to make a full commitment all the way around.

We have to make sure our schools are the best schools for our children to be in. I have been in schools where they are teaching our children with disabilities out in the hallway.

I can tell my colleagues personally, if you have learning disabilities, you have to have a quiet setting, not somewhere where you are hearing everything out in the background. People with hearing problems are being taught in hallways and closets. The bathrooms, I am telling my colleagues, it is horrible.

This is what we are supposed to be doing. This is the money that we should be giving to our children. Mr. Speaker, I wish everyone will vote for this motion. We have to take education seriously.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ), my colleague who is a distinguished leader on education.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Lowey motion to instruct. School construction is an issue with broad bipartisan support.

This week, we had the opportunity to pass the President's school construction bill. It would reduce class sizes in early grades, hire 20,000 new teachers, raise student achievement and make urgent safety and help repairs in 5,000 schools in low-income areas. Instead, Republicans did their own version, a watered-down version, that postponed any school construction for up to 4 years and did little for our needed schools.

I want to remind my colleagues, it is one thing to play games with sham legislation here in Congress. It is another thing to send a child to school in the boiler room or a broom closet or the hallway of a broken-down school, like we in New York and too many other communities Nationwide. Too often, those affected are at-risk children living in minority neighborhoods.

This is not the way to treat our most precious resource, the young people who will follow in our footsteps in this great institution.

Mr. Speaker, I support and I urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's work and I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), our education chairman.

I have the greatest respect for the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and for the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), and I want to take two comments they made and try and bring this to fact and reality.

First of all, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) said that the children of America are listening. Well, I doubt if many of them are right now, but I hope they all are and I hope their parents are as well because Mrs. LOWEY made one statement of fact that is absolutely correct and then bundled around it the delusions that many are trying to portray on this floor as a lack of commitment on one side or the other to education when, in fact, I would submit to my colleagues that both sides are committed to it.

The gentlewoman's fact that was correct was that there is an unfunded need in America of \$303 billion for classroom construction; that is absolutely the exact number published in the report she cited. What she did not tell my colleagues is that the President's proposal to solve that is \$1.3 billion in the appropriations act, which is three-tenths of 1 percent and would take 35 years of annual appropriations just to meet today's need, if there was no other need in the future.

The fact of the matter is, our difference is let us do something that is meaningful and within our scope. Let us not try and lead an illusion that we are going to fix every stairwell or replace every school. The negotiators right now have said, let us agree on school construction, let us agree on it to do those Federally mandated things, such as IDEA, asbestos removal, health safety and welfare of our children. That is what they are negotiating right there.

We are not talking about building and replacing every school in America. We are talking about an illusion in this motion that we would do that when we cannot.

The reason I say illusion is because the distinguished lady from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) said this would give property tax relief to her constituents. Property taxes are what schools are built upon in the local level. If we ever pass the false hope that we can build the schools America needs, the demand of which is greater than our surplus today, then there would never be a local bond issue passed, and American education would be a travesty.

Secondly, on school size and classroom size. Last year, the Republicans and the Democrats agreed on classroom size reduction. It is in the budget now. It just simply says that we must also have trained teachers in the classroom, not just teachers in the classroom.

On this Wednesday, Secretary Riley and our committee and many Members on the floor on the other side heard it. When asked the question, are there 100,000 trained and certified unemployed teachers to be hired; well, no, there are not. There are many that need training to be brought up to date, which is why last year's agreement was to be able to use the funds to hire new teachers or to train teachers that exist at the local level who are not certified.

We are on the cusp, the negotiators are right now. We are on the cusp right now. We agreed basically on classroom size reduction that was done last year and redone this year. We are now about to agree on what is meaningful in construction but also doable in construction.

If the children are listening and the parents are listening, Democrats and Republicans are this close to making a real solution and a meaningful contribution to education.

But this motion portends that we can do what they know we cannot, that we would make a false promise to the American people; and that would be wrong for us to do in a motion, just as well as it would be wrong for us lead people to believe we could do it in a budget.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Members are reminded that remarks in the House are to be directed to the Chair, and not to other persons outside the Chamber.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly respond to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON). We are talking about an emergency \$1.3 billion to respond to the emergency that is out there because this Congress has not acted in spite of the crumbling schools. Then we would like to pass the bipartisan Rangel-Johnson bill that would provide tax relief for the local government, which is a tax bill that would provide for the tax on the bonds that will be issued by the local government.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to the remarks made initially by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON). Both spoke very rationally. They spoke to the point. I wish we could have more of that kind of debate.

But there is a difference, I tell the gentleman from Georgia, and it is a significant difference. It is a substantive difference. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), when he made his presentation, said that the difference between us is that we want Washington to decide and they want the LEAs to decide, the local education agencies to decide. Because it is their proposition, effectively, that the money that they have included in is not targeted for school construction, indeed, not targeted, per se, for teachers, but is a revenue-sharing program. That is essentially the flexibility. I am sorry that you grimace.

But the fact of the matter is the rhetoric on their side has continually been that the locals can decide. Some

people may need classrooms. Some may need additional teachers. But some may need computers. Some may need recreational facilities. They will have the flexibility.

Now, I suggest to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) that he is correct that this amendment will not solve the classroom shortage in America. No amendment could do that. No bill in one year could do that.

What this amendment, however, seeks to say, I tell the gentleman, is that we at the Federal level have identified two very significant critical problems. One, we do not have sufficient classrooms in America to house the swelling number of students in America. Two, we do not have sufficient teachers, quality teachers to teach those children.

There are other problems in America. But as we do on so many of the educational programs that my colleagues referenced and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) in particular referenced, we say there is a problem here. We are going to put some dollars. LEA, if one wants to solve the problem here, are the dollars to do it.

That is the difference between us. We do not want to turn this \$1.5 billion into simply a grab bag. It is for emergencies that exist in school construction and safety.

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) is exactly correct. The gentleman ignored the tax component of this, which spends \$5 billion or \$6 billion to leverage five times that or 500 percent times that, five times that to \$25 billion in bonds that can be issued by local governments.

Now, who decides to hire the teachers? The local government. Who decides whether to build the schools? The local government. The Federal Government does not make that selection, nor does it demand that the local governments do that.

To that extent, I suggest to my colleagues that, when they represent that we want government at the Federal level to decide, that is a misrepresentation and not useful for this debate. The issue really is whether or not we have a targeted sum or we have a general sum. The general sum clearly, I tell the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), will not solve the school construction problem or the teacher problem.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for helping me make the case that I set out to make a few minutes ago, partially helping make that case I would say.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for yielding me this time. I thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for his support for

quality public education in the United States of America.

As I was sitting here, Mr. Speaker, listening to the debate and hearing the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING) of the Committee on Education and the Workforce speaking, it occurred to me that he has worked an entire lifetime for education in the United States of America. This may be one of the last speeches that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING) will be able to make on the floor of the House with regard to education.

I salute him for an entire career devoted to quality public education, flexibility at the local level, and the absence of Federal mandates. That is really the difference in philosophy that we are talking about here on the floor of this House on this Saturday afternoon.

I have two children in public schools in Mississippi. I support public education. I have a record of supporting public education, not only in this Congress, but also when I was a State legislator. We all support quality public education, and there is not a Member within the sound of my voice this afternoon in the House of Representatives or in the other body that does not support better school facilities and better school construction. We would all like to have better school buildings all across the United States of America.

The question is, how can we as a Nation get the job done. This points out the difference in philosophy. Regardless of what the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the previous speaker, said, there is a strong difference in the way we would approach this bill.

Now, my friends on the Democratic side see a need somewhere in the United States of America, and they immediately see a Washington, D.C. Federal solution to the problem. We on the other hand, particularly when it comes to education, when we see an education problem, we try to find out how best to solve that problem at the local level and how to provide the flexibility and authority to local governments to solve those problems.

Now, as the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) pointed out, and as the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) pointed out, there are over \$300 billion in school construction needs right now. Those needs, undoubtedly, will go up. She terms them an emergency. The President's proposal would fund only a very, very small percentage of those problems.

But what if we start out this year at \$1.5 billion, Mr. Speaker? What will that program look like with all the Federal bureaucracy and all of the regulations that it will entail, what will it look like in 5 years? I say we can expect a Federal program of about \$15 billion in 5 years. A few years later, we might have a program of \$150 billion. That is the way it always works.

I implore my colleagues to vote against this motion today. If there is

any notion left of local control over school construction decisions, we will oppose this motion. Let us provide more flexibility for education at the local level.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), someone who really knows about this issue because he was the former superintendent of schools in North Carolina.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting, as I listen to the debate today, this is the same debate that I heard over 4 years ago when I decided to run for this body, because I was so disgusted as a State superintendent at a Republican leadership that was going to abolish the Department of Education, reduce school lunches, and the list is long. That would have directly impacted in the most negative of ways the children of this country.

Now we are saying we do not really need to put in school construction. We will do this; we will do that. Let me explain to my colleagues very quickly, if I may, because the Republican leadership's tactic, in my opinion, may have changed. But their cynical game is the same. Back then, the revolutionaries wanted to do all the things I have talked about.

Today they continue to play politics by blocking what I think is a bipartisan piece of legislation to build schools. Bottom line, \$25 billion will build schools. Local units will determine where it is. All we do is pay the interest.

Let me tell my colleagues what one of the House leadership Members said yesterday. We are winning the education debate. That is not my words. They are published in today's RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this loud and clear. Our children are too important to fall victim to partisan politics. Bottom line, the quality of education that we provide our children today will literally determine the future of the kind of Nation that we are going to have in the 21st century. This is not a game.

Despite the cynical politics the Republican leadership is talking about, this is about our children. The stakes are high. I say let us pass it. I support this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Lowey motion. It is long past time for this Congress to do the right thing on school construction. Four years ago, I sought this office because I was sick and tired of watching Republican politicians in Washington playing politics with our children's future. The Republican leadership's tactics may have changed, but their cynical game is still the same. Back then, the Republican revolutionaries were trying to cut school lunches, slash student loans and shut down the entire Education Department. Today, they continue to play politics by blocking our bipartisan school construction bill because their goal is partisan politics. The House Republican Leader yesterday said, "we are winning the education debate."

Mr. Speaker, let me say this loud and clear: our children are too important to fall victim to

partisan politics. The quality of the education we provide our children today will literally determine the kind of nation we will become in the 21st century. This is not a game, despite the cynical politics of the Republican leaders. This is about what kind of future our children are going to have in this country. The stakes could not be higher. Right now, we have a crisis in this country. Throughout America children are stuffed into overcrowded classrooms, trapped in run-down schools and stuck in makeshift trailers. We in this Congress have an opportunity and a responsibility about this crisis by passing meaningful school construction legislation for our children. I call on the Republican leadership to call off their partisan tactics and pass the bipartisan school construction bill—now.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to say we are not talking about construction, we are talking about maintenance and renovation. It would really be a joke if we were talking about construction at \$1.3 billion.

I also want to compliment North Carolina in the last 4 years. In the last 4 years, North Carolina has made dramatic steps forward in their public education system. In the last 4 years, they did not come to Washington and ask them to do it for them or tell them how to do it either.

But I would hope that we start thinking more in terms of quality and not quantity. I would hope we would start thinking in terms of results and not process.

My colleagues talk about flexibility and the whole idea of pupil-teacher ratio. Let me give my colleagues one example how something that looked good went awry. In the very next school district to my school district, they got two teachers federally financed. Their ability to finance their own system is much greater than the one that I live in, which I pay \$4,000 school tax. So I do not mind paying my income tax to help the city of York. But it does not make sense that I am buying two teachers when I am already paying in my own district far more school tax than they are paying in the district where they are more affluent.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) use her time. I think she has considerably more time left than I do.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), our gracious chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Johnson-Rangel bill. It is a bipartisan bill that provides a tax credit to deal with the school districts we have been discussing this morning and the school construction problem. It is a bill that preserves local control to school districts to decide how to spend the money.

Now, we all say we are for aid with school construction, with money which is the subject of the motion to instruct, and the tax credit. But we need to get serious about this because the devil is now in the details.

What I want to highlight to my colleagues is the fear I have that, in the final appropriations bill, there either will be nothing on school construction for tax credits, or there will be the language that we voted on the other day, which I find extremely unacceptable because it does two things that I think insult the intelligence of anyone that supports school construction aid.

The first thing is the arbitrage issue, which says to a school district that, if they borrow money to build schools and they hold that money for 3 or 4 years, they get a benefit in a tax credit. No school district is going to borrow money to build schools and let it sit there 3 or 4 years.

The second is, we have created a brand-new program called Private Activity Bonds for School Districts. In my district, building schools is a public responsibility, not a private activity. We need to do it the right way through the Johnson-Rangel bill.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

(Mr. Udall of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the motion of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) to instruct conferees on dedicated funding for class size reduction and school renovation.

The school classroom size reduction program is helping the schools in my home State of New Mexico. Of the \$9.6 million that was awarded to New Mexico school districts, 87 percent was used to hire an additional 230 teachers, 9 percent for professional development, 2 percent for administration, and 2 percent for recruiting and training of teachers.

These are dollars that are targeted and managed at the local level. This is not about Washington versus local control. This program supports local school districts to hire teachers. The locals do the hiring.

1315

The locals do the hiring. We are for the locals and for local control and local control management of our schools.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the motion of the gentlewoman from New York to instruct conferees on dedicated funding for Class Size Reduction and School Renovation.

The Classroom Size Reduction Program is helping the schools in my home state of New Mexico.

The amount awarded to my state for the 1999-2000 school year was \$9.6 million.

Depending on the amount of funds received by the school district, funds could be used to recruit, hire, and train certified teachers and be used for professional development.

Of the \$9.6 million that was awarded to New Mexico school districts, 87 percent was used to hire an additional 230 teachers, 9 percent for professional development, 2 percent for administration, and 2 percent for recruiting and training of teachers. These are dollars targeted and managed at the local level.

As you can see Mr. Speaker the Class Size Reduction program has had a huge amount of success in my state and district—as I'm sure it has in my fellow colleagues' states and districts.

In the area of School Construction in my State: 69% of schools report at least one inadequate building feature (e.g., roof, plumbing, electrical, etc.) 75% of schools report at least one unsatisfactory environmental factor (e.g., air quality, heating, lighting, etc.)

Enrollment in New Mexico increased 12.3% over the last decade. And current estimates indicate that my state faces a \$1.8 billion cost for school modernization, including \$1.4 billion for infrastructure and \$340 million for technology needs.

By supporting the President's request for \$1.3 billion for grants and loans for emergency renovations—Schools in New Mexico and across the country would be able to compete for funds allocated to the state to assist them in their school construction needs.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about education we need not think of the politics which divides this chamber and polarizes our work. When we talk about education we need to think about our teachers who teach in over crowded classrooms.

We need to think about our students who are being taught in crumbling classrooms and schools.

We need to think about these current problems—And we need to act now, and act today by supporting the President's education agenda and supporting our nation's teachers and students. Our students and their families, and our country cannot afford anything less.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, in Greenfield, Massachusetts, a town of 20,000 people, the middle school was closed because walls were literally crumbling, threatening the safety of students. Now the middle school students are crammed into the town's overcrowded high school which has leaking roofs.

Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago, the majority passed a bill that assigned \$2.5 billion over 5 years for school construction bonds to build and repair schools. In the very same bill they assigned \$18 billion, seven times as much, in business tax cuts over the same 5 years. Those business tax cuts included increasing the business tax deduction for meals from 50 to 70 percent and repealing several taxes on producers and marketers of alcoholic beverages. Remember, the three-martini lunches? That is a very clear picture of wrong priorities.

This is October 28. We are 4 weeks into the fiscal year, CR number eight,

and our work is not done. This is the longest session in the history of the Nation.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), a leader on the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from New York, for yielding me this time. I also want to commend the Chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, who I have served with for the last several years, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

I rise in support of a partnership between the Federal level and our local communities to help on reducing class size, to help with discipline in the classroom, to help with parental involvement, to help with quality teachers.

Something that I have worked with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) on and with several Democrats and Republicans is to try to move and transition to teaching people with math and science and technological experience from mid-career positions into the classroom. That transition to teaching, to provide those people with expertise from Main Street into the classrooms, will help us in our local communities decide what to do about the challenges of educating all of our children. It is local accountability, it is local flexibility, but it is putting emphasis on quality teaching. I hope that this Congress will act in a bipartisan way on that.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for this initiative; and, frankly, I think the Baltimore Sun is right, this is a Republican gridlock. Because any parent in America who can say to me that they have not seen crumbling school buildings or overcrowded school buildings are probably not looking at the Nation's schools in the last 10 to 15 years.

What we are suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that we have a crisis, similar to the Marshall Plan after World War II. We need to confront schools on a national level to rebuild them. What we are trying to say is that this budget and appropriation bills that have been put forward by the Republicans do not address the crisis and the emergency.

This is not a game. This is a serious effort to ensure that we leave here with local communities having tax credits and incentives to put the money directly on rebuilding the schools. It is plain and simple. That is why we are here on Saturday. That is why we will be here on Sunday. And that is why we will be here throughout the time, because we need to do the right thing.

I want to see children in safe, secure, well-heated and proper schools. Mr.

Speaker, let us do the right thing together.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have heard all my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, particularly the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, tout some of the successes of the committee. I serve on that committee and am glad to serve under his leadership, but I might add that some of the successes that we tout we have not seen them signed into law. I think the chairman would admit that he has had difficulty with some of these even on his side.

I heard the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) talk about how close we are and how sad it is that we cannot close that gap. He mentions that we are perhaps promoting something false on this side. There is nothing false about kids learning in closets, there is nothing false about children learning in bathrooms, there is nothing false about children learning in trailers connected to their schools.

If we can find \$.25 trillion a year to help build roads and highways and bridges; if we can find Federal dollars to build prisons, then we ought to be able to find some dollars to build schools for children. The only quota that my friends on the other side of the aisle support, and I have many friends on that side of the aisle and do not mean to cast aspersions, is the quota to raise the number of foreign workers we allow into our nation to hold down jobs which we cannot produce enough people in our country to do that.

Let us pass this motion and do right by our children. I look forward to working with both chairmen to get this done.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, to advise my dear friend from New York that I will be yielding to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) in just a minute, and then I will reserve the balance of my time so I can have a closing statement prior to the time the gentlewoman makes her statement.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the chairman and to advise him that I believe I have two more brief speeches.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), but I just wanted the gentlewoman to know in advance what my plan was.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

I have listened with great interest and with, sadly, some misgivings to the tone of this debate. Let me start with a point of agreement. My friend from North Carolina and my neighbor from New Mexico said this is not a game. They are exactly right. How sad it is,

then, that such partisan invective is brought into this debate.

As the father of two children in the Cave Creek Unified School District in Arizona, I have a firsthand knowledge of the challenges teachers face in the classroom, of the special challenges of growth in that school district, of the bond issue that will be on the ballot in a few short days. I heard the litany of challenges outlined on this side. I would not take issue with the reality of the need that is there. But I am compelled to point out the fact to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that just 2 days ago we empowered local districts with over \$16 billion to deal with a variety of projects.

My friend from Pennsylvania, under his leadership, we have moved for the full Federal component of funding for children with special needs, a promise made nearly a quarter century ago that was left unfulfilled.

There reaches a point, my colleagues, when we must put people before politics. Join with us in the broad goals of empowering local districts, parents in the homes, teachers in the classroom, leaders in the communities, and give them the latitude they need.

Sadly, I must ask my colleagues to reject this motion to instruct and deal with the reality and come together in an agreement that is good for every child in this country.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentlewoman from New York has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, just 2 weeks ago, in the City of Cleveland, at a high school called East High School, the roof fell in. I called the Department of Education and said, "Is there emergency money at the Federal level to assist my public school in a situation like this?" Sadly, it was reported that there was none.

In Ohio, the Supreme Court has determined that the way in which schools are funded throughout Ohio is unconstitutional. It is done by way of property tax. So that means that in one city in Ohio \$2,000 is spent on education per capita, but in another city in Ohio \$15,000 is spent on each child per capita.

I ask my colleagues to vote for this motion to instruct because our schools need funding and assistance.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

I want to rise in support of this very important motion to instruct. Over the last year, I have taken the opportunity to visit every school in my district,

and I have seen students trying to learn in hallways, in bathrooms, in closets, and cafeterias. It is time to do something to help our local school districts.

This is not about the Federal Government stepping in and telling local school districts what to do, it is about working in partnership with our school districts all over the country, whether they be in rural or urban or suburban or fast-growing districts.

I urge this body to support the motion to instruct. There is nothing more important we can do for our future and for our children.

I rise today in support of the School Construction Motion to Instruct Conferees, because I believe the last days of this Congress present us with a clear choice. We can help communities hire 100,000 new teachers, reduce class size, and modernize schools or we can pass block grants that don't ensure that a single new teacher will be hired or a single classroom built.

My district, the Second Congressional District of Colorado, is a microcosm of the American West. It is urban, suburban and rural, high growth and unspoiled mountain communities. For all of my districts diversity of terrain and community size, it is a district of crumbling schools.

Since coming to Congress last year, I have traveled to every high school in my district. I can tell you there are far too many kids crammed in classrooms of 30 or more and far too many students trying to work in modular or temporary spaces like trailers. One High School I visited (one of the newer schools) is already surpassing its growth projections. High Schools built in the 1970s and designed for graduating classes of 200–300 students, now face numbers that are two and three times that.

I am not happy to be here on a Saturday morning, nearly a month into the fiscal year, to encourage the Majority to make good on their stated goal of improving education. I would rather be at home with my family, among my constituents, but I am here because a firm commitment to school modernization and construction is needed nationwide. With this vote we can send a message to the Majority that it is time to target funds to build much needed new schools and to rebuild our crumbling schools.

While time is running short, I believe there is still time to do right by our nation's children.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York, my good friend, for yielding me this time. We represent similar areas in New York, Bronx County, Westchester County; and we know there are problems with schools in those counties.

We need to hire 100,000 new teachers. We want to get our schools' classes down in size so there are no more than 18 students per class. We will need to build new schools, hire 100,000 teachers and fix and repair crumbling school buildings.

I am the father of three children. I am a former teacher; my wife is a former teacher, I was a guidance counselor. There is nothing more important

to the future of this Nation than to get our class sizes down. Any parent knows that the less children there are in a classroom the more the children can learn and get personalized attention.

So I support this instruction for conferees. I think we should move in a bipartisan fashion to fund our schools, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this.

Again, we need 100,000 teachers, we need to build new schools, and fix and repair crumbling school buildings.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. One point I would like to make to the gentleman that said there was no money for her schools is that the Department of Education's books have been unauditible. In one year, one year, they have over \$100 million of student loans they cannot even account for. All of the agencies need to be digitalized so that they can at least track the funds.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from New York for bringing up this issue because this is a good debate. We need to be discussing this issue.

I heard some things on that side that I agreed with. In fact, I heard one of my colleagues on the other side say that this should be a partnership. Mr. Speaker, I agree, this should be a partnership. That is where both partners have equal enjoyment of the authority and the jurisdiction. But under the motion to instruct, I just have the feeling and I am really convinced that this would be a one-sided partnership with the Federal Government being by far the most senior partner.

Now, that really disturbs me, and the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) just made the case that the Department of Education could not account for \$100 million worth of student loans last year and could not audit their accounts. Now, I do not think I want that educational department running the school districts in Pinellas County, Florida, where I have the privilege of representing the teachers and the students and the parents. But we will soon vote on this issue, and we are going to decide whether or not we want the Federal Government and Federal aid with all kinds of strings on it to our local systems.

But I want to make this as a closing argument. We believe strongly in education, and the money that we have already agreed to provide is in excess of what the President requested.

1330

Let me say that again, Mr. Speaker. The money that we are agreeing to provide as we speak today is in excess of what the President of the United States asked for. As we negotiate the final agreement on this appropriations

bill, I am convinced that that number will be even higher. So we are not arguing about the dollars. What we are arguing about is who controls the dollars. Our position is that the dollars should be controlled by the people in the school districts, where they know what their needs are far better than the Department of Education or some other bureaucracy here in Washington, D.C.

And then I want to say this, Mr. Speaker. I have spent a lot of my time in the Congress, my assignment being national defense, national security, intelligence, and I am proud of the fact that we have a tremendous military capability. We have the best kids serving in our uniforms. They are all not kids but the vast majority of them are. I have visited with almost every one of the sailors aboard the U.S.S. *Cole* who were injured. I visited with them as they came home, I visited with them in the hospital, I even visited with some of them in their ambulances. They are kids. But they provide a strong national defense.

We do not have the largest Army by a long shot. There are five or six other countries with a much larger army than we have. In Desert Storm we had 18 divisions. Today we only have 10. That is a tremendous downsizing which I do not agree with. But we have a technological advantage. We have created superior technology, superior weapons systems, and we have smart young people who are able to handle these defense systems. That is important, because without a strong national security, most of these other things we argue about would not even be arguable. In fact, without a strong national security, this Congress probably would not even be here; we would not exist. Some dictator would be running this country.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, that without a good, strong, effective educational system, we could not develop the technology that we have developed, that is super, that is better than any other in the world. There are still others out there that have nuclear weapons and have all kinds of threats they could pose to the United States. But we have the great technology, and we have the young men and women who are able to handle, to manage, to administer that technology. If we do not maintain and continue to improve our educational systems, the ability to defend this country deteriorates as we allow our educational systems to deteriorate.

We believe in a strong education. We are determined to provide for a strong and effective education. But we understand that when we are dealing with K-12 and local educational communities and local schools and local teachers, that the decisions on whether they need new schools or whether they need more new teachers or whether they need special education, whether they need more books, whether they need computers, those needs should be de-

termined in the school district, by the people who know what their needs are, not by the Department of Education in Washington, D.C. who cannot even account for \$100 million worth of student loans this last year.

I hope we reject this motion to instruct the conferees. Let the conferees continue on the track that we are on now, which is providing more money for education but guaranteeing that local people, local teachers, local taxpayers, local parents will have control over how that money is spent.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this motion to instruct.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot let go unanswered the comments of the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) and the chairman about the Department of Education, who, when they had some difficulty in one of their audits, responded more quickly than any other agency I can remember in righting that ship.

It is amazing for people that do not want to get partisan, they neglect to note the fact that the Department of Defense financial statements for 1998 were less timely than ever and a record \$1.7 trillion of unsupported adjustments were identified by auditors. The same was true roughly in the following year. They do not ask for the Department of Defense to be closed down, but both the Texas platform of the Republican Party and this party on the other side of the aisle is in favor of closing the Department of Education. They should be ashamed of raising an issue like that.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My good friend and colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been doing a lot of talking during this campaign about education. We hear about how important education is. Yet they want to close down the Department of Education. I want to make it very clear. I have visited schools all over this country. I have seen young people who have to work in the shiny corporations because they do not have computers at their desk. There are wires hanging out of windows. Vandals will cut them at night. There are youngsters who have to run from one side of the building to the other side of the building because it is raining. The schools are crumbling.

In 1996, the problem was \$112 billion. Now it is \$300 billion. If we can build roads, bridges, highways, prisons, then while we are assisting our local governments, we can provide the emergency aid to rebuild our schools. Our children deserve no less.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The Chair reminds all persons

in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

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

Mrs. LOWEY. 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 150, nays 159, not voting 123, as follows:

[Roll No. 573]

YEAS—150

Abercrombie	Hinchey	Nadler
Allen	Hinojosa	Napolitano
Baird	Hoeffel	Oberstar
Baldacci	Holden	Obey
Baldwin	Holt	Olver
Barcia	Hooley	Ortiz
Barrett (WI)	Hoyer	Pallone
Berkley	Inslee	Pastor
Berman	Jackson (IL)	Payne
Berry	Jackson-Lee	Pelosi
Blumenauer	(TX)	Pomeroy
Bonior	Jefferson	Price (NC)
Borski	John	Quinn
Boswell	Johnson (CT)	Rahall
Boyd	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Brady (PA)	Jones (OH)	Reyes
Capps	Kildee	Rivers
Capuano	Kilpatrick	Rodriguez
Cardin	Kleczka	Roemer
Carson	Kucinich	Rothman
Clayton	Lampson	Roybal-Allard
Clement	Larson	Sanchez
Condit	Lee	Sanders
Conyers	Levin	Sandlin
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
Coyne	LoBiondo	Scott
Cramer	Lofgren	Serrano
Cummings	Lowey	Sherman
Davis (FL)	Lucas (KY)	Shows
DeFazio	Luther	Skelton
DeGette	Maloney (NY)	Slaughter
DeLauro	Markey	Snyder
Deutsch	Mascara	Stabenow
Dicks	Matsui	Stenholm
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Strickland
Dixon	McDermott	Tanner
Doggett	McGovern	Tauscher
Doyle	McKinney	Thompson (CA)
Engel	McNulty	Thurman
Eshoo	Meehan	Tierney
Etheridge	Meeks (NY)	Towns
Evans	Menendez	Turner
Farr	Millender	Udall (CO)
Fattah	McDonald	Udall (NM)
Filner	Miller, George	Velazquez
Forbes	Minge	Waters
Ford	Mink	Waxman
Gilman	Moakley	Weiner
Gonzalez	Mollohan	Woolsey
Hall (OH)	Moore	Wu
Hill (IN)	Moran (VA)	

NAYS—159

Aderholt	Bachus	Barrett (NE)
Archer	Baker	Bartlett
Army	Ballenger	Bass

Bereuter	Greenwood	Pryce (OH)
Biggett	Gutknecht	Regstad
Bilirakis	Hall (TX)	Regula
Bliley	Hansen	Reynolds
Blunt	Hastings (WA)	Riley
Boehlert	Hayes	Rogan
Boehner	Hayworth	Rogers
Bonilla	Herger	Rohrabacher
Bono	Hill (MT)	Royce
Brady (TX)	Hilleary	Ryan (WI)
Burr	Hobson	Ryun (KS)
Burton	Hoekstra	Salmon
Buyer	Horn	Sanford
Callahan	Hostettler	Saxton
Camp	Hunter	Scarborough
Canady	Hutchinson	Schaffer
Cannon	Isakson	Shadegg
Castle	Istook	Sherwood
Chabot	Jenkins	Simpson
Chambliss	Johnson, Sam	Skeen
Chenoweth-Hage	Kelly	Smith (MI)
Coble	Knollenberg	Smith (NJ)
Combest	Largent	Smith (TX)
Cook	Latham	Smith (WA)
Cooksey	Leach	Souder
Cubin	Lewis (CA)	Spence
Cunningham	Lewis (KY)	Stearns
Deal	Linder	Stump
DeLay	Lucas (OK)	Sununu
DeMint	Manzullo	Sweeney
Doolittle	McCrery	Tauzin
Dreier	Mica	Terry
Ehrlich	Miller (FL)	Thomas
Emerson	Miller, Gary	Thornberry
English	Moran (KS)	Thune
Everett	Myrick	Tiahrt
Ewing	Nethercutt	Toomey
Foley	Ney	Trafficant
Frelinghuysen	Northup	Upton
Galleghy	Norwood	Vitter
Ganske	Nussle	Walden
Gekas	Ose	Walsh
Gibbons	Oxley	Wamp
Gilchrest	Packard	Weldon (PA)
Goode	Paul	Whitfield
Goodling	Pease	Wicker
Goss	Peterson (MN)	Wilson
Graham	Petri	Wolf
Granger	Pitts	Young (AK)
Green (WI)	Pombo	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—123

Ackerman	Gephardt	Murtha
Andrews	Gillmor	Neal
Baca	Goodlatte	Owens
Barr	Gordon	Pascrell
Barton	Green (TX)	Peterson (PA)
Becerra	Gutierrez	Phelps
Bentsen	Hastings (FL)	Pickering
Bilbray	Hefley	Pickett
Bishop	Hilliard	Porter
Blagojevich	Houghton	Portman
Boucher	Hulshof	Radanovich
Brown (FL)	Hyde	Ros-Lehtinen
Brown (OH)	Jones (NC)	Roukema
Bryant	Kanjorski	Rush
Calvert	Kaptur	Sabo
Campbell	Kasich	Sawyer
Clay	Kennedy	Sensenbrenner
Clyburn	Kind (WI)	Sessions
Coburn	King (NY)	Shaw
Collins	Kingston	Shays
Cox	Klink	Shimkus
Crane	Kolbe	Shuster
Crowley	Kuykendall	Sisisky
Danner	LaFalce	Spratt
Davis (IL)	LaHood	Stark
Davis (VA)	Lantos	Stupak
Delahunt	LaTourette	Talent
Diaz-Balart	Lazio	Tancredo
Dickey	Lipinski	Taylor (MS)
Dooley	Maloney (CT)	Taylor (NC)
Duncan	Martinez	Thompson (MS)
Dunn	McCarthy (MO)	Visclosky
Edwards	McCollum	Watkins
Ehlers	McHugh	Watt (NC)
Fletcher	McInnis	Watts (OK)
Fossella	McIntosh	Weldon (FL)
Fowler	McIntyre	Weller
Frank (MA)	McKeon	Wexler
Frank (NJ)	Meek (FL)	Weygand
Frost	Metcalf	Wise
Gejdenson	Morella	Wynn

1356

Messrs. DEMINT, GILCHREST and GEKAS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I was not present during rollcall vote No. 572. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

Additionally, I was not present during rollcall vote No. 573. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote Nos. 570, 571, 572 and 573, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

ADJOURNMENT TO SUNDAY, OCTOBER 29, 2000

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 6 p.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

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.

WHAT WE DO IN WASHINGTON DOES MATTER AND MATTERS A LOT

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a great fiscal debate going on in this country and I felt I would use these 5 minutes to address some of the key points in that debate.

The governor from Texas has come up with a novel and dangerous argument, and that is that fiscal responsibility does not matter; that what goes on in Washington has had nothing to do with the prosperity that we currently enjoy.

Now I can understand why someone running against Washington would want to say that what we have done here over the last 8 years has nothing to do with the prosperity enjoyed in this country and the prosperity we hope to enjoy in the future, but that argument, however politically appealing, is a dangerous one, because once one argues that what goes on in Washington has nothing to do with the economy of the country then one grants a license to Democrats and Republicans to be fiscally irresponsible.