

“(C) the potential threat of developments related to such effects on the security interests of the United States and its friends and allies in Asia.”.

SEC. 1222. REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR REPORTING TO CONGRESS ON MILITARY DEPLOYMENTS TO HAITI.

Section 1232(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106-65; 113 Stat. 788; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) is repealed.

SEC. 1223. REPORT BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL ON PROVISION OF DEFENSE ARTICLES, SERVICES, AND MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General shall conduct a study of the following:

(1) The benefits derived by each foreign country or international organization from the receipt of defense articles, defense services, or military education and training provided after December 31, 1989, pursuant to the drawdown of such articles, services, or education and training from the stocks of the Department of Defense under section 506, 516, or 552 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2318, 2321j, or 2348a) or any other provision of law.

(2) Any benefits derived by the United States from the provision of defense articles, defense services, and military education and training described in paragraph (1).

(3) The effect on the readiness of the Armed Forces as a result of the provision by the United States of defense articles, defense services, and military education and training described in paragraph (1).

(4) The cost to the Department of Defense with respect to the provision of defense articles, defense services, and military education and training described in paragraph (1).

(b) REPORTS.—(1) Not later than April 15, 2002, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress an interim report containing the results to that date of the study conducted under subsection (a).

(2) Not later than August 1, 2002, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a final report containing the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 314 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 314

Resolved, That it shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of Wednesday, December 19, 2001, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, provided that the object of any such motion is announced from the floor at least one hour before the motion is offered. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the cus-

tomary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 314 is a rule providing for the consideration of motions to suspend the rules at any time on the legislative day of Wednesday, December 19, 2001.

The rule further provides that the object of any motion to suspend the rules should be announced from the floor at least 1 hour prior to its consideration, and that the Speaker or his designee will consult with the minority leader or his designee on any suspension considered under the rule.

It is a fair rule, Mr. Speaker. It will allow for the consideration of important legislation. I would urge my colleagues to support this straightforward, hopefully noncontroversial, rule.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, under rule XV of the House rules, bills may be considered on the House floor under suspension of the rules only on Mondays and Tuesdays, and this resolution will permit bills to be considered under suspension of the rules on Wednesday, December 19.

This special rule is open-ended. It authorizes the Republican House leadership to bring up any bill under suspensions of the rules. Other special rules considered during this Congress to create new suspension days covered only specific measures.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that this rule requires only 1 hour's notice before bringing up a bill under suspension.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, during the last moments of a session when Members are rushing to wrap up the year's business, it is easy to make mistakes. It is also easy to take shortcuts that undermine the deliberative process and restrict the rights of the minority. Under these circumstances, 1 hour's notice is simply not enough time.

Towards the end of the session in 1999, the House passed an open-ended suspension rule that required at least 2 hours. Near the end of the session in 1998, the House also passed an open-ended suspension rule that required at least 2 hours. I fail to see why this rule should require only 1 hour's notice.

For this reason, I must reluctantly oppose the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and

I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. 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. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

□ 1200

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1, NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 315 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 315

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1) to close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my colleague and friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 315 is a standard rule waiving all points of order against the conference report to accompany H.R. 1, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The rule also waives all points of order against its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, today we take an historic leap forward on behalf of our children, parents and teachers across this great Nation. While lately, the attention of Americans has been focused on the war on terror, the Congress has continued to focus its attention on our Nation's most precious resource, our children. This conference report does just that and recognizes that investing in our children today will prepare them for the challenges of tomorrow.

The Committee on Education and the Workforce, assigned the demanding task of reforming our Nation's failing Federal education policy, has reported back a conference report that we all can and should support. I am pleased to

stand before my colleagues today to present a rule on a bipartisan piece of legislation that will transform the Federal role in education to ensure that indeed no child is left behind.

The education of our children is the top priority for our President and a major concern of most Americans. H.R. 1 represents the most sweeping, comprehensive education legislation to be brought before the House during our tenure.

I would like to take a moment to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), my colleague and very good friend, for his hard work and commitment to improving the educational system for our children. I would also like to commend the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), for all his work and support for this bipartisan legislation.

Despite a decade of economic growth and Federal spending of more than \$130 billion since 1965, the achievement gap dividing our Nation's disadvantaged students and their peers has continued to widen.

Mr. Speaker, the message is loud and clear. Money alone is not the answer. It is time for accountability. It is time for reform. It is time for a renewed commitment to our children.

This conference report embodies President Bush's education vision and stays true to his four principles of education reform, accountability, flexibility and local control. It expands options for parents and funds what really works.

It all starts with determining which students are in need of additional help and which schools and school districts are in need of improvement. H.R. 1 accomplishes this task by implementing annual assessments in the core subjects of reading and math for students in grades three through eight. However, the bill also recognizes that communities know more about their children than Washington bureaucrats.

H.R. 1 respects local control, by allowing States to design and implement these tests, and provides Federal funds to aid them in this task. It also explicitly prohibits federally-sponsored national testing or curricula.

Armed with knowledge, we will be able to determine which schools are failing to educate our children. This information will be readily available to parents in the form of annual school performance report cards. Based on these facts, H.R. 1 provides a system of accountability to ensure that students do not become trapped in chronically failing schools.

H.R. 1 provides real options for parents with students in chronically failing schools. Parents would be allowed to transfer students in failing schools to better performing public or charter schools. Supplemental services would be provided from Title I funds for tutoring, after-school services, and summer school programs.

Finally, charter schools would be expanded to provide opportunities for

parents, educators and community leaders to create schools outside the bureaucratic red tape of the educational establishment.

In exchange for these new accountability measures, the plan will dramatically enhance flexibility for local school districts, granting them the freedom to transfer up to 50 percent of the Federal education dollars they receive among an assortment of ESEA programs and target the true needs of their individual communities.

Mr. Speaker, since the creation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965, numerous programs and restrictions have been piled on the Act, creating a bureaucratic maze of duplicative policies, all well-intentioned, but amazingly inefficient. H.R. 1 will give some needed organization to this patchwork of programs by consolidating the programs under ESEA and targeting resources to existing programs that serve poor students.

We know that over 60 percent of children living in poverty are reading below the very basic level. We cannot expect these children to succeed. Children who cannot read are destined for academic underachievement. We cannot allow children to be denied access to the world that can be opened to them only through books. The President's Reading and Early Reading First programs will introduce a scientific-based comprehensive approach to reading instruction that will serve to refocus education policy on this fundamental skill.

The President's education plan, No Child Left Behind, also emphasizes two other fundamental areas of education, through the establishment of math and science partnerships. The United States cannot remain a world leader in technology and scientific discovery without fundamental math and science education.

I am pleased that H.R. 1 includes an initiative which will encourage States to partner with institutions of higher learning, businesses and nonprofit math and science entities to bring enhanced math and science educational opportunities to our children.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1 is filled with calculated reforms that will restructure Federal education policy. It includes provisions to increase safety in our schools, promote English fluency and improve teacher quality, and provides the most important change in Federal education policy in almost 40 years.

Every Member of this House has a vested interest in the education of our children. We cannot afford to sit idly by or be timid in fulfilling our responsibility to ensure that every child has access to an education that gives them every chance to reach their full potential and exceed their goals and their parents' dreams for their future.

I urge my colleagues to keep the children at the forefront of our focus. Support this rule, adopt this conference report and send this historic legislation to the President of the United States so that no child is left behind.

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

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a measure that many of us have been worried might not ever see the light of day. As the measure moved through the House, the thoughtful and carefully crafted compromise almost collapsed as extreme measures such as vouchers and block grants became attached.

I am pleased to report cooler heads have prevailed in conference. What has emerged is one of the most critical pieces of one of the most important pieces of domestic policy to emerge from the Congress this year.

This education bill has the potential to truly make a difference in the lives of our children. Congress, for the first time, has tackled the inexcusable achievement gap between rich and poor students and minority and non-minority students that has plagued our educational system for decades.

In addition, for the first time in history we set as Federal law that teachers must be qualified in their subject area within four years. That is a very important step. Moreover, this measure provides funding adequate enough to match our rhetoric. Over \$27 billion has been authorized in fiscal year 2002 for Federal elementary and secondary education programs. This is \$3.5 billion more than the amount authorized by the House and is well needed.

For the first time, Congress is giving teachers the resources for training, support and mentoring that they need to reach the goals. Many of us were concerned that the administration failed to request any significant increase in funding to back up the broad outline of the President's for reform.

It is now my understanding that labor HHS appropriations bill which will be considered shortly will provide nearly \$4 billion more in funding for all elementary and secondary education programs funded by the Federal Government, nearly a 20 percent increase in appropriations.

This is a historic bill because it targets Federal dollars better than ever before to those students who need it most. Moreover, this bill finally fulfills the promise made in 1965 with the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The promise to ensure that all children have an opportunity to learn regardless of income, background or ethnic identity.

Mr. Speaker, it is really a shame that it has taken us from 1965 to call for a quality and equity in education.

Finally, Congress will back up our commitment with a set of unambiguous expectations, time lines and resources and accountability will be a

part of it. I am really pleased to support this rule and this bill.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and someone very instrumental in the good work that has gone into this bill.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) for her leadership and for yielding me time. I thank the Members on both sides of the aisle for the words that have been spoken and will be spoken about No Child Left Behind.

A year ago next Friday, then President-elect George Bush invited 16 members of House and Senate, Republicans and Democrats, all members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. He expressed his vision for No Child Left Behind, and then did what is so exemplary of our President. He asked all of our opinions on what we thought. And it was from that basis that House Resolution 1 was introduced about 12 months ago and we began the work which results today in the final conference committee report on No Child Left Behind.

Everyone had a chance to have their say. Every issue of importance had its chance to have a vote. And in the end, bipartisanship prevailed and the interests of the America's poorest students most in need has been met, and, in fact, I believe exceeded beyond the wildest dreams of me or our President or the other members some 12 months ago.

Mr. Speaker, I am very fortunate. I was born to a loving mother and father who nurtured me and made education important, who gave me the resources and the discipline and made the demands to ensure that I learned to read and to write. I owe them very much. On the other hand, I also recognize I owe very much to those who were not nearly as fortunate as I was.

No one should mistake what this bill is all about. It is about seeing to it that those who are the most disadvantaged, those who are the most poor, those who are the most at risk are given the resources and the institutions that teach them the accountability to ensure that they are not left behind, that they can read, that they can compute, that they can graduate, and they can realize the American dream.

While someone may nitpick over something they did not get in this bill, every child in America and every American taxpayer is getting the benefit of a better, more intelligently, more proud and more self-assured population in the future because we will leave no child behind. And today this Congress will adopt the dream of this President in his most important promise of his campaign just a year ago.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and of the conference report. The work that has been done on this bill by the President, by the leaders of our efforts, the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER) and the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) are to be commended, as well as the efforts of Senator KENNEDY and Senator GREGG.

We will hear more about the overall themes of this bill during the general debate. I wanted to extend my appreciation to these leaders for including in this legislation two initiatives which have great importance to me that I have worked on throughout this process. The first is a provision that will permit for the first time Title IV money to be used to broaden prekindergarten opportunities for 3, 4 and 5 year olds across the country.

The evidence is overwhelming that children who receive a high quality prekindergarten education perform better throughout their school careers and throughout their lives. For the first time, because of the inclusion of this provision, we will be able to reach more children.

Second, we have had an epidemic of school violence in our country which we all regret. One of the ways that has been proven successful to deal with school violence is peer mediation programs among students. Because of a provision that is in this bill, we have been able to provide for the use of Safe and Drug Free Schools money to promote the use of peer mediation programs among students across the country so they may learn to talk about their differences and resolve them before those differences spill over to bloodshed and violence in our schools.

There are many good things in this legislation. I am appreciative of the cooperation of the bipartisan leadership in including these two initiatives in the bill. I would urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the bill.

□ 1215

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. The poet Shelley once wrote that it is very important that children believe in belief; that children believe in Santa Claus; that children believe that pumpkins can turn into carriages; and that children believe that little elves can whisper into people's ears.

For too long, Mr. Speaker, we have believed that we provide a good, excellent education to all children in this country and that title I helps the disadvantaged. With this bill we shatter and attempt to destroy the myth that

poor children cannot learn as well as wealthier children and that we really have targeted resources to help these disadvantaged children over the last 30 years.

This bill, with good people working on a good product, achieving good results in a bipartisan way, has really brought great credit to this institution. And a lot of people deserve credit for that achievement. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), our Republican chairman and my classmate, has worked hard on this bill and brought trust to the process; the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) has fought hard for accountability and new ideas so that poor children can get great teachers; the President brought many of us together in Austin, Texas, and showed passion on this issue; new Democrats helped put together a bill that probably is 65 to 70 percent in this bill, demanding results for the poorest children.

I just want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, and I will talk more on the bill itself later, that this bill, this achievement of good people with good policy brings great credit to the institution of Congress. I wish and pray that this is a model for more of this behavior and these results in future Congresses.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I rise today as a strong supporter of President Bush's No Child Left Behind Act.

I support this important education reform legislation because it will bring about a meaningful change in what I call the three R's: reading, resources, and red tape relief.

First, I will address the reading issue. A child's success in school, and indeed in life, is dependent on his or her ability to read. Unfortunately, 70 percent of the fourth graders in our inner-city schools cannot read at a basic level. In other words, they cannot read and understand a short paragraph that one would find in a simple children's book.

This legislation addresses that issue head on by investing \$5 billion over the next 5 years in reading for children in grades K through 2. That means that next year Federal funds for improving reading will be triple.

The second reason I support this legislation is because this bill represents the single largest investment of Federal dollars in K through 12 education in the history of the United States.

For example, we are investing 43 percent more dollars in education than last year, and we have a 57 percent increase in the amount of money we are investing in title I. This will help to

make sure that all children, rich or poor, will have the opportunity for a first-class education.

The third reason I am supporting this legislation is because of red tape relief. This bill gives our local school boards the freedom to do their job without a lot of unnecessary red tape from Washington.

For example, under this legislation, local school districts will have the flexibility to spend up to 50 percent of the Federal dollars they receive on locally determined priorities, from class size reduction, to higher teacher salaries, to more computers in the classroom. And 95 percent of the funds will go directly to the classroom.

In short, this education reform legislation achieves the three R's of reading improvement, resources, and red tape relief. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 1.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

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

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

As a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I rise in support of the rule and also in support of the reauthorization act before us today. President Lyndon Baines Johnson helped usher the first Elementary and Secondary Education Act through Congress back in 1965, and he was fond of saying that nothing matters more to the future of our country than education. I believe that, and I believe the American people believe that. That is why there is such overwhelming support throughout the country for us to do more to improve the education for all our children.

Is this a perfect bill? No. But it is a bill that is the product of a good process. And for that I commend the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER); the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER); my colleagues on the Committee on Education and the Workforce; and those who served on the conference committee for helping make the process work in away in which it is intended.

This was a product of much compromise and much negotiation. The administration and the President himself injected himself in the process when we needed some logjams to be broken. I commend Sandy Kress in the role he played; Secretary Paige and the role he played; because overall this is a very good bill that advances the cause of education. It has a lot of good features in it: more funding and better targeted assistance to the most disadvantaged students in our country, the consolidation of Federal programs, and greater flexibility to school districts to better target the money in the ways they see fit to work in their own local area. There is a heavy emphasis on professional development and the recognition

that we need quality teachers in the classroom. And in an area I did particular work on, an emphasis on professional development of the leadership of our school districts, principals and superintendents.

But I also think there are some question marks remaining in regards to the overall bill, and one is the testing element and the accountability; whether we are providing enough resources to allow the school districts to develop and implement these tests for diagnostic purposes, and whether we are providing enough resources for remediation of those students who are falling behind.

Another glaring absence is the failure of this Congress to recognize our obligation to fully fund special education. We are supposed to fund it at 40 percent. We are only funding it at 15 percent. And that is the number one most pressing financial issue affecting school districts throughout our country. It is an issue we need to address next year with the reauthorization of IDEA, while also addressing the funding issue for special education.

At the beginning of this year, Congress set out to improve the quality of education in America's public schools through the reauthorization of the 35-year-old Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). As a member of the Education and Workforce Committee, I am pleased that I had the opportunity to work on reauthorization of ESEA and I would like to praise my colleagues for the bipartisan effort that was put forth to enact true education reform; it is a victory for America's students.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

This bill will continue the federal government's commitment to assist schools in teaching low-income and low-achieving students by offering more flexibility to schools using federal funds while requiring them to show that their student's learning is improved by the investment. While this bill encompasses many reforms, one issue in which I was actively involved during committee consideration of ESEA was improving professional development for our teachers, principals, and administrators. They are key to our children's success in school and we need to acknowledge their hard work and dedication.

That is why I offered two amendments to ESEA that focused on professional development. The first amendment establishes teacher and principal corps, which are designed to recruit, prepare, and support college graduates or mid-career professionals as they begin a teaching career or pursue further professional development to become a principal.

The second amendment I offered develops leadership academies, which will train the best and brightest candidates to become effective educators. The academies will focus their efforts on training current principals and superintendents to become outstanding managers and educational leaders. I am pleased that my colleagues recognize our country's need for strong leadership for our students. It is not only important to have the best principals, but recent reports estimate that 40% of today's principals are eligible to retire in the next five years, and 50% of school districts nationwide are already experiencing a principal shortage.

EDUCATION TECHNOLOGY

Technology is another tool that is critical in educating our youth in the 21st century. Technology, when used effectively, can stimulate learning, enrich lives, and create greater opportunity for our students. All students, regardless of the socioeconomic conditions of their communities or families, should be able to access and use the technology that is driving the New Economy. It is also very important to ensure that our teachers are equipped with the necessary tools and skills to use technology effectively in the classroom. I am pleased that after the initial proposed cuts in funding for technology is ESEA, that the final agreement authorized the education technology program at one billion dollars.

RURAL EDUCATION INITIATIVE

During committee consideration of ESEA, I also worked with several of my colleagues to ensure that ESEA included the Rural Education Initiative. This program authorizes new funding and increased flexibility for rural school districts. Across the nation, many of our rural schools cannot compete for federal education grants because they do not have adequate resources. As a result, many of our students' academic performance suffers.

Furthermore, due to the fact that rural school districts do not lie near population or commercial centers and generally have small staffs, their schools have a harder time attracting personnel and taking advantage of training and technical assistance. Rural schools also frequently face higher costs associated with building infrastructure and upgrading technology.

INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES IN EDUCATION ACT (IDEA)

Although I am pleased with the ESEA conference report, I am concerned that the government continues to impose federal mandates on the states in the area for special education, while not providing the necessary resources. In addition, these mandates are occurring when many of these states are already facing budget shortfalls.

Since 1975, when IDEA was enacted, Congress told the states they must educate all children with disabilities, regardless of costs. Yet, because educating students with disabilities is typically twice as expensive as educating non-disabled students, Congress made a commitment to the states that the federal government would pay 40% of the cost of educating disabled children. But 26 years later, we have not kept that promise. Congress funds only 15% of the cost of special education.

The financial burden of meeting the costs of this important program falls directly on states and local communities in every congressional district. We have an obligation to ensure that a fundamental and fair educational opportunity exists for all our students, regardless of physical or developmental ability. The lack of adequate funding for special education misses the opportunity to truly leave no child behind.

MANDATORY TESTING

Furthermore, I fear that this lack of funding for IDEA will ultimately result in inadequate resources for states to being implementing the mandatory annual tests. This bill imposes significant new demands on schools to annually test 3rd–8th grade students in reading and math. Although there are assurances that the Federal Government will pay its required share of the costs for the new tests if the government fails to pay its share, then the state

will not be required to implement the annual tests. This is troublesome because in the end if there is not enough money to ensure accountability, then it will be the students whole will suffer.

CONCLUSION

Nonetheless, I am pleased with the overall outcome of the conference report and I commend the conference committee for the hard work and dedication over the past couple of months. I am honored to have worked with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle over the past year on this piece of legislation, which is guaranteed to make a difference in the nation's public schools. I find satisfaction in knowing that it is within those public schools back in western Wisconsin and throughout the nation where we will find our future leaders.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER), also a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, certainly in response to my colleague who last spoke, let me say that if he looks historically over the last several years in the funding for IDEA, he will find that since the Republicans have taken control of Congress, percentage-wise we have increased the funding for IDEA substantially over what previously had been funded, and I think we are doing a remarkable job as we increase the funding for that.

I also rise to lend my enthusiastic support to President Bush's education reform plan, No Child Left Behind. First, I would like to congratulate the Committee on Education and the Workforce chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), and the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for this landmark piece of legislation and thank them for nearly one full year of work to produce a true education reform bill. I would like also to thank the conferees, both those in the House and the other body, whose work and support were vital to this bill.

President Bush took office and immediately began his efforts to reform education in America. We tried to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in the 106th Congress; but at that time, because of partisanship, even though we had crafted a good bill under Mr. Goodling, we were unable to overcome that partisanship to get that legislation enacted.

This year, H.R. 1 is not just a good bill, it represents true education reform in America and will begin to correct the shortcomings and failures of the Federal role in education in America since ESEA was first authorized in the 1960s.

We will hear a lot today about funding for education and how important that is and how some Members in this body do not believe there is enough funding for education. I believe we should provide funding for education, and I have supported that idea with my votes here in the House since elected to Congress.

A little over 2 months ago, the House approved the education spending package for this fiscal year that provided \$3.5 billion over the budget request for the programs included in the President's elementary and secondary education initiatives authorized in H.R. 1 and special education programs. Total funding for elementary and secondary education funds was \$29.9 billion, \$4.9 billion over last year's levels.

But just throwing money at problems we face in the education of America's children is not enough. President Bush has made it clear we must tie funding and resources to reform. The President outlined four pillars of education reform, and the conference report we are considering today has all of them: flexibility and local control; accountability; expanded choices for parents and a reemphasis on the role of the parent in education; and, finally, the idea that we need to fund programs that work, including the President's newly created Reading First and Early Reading First initiative, which is a scientifically based approach to overcoming illiteracy in America.

The President has stated, since taking office, that the Federal role in education is not to serve the system, it is to serve the children. I am glad we have someone in the White House who is willing to hammer home this truth, and I am proud to support this rule and urge my colleagues to vote both for the rule and the passage of the conference report.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy.

For the second day in a row, Mr. Speaker, we are seeing the House move forward with important items for America's future. Yesterday, it was election reform. Today, education is our priority. We are moving in the right direction, not necessarily allowing the perfect to be the enemy of the good. There is something in this legislation for everyone to support.

I personally am deeply appreciative for the work of the committee dealing with areas of special education and school modernization. But I would, Mr. Speaker, just like to say a word about leadership. I have been somewhat critical of some things that our President has done in the domestic area. This showed what our President can do when he focuses and works with the congressional leadership, and I think the product has been worth his efforts and I commend him.

I think it is important also to acknowledge the chairmanship of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), who much has been said about already, much more will be said on the floor, and I think it is all deserved.

But I would, if I may, Mr. Speaker, say a word about the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), our friend from California. He is a man of

great passion about a whole range of issues, but he has dedicated years of his life to advancing the interests of America's children. Nobody in this Chamber has worked longer or harder than the gentleman from California, not just publicly in this arena but doing private things. I know that for months he would teach children in an alternative high school before getting on a plane and flying back here to Washington, D.C. Fighting on behalf of America's children and their future is something that has been worth doing. This legislation would not have happened without him.

I hope the hard work of the gentleman from California, Chairman BOEHNER, and the President will set the tone for the progress of this Congress in the last year of this session. I think America needs it.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) has 15 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 19 minutes remaining.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for this opportunity, and I commend the entire conference committee and staff for their hard work in getting this report, and certainly thank the Committee on Rules for a fair rule.

One aspect of the bill that is especially important to me are the provisions for math and science education. In the Subcommittee on Research that I chair, we held several hearings on how to improve math and science education, where we have not been doing very well, especially considering the challenges ahead of us and the high-tech world that young people will be entering into.

□ 1230

Today's information-driven economy and high-tech industry require workers, not just the specialists, not just the scientists, but the workers to have more math and science and technology skills than ever before. Understanding basic math and science is essential for individual prosperity and our Nation's continued economic growth.

In this bill, we call on our world-class universities to play a greater role in improving the K-12 education, especially in math and science. And through research, through partnerships with local schools to develop better and more rigorous math and science curricula, and fellowships for elementary and secondary teachers, we can improve our math and science education in this country.

I hope this legislation helps to ensure that every child develops the knowledge and skills needed to succeed in the 21st century. I support the rule, and I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes."

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes 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, so many of us in this body are products of the public school system. So many of us got our start because teachers gave us an opportunity. I represent many districts in my congressional district, school districts, which do not have the necessary resources, pens, paper and computers to teach the students as they should.

I rise to support this rule and this bill and to support this concept. I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for working together. I thank the committee for working together, the conference for working together. I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), and many others.

I know that Secretary Paige coming from Houston had a hand in a lot of this because we have made some strides in Houston, Texas, and I thank him for putting his handprint, along with the aggressive leadership of President Bush.

There are some good points in this legislation we should note. The commitment to close over a 12-year period the gap between poor and disadvantaged children and those in more influential and wealthier schools. It is also very important that we emphasize the importance of making sure that in testing the children, it is diagnostic testing and that we provide in the diagnostic testing the resources. I hope to have more resources, but the one point that is very good is that parents, when they find out that the children are not making the grade, will be able to secure resources from the school districts to provide extra tutoring for the children. They will be able to secure the type of tutoring that is most helpful to their child. In addition, we have restored funding for school construction and after-school programs, teacher development, principal development and administrative development will be funded.

I believe the important challenge that we have in the future is to continue education and work with the special needs children. It is a difficult hurdle for parents with special needs children. We have done great things today, and I hope that we pass this legislation so we can support the education of the Nation's children.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) for his leadership, not only in the committee, but in the conference. It has been a long, arduous task. I also thank the ranking member,

the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), who I think has shown exceptional leadership throughout the process, and to the staff of the Committee on Education and the Workforce which I understand basically has not been to bed for 2-3 days.

Mr. Speaker, I am relatively new here and I have been told how contentious the Committee on Education and the Workforce is, but I saw little of that. I was impressed with the spirit of cooperation and the fact that this is truly a bipartisan bill. Something had to be done. When we think about the fact that 40 percent of our 4th graders are functionally illiterate, we rank something like 19 out of 21 countries on international math scores. I think there are 3 or 4 things that I would like to mention that are particularly noteworthy about this particular bill.

First of all, the issue of accountability. It has been my experience, unless there is accountability, there is no possible way to have excellence. In this bill we hold the teachers, the students and the schools to a relatively high standard of accountability. I think this will pay off.

Secondly, I think the flexibility, the ability to use Federal funds at the local level in ways that the local school boards feel is important will help education and help our local agencies.

Thirdly, small schools really have suffered in terms of competing for grants. They do not have grant writers. This allows schools with 600 students to receive at least \$20,000 and to pool their funds.

On the issue of mentoring, we find that many young people today are in dysfunctional situations. For children in dysfunctional situations, it is difficult to come to school with any ability to learn anything. We find that pairing a student with a caring adult who is an adequate role model certainly helps.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 1, and want to commend those who have been involved in authoring it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of this rule. I commend the committee on a bipartisan effort. We really have come together and compromised. Education is our top priority, and should always be our top priority. We want to make sure that every child has an opportunity to learn and be all that he or she can be.

We believe that H.R. 1 returns those original goals to targeting the funding for students who need it most, closing the achievement gap between the rich and poor, minority and non-minority. If we state that no child is left behind, we have to address this issue. H.R. 1 begins to address that issue, and I commend President Bush in making the

statement that no child be left behind. This begins to address that.

It is important that each and every one of our students receive the appropriate education, the training, and that we do have accountability. This provides for accountability in our schools. It provides opportunity for parental involvement in our schools which is very important. It is important that our students receive motivation, self-esteem, that they are able to go on. It is with dedicated teachers and accountability. I know because my son, Joe Baca, Jr., is a teacher in secondary schools. My wife has been a substitute teacher for over 20 years. My daughter is a teacher's aide.

This is a step in the right direction. We still have a lot of work ahead of us as we look at class size reduction, school modernization and special ed. We want to make sure that every child is prepared to go into the 21st century, to make sure that he or she can be all that they want to be, that they can obtain jobs and employment, but have the same advantages as others.

This also addresses a critical issue, the Hispanic dropout rate. When we look at the dropout rate, we have a 30 percent high school dropout rate. It addresses issues which are important to us, and hopefully we can reduce those numbers and provide opportunities and ensure that these students finish high school and go on. With that I say, let us support this bill. It is moving in the right direction.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

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

Mr. Speaker, while the conference report that we are considering today includes some important and exciting education reforms, I will not be able to support this bill. However, I do encourage my colleagues to vote for the rule and move the bill forward. The bill is an important component that the President has outlined for education reform. However, it is only part of the President's vision.

The mandates and the testing requirements in this bill are not balanced with the remainder of the President's bill, the parts that empower parents and free schools from the Federal bureaucracy. New mandates should not be the first step in education reform. I am encouraged that this bill has seen some progress since the original bill that left the House. High stakes testing, testing with rewards and sanctions tied to test performance, that has been removed. There are provisions that will hold schools accountable for student performance, and give children in failing schools opportunities for a better education.

Also, States will only have to implement new testing requirements if the Federal Government steps up and fully funds this new mandate.

As I said, I am also most encouraged that this bill is only a part of the

President's vision. I look forward to working with the President and the administration in implementing the remainder of the vision that he outlined to the American people. These important steps, including empowering parents, giving States and schools more flexibility and fully funding our commitment to special education, with these opportunities, the accountability that is outlined in H.R. 1 becomes a reality because information is only useful if parents and schools can act on the information that they receive.

As the President's No Child Left Behind plan originally stated, systems are often resistant to change, no matter how good the intentions of those who lead them. Information and parental empowerment can be the stimulus a bureaucracy needs in order to change. Once these additional steps that the President has outlined are taken, I believe we will have completed the goal of education reform that will give all students a chance to learn and succeed. We will have completed the remainder of the plan and vision of the President that was left behind. Through accountability, through parental empowerment and through flexibility at the State and local level, we will have a plan that will leave no child behind.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote for the rule. Let us move this process forward and let us move on to the other parts of the President's agenda.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), a valued member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in praising this bill, and I would like to point out a few things. The conference report maintains strong civil right protections prohibiting organizations from discriminating against employee and program participants.

The conference report increases funding for after-school programs by about 18 percent over the amount appropriated last year. Unfortunately, the conference report does not provide increased funding for school construction. School construction and repairs are totally ignored, and that is unfortunate.

H.R. 1 increases support for teachers through increased professional development, mentoring and recruitment. However, the failure to provide greater funding does not relieve local school districts of certain burdens that would allow them to transfer funds into teacher salaries.

We have a serious problem with teachers' salaries in New York City. In Middleton, Connecticut there was a strike by teachers. Members might have seen them humiliated before the television cameras, in handcuffs and prison suits. Those teachers are fight-

ing for a decent health care plan. Teachers should not be held in contempt and treated as if they are at the bottom of the professional ladder. They need decent salaries and benefits.

The testing provisions ensure that States can no longer ignore the academic performance of poor and minority children. That is a big plus. H.R. 1 improves targeting for schools located in underserved communities. The President is to be applauded for interfering with a trend that had taken place to spread out the money and lessen its effectiveness. Title I was originally intended to target poor children in poor districts, and we have returned to that.

The Reading First Program is a great step forward, almost \$1 billion to focus primarily on reading in K-3. The conference report includes \$250 million for school libraries which shows that we mean business about reading.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good new beginning. President Johnson made a great step forward in this area, and this bill follows in those footsteps. We need more funding and resources for education.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1245

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

(Mr. UDALL of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule and the underlying conference report. I am particularly proud of two provisions that the conference committee adopted that I have championed since coming to Congress. I am very happy that the conferees have seen fit to authorize significant increases in funding for after-school programs. In 1999, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) and I first introduced the After School Education and Anti-Crime Act, a bill to increase funding for after-school programs. Since then, we have worked to see federally funded after-school programs grow from a few million dollars in fiscal year 1999 to today's landmark increase. These funding levels will provide nearly 4 million children in need access to after-school programs by 2007.

I am also proud that the conferees have included in the final report the High Performance Schools Act, a bill I first introduced in 1999. High performance schools are a win for energy savings and a win for the environment, but best of all they are also a win for student performance. A growing number of studies link student achievement and behavior to the physical building conditions.

We have an enormous opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to build a new generation of sustainable schools, schools that incorporate the best of today's designs and technologies and as a result pro-

vide better learning environments for our children, cost less to operate and help protect our local and global environment. I am glad that the conferees agreed with me on the importance of this opportunity. I thank them again for including the High Performance Schools Act in H.R. 1. I support the rule and I support the underlying bill.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support for this education bill. I want to take this opportunity to thank Chairman BOEHNER, Ranking Member MILLER, and the rest of the conference committee members for their hard work on behalf of all of our children.

I am really proud of this bill. This bill not only puts \$26.5 billion into education, it provides accountability measures for these Federal dollars. In addition, it gives flexibility to schools on how they spend their Federal dollars. Today's bill includes my amendment that gives our school Federal funds to pay for their own school nurse. Never before have schools been able to use Federal dollars to pay for school nurses. No longer will school districts have to share a nurse.

This bill also provides essential teacher mentoring programs. Through my mentoring amendment, we are providing new teachers with one-on-one mentoring by veteran teachers. Now our new teachers will find the support they need to stay in the profession. With the dropout especially in teaching after 5 years, we have to do more to retain our teachers. As a member of the committee, I am thrilled to mention that today's bill invests an additional \$154 million in after-school programs, for a total of \$1 billion. After-school programs, as we all know, are the cornerstones to keeping our children safe and giving them extra time to learn.

Finally, this bill, through my academic intervention amendment, schools can develop programs to help troubled students stay focused and achieve their goals. I certainly urge all of my colleagues to support this education bill. I am looking forward to next year when we will be tackling the problems that we are having with IDEA. Certainly I know with our committee we will be fighting to increase the funding to help those children with disability.

I thank the staff. I know how long and hard it has been for all of them. It has been a long battle, because both sides had disagreements. But it kind of shows when we work together, we can get this done. I thank everyone who was involved.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report. I commend Chairman BOEHNER and Ranking Member MILLER for their leadership and their diligence in bringing this bipartisan bill to us. It is certainly an example of excellent bipartisanship and compromise. Although it has not been an easy process, it shows that we have all agreed that children are the future of our great democracy and the foundation of our global economic leadership. I truly believe that this bill will prove to be landmark legislation. Also, I should commend President Bush for his leadership on this.

But in any case, I do want to point out a couple of particular areas where it is especially advanced in giving leadership. One is the accountability demands here. We are not saying again that we just give money to State and local school systems, unless they demonstrate clearly accountability standards are being met in terms of math, English and reading, reading abilities, and the science abilities. These tests are specifically evaluated not only by State standards but also verify the State standards by sampling through the national assessment test. That is good, it is objective, and it really demands that students and staff and school boards are being held accountable for national standards.

I do want to make a point about the mental health provisions here. I was a leader on the bill; and I was more than a little disappointed that we did not receive a separate authorization in one area in the final conference report, but we do have in the final bill, nevertheless, important school-based mental health provisions in the safe and drug-free school programs, and certainly that is an advancement certainly with the kinds of violence that we have seen in our schools today. It is not as much as I wanted, but it is an excellent giant step forward.

I do want to also point out, and this is something that was rather controversial in the bill and in the final, but it has to do with the IDEA, special education. Here I want to make the commitment. This was inappropriate to put in this particular bill, but the commitment for next year, and I plan to take leadership on this, is that our education committee deals with IDEA reauthorization and deals with those controversial issues that have come up about discipline and specialization and integration, et cetera. So we are going to reform IDEA based on legitimacy of the questions that are involved and bring all the proper authorities in to discuss this. That is something that has been postponed until next year. It was appropriate to do. I just ask our colleagues to strongly support this landmark legislation. Leave no child behind.

I rise in strong support of the conference report. First and foremost, I would like to commend the Education and Workforce Committee Chairman BOEHNER and Ranking Member GEORGE MILLER for their leadership, hard

work, and diligence to complete our work on education reform.

This bill is truly an example of bipartisanship and compromise. But make no mistake—this has not been an easy process. There were many hurdles along the way and many times we all thought an impasse had been reached. But no one on either side ever lost sight of the goal: to ensure that every child, in every public school in America receive a quality education. This process has not been about politics. This process has been about the children who are the future of our great democracy and the foundation of our global economic leadership.

BUSH PLAN

On his second day in office, President Bush made it his first priority to ensure that every child in America learns. I am pleased that this conference report reflects President Bush's vision for education reform—to have the best education system possible to ensure that no child is left behind. The H.R. 1 conference report ensures accountability through testing and provides flexibility and local control.

H.R. 1 provides unprecedented flexibility and local control. Educators are given the flexibility to shape federal education programs in ways that work best for our teachers and students. Cutting federal education regulations and providing more flexibility to states and local school districts is vitally important. Flexibility allows school districts the ability to target federal resources where they are needed the most. This will ensure that state and local officials can meet the unique needs of their students.

H.R. 1 dramatically enhances flexibility for local schools. H.R. 1 allows school districts to transfer a portion of their funds among an assortment of ESEA programs as long as they demonstrate results. Every local school district in America will immediately receive the freedom to transfer up to 50 percent of the federal dollars they receive among an assortment of programs. In addition, the bill provides for the establishment of up to 150 local flexibility demonstration projects across the nation. Local school districts choosing to participate would receive a virtual waiver from federal education rules in exchange for signing an "accountability contract" with the Education Secretary, in which the school district would agree to improve student achievement.

The conference report provides more state flexibility than the House passed bill. All 50 states would immediately receive the freedom to transfer up to 50 percent of the non-Title I state activity funds they receive from the federal government among an assortment of ESEA programs. In addition seven states would be allowed flexibility in the use of 100 percent of non-Title I federal funds in a variety of categories.

H.R. 1 ENHANCES ACCOUNTABILITY AND DEMANDS RESULTS

As we provide more flexibility, we must also ensure that federal education programs produce real, accountable results. Too many federal education programs have failed. For example, even though the federal government has spent more than \$120 billion on the Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA) since its inception in 1965, it is not clear that ESEA has led to higher academic achievement. Federal education programs must contain mechanisms that make it possible for the American people to evaluate whether they work. This bill provides accountability and demands results

through high standards and assessments. And it provides appropriate responses to address failure.

Specifically, the H.R. 1 Conference Report requires states using federal education dollars to demonstrate results through annual reading and math assessments for students in grades 3 through 8. \$400 million is authorized to help states design and administer these tests. To demonstrate not just that overall student achievement is improving, but also that achievement gaps are closing between disadvantaged students and other groups of students, states would be required to disaggregate test results by race, gender, and other criteria. Further, in order to provide parents with information about the quality of their children's schools, the qualifications of the teachers teaching their children, and their children's progress in key subjects, the bill requires annual report cards on school performance and statewide results.

As a means of verifying the results of statewide assessments, the conference report requires a small sample of students in each state to participate in the fourth and eighth grade National Assessment Educational Progress (NAEP) in reading and math every other year. The bill includes a number of improvements to the NAEP to ensure that the test remains an independent, high-quality, accurately-reported test.

This bill does not just require assessments. It also ensures results by focusing funding on what works.

Reading: The bill is grounded in the principle that every child should be reading by the third grade. The Reading First initiative will work to accomplish this goal by using federal dollars to improve literacy and by promoting research based reading instruction in the classroom. In addition, allocating funds to ensure that children begin school with the pre-reading skills they need to be able to read by third grade.

Teachers. To help school improve states will be required to have a highly-qualified teacher in every classroom by 2005. We make it easier for local schools to recruit and retain excellent teachers: current programs are consolidated into a new Teacher Quality Program that would allow greater flexibility for local school districts in achieving a quality teaching force. Teacher Opportunity Payments provide funds for teachers to choose professional development activities.

Technology: H.R. 1 streamlines duplicative technology programs into a performance based technology grant program that sends more money to schools. In doing so, it facilitates comprehensive and integrated education technology strategies that target the specific needs of individual schools. It also ensures that schools will not have to submit multiple grant applications and incur the associated administrative burdens to obtain education technology funding. States and local school districts may use this funding to increase access to technology, improve or expand teacher professional development in technology, or promote innovative state and local technology initiatives that increase academic achievement.

MENTAL HEALTH PROVISIONS

I am pleased that the final conference report retains important mental health provisions from the House bill. Currently, schools are not adequately equipped to address the mental

health needs of students. Even before September 11, our nation was experiencing an urgent need for school-based mental health services.

The serious shortage of counseling programs in America's schools has further undermined efforts to make our schools safe. In addressing school safety, it is critical that we ensure that children with mental health problems are identified early and provided with services they so desperately need. Many youth who may be headed toward school violence or other tragedies can be helped if we address their early symptoms.

I should say that I am disappointed that the Elementary and Secondary Counseling program did not receive a separate authorization in the final Conference report, as was done in the House bill. The School Counseling Program has a track record of preventing school violence. This is a vital program that helps students develop the tools they need to interact with their peers, make healthy decisions, and succeed in school. Currently, this is only federal program designed to increase students' access to qualified school-based mental health professionals.

The School Counseling Program directs much-needed federal resources for school-based mental health programs. At the current funding level, 382 schools in 29 states benefit from counseling programs under this provision. It is obvious that many more schools are in need of these funds to provide counseling services to their students. I will work diligently to ensure that funding for this program will grow to meet the mental health needs of our nation's children.

The final bill does retain the important school-based mental health provisions in the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program that I worked to include in the House bill. These provisions provide resources to ensure that mental health screening and services are made available to young people.

At the local level, school districts are allowed to use their Safe and Drug-Free Schools funds for the expansion and improvement of mental health services. In addition, governors are required to give special consideration in awarding competitive Safe and Drug-Free Schools grants to those school districts that incorporate school based mental health services programs in their drug and violence prevention activities.

IDEA MANDATORY FUNDING

One of the major hurdles in this Conference was the issue of full funding of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA). Everyone agrees that the federal government is failing to pay its fair share of the costs of special education and all sides agree on the need for more money for students with disabilities. The problem is that this bill is not the appropriate vehicle to address the IDEA funding problem because funding and reform must be linked.

I want to alert and focus the attention of my colleagues on the fact that IDEA reauthorization is the next major education priority for the Education Committee. We must focus on reforms that would ease the special education burden on states and local schools while making the system work properly for students with disabilities. The Department of Education and the President's Commission on Excellence in Special Education is preparing to assist Congress in a comprehensive, evidence-based review of IDEA's programs.

VOTE FOR THE CONFERENCE REPORT

I am confident that this bill will prove to be landmark legislation—it is not perfect, but provides a firm foundation for reforming our nation's education system. I recognize that we cannot allow the perfect to be the enemy of the good. Is this a good bill? Yes. Does it reflect the President's priorities? Absolutely. Will it improve education in America today? I have no doubt about that. The bill we are voting on today takes a meaningful step towards leaving no child behind. I urge all of my colleague to support it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the conference report and want to highlight two points in particular from the conference report.

The first is that this bill authorizes for the first time a proposal that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), and myself introduced a couple of years ago called the Transition to Teaching Act which provides a financial incentive for people to consider making a midlife career change into teaching, subject to the same rigorous standards that anybody has to meet to be certified as a teacher in a State. This bill will authorize up to \$150 million for that program. Universities, colleges of education, school districts can team up with the private sector to provide this way to deal with our growing crisis in this country as we face the need for over 160,000 new school teachers in my State alone, Florida, and 2.2 million nationally.

The second thing I want to highlight about this bill has to do with the standardized testing section. I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), and Senator KENNEDY for working hard to include in the reporting language the requirement that testing provide diagnostic value. By that, I mean that when a child is subjected to a standardized test, as that child's parent, if my son is not doing well in fourth grade math, I want to know what the problem is; and most importantly, I want to know how to fix it. The reporting language in this bill says that a State should take that testing information, should share it with teachers, share it with principals, share it with parents, share it with students so they understand what the problem is and how to fix it, because that is the purpose of testing.

Please do not let happen to your State what has happened to my wonderful State, Florida. The politicians have hijacked standardized testing in Florida. It is a crime in my State to share the content of the test or the test results with a parent, a teacher or principal. That is a crime in and of itself. Testing should be used to help

teachers teach, children learn, and parents take responsibility for their children's education. Let us do standardized testing the right way. It should have diagnostic value. That should be the principal purpose of testing. This bill provides a model for those States that are going to develop standardized testing and hopefully a first step towards getting States like mine back on the right track.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reemphasize some of the comments. I also support the rule. I will vote for the rule, but I will not vote for the conference report. There are many good things in this legislation. The President has helped the House and the Senate develop a lot of positive things that the Federal Government can do to become involved in the process of stimulating curiosity, intellectual curiosity and knowledge. But the critical area that fails in this legislation in my opinion is based on the conversation that the gentleman from Florida just mentioned, and, that is, that the Federal Government is requiring, through a pretty heavy hand, that the State governments create a testing tool, whether it is diagnostic or not, that will have a fairly riveting effect, in my judgment, of sterilizing and taking away the uniqueness of each individual teacher's expertise. When you do that, you do not create an academic environment that the teachers thrive on or the parents or the students.

Unfortunately, I rise to support the rule but oppose the conference report.

I rise in opposition to the Conference Report on HR 1. While I am thankful for the President's commitment to improving America's schools, particularly those failing our most vulnerable children, I feel strongly that this legislation will take us in the wrong direction, and, in the end, alienate parents from their local schools, rob teachers of their passions and gifts, and deprive children of not only the opportunity to learn through curiosity, imagination, and investigation, but also the realization that a lifetime of education can be exciting and invigorating.

Although this debate over how best to address the problems of our public schools has focused our attention on an issue we all cherish—but too often neglect—and forced us to search for common ground—something we too often forgo—I am more convinced now than ever that, through this legislation, we will be turning our backs on the heart of successful public education: local control of curriculum, parental and community involvement in school decisions, and the utilization of individual teachers' unique excitement and expertise. For this reason, I will not vote for the Conference Report.

Throughout much of the 20th Century, Congress often followed a single formula when addressing domestic problems: take away the

authority of local governments and rely on federal control. In many instances this formula left citizens and communities out of the process and forced federal taxes and spending through the roof. We also know that this formula failed to solve—and often made worse—many of our most serious problems. And yet, despite these lessons, this House is going to apply this same failed formula to public education.

The testing provisions in the Conference Report are most indicative of this continued mindset and are the elements that trouble me the most. Because many here in Washington have decided testing is the key to school reform and accountability, this legislation will force states to create monolithic tests and subject curriculums, which the states will force upon local schools. Once again, we revert to believing all wisdom flows from Washington and state capitals.

The unavoidable consequence of this legislation will be less freedom for school boards, principals, teachers, and parents to decide what is best for their schools. Tests, ordered by federal bureaucrats and crafted by state bureaucrats, will be the dim light guiding our schools. Tests will determine what gets taught, what gets left out, which schools get more funding, and which teachers get raises. All the while, parents and teachers, those most committed to the well being of our children, will be left with their hands tied, interpreting test results published in the newspapers.

At times, however, this Conference Report seems to realize, though vaguely, that our schools should not be simply creatures of the Federal Government. It provides for increased funding going directly to localities and greater flexibility in the use of these funds. But if we trust the towns, counties, and neighborhoods of this country to make the right decisions with all of these federal dollars, why do we fail to trust them when it comes to what should be taught on the front line, day-to-day in the classroom?

We are putting power in the wrong place, creating an environment where vindictive behavior can thrive, sterilizing curiosity and creativity and ensuring mediocrity. Competition between schools will not be academically motivated, but rather more politicized.

Whether we are fighting for peace and stability around the globe, trying to create a more productive work place, or attempting to build dynamic research institutions, Americans have learned that one rule predominates: give honorable, hardworking, dedicated humans the freedom to think and create, and they will excel every time. Constant testing is not the answer. Empowering parents, teachers, and principals is. Democracy of the intellect is preferable to an aristocracy of the intellect.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS), a member of the committee.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I also want to join my colleagues in support of the rule and the conference report. I am proud to be here to support this education reform legislation. I know this measure is going to go a long way in helping all the students that I represent in my district. I want to applaud our chairman and our ranking member and all the members of the conference committee for their hard work in compromising in this whole area of edu-

cation reform and making it work so that kids in my district, kids who do not have a fighting chance in many cases, will have an opportunity to learn, and those that are limited-English proficient will be able to acquire those skills, have testing and also be served by teachers that will have enough funding to be credentialed or get that credential.

Not only that, I am very, very pleased that the conference committee also encouraged more support for paraprofessionals, paraprofessionals that also work sometimes as instructors with our students, and they help provide a helping hand to many of our students. I want to also commend our side as well as the other side for providing so much support in title I funding for low-income disadvantaged students. Now we can honestly say that we are doing the right thing; that hopefully no child will be left behind; and that in years to come when we look back at the work that has been done here, we can with all assurances know that our effort was not for naught, that we really did do something good to make our children of all cultures and all races a part of the American dream. That American dream means do not leave any child behind and make education available to them in what language they need to acquire English skills. I applaud the conference committee.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT), a hard-working and very important member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the rule on H.R. 1, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. This bill empowers parents, helps children learn to read at an early age, and grants unprecedented new flexibility to local school districts while demanding accountability.

I would like to focus on two sections of H.R. 1 that have not received as much attention as others. First, I am proud that this legislation authorizes \$70 million per year for homeless education. This will have a profound impact on the estimated 1 million homeless children in our Nation. Being without a home should not mean being without an education. This legislation expands our commitment to these special kids who face desperate circumstances.

I am also pleased that this legislation provides \$450 million for math and science teacher training. Our new high-tech economy demands that children have stronger math and science skills. That means that teachers also need better training in these areas.

□ 1300

This new program will help teachers prepare better for students for careers in engineering or the hard sciences.

This result will be a workforce better able to compete globally. Congress is giving America's teachers and students the best possible holiday present through this legislation. I congratulate the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER) and the conferees for their hard work.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. SUSAN DAVIS).

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to support the rule and the report today. We have heard today the results of months of work by the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House and the Senate Education Committee, and following that, by the conference committee, and I honor those Members who have struggled so diligently to reach this goal.

As a Member of the California Assembly, I worked to establish similar accountability measures for California schools, programs which began 2 years ago. I applaud the committees for bringing this reform to all of the States.

It will not be easy, nor will it be troublefree. However, requiring testing and accountability reporting which tracks the progress of distinct groups of children also encompasses the need for local schools and states to identify curriculum goals and academic standards. This is a good foundation for improving the focus of teaching. And, most important, as stated earlier by my colleagues, the critical aspect of our testing should be diagnostic. I am pleased that this is clearly stated in our rationale and implementation support.

Important parts of this program are those that will enable teachers to improve their teaching skills. High quality teachers are the most critical predictor of student achievement. I am particularly pleased that the bill will continue to support programs like the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Credential Program that provide the opportunity for teachers to demonstrate high standards of their actual teaching accomplishment over a year of classroom performance.

Like many of my colleagues and a majority of the Senate conferees, I am disappointed that as we are mandating programs to local school districts and have expressed our intent to fund them adequately, while we have done that, we have failed to phase in funding to meet the commitment Congress made 26 years ago to fund special education. It is particularly ironic that as we have rightly focused H.R. 1 on the needs of the poorest children through Title I, we have failed to recognize that two-thirds of all children with disabilities are also eligible for Title I funds. We must work forcibly next year to meet this promise.

There is much hope in H.R. 1, and I am happy to support this new focus on

the importance of teaching all of our children.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to close by saying this is a standard rule for the consideration of a conference report, and it will allow us to consider historic education that will provide parents, schools and communities with the tools needed to better educate our children. H.R. 1, the No Child Left Behind Act, is the vision of our President, and promises to bring accountability, flexibility and consolidation to Federal education policy.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that this Nation owes a big thank you to the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER), the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and for our President for showing us that this Congress can work together in a bipartisan basis and, at the same time, do what is right and good for our kids.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this straightforward rule and the bipartisan bill which it backs up.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 315, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1), to close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of December 13, 2001, Part II.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

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

Mr. Speaker, almost 37 years ago, the Federal Government made a promise to the children of our Nation, a promise that all children, regardless of race, income, faith or disability, would have an equal chance to learn and to succeed. Thirty-seven years later, the Federal Government is still failing to meet that promise, and Republicans and Democrats have come together to say enough is enough. No more false hope for our children, no more broken promises, and no more mixed results.

The legislation before us today lays the foundation for the most significant Federal education reforms in a generation. If properly implemented, these reforms will bring purpose to a Federal law that has lost its focus and never met its promise. It will mean immediate new hope for students in failing schools and new choices for parents who want the best education possible for their children. It will mean new freedom for teachers and school districts to meet higher expectations and give our children the chance to learn and to succeed.

Others before us have renewed this law, and have made similar claims. We must have the courage not just to vote for these reforms today, but to ensure that they are implemented.

This process began nearly a year ago in Austin, Texas, thanks to the leadership and courage of President Bush. It is marked not just by bipartisanship, but by a willingness on the part of those involved to take a gamble on behalf of our poorest students. It has been marked by the courage of legislators on both sides of the aisle to challenge conventional thinking and party orthodoxy for the sake of meaningful change.

I want to acknowledge my partner in this process, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER). We have many different views and we disagree instinctively on many things, but I would suggest that when it comes to the education of our children, there is no Member of this body who is less content to accept the status quo than the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER). His courage, his honesty and his leadership throughout this process has been instrumental, and, without it, we would not be standing here today.

I also want to thank our colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have worked so hard on behalf of America's students: The gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. HILLEARY), and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM); and on the Democrat side, let me recognize the contributions of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROMER), all who have been vital to the success of this very important bill.

I know the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) joins me in giving particular thanks to our staff, who have made incredible sacrifices to bring this bill to completion.

I want to thank Sally Lovejoy of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce majority staff, who has put her heart and soul into this, and

her counterpart on the Democrat side, Charlie Barone, who have worked literally 10 times more hours than the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and I in putting all of the incredible intricate legislative language together that allows us to be here today.

I also want to thank Danica Petroschius of Senator KENNEDY's staff, Townsend McNitt of Senator GREGG's staff and Denzel McGuire of the Senate HELP Committee, who worked with us day and night over the last year to bring this bill together.

I also want to thank my own committee staff, George Conant, Pam Davidson, Kirsten Duncan, Scott Galupo, Joyce Gates, Kate Gorton, Blake Hegeman, Cindy Herrle, Charles Hokanson, Patrick Lyden, Doug Mesecar, Maria Miller, Paula Nowakowski, Lisa Paschal, Krisann Pearce, Kim Proctor, Ron Reese, Whitney Rhoades, Deborah Samantar, David Schnittger, Kevin Smith, Kathleen Smith, Jo-Marie St. Martin, Linda Stevens, Rich Stombres, Bob Sweet, Holli Traud and Heather Valentine, who all have participated in this very worthwhile project.

Let me also thank the staff of our conferees, James Bergeron, Jeff Dobrozsi on my staff, Jessica Efrid, Kara Hass, Mike Kennedy, Lesli McCollum, Janel Prescott and Glee Smith, for all of their efforts.

We are also grateful for the enormous efforts and assistance that we have received from the Secretary of Education, Rod Paige, and his staff at the Department of Education. His expertise as a former superintendent of a major urban school system has been invaluable. Let me also recognize Margaret Spellings and Sandy Kress from the White House staff, who I expect will be here today with us, for the instrumental role that they played in this process.

But, most of all, however, I believe we should recognize the role of our President. Without his courage in proposing these reforms and his courage in continuing to press for them after taking office, none of this would have been possible. These reforms mark the first time in a generation that Washington has returned a meaningful degree of authority to parents at the expense of the education bureaucracy. They will streamline a significant share of the Federal education bureaucracy in one stroke, and, most importantly, they will provide new hope for the next generation of disadvantaged students, and we can help them avoid the misery of low expectations. If implemented properly and reinforced by a continuing commitment to real reform, it will bring an era of false hope to a long overdue end.

I am grateful to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have worked hard to turn the President's vision for education reform into a reality. I believe we produced a plan that is worthy not just of the support of Republicans

and Democrats and independents, but also of teachers, parents and, most of all, our children.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that I believe that today the Committee on Education and the Workforce brings a product that we can all be very proud of and that I believe everyone in this House can support.

I want to begin by thanking a lot of people that made this possible. The merits of this bill and the content of this bill is pretty widely disbursed right now, so I want to take a moment to thank those individuals that made this bipartisan product possible.

I want to begin with the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER). It just simply can be said that without him, this conference would have never been successful, and without him, we would not be standing here today to present a dramatically new reform of a 30-year-old program that is going to provide, I think, a greater educational opportunity for America's disadvantaged children. He kept his word about where we were going, he worked hard to see that we got there, and he worked very hard the last 24 hours to drag us across the finish line. I cannot think of a better working experience I could have had with the chairman of my committee.

I also want to thank my Democratic Members of the conference committee: The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), who probably knows more about reauthorizing ESCA than anybody else in the House of Representatives, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), all of whom contributed an immense amount of time, an immense amount of knowledge on this subject, and a commitment to our children.

I want to say the same for the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. HILLEARY) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Republican Members of our working group who helped us frame this piece of legislation, to present it to the committee, and, ultimately, to present it to the House, where we received an overwhelming vote of 384 to 45.

I want to thank our Senate counterparts, Chairman TED KENNEDY of the Senate Committee on Education, and Senator JUDD GREGG, the senior Republican on that committee, that were so helpful to us in the conference committee.

Clearly the involvement and the support of Secretary Paige and the President's special assistant on this matter, Sandy Kress, who, again, helped guide us through this process.

The staff of this committee has worked long and hard. They have spent many days where they worked 24 hours, or longer, 30 hours, going through this legislation and getting it in shape so we could bring it before you. I want to begin by thanking Charles Barone, John Lawrence and Danny Weiss of my staff and of the committee staff, and special thanks to Alex Nock, who worked for the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), who, again, just had a tremendous amount of expertise on the history of this bill, the intent of this bill, the purpose of this bill, and where we should be going would it. To Denise Forte, who worked hard on civil rights.

□ 1315

I want to thank Denise Forte, who worked hard on the civil rights, and Mark Zuckerman, who was our pit bull here, our House attorney, and to Ruth Friedman and James Kvall, all of whom provided support for this legislation. I just want to mention that Denise Forte cannot be here today as we pass this legislation because she is out receiving an award from the National Youth Law Center for her work on juvenile justice legislation that we addressed earlier in the year.

I also want to give special thanks to Brendan O'Neil, who works for the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), who was very, very helpful to us, and Maggie McDow who works for the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), who was helpful in constructing a way out of a room that maybe I had painted our conferees into, but she constructed a way out that I think is going to provide a new day for local districts and the flexible use of their fundings.

I want to thank Danica Petroschius from Senator KENNEDY's office, who really led much of the effort on our side. To Sally Lovejoy, let me just say thank you. Thank you. Thank you for urging us on all of the time and thank you for your cooperation in working with our staff. And to Paula, thank you for overseeing this. Sometimes just sitting there kind of silently rolling her eyes thinking, what is it you are talking about and why do you not stop talking and move on. But we thank you for that effort.

Obviously, when we do a reform of this magnitude and this nature and this far-reaching, there is a lot of people on the outside who have serious concerns about the impact on this Nation's children. I want to thank the individuals from Education Trust, Kati Haycock and Amy Wilkins, and I want to thank Bill Taylor and Dianne Piche from the Citizen's Commission on Civil Rights, and the people from the Center for Law and Education, Paul Weckstein from the Center for Law and Education for their help and guidance that they gave us in making sure that this bill really was an improvement for disadvantaged children in this Nation. That was our intent. I believe that is what we accomplished.

I will have a little bit more to say about it, but I want to make sure that we have time for the members of the conference committee and members of the committee to talk in support of this legislation and give us the benefit of their thoughts.

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), a valued member of the committee and one of our conferees who has worked diligently over the years on behalf of our children.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my chairman for his leadership on this important issue.

I rise in support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1. This is a significant accomplishment of this Congress and a great achievement for President Bush, who made education the top priority of his domestic agenda. The conference report largely reflects his priorities and his active support and involvement in this process, which has been crucial in bringing us to this point.

There are many features of this bill that represent significant departures in Federal education policy. In this bill, we have given States and school districts more flexibility to use Federal funds as they see fit. We have included, as one of the many new options for children trapped in failing schools, an opportunity to use title I money to purchase supplemental services such as tutoring, which is a reform that many in this House have advocated for years. We have also consolidated many of the current duplicative education programs to better focus money to the students who need help the most, while continuing proven initiatives such as the Troops to Teachers program which has put several thousand high-quality teachers in our high-need schools since 1993.

To be sure, I have some misgivings about the new accountability provisions in this conference report. Many States such as Wisconsin have spent years developing successful accountability systems that do not necessarily involve testing all students on an annual basis. For the Federal Government to now demand that annual testing in reading and math take place every year in grades 3 through 8 amounts to a new mandate placed on the States.

On the other hand, given that the national government has poured upwards of some \$130 billion in the elementary and secondary education over the last 36 years with no discernible improvement in educational outcomes for our most disadvantaged students, I fully understand the urgent need to find some ways to make sure that new Federal resources are tied to results.

In any case, I am pleased that this conference report makes a credible attempt to address my concerns about saddling States with this new responsibility. This conference increases the

amount of money authorized to help States develop and administer the tests.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), who is our ranking member on the Subcommittee on Elementary and Secondary Education; and I want to publicly thank him for his work to make sure that we had an independent, freestanding after-school program as a part of this legislation.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I want to start by thanking both the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) for their strong leadership during this very historic conference. Their bipartisan mission was to produce a bill that will truly help the most disadvantaged children. The conference report before the House accomplishes this feat, and I urge Members to support its passage. This legislation has many, many positive aspects; but in the short time I have, I will only touch upon a few of them.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1 rejects attempts to authorize private school vouchers and Straight A block grants. The conference report does, under the Roemer provision enacted in the House, authorize additional flexibility for local school districts while maintaining accountability and targeting of resources. In short, this bill returns ESEA to its original focus by primarily centering on increasing educational opportunity for disadvantaged children.

H.R. 1 also does not block grant the 21st Century and Safe and Drug-Free Schools programs. It maintains both of these authorities separately.

In addition, the conference report will make much-needed improvements to the 21st Century program to increase community involvement, extend the grant cycle, and require a match of local resources. Most importantly, the 21st Century program will have a renewed focus on quality and academics, reinforcing current administration of the program.

This bill will build upon the disaggregation requirements of the 1994 reauthorization of ESEA by ensuring that State accountability systems do not mask the failure of at-risk subgroups of children. No longer will subpar results for minority, low-income, disabled, and limited-English proficiency children be masked by the higher performance of the majority.

In addition, H.R. 1 vastly improves the targeting of resources to disadvantaged areas, while not stripping funds from localities which presently receive them. One of the main points of contention during the 1994 reauthorization of ESEA was the difference between the two bodies on title I formula. I believe the compromise that we will ratify here today was reached through hard work and compromise on all sides.

When the Congress last reauthorized ESEA in 1994, I was chairman of the subcommittee. We produced a strong, bipartisan bill in 1994 that gained the support of a large majority of the House. But under the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), we have produced a much better bill today. I urge all Members to support this conference report.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership during this conference.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), one of our conferees and one of our real partners throughout the process, a former president of the State school board of the State of Georgia and a member of our committee.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the well in lieu of the desk so I can look the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member, in the eye and say "thank you," not out of courtesy, but out of great admiration for the great job these two men have done. Both had the opportunity to succumb to unbelievable pressures, both partisan and political, and neither did. They kept the interest of America's children and the number one issue of our President paramount. Because of them and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), and the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), and the hard work of Ms. Lovejoy and, for me, without the help of Glee Smith, it would have been impossible to spend the time.

I am a subscriber to a great quote: "Our children are a message we send to a time we will never see." The last generation of American politicians, though unintended, sent a mixed message. Our richest and most affluent children have prospered and succeeded and grown, but our poorest and our most disadvantaged have not progressed; and in fact, the gap between them and our best and most affluent has widened.

We will send a new message to a generation that we probably will not see with the development of this legislation.

Robert Browning said that education is a journey, it is not a destination; and I know from my work in Georgia that it is a process, it is not an event. Over time, the investment of this bill means that 13 years from now when this year's kindergarten graduates from high school, our dropout rate will be lower, our reading comprehension rate will be higher, and America's children will enjoy the promise of Amer-

ica: employment, wealth, and, most of all, self-pride.

I could talk for hours about the opportunity this bill gives, but I want to summarize by saying this: to parents, it gives choices of academic enrichment; to students, it gives the investment of resources they have never had; to teachers, the flexibility to use the materials they believe are right; to school boards, it gives the direct order, we are going to leave no child behind. You will have the resources, but you will also have the responsibility. And to America's taxpayer, for the first time, it gives accountability for the dollars that are invested in America's children.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how long I will serve in Congress, and I have been fortunate enough to be in public life for 24 years. Today is the most important day, and this is the most important event, I have ever been a part of; and I would venture to say, regardless of what the future holds, when my career is over, I will say the same. I have had the occasion to work for a great chairman, a great ranking member, and with men and women who are dedicated to leaving no child behind. I am pleased to serve under a President who has led our party in a positive direction toward the education of our children, all of our children, rich and poor alike. We are a great Nation and the generation that we are about to send into the future will be better off because of the efforts of this Congress and this President.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK). Again, I want to thank her so much for really being so tenacious on the question of making sure that these resources were targeted and that they were going to be there for the disadvantaged population and also for her outspoken support of the Women's Equity program in this legislation.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member of our committee, for his kind words and for giving me the opportunity to serve on the small task force that worked on this bill prior to its coming to the floor of the House, and again, appointing me to the conference committee so that I could have a chance to monitor the discussions and the debates on this bill.

I want to join the comments of the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and commendations to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and all of the Members on his side for their great efforts in bringing us to this point today. I would not want to describe it as a miracle, but a near miracle that we were able to put such a monumental piece of legislation together and to win the consensus of such a wide-ranging group of people that come to the table with some very, very strong ideas about education.

□ 1330

This bill was in the making for well over 3 years. We have debated many, many issues. In the process, we have worked together by consensus to an agreement on the importance of developing legislation that prescribes programs and allocates money and encourages school districts to perform so that our children can have a better opportunity in the end.

What is remarkably different about this bill is that it sets guidelines in a very forceful way which will challenge our school districts to do better because they will have the opportunity to use the resources that the Congress will be providing in a way that will be helpful to children.

I know there has been a long harangue about the tests. I was one of them who said that this is a very onerous burden to place upon our schools, to have testing each of the years from 3 to 8, and the inability of many school districts to pay for it was also part of the discussion.

But in the end, with the tests, which will be put together by the States, it will be under their judgment; and we will have a chance to look at all the school districts in the country and measure them against national standards. Parents all across this country will finally have an opportunity to know whether their schools are performing to the best interests of their children. So I think that is a remarkable difference.

In the end, what is going to make this bill an opportunity for our children and allow the promise of the President that no child shall be left behind to be fulfilled, that will happen only if our local administrators will read this bill and take to heart that they have a special responsibility and challenge to use the tools that this legislation will provide.

My district has a horrible problem in getting teachers, and there are 500 or 600 vacancies every September that cannot be filled. We have roamed the country to try to find teachers. But in this bill is the way and the method for our school districts to use the monies that are being provided to take care of the essential requirements of our school districts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to support this legislation.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), one of the integral members of this conference who helped push us along.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I will lend my voice to the chorus. I feel like we are preaching the eulogy for the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) here; and they are still alive and well, for people listening in.

But these two gentlemen deserve our praise, and they are going to add much more to the future of education to

come. This is not the end of our work day; this is just the beginning. But it was a great job well done in a bipartisan manner.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great move forward; but at the end of the day, local control is still dominant in education. We have increased funding dramatically under the bill; but 90 percent-plus of funds for education come from the local area, from the State area. The formula for education excellence has not changed at all. It is a parent and a child with a good teacher and a caring community, and that is still the formula for success.

But what we have tried to do is build on that formula and change the way we do business in Washington. The President gave Congress a test when he came into power. He asked us, is the current situation okay? And the right answer was, "no." So we passed the test. The answer was "reform." This bill is big on reform, and the students are at the center of everything we have done. There is more money, but that is not the answer. There is more accountability; that is not the answer. The two together are the answer: more accountability and the funds to get there.

I am proud to be part of this work product. Our children are going to benefit. We have a good mix of local control with national standards to be implemented at the local level, and we are going to actually see how our children are doing in the area of math and reading from the third through the eighth grade nationwide, and let each State move forward.

If we have a school district that fails our children, we are not going to just sit on the sidelines anymore; we are going to make that school district better, and we are going to give some options they never had.

We are getting close to the holidays, and I think this is Congress' holiday present to the American people and the schoolchildren of this country: a bill that focuses on the student and not on bureaucracy; more money, more accountability.

I am proud to be part of a Congress that actually delivered and passed the test.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), and I would thank him for all of his help here with the preschool portions of this bill and also the efforts to expand and support charter schools. I thank him for his work.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I begin by offering my thanks and appreciation to the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), our ranking member, for their very gifted leadership; for the diligence of my Republican and Democratic colleagues on this conference; for the professionalism of the staff on both sides that did such

an outstanding and hard-working job; and especially to Matt Walker of my own staff.

Mr. Speaker, this is an achievement that presents us with both a golden opportunity and a great responsibility. To understand that golden opportunity, we need to understand what life has been like for one of the children who have had the misfortune of attending one of the dark and often violent places called schools where not much learning has gone on in recent years in America.

When that child fails year after year, or when that child is failed by her school or his school year after year, they just move on to third grade or fourth grade or fifth grade, and then fifth grade becomes junior high school, and then too often junior high school leads to the streets or to a drug rehab center or to a dead end job, or to a morgue.

These schools have failed these children year after year, and this bill I believe can make a great difference because this bill says that America's taxpayers will no longer sit back and permit that failure to occur.

If a school continues to fail its children year after year, something is going to happen. Instead of spending money on public relations for the board of education or a new hire who is the Mayor's brother-in-law, the money is going to go to tutors and technology and summer school and after-school programs.

And if it does not, something is going to change. The people who refused to make that change will be replaced and removed, and that child will have a new opportunity.

We have a great responsibility that accompanies that golden opportunity, because we have to make this work. We have given the Department of Education and the States and the teachers and the school districts and the students of this country tools to make this happen, but we need to make sure that it works; that the excuses are cast aside and the attempts to evade this new responsibility are not tolerated.

Mr. Speaker, this conference, of which I have been honored to be a part, has done a great job to write what I believe is a strong law; but we all have ahead of us a new responsibility to make sure it works.

When it does, I believe people will look back on this day as a day that education changed for the least fortunate students in this country and became more than just a promise, but became a reality in their lives and in the lives of our Nation.

I would urge an overwhelming "yes" vote for this great piece of legislation, and again thank our leadership for this bill.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. HILLEARY), who provided a special focus on this conference to the needs of rural schoolchildren.

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the committee for everything that he has done, along with the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), as well as all our colleagues on the conference committee, and the staffs, the staffs from both ends of this building, for putting together what I think is a great product here today.

I am also thankful to the administration, President Bush and Secretary Paige, who I think is exactly the right man at the right time with the right qualifications to get the job done for our children in this country as Secretary of Education.

Education must remain a primary responsibility of State and local school systems. I hope it will always remain so. But in many cases, even though we have many diamonds in the rough, in many cases that job is not getting done; and it is simply not fair for the children to continue to fall through the cracks while we are waiting for them to get their acts together.

That is what this bill does, in effect. It does have more flexibility for local school systems, it requires more accountability; and in exchange for that, it provides more dollars so that they can get the job done.

As the chairman of the committee mentioned, a special part of this bill was the part that I was able to have a big part in, and that was providing a little more money for rural school systems. They sometimes operate at a competitive disadvantage to their affluent suburban counterparts and their inner-city counterparts because of the formula scheme with title I, as well as the fact that rural school systems do not have an army of grant-writers to compete really on an even playing field. So hopefully we will begin the process of evening the playing field.

We also protected the Boy Scouts in this legislation, which I also authored, which I appreciate the gentleman's cooperation in in keeping that in the bill; and we have required that military recruiters have access to the schools, so that especially at a time like now, when it is so important, they can recruit the best and brightest, and at least give the young high school graduates an opportunity to serve in the military.

Finally, I just want to say that we have worked awfully hard on this, and it is a great product. I just hope that everybody will give the children of this country a Christmas present this year by voting for this bill. I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), and publicly again I just want to thank him for all of the work that he did on flexibility, where he helped us overcome what was going to be a terrible, terrible political stalemate and I think worked out to the satisfaction of all of the members of the conference committee.

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, this is not a perfect bill, but it has been almost a perfect process.

Due to the integrity and the leadership and the skills of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), we are at a point of passing landmark and historic legislation to help poor children get a truly good opportunity in this country to get a great education.

There is a lot of credit that goes around. I want to thank the working group, a number of Republicans and Democrats that have met for the last 10 months and with tenacity and intelligence worked through these issues.

I want to thank my staff member, Maggie McDowell, who helped us balance principle and politics. I want to thank the professional staff on both sides. I want to thank the New Democrats that helped us design a bill that is 65 or 70 percent of this bill.

Also, I want to thank the President of the United States for his leadership and passion on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, this country, with the passage of this bill, will no longer tolerate meaningless degrees. We will no longer tolerate saying that children who come from poor backgrounds can get less of an education. We will no longer tolerate unqualified teachers in poor schools that are not working well.

How do we achieve all this? Briefly, we have diagnostic tests, not high-stakes punitive tests, but tests that will help us actually find out why that child is not reading well, and remediate.

Secondly, we have the resources to help get the tutoring from private and public sources to help these children; and we will have to fight for more resources, especially for IDEA, children with disabilities.

Thirdly, we have set a standard, 4 years for all teachers to be qualified.

Fourth, we have the flexibility that the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) mentioned: flexibility to move funds within different accounts, except title I, and to transfer when they meet those programmatic goals in technology, or with qualified teachers. If they have met those goals, we provide the transferability and flexibility to move some money around from account to account.

We have public school choice and charter schools, and more help for those needed charter schools; and we have the NAPE test, a test that will help us gauge the strength of our State tests.

Mr. Speaker, in my 11 years as a Member of this body, today especially I am proud to be a Member of this great institution, this law-making body that combined process with product to help our Nation's poorest children get a better education. I am very proud of this bill.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON), the chairman of the Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness on the Committee on Education and the Workforce and a valued member of our team.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference for H.R. 1, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. This landmark legislation will reform our Nation's public school system.

As a grandfather of 24, all of whom having reached the proper age and are attending public schools, I stand here with great pride to support a bill which embodies the principles President Bush has championed since taking office in January of this year.

Leadership really does make a difference; and last year, many of us on the committee, along with Senators on education, were called to Austin to meet with then President-elect Bush. He put forth the principles that he believed in, and he gave us all an opportunity to tell him how we felt.

And then the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) took up that challenge, and they have worked together very diligently. They have provided an atmosphere where all of us could participate and be a part of working on this great bill. I want to thank them for that.

□ 1345

This bill contains the President's vision that the best way to improve America's schools is to hold them accountable, to increase local and State flexibility, to fund what works and to expand parental options.

Even though the centerpiece of the President's proposal is the annual testing, where problems can be found before it is too late to fix them, and parents can be given information to choose a better performing school, I would like to touch on a few other provisions which I believe are very important.

First, the bill will provide unprecedented new flexibility for all 50 States in every local school district in America in the use of Federal education funds. Having served on a local school board for 9 years I know that those school boards will appreciate that flexibility. I know that the superintendents will appreciate that flexibility.

Under the conference report, every local school district will immediately receive freedom from red tape to transfer up to 50 percent of the Federal dollars that they receive among an assortment of programs. It will also allow up to 150 local flexibility demonstration projects, where locals can receive a waiver from Federal education rules in exchange for signing an accountability contract with the Department of Education, and it will allow seven States

to receive waivers from various Federal education requirements. Hopefully these demonstration projects will help us in further moving more freedom of flexibility to all the other local schools.

State and local officials know best how to educate our children. This bill will allow States and local school districts to advance their own priorities such as reducing class size, hiring new teachers or buying new textbooks and computers.

Next, as chairman of the Subcommittee on the 21st Century Competitiveness, I am especially pleased to see this conference report includes strong teacher professional and education technology sections. The bill retains key provisions that the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), my colleague and good friend, and I, along with many others, have been working on over the last Congress with the flexibility to decide whether to spend funds on hiring new teachers or improving the skills of the teachers already in the classroom.

Technology can be a powerful means for improving student achievement and academic achievement. In fact, States and local school districts are already experimenting with promising technology programs, everything from on-line research to distance learning. Such innovation should be encouraged by the Federal Government and bolstered by Federal spending.

To help further the effort to integrate technology into teaching, we need to make sure teachers know how to use that technology in their teaching and increase access to technology for their students.

The conference report on H.R. 1 accomplishes this by consolidating a number of technology programs into a single stream of funding to our local school districts. Further, the bill fully integrates technology into the curriculum by increasing access to the highest quality teachers and courses possible, regardless of where the students live.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to again thank the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Boehner), and all those who have worked so diligently to pass this bill that will help further the education of all of our children and leave none of them behind.

I urge support of this bill.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) and thank him for all of his work. He probably said it many times in this committee, that if we gave disadvantaged children an opportunity to learn with all of the resources necessary and the well-trained teacher, he was fully prepared to accept the accountability, believing that those children could meet and exceed those marks of accountability, and I think it kept us focused on that central theme of this legislation.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank and congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), my leader, the ranking Democrat on the committee, and thank and congratulate the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the chairman of the committee. They did a marvelous job of fashioning this bill through a process with a lot of creative, independent minds on both sides of the aisle, and we have arrived at a bill I think we can all be proud of.

It is in the details. If my colleagues look in the details, we find a lot of hard work has been done, a lot of creative work has been done here, and we should not leave out congratulations and thanks to a job well done by a hardworking staff. I think the leadership of Sally Lovejoy in her stern, productive way, has produced some details in this bill which carry forth the real meaning of what we do in education reform.

I also want to thank my staff member, Larry Walker. They spent a large part of the summer here and late nights and long days, and they are to be congratulated for producing the document which in the details we will find a lot of creativity.

I also want to note the fact that this is great step forward. Lyndon Johnson took the first great step forward when he initiated the Elementary Secondary Education Assistance Act after many long years of the Federal Government insisting that it had no role in elementary secondary education, and now we are taking the next great step forward building on what Lyndon Johnson started.

The President is to be congratulated for taking such divisive nonproductive items as vouchers off the table as Federal policy. He needs to be congratulated for concentrating back on the poor and the disabled, as Lyndon Johnson originally intended. We can go forward within this framework.

The only problem is the problem we ended up with in the committee, a fervent plea for the funding of IDEA. If we funded special education, we would be on our way toward providing more resources for education at a level that is great enough to make a significant difference. There are increases here, make no bones about that. There are increases here, but they are not great enough.

We have a situation where the Federal Government of the United States only covers 7 percent of the overall expenditure for education, and this includes higher education. It is far too little. We should move toward a more rational figure like 25 percent. We are the only industrialized Nation that has such meager support at the national level for education. It is an extreme. We are at the extreme with 7 percent. We do not want to centralize our education. We do not think there is any great virtue there, but why be at the extreme? There ought to be a medium, a means somewhere that we could

strive for, where more resources are given for education to relieve the local education agencies and the States of the great burdens they have.

I am proud to be a part of this effort, and we must take the next step in terms of providing more resources.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The Chair would announce the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) has 10 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education Reform, a gentleman who has been at the heart of this process for a number of years, and the former governor of the State of Delaware.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, not just for his kind words of introduction but for the work that he and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) did which has been stated by practically everybody which very sincerely was extraordinary on this legislation.

Thirty-five years ago, Congress made equal access to a quality public education a birthright for all Americans. Today education is the foundation for future success as an individual and a source of strength for our Nation. Yet too many Americans are unable to participate fully in the American dream. Worse, those with the greatest academic difficulties include a disproportionate share of children from low income families and racial and ethnic minority groups.

For these reasons I am pleased to express my strong support for the conference report to H.R. 1, the No Child Left Behind Act. Over the course of the year Republicans and Democrats put an end to the divisive tactics that have stymied recent reform efforts and produced a serious bipartisan agreement to improve the way we educate our children for the better.

As a primary goal, this legislation strives for excellence in education by encouraging improvements in academic achievement while also securing greater assistance for those who are having the most difficulty mastering academic content and as a result, have fallen behind their peers. To that I want to discuss just three reasons, and there are many, many more why we should embrace this agreement.

First, H.R. 1 fully authorizes the President's request for \$975 million to ensure that every child can read by third grade. The reading programs contained in this bill will identify students at risk for reading failure and then provide intensive instruction by trained educators to bring them up to a proficient level. In this way, we will reduce the number of learning disabled students referred to special education and we will give all students the tools

they need to master more advanced course work.

Second, to ensure our children are learning, H.R. 1 asks States to access students in grades 3 through 8 annually in math and reading. The results of these assessments will provide parents and the public an effective, highly visible measure of how well their children are performing in school. This in turn will help parents, teachers and school officials diagnose problems and design remedies to improve student achievement.

The bill also recognizes the best way to ensure achievement is to hold the system accountable at all levels, not just the individual student level. For this reason, H.R. 1 gauges each school's academic success by the progress of every student in that school, not just the average student.

Finally, the new flexibility in this bill will allow State and local districts to better align Federal dollars for their own education priorities. In addition, the 2 new flexibility demonstrations, H.R. 1 allows States and locals to transfer up to 50 percent of Federal formula grants between programs. Unlike earlier flexibility provisions, this option is available to any State or school division and it is automatic.

For too long we have allowed our most disadvantaged children to be promoted through our public schools without regard to actual achievement. For too long we have allowed Federal dollars to flow to failure, convincing ourselves that some children were simply beyond our reach. For the first time, H.R. 1 fulfills the promise of education and opportunity for all children, rich and poor, black and white.

Finally, to those who will argue that Members should oppose or recommit this legislation because it does not include IDEA mandatory funding, I ask that you not scuttle a generally good bill. Forty-eight million public school students have waited patiently for the Congress to take notice of their plight and provide the help they so desperately need. Let us not make them wait any longer. Let us approve this bill and send it to the President this year and then beginning next year, I invite you to work with me when this committee takes a comprehensive look at the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act. In that way, we will ensure that our special needs children get the financial resources and the academic support they need to realize their greatest potential.

I do want to express their gratitude to the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and to the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), and to all the other colleagues on this. As everyone knows, this was a great team and a great staff effort by everybody. Those who sacrificed many weekends and summer vacations to produce a legislation. My staff in particular, Kara Haas; and the President of the United States, who was so involved in this. We thank President Bush as well.

I encourage everyone to support this legislation which will help all children.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on H.R. 1, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

First, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER) and the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for their responsible leadership in holding our bipartisan coalition together and for crucial support for individual members' concerns regarding the policy and resource allocation and recommendations. It was an honor for me to work with all the members of Committee on Education and the Workforce. I also congratulate Senator KENNEDY and Senator GREGG for their valuable contribution and I thank President Bush and his administration.

I also wish to recognize the extremely important support of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus led by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) in fighting for provisions very important to the Hispanic community.

There are many positive features to commend in the conference agreement, and I wish to mention just a few of them. This bill will give many disadvantaged students a great opportunity to excel and to reach as high as they can dream. The conference agreement protects the principle of public funds for public schools.

There are many, many things, and there is not enough time to thank everyone and to mention all of these things in the provision, but I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

It was an honor for me to work with all the members of the Education Committee. I also congratulate Senator KENNEDY and Senator GREGG for their valuable contribution and I thank President Bush and his administration. I also wish to recognize the extremely important support of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, lead by Chairman REYES in fighting for provisions very important to the Hispanic Community.

There are many positive features to commend in the conference agreement and I wish to mention a few of them. The bill will provide local flexibility, with accountability for reaching performance goals and formulas that target funds to schools with the greatest needs. This bill will give many disadvantaged students a great opportunity to excel and to reach as high as they can dream.

The conference agreement protects the principal of public funds for public schools. Program authorization and funding will be provided for school construction and modernization as well as for funding for separate federal after-school and violence prevention programs. Civil rights protections are still included and teacher quality programs will be increased in funding authority by forty percent.

I am very pleased that the Bilingual and Immigrant Education programs will be protected

and expanded and that program accountability and funding for teacher-training will be increased. Hispanic parents will find some previously established barriers removed and will find it easier to participate in school improvement committees.

Migrant students will be provided additional resources and both bilingual and migrant students will be assisted in program enhancement with the continuation of national information clearinghouse for research and evaluation. The Department of Education will assist the states in the interstate electronic transfer of crucial migrant records. Time does not permit me to point out other positive provisions. However, I do want to encourage the members of the Appropriations Committees in both chambers to accept the recommendations of the authorizing committees and to fully fund these programs. Reform without resources is meaningless. I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to help us pass this bipartisan conference report on H.R. 1.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise also to support this conference report. And I say, good job, gentlemen. It was hard but they made it happen.

I would prefer a bill, however, that includes more funding for all that we are asking of our schools and of our teachers. We have made quite a list of accomplishments. We need to fund them so they can have the help they need.

I particularly regret that we are not fully funding our Federal share of special education. There is not a school district in this Nation that is not having trouble meeting those costs.

I am pleased, however, that the bill keeps funding for hate crime prevention intact. It is so important because as a result of the 11th of September, there has been a dramatic increase in hate crimes, particularly crimes directed at innocent people and innocent children, including school children.

□ 1400

Now, more than ever, because we have this in the bill, we will be able to teach our children constructive ways to express their feelings.

Nothing matters more to the future of this country than the education of our children. They are the workers, the soldiers, the diplomats, and voters of tomorrow. Congratulations, gentlemen.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I would like to thank both the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Boehner) for the bill we have before us today.

I rise in support of H.R. 1, a bill that truly takes a step forward in helping

our children get an education in the United States. Under this bill, our Nation's schools will now take steps to narrow the achievement gap between high- and low-income students.

For example, in Santa Ana Unified or Anaheim High School District or the Anaheim Elementary School District, these are all some of the poorest school districts in our Nation and certainly some of the most overcrowded in our Nation. Over 50 percent of the students who are taught in these districts go to school in portable classrooms. H.R. 1 will help our Nation take a significant step forward in helping students like those in these school districts that I have the pleasure of representing.

This bill increases funding for title I programs, increases funding for bilingual education and authorizes funding for school construction and modernization. It also includes funding for pedestrian and bicycle safety, a great issue of importance in my district.

Although Congress still needs to do more to assist schools that teach children with special needs, H.R. 1 is a critical step in ensuring that no child is left behind.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), a member of the committee.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of H.R. 1, a truly landmark piece of legislation. I think it shows what we as a Congress can accomplish when we are willing to sit down and work together.

Along those lines, I would like to heap more praise on the chairman and the gentleman from California, and I think the President deserves a good measure of praise for his constructive role in this, too.

The agreement, I am pleased to see, addresses the subject of math and science education, especially the recruitment and professional development of teachers. And if we are going to continue to grow as a Nation, science and math education is critical.

I am also pleased that the legislation authorizes increased funding for a number of programs targeted to the neediest and poorest, programs for title I and teacher quality, bilingual and immigrant education.

But I do want to raise two items that I am disappointed about. I am disappointed this legislation does not adequately address the Federal Government's share of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. In New Jersey, the communities I represent tell me this is one of the biggest challenges they face.

Secondly, I am disappointed this legislation does not address the issue of pesticides in our schools and does not include notification of parents and teachers when potentially dangerous chemicals are used around their children.

But despite these concerns, however, Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate my

support for the bill and thank the conferees for work very well done.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the conferees for a job well done.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about the conference report on H.R. 1, the Leave No Child Behind Act. I want to commend Ranking Democrat GEORGE MILLER, Chairmen JOHN BOEHNER and Congressmen DALE KILDEE and MIKE CASTLE for their leadership over the past many months on this most important issue.

As the only Member of the United States Congress who has actually run a state school system, I have a unique perspective on federal support for public education. Perhaps the most important provisions of this legislation are those that are not contained in this conference report. There are no vouchers to siphon public dollars to private schools. There are no irresponsible block grants like those that have been proposed before in this Chamber. There is no effort to close the U.S. Education Department by the Republican Leadership. And there are no massive cuts to public education like those we have defeated time and again in this body. Those are very significant accomplishments, and I especially commend my Democratic colleagues for maintaining our party's historic commitment to quality public education for all children.

As the former Superintendent of North Carolina's public schools, I know firsthand what it takes to achieve real results in academic improvement. It takes setting high standards and ensuring accountability. But most importantly, it takes a commitment to ensure that all of our children have quality educational opportunities to achieve the goal of "no child left behind."

Although this bill falls short of fulfilling our commitment to fund the federal mandate on special education, I am pleased that this conference report takes significant steps toward substantial improvement in education. The bill targets federal funds toward the neediest students to close the achievement gap between disadvantaged children and their more affluent peers and between minority and non-minority students. The conference report strengthens teacher training so that our school teachers are qualified to teach in their subject matter. It provides new resources for mentoring, training, salary enhancement and other improvements that give teachers the resources they need to do their very important jobs.

For the first time in federal law, this bill will require that parents are clearly informed about the quality of their children's education. And it makes a significant new commitment to bilingual and immigrant education.

I am disappointed that the conferees did not include the Wamp-Etheridge amendment to provide \$50 million in dedicated funding for character education. The conference report instead includes character education in the Secretary's discretionary Fund for the Improvement of Education, and I call on the Secretary to fully fund character education, which we have pioneered in North Carolina to strengthen values-based lessons for our children.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this country faces several critical educational challenges beyond the

scope of this legislation. First, we must take action to relieve the crisis of the lack of adequate school facilities in this country. In my district, our schools are bursting at the seams, and too many children are stuffed into overcrowded classrooms or second rate trailers. We must pass school construction legislation to help build new schools for our children. We must invest in science and math to ensure America's global economic leadership in the 21st century. We must increase aid for college so middle class families have the opportunity to achieve the American Dream. We have so many educational challenges ahead of us that we must treat this bill as the very beginning of our commitment to improving education and not the end of the process.

In conclusion, this legislation will only work if we back up its requirements with the resources to get the job done. Tough reform without resources simply amounts to cruelty to our children. I understand that the appropriations bill nearing completion contains enhanced education resources for next year. We still must do much more to live up to the federal commitment under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), and I will be working during next year's reform of that statute to fulfill that commit. My biggest concern is that in the hears to come, especially when the full effects of this year's massive tax bill are felt, Congress will neglect to provide the necessary resources to fulfill the promises of H.R. 1. I will fight every step of the way to make sure that does not happen.

Mr. Speaker, this bill represents a hopeful first step toward better schools for all children in America. I will vote to pass the conference report on H.R. 1, and I urge my colleagues to join me in doing so.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

(Ms. WATSON of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WATSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the "No Child Left Behind Act." I comment the sponsors and conferees of this ambitious bill that seeks to address many educational reform goals. H.R. 1 is a bill with good intentions that moves education in the right direction. My question is, "Are we going to see the results that we want, given the proposed authorization levels?"

Mr. Speaker, new federal mandates without providing the necessary resources to implement them will simply set children and schools up for failure. Funding has increased, yet many key education programs, such as Title I, are currently unable to serve all eligible students. In addition, states facing serious economic downturn coupled with rising school enrollments are already moving to cut critical education programs.

Mr. Speaker, directly after the tragic events of 9-11, President Bush asked for \$40 billion dollars to fund home land security and emergency relief efforts. Congress moved quickly, in a bipartisan manner, to address our national security needs. Education funding is just as critical to our national security. Education is the cornerstone of our society. Education of our children is important to the American ideal of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to consider seriously increases in education funding next session so that we can truly "Leave No Child Behind."

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a letter from the NSBA regarding this bill:

NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS
ASSOCIATION,

Alexandria, VA, December 12, 2001.

Re Conference Report on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

MEMBER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the nation's 95,000 local school board members, we wish to express our disappointment that the conference report on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) fails to address the ever-expanding financial burdens that the federal government imposes on the nation's school systems and local taxpayers.

Unfortunately, the conference committee rejected an opportunity that would have recognized both the financial realities confronting local school systems and the opportunity to make this legislation the full success it should be. Had the conferees accepted the Senate provision for the mandatory funding of the federal share of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), some of the pressure that this special education mandate places on school districts would have been relieved and more local funds would have been released to at least partially support compliance with the new federal ESEA provisions.

The legislation does provide a promising framework for raising standards and accountability for all students—with an important emphasis on raising the achievement of educationally disadvantaged students. However, the accomplishment of that goal also involves new mandates; some are explicitly set forth in the legislation while others will naturally result from the additional classroom resources that will be needed. Unfortunately, the legislation does not contain any commitment by the federal government to adequately fund these new costs or its ongoing obligation under IDEA.

Meanwhile, across the nation virtually every state is experiencing revenue shortfalls. Even small states are experiencing shortfalls in the billion-dollar range over their biennial budgets. As a result, reductions in state aid are forcing cuts in school district budgets. Now, as school systems must also look toward funding the new requirements in this bill, as well as serving expanding enrollments of Title I eligible students, as well as meeting the expanding costs of the under-funded federal special education mandate (IDEA), they will have no choice but to raise local property taxes where they can or suffer severe cut backs in their general programming. This should not become the local legacy of ESEA.

Given the unique and historic role that this important legislation can play in American education, state and local policy makers should not, as a result of inadequate funding, be forced to lower their sights on high academic standards, limit their use of the many public school choice options that are now available, or lose the opportunity to enrich classroom instruction by having to settle for cheap test prep programs to drill lower achieving students to pass a test. Without adequate resources what other results can we expect? With the shortfall in state and federal funding, what other impact can we expect than increases in local taxation?

The stark financial reality of the ESEA reauthorization will become clear across the

nation when school opens next fall. As attractive as the incremental increase to the pending FY 2002 education appropriations bill may appear, it does not match the needs under IDEA or the new ESEA requirements, which the Congress is about to adopt.

Local educators and local school board members want this legislation to work, and more importantly, they want the nation's 47 million public schoolchildren to reach higher levels of academic achievement. They are also very appreciative of the increased flexibility that the legislation provides in their use of federal funds. But they do not want to be set up to fail because of a lack of financial accountability by the federal government.

Despite our financial concerns, NSBA does not oppose the passage of this legislation because the bill does establish a promising framework for raising student achievement. However, we urge Congress to view the passage as the first of a series of steps during the remainder of the 107th Congress to ensure that both the new requirements of ESEA and the federal share of the cost of IDEA are fully funded.

Sincerely,

JAMES R. RUHLAND,
President.

ANNE L. BRYANT,
Executive Director.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to express my support for H.R. 1.

It gives appropriators the authority to allocate a 20 percent increase in federal education spending, over the 3 percent the President requested. It allows for the creation of a formula to target federal aid to where the greatest needs in bi-lingual education exist. It provides new resources for mentoring, training, salary enhancement, and other improvements.

This bill provides a promising framework for raising standards and accountability for all students, and this bill will mean a great deal to New York City.

It allocates approximately \$636 million for FY2002 to New York City, a 28 percent increase from last year, and \$141 million in Title I funding, a 20 percent increase.

With New York City threatening massive across the board cuts, this increased Federal funding is more important than ever.

And, while I am disappointed that this bill doesn't make federal spending on disabled students an entitlement program, and that it does not include desperately needed funding for the rebuilding and modernization of crumbling overcrowded schools in my district I nevertheless applaud the hard work of the House and Senate conferees in bringing this long overdue reform bill to the floor today.

H.R. 1 gives students a chance, parents a choice, and America's schools the mandate to be the best in the world.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the chairman of

the committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), and the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER). As an alumni of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I can say that this is great work that they did on this, which provides additional funding for bilingual education, ESA, and the commitment for special education.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, legislation to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. ESEA, and Title I in particular, has meant so much to low-income students across this country. This legislation provides crucial funding for school districts that might not otherwise have the resources they need to provide a quality education.

I think we can all agree that we must hold school districts accountable for the federal dollars they receive. And this legislation has a number of important testing provisions to ensure that our students are receiving the education they need to thrive in the 21st Century. But equally, perhaps even more important, we must provide schools with the resources they need to meet those standards. By doubling Title I funding over the next five years, I believe we will see a dramatic improvement in low-income, lower-achieving schools.

I am also pleased to see increases to the Bilingual and Immigrant Education programs. As our most recent census reports, there has been incredible growth among Latino populations. Many of these first-generation Americans are not exposed to English in their homes, and have limited English proficiency. We must target resources at school districts with high populations of Limited English Proficiency students, to ensure that all children, regardless of their ethnic background, receive a high quality education.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the testing provisions. In Texas, we have annual testing for children in grades three through eight. Because our state standardized test are equivalent, Texas will not have to implement new tests. I hope that all other states which adopt these tests will have the same successes that we've seen in Texas.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good, bipartisan, consensus bill. It is probably the first truly bipartisan bill we've seen this Congress. Support H.R. 1, and let our parents, teachers and administrators prepare our next greatest generation.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise today in support of the conference report on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). I commend Chairman BOEHNER and Ranking Member GEORGE MILLER for their commitment to our students in working to ensure the development of a strong law to govern our schools.

The bill before us today will ensure that all children have an opportunity to learn and that we will not tolerate the failure of our poorest students. For the first time, we have established clear goals and a timeline for narrowing

the achievement gap between disadvantaged children and their more affluent peers and between minority and non-minority students. I would also like to point out that this bill provides a significant increase in funding levels for ESEA programs. This bill provides our appropriators with the authority to increase education funding by 20 percent for the next fiscal year. This a great achievement for which I again applaud Mr. BOEHNER and Mr. MILLER.

Today, however, I would like to focus on two matters that I have spent a significant amount of time pushing for. First, I would like to talk about the need to recruit and train qualified teachers, which is addressed in H.R. 1.

As we all know, we are approaching an education crisis in our country. Over the next decade, school districts throughout the country will need to hire 2 million new teachers. In my home, Hillsborough County, Florida, our school district needs to hire more than 7,000 new teachers over the next decade. To meet this need, talented Americans of all ages should be recruited to become successful, qualified teachers.

We need to find creative ways to address the critical shortage of teachers that our school districts are facing. For that reason, my colleague from Indiana, TIM ROEMER, and I, passed legislation in the 106th Congress, the Transition to Teaching Act, to target mid-career professionals who are looking for a career change and want to be a teacher. The Transition to Teaching program will help move people from the boardroom to the classroom, from the firehouse to the schoolhouse or from the police station on Main Street to the classroom on Main Street.

During the last Congress, we were successful in getting a temporary authorization for this program and small amount of initial funding. I am pleased today that the Conference Report to H.R. 1 provides permanent authorization for their very valuable program. In addition, this bill provides a significant increase in funding for the Transition to Teaching program. Under this bill, our appropriators will be able to provide \$150 million to help us recruit new, qualified teachers under this program for Fiscal Year 2002. While this is only the one step in helping our schools deal with the teacher crisis over the next decade, it is a significant step in the right direction.

Now, I would like to address student testing. At the beginning of this year, I got an earful from parents, teachers and students who are concerned that standardized educational testing in Florida has run amuck. When the House considered H.R. 1 earlier this year, I rose on behalf of hundreds of thousands of Florida public school students subjected to these tests and expressed my concerns that the principal purpose of testing should be diagnostic—to help teachers teach and students learn. I had previously expressed my concerns on this issue to the Secretary of Education and the President's Chief Advisor on his education proposal. Both of them said they agreed with me.

Testing should determine where my child is at the beginning of the school year and what he needs to work on to get where he should be at the end of that school year. Testing should tell my child, his teacher, my wife and me what we need to know to help him improve as a student.

As many of you know, Florida is already testing students in grades three through eight

in reading and math. The Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) also tests writing in grades four, eight and ten. Unfortunately, as I stated above, the purpose of the FCAT is to grade our schools and implement high stakes penalties or rewards based on their scores, not to see where our students need help to boost their performance.

That's right. Under the FCAT, teachers, principals, parents and students get no information from the test identifying the needs of individual students and how to help them improve. Therefore, it was important that the federal law provide some direction on this matter.

The original House bill was silent on this issue. However, I am very pleased that the Conference Report before us today is no longer silent on the need for diagnostic testing of our students. This bill contains a reporting requirement that requires our schools to produce individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports. This new requirement will ensure that our parents, teachers, and principals will know and be able to address the specific academic needs of students. More importantly, this new requirement will ensure that as soon as is practically possible after the test is given, this diagnostic information will be provided in an understandable and uniform format, and to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand.

With the diagnostic provisions included in this Conference Report, we will give our teachers the tools they need to teach and to make sure that our students are learning. I commend the House conferees for fighting for this very important student centered testing. I look forward to our states, including Florida, making the necessary changes under this new law.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to adopt the Conference Report to H.R. 1, which is truly a bipartisan effort. This is a significant step in the right direction to make sure that our public schools continue on the right track.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. I support the bill, I think the bill does what it says, and I appreciate all the hard work the chairman and ranking member have put into this bill.

But I am extremely upset about one single provision that only affects New York City and Hawaii. The provision known as the County Provision divides New York City as no other Federal law does. New York City is one unique local education agency; yet this provision mandates that the city be treated as five separate LEAs when it comes to title I funding. The provision, which was added in 1994 to the ESEA, allows for Staten Island to receive almost 150 percent more in title I funds than the city-wide average. In fiscal year 2001, Staten Island received \$1,718 for a title I student, whereas Brooklyn receive \$811 and the Bronx, which I represent, receives only \$552 per title I student.

This provision undermines the very premise of the bill. We tried to elimi-

nate this provision. We thought we had a compromise, but we did not quite reach it.

Overall I support this bill. It ensures that all teachers are qualified to teach in their subject matter, supports teachers by giving them the resources they need to do their jobs, targets federal aid for bilingual and immigrant education to those students who need it the most, and expands after-school programs.

A compromise that was reached by the conferees from New York would have held Staten Island harmless, keeping it at \$1718 for the life of this authorization while allowing the per pupil allocations in the other boroughs to creep up, was rejected.

I am extremely upset that while the title of this bill is "No Child Left Behind" the poor children in the Bronx will continue to be left behind.

I would like to thank the Chairman, the gentleman from New York, Mr. OWENS, and Senator CLINTON for all of the work they have done to right this wrong. I look forward to working with them in the future to put an end to the County Provision.

I would say to the chairman that this county provision needs to be revisited, and I would like his comments on it because I know he has publicly said they were going to make this more equitable.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I understand the discrepancy in the funding in New York City. This was part of the 1994 act, under agreement by the Members from New York City, and I do think it had unintended consequences. We sat out early this year to try to bring some resolution, and the conference committee believed that the Members from New York should work this out amongst themselves and, frankly, they were unable to.

As I have learned more about this issue, I do understand the gentleman's concerns, and I have expressed to other Members of the New York City delegation and to Senator CLINTON that as we proceed in the coming years, that we would continue to look at this and to work with this to see if we cannot bring about some better resolution.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I add to the compliments for my colleague, the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), and the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER). This is a great product that the conference committee has delivered, and it goes a long way to addressing some very important issues.

I particularly want to mention a provision that would require States, over a number of years, to do a much better job in terms of providing an effective quality teacher in every classroom and also the targeting provisions of title I.

There is more work that will be required of us as we go forward, but I think this is a conference committee that we can all embrace. It is a giant

step forward, but we are still a long way from making sure that poor children do not end up with a poor quality instructor and poor quality textbooks and educational materials. This is, as a Federal Government, I think, an appropriate role for us to play.

But I want to commend the gentlemen for their work and the work of all of those on the conference committee from both Chambers, and I look forward to additional work in the future.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of the conference report for H.R. 1, the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Nearly a year ago, Congress embarked on a mission to improve the education of America's public school students. Today, I am proud to say that we have produced a consensus bill that, when implemented by the Administration as intended by Congress, will dramatically expand the opportunity for all children in our country to learn.

A COOPERATIVE AND BIPARTISAN PROCESS

This bill is the result of many people's labor and ideas. I deeply appreciate Chairman JOHN BOEHNER for the leadership, candor and honesty that he displayed throughout his process. He has been a man of his word.

President Bush told us a year ago in Texas that he wanted to make education reform the hallmark of his administration, and that his central goal was to target federal resources towards the neediest students. We have worked with him throughout this long process, and the bill we have written meets those objections.

Senator JUDD GREGG has been deeply engaged throughout this effort, and, while we often disagreed, we were able to work successfully to resolve our differences.

And I am particularly pleased to have been able again to work closely with my longtime friend and colleague Senator TED KENNEDY, with whom I have participated in so many efforts on behalf of those who need our help the most but who are most often ignored. His commitment to a strong reform bill on behalf of all of America's children was critical to forming this final product.

Great credit, of course, goes to all of the members of the Conference Committee that produced this bill, and I also want to thank all of the members of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce who crafted this bill earlier in the year.

In particular, I want to express my appreciation for Congressman ROEMER of Indiana, whose creative contribution to the issue of flexibility formed the basis for our successful resolution to the fight over state block grants, one of the issues that delayed completion of work on this legislation earlier this year.

Last, I wish to express my appreciation to the staff of the House and the Senate education committees who worked diligently, through many nights, weekends and vacations, to see this bill through to the end. I feel particularly privileged to have as my lead education adviser Charles Barone, an enormously dedicated and capable public servant whose expertise and insight were invaluable to the successful completion of this bill.

AN URGENTLY NEEDED BILL

Despite a commitment by our government to the contrary, our educational system has toler-

ated extremely low educational achievement for decades. Many thousands of schools throughout this nation, disproportionately in neighborhoods serving low income and disadvantaged youth, have unacceptably high percentages of children who cannot read, write or do math at their grade level. The problem is not that they do not have the ability to succeed or that they are not capable of higher levels of achievement. The problem is that states and school districts have not provided them the opportunity to do so. Those same schools have the least qualified teachers, the highest dropout rates, and are in the greatest physical state of disrepair.

Report after report on the weakness of our educational system was published over the years with an inadequate response:

25 percent of teachers who are not qualified to teach in their subject area;

68 percent of 4th graders not able to read at a proficient level;

73 percent of 8th graders not able to conduct math at a proficient level;

An unmet school construction and repair bill of \$127 billion.

Now, with this legislation, we are not only once again committing ourselves to opening the door to quality schools for every child and closing the door on acceptable losses, but we are backing up that commitment with resources and a strong accountability system.

This year's effort is rooted in my firm belief that if teachers and their schools have adequate resources and high standards, and not just rhetorical support, America can have a world-class K-12 public school system for all its students.

I know that we can do better. Having spent over 25 years on the House education committee, 10 years as chairman of the House Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, and having worked with and taught in schools in my congressional district over the years, I know that we can do much more to ensure that all children get the kind of education each of us would want for our own sons or daughters.

I have spent much of the past decade fighting to pass the key provisions of this bill: teacher quality, parental notification, school accountability, and new and unprecedented targeting of resources.

Given the broad support this legislation enjoys, it is difficult to believe that fewer than ten years ago, my efforts to guarantee every child a qualified teacher were dismissed by the Congress. Today we do that, and much more.

AN EMPHASIS ON ACCOUNTABILITY, RESOURCES, AND QUALITY

As a result of the changes we have made in the conference committee to the bill introduced earlier this year, this bill will help return our school system to the original goals of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act—to ensure that all children have an opportunity to learn regardless of income, background or racial or ethnic identity. But unlike the laws on the books over the past 35 years, we will back up our commitment with a set of unambiguous expectations, time-lines, and resources.

In this bill, we are prepared to offer a significant increase in resources in exchange for meeting real goals—teachers who teach, students who learn, and schools that succeed.

Our bill, for the first time in federal law, establishes clear goals to close the educational

achievement gap over a 12-year period. Through a system of state-based annual tests in grades three through eight that will act as a diagnostic tool, we will identify schools in need of improvement and ensure they receive adequate resources to improve.

Our bill provides for the unprecedented targeting of federal dollars to the neediest students, including a change in the Title I formula that will reward states who make strides to reduce school finance inequity.

Our bill sets the clearest educational standards in history.

For the first time in federal law we establish a clear goal of requiring that every teacher is fully qualified to teach in his or her subject area within four years. And we offer the greatest support for our teachers in history.

For the first time in federal law we establish a formula to target federal aid for bilingual education based on the number of children in a particular school district who need it.

For the first time in federal law we will require that parents receive report cards with clear and precise information on the quality of their child's school.

We will allow for unprecedented flexibility in administering programs at the local level.

We greatly expand the reading program initiated by Democrats in 1998 and favored by President Bush, including a new pre-K program.

We also ensure that all state tests would be compared against one, credible national benchmark test, the NAEP test, and not a smattering of different benchmark tests as the House bill had called for. The NAEP test is already used in a majority of states.

To ensure that the requirements of this bill can be met, we provide new resources to schools:

New money for teachers to receive mentoring, professional training, and salary enhancements. We are supporting teachers by giving them the resources they need to meet our new standards;

We significantly increase funding for Title I, the program for disadvantaged students, and better target the money to the neediest students;

We provide assistance for struggling schools;

We significantly increase funding for technology, after-school, and other programs that have proven to enhance educational quality.

Both on the House floor earlier this year, and then again during the conference committee, we successfully defeated a negative, conservative education agenda that threatened to undermine the original goals of this effort.

There are no vouchers in this bill to divert public school money to private schools.

There is no "Straight A's" state block grant to eviscerate the federal targeting of dollars to the neediest students and to waste critical education dollars on state bureaucracies.

We maintain and expand the After-School program, despite the President's attempt to eliminate it as a separate program.

We provide authority and resources for school construction, despite opposition to a federal role in modernizing school facilities by the President and Republicans in Congress.

We also defeated a negative, conservative social agenda that some attempted to insert into this bill. They wanted to eliminate the Hate Crimes program that teaches tolerance

in our schools, but we kept the bill. They wanted to weaken civil rights protections in current law, but we stopped them.

A REAL INCREASE IN RESOURCES

Finally, as I mentioned above, we have made great strides in boosting funding over and above what the President and Republicans in Congress offered.

The President began this effort with virtually no increase at all for education:

The President asked for only a 3% increase in ESEA. We will now see a 20% increase in ESEA in real appropriations under the FY 02 Labor-HHS appropriations bill;

The President asked for only a 3% increase for Title 1. We won a 16–20% increase in appropriations,

The President asked for only a 3% increase for teacher quality. We won more than a 40% increase in appropriations;

The President asked for zero percent (0%) for After-School programs. We won an 18% increase in appropriations.

COMMITMENT TO SPECIAL EDUCATION FUNDING STILL UNMET

Mr. Speaker, there is one final point, regretably, that I must raise. In this bill, unfortunately, the conferees were not able to reach an agreement on providing additional funding for special education. The Senate bill would have fully funded our federal commitment to special education, whereas the House rejected that provision. But you cannot fund only two-fifths of our commitment to special education and still "leave no child behind."

Yet, despite strong, bipartisan and bicameral support for full and mandatory funding for special education, the conference committee twice refused to provide the funding we promised school districts and parents 26 years ago.

CONCLUSION

Despite our serious disagreement over the critical issue of special education, I believe that the other reforms and resources that we provide for America's school children in this bill are unprecedented achievements that deserve to be enacted into law without delay and implemented by the Administration in the very manner in which the conference committee intended.

There now lies a tremendous obligation by the Bush Administration to write the regulations for this bill and implement those regulations in a manner consistent with the urgent need that led us to write this bill in the first place.

This is a strong bill, it is a reasonable bill, and it is a historic bill that draws bright lines for our students and provides new resources to where they are needed most. I look forward to the enactment of this bill before the end of this year.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS—H.R. 1

I would like to acknowledge a number of people who helped to make this bill a reality. As I said at the outset, it was a bi-partisan and cooperative process.

I would like to acknowledge and thank President George W. Bush, Committee Chairman JOHN BOEHNER, Senator TED KENNEDY, and Senator JUDD GREGG. I would like to acknowledge and thank the other House Democratic conferees for their contributions, Representatives DALE KILDEE, PATSY MINK, Major OWENS, ROB ANDREWS and TIM ROEMER.

I would like to express my grateful appreciation for the hard work of my committee staff,

including my top education advisor Charles Barone, as well as John Lawrence, Daniel Weiss, Alex Nock, Denise Forte, Mark Zuckerman, Ruth Friedman and James Kvall, and also the staff for Congresswoman MINK, Brendan O'Neil, for Congressman ROEMER, Maggie McDow, and for Senator KENNEDY, his top education aide, Danica Petroschius.

I would like to thank Chairman BOEHNER's committee staff, his top education aide, Sally Lovejoy, and his staff director, Paula Nowakowski.

In addition, there were many experts and organizations who provided invaluable expertise to our committee as we developed this legislation. Some in particular whom I would like to thank for their help include Bill Taylor and Dianne Pichè at the Citizen's Commission on Civil Rights, Kati Haycock and Amy Wilkins at the Education Trust, and Paul Weckstein at the Center for Law and Education.

I hope that everyone who had a hand in this enormous effort feels as proud as I do today about this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, back in May, this House spoke with almost a unanimous voice, with a strong voice, regarding the kind of education bill that they wanted. I believe that we can say to the Members of this House that we have brought them back a better bill than the bill we passed.

My colleagues said they wanted accountability for closing the achievement gap, and we have provided that. They said they wanted to improve the targeting of funds on poor districts and disadvantaged children, and we have done that. They said they wanted new investments and a stronger commitment to teacher and professional development, support and mentoring, and we have done that.

They said they wanted a new formula program for bilingual students so the money would go where the students in needs are, and we have done that. They wanted assistance for those schools struggling to turn themselves around, and this legislation does that. They said they wanted the expansion of the reading program, as outlined by the President and other people who are critical of the current reading resources in the Federal program, and we have done that. They wanted the use of nationwide tests so we could test whether or not the assessments made at the State level were accurately reflecting the educational achievement of those children. They also said they did not want Straight A's, and we do not have that. They said they did not want vouchers, and we do not have that. But they wanted flexibility, and we provided that flexibility without the Straight A's.

So I think we have delivered a bill that this Congress on both sides of the aisle have overwhelmingly spoken on behalf of for many years, and the results are now here.

But let me just say one thing this bill does and what it is built upon. It is built upon a deep and uncompromising belief by the chairman of this committee, by the President of the United States, by Chairman KENNEDY, by Sen-

ator GREGG and myself, and so many other Members of this Congress and this committee that all of America's children can learn. We believe that an impoverished child does not mean a child that cannot learn. We believe that because an individual is a minority does not mean they cannot learn. And the evidence is overwhelming that we are right.

What we did with this legislation was redirect those resources to dramatically enhance the opportunities for success by America's children. The opportunity for success. We cannot guarantee the success, but we can provide the opportunity.

Yesterday, the Education Trust put out a report on the eve of our consideration of this bill that identified 1,320 districts with high-poverty students, high percentage of poverty, high minority schools that are excelling in the top third of their States. We can no longer accept the level of failure that we have in the past, and this legislation says that we will not.

Yes, it is going to be hard to meet these achievements; yes it will be hard to meet these goals; and yes, it will be hard to hold ourselves accountable, but there is no option to our doing this on behalf of America's children.

We heard back in August when many people said this is impossible. I was shocked to hear it from so many educators. Maybe they are in the wrong field. Because here are 1,300 schools that are using the basic tools that are provided in this legislation, that are strengthened in this legislation, that are enhanced with the resources in this legislation, using the very tools in this bill, these 1,320 schools are among the top performers in their States. We want to replicate that all over this Nation for all of America's children.

Again, I want to thank the chairman for making this possible. I believe we will do all this with an "aye" vote on the passage of this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I feel today like I did on the day of the birth of my two daughters: exhausted. It has been a long process and a long year. And as tired as I and the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), and the members of the committee are, I think all of us understand that our staffs have done much, much more than we have, and have spent much, much more time. And I think that the Members here deserve to give our staff a big round of applause.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of thank-yous that have gone around today, and a number of people have mentioned the President. I think a lot of us know that President Bush, during his campaign last year, took a courageous stand, as a Republican candidate for President, when he took the issue of education and our party in a new direction. It was a bold and courageous move on his part, but he did it.

But not only did he do it during the campaign, he maintained that effort

and that focus to make this his number one domestic priority. That is when the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and I, and others, were brought down to Austin, Texas, to talk about the foundations of this bill. That is why the first full day in office, on January 22, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), Senator KENNEDY, Mr. JEFFORDS, and I were in the Oval Office with the President telling us how important this bill was.

The President believed that we needed more accountability in our Nation's schools; that we needed more flexibility for our local schools and our teachers at the local level; that we needed a new investment in early childhood reading programs and early grade reading programs; and that we needed to consolidate the number of Federal programs; and, lastly, to refocus the Federal Government's efforts at the neediest of our students.

□ 1415

But as important as this bill is, there is another important dynamic that occurred over the course of the year, and that is how this bill is going to become a law.

If we go back to last year during the campaign, the President talked about the need for a new tone in Washington. The President said that we needed to be more bipartisan here in Washington, and the American people applauded him for his willingness to say that. When the President brought us to Texas on December 21 of last year, he brought us down there to talk about education, but he also talked to us about wanting to move ahead together.

And on January 22 when we were in the Oval Office, it was the President who once again said that we need to move this process together, and we need to work together. I can tell Members that I believed the President when he was a candidate, and I believed him all during this year. And I believe, as many of our Members on both sides of the aisle believe, that it is time that this body become more bipartisan.

Now if the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), who, as he said, have spent 10 years throwing bricks at each other, and every Member knows that the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and I can be as partisan and as hard-nosed as anybody on either side of the aisle, if we can work together with the members of our committee, which is a very partisan committee, it has been the most partisan committee in this House for the last 3 decades, if we can do it, there is no reason why any other committee in this House cannot do it.

I can tell Members during the 20 years that I have been in this business, this is by far the most important piece of legislation that I have ever worked on. It is my proudest accomplishment. It is the work product that I am proud of; but, as importantly, the way that we did this. Bipartisanship means that

Members have to trust each other. Bipartisanship means that Members need to work together and find common ground.

To the pundits who said that the bill was stalled, were not sure we were going to get it, let me suggest the bill was never stalled. It took a great deal of patience and listening, and it took a great deal of trust to actually bring this product to where we are today.

As I said earlier, I could not have had a better partner in this process than the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER). We did not know each other very well when this year started, but I laid out a vision for our committee and a vision for how this bill could become law, a vision of starting in the right place in order to end up in the right place.

The gentleman from California had his critics on his side of the aisle who could not understand how he could support a bill that I was supporting; and I clearly had my share of problems with Members that could not believe I could be supporting a bill that the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) was supporting.

Mr. Speaker, we went through this process together, and I could not have enjoyed our experience, nor could I have developed a better friend than the gentleman from California.

Let me say to my colleagues in the other body who worked with us over the last 4 or 5 months, Senator KENNEDY and Senator GREGG, their willingness to sit and work through this process, their willingness to take the time and to trust each other, helped to develop what I think is a landmark piece of legislation. I thank all of them for their efforts.

When we step back and look at what we are trying to do here, it is simple. The gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) said it in his closing remark, and that is the gentleman from California and I, Senator KENNEDY, Senator GREGG and Members on both sides of the aisle are committed to the concept that every child in America can learn, and that every child in America should have the opportunity to get a sound, basic education.

Every Member in this body understands that without a sound, basic education, the chance at the American dream does not exist. For 35 years we have promised from the Federal Government that we would help the poorest of our children. We failed, and we failed miserably.

This is not the end of this process. Let me suggest to Members, this is the beginning of the process. The writing of the rules, the implementation of this bill in each of our 50 States is going to be a Herculean battle, not unlike what we have seen over the course of this year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to not only vote for this bill today, but to keep up their vigilance at home to get this bill implemented correctly be-

cause at the core of it, what we are trying to accomplish here is to ensure that every child in America has a chance at a good education, and that every child in America has a chance at the American dream.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1. This bill addresses the vital school construction needs unique to federally impacted schools by authorizing a new competitive construction component within the federal Impact Aid program. In many cases the local tax base does not have the needed resources to draw upon to meet the needs of our military and Indian schools. As a result, lack of funds has until now left those schools without the resources for new construction, renovation, or modernization initiatives. H.R. 1 adds the new construction component that will allow these schools to complete important projects by enabling them to compete for funding, on the basis of need.

However, I am disappointed that this bill does not allow for separate construction funding sources for all eligible categories of federally impacted schools. While the current provision appears to benefit the entire Impact Aid community, the military component of the program has little prospect to successfully compete for discretionary money, as Indian districts have the greatest need for emergency funds. While unintentional this Bill would leave military districts with pressing construction needs on the side of the road once again. From my own travels to several military installations, it is clear that more—much more—needs to be done to ensure adequate funding for both of these eligible categories.

In closing, I want to express my appreciation to my colleagues for their concern in addressing this problem overall and I look forward to working together in the future to create a division of these construction funds to ensure the unique needs of the two major categories of federally connected school districts are met.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Elementary and Secondary Education Authorization Act Conference Report.

I would like to join my colleagues in commending the members of the Conference Committee, namely Chairman KENNEDY, Chairman BOEHNER, and Ranking Member GEORGE MILLER, for their hard work and commitment on this conference report. This bill was truly the product of bipartisanship. The best interests of our children and teachers took priority, and because of that they will continue to prosper.

The goal of this bill was to eliminate the achievement gap between rich and poor students and minority and non-minority students that has burdened our schools for years. Not only does this bill begin to address these issues but it puts forth a realistic twelve year time frame to achieve it.

I am particularly pleased with the agreements made in regards to bilingual education. This bill will empower our parents and given them the option to remove their children from bilingual education at any time. Also, no time limit will be imposed on our students regarding their length of enrollment. The funding formula for bilingual education will base its funding levels on the size of its limited english proficiency student population. Our teachers will also be provided funds for training and professional development.

This bill also authorizes a funding increase of nearly twenty percent for elementary and secondary education programs. This is a significant and well deserved increase. Students and teachers of El Paso will surely benefit and I am pleased to show my support for its passage.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, today I will vote for The No Child Left Behind Act, H.R. 1. While I support this legislation it is not without some reservations, particularly the inadequate federal support that the bill provides for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Overall, this bi-partisan legislation strengthens our commitment to closing the achievement gap between rich/poor, minority/non-minority students, improves targeting of funds to low-performing students, improves teacher quality, preserves the After-School program and key civil rights safeguards, and expands local flexibility in the use of certain federal education funds. And this bill contains the high levels of authorizations needed to assure that adequate resources will be provided to carry out the mandates of this new law.

I do, however, find the level of funding for special education to be cause for grave concern. Twenty-one years ago the federal government said it would spend 40 percent of the cost of educating children with disabilities. Yet today the government provides only 15 percent of that cost. Children with special needs often require additional resources that put a great burden upon states and local school systems.

That is why I asked the Conferees to provide the 40 percent funding that the federal government promised so long ago. I am very disappointed that they decided to wait until next year to address this issue. In the meantime, states, local school systems and families of these children will continue to suffer.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a flawless bill, but it is a very good start. Despite my concerns about funding for special education programs I am going to vote in favor of the legislation. Our children's education is far too important to let the Perfect be the enemy of the Good.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Reauthorization bill, also known as the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

At the outset, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio, Chairman BOEHNER and our Ranking Democrat, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for bringing to the Floor a good conference report.

This legislation reauthorizes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for six years and authorizes \$26.5 billion for its programs in fiscal year 2002. While President Bush made education a priority at the beginning of this year, he failed to request any significant increase in funding to back up his broad outline for reform. But Congress has stepped in to provide a significant increase in real funding. The appropriations bill that goes with this reform bill will provide nearly \$4 billion more in funding for all elementary and secondary education programs funded by the federal government, nearly a 20 percent increase in appropriations. President Bush asked for only a three percent increase.

Mr. Speaker, New York City's public schools face a host of difficult challenges including: overcrowded and outdated facilities; more students with special needs; increasing teacher

shortages; and keeping up with rapidly advancing technology. I am pleased that H.R. 1 contains a number of important provisions that will help New York City meet its goals of greater student achievement levels by supporting enhanced efforts in these areas. For instance, NYC is estimated to receive an increase of \$140 million in Title I funds under pending agreements to allocate most of the new Title I money to districts serving high numbers of poor students. H.R. 1 also retains targeting for the newly consolidated teacher quality program, which will be of great value to our current teacher recruitment, retention, and training efforts.

The bill offers new flexibility to school systems through the 150-district "local A's" provision and through the "transferability" language. The flexibility, moreover, is achieved without state block grants, portability, vouchers, or other provisions that could have diluted otherwise-targeted assistance.

As a native of Puerto Rico, I am pleased that this bill moved Puerto Rico to full participation in Title I over the next 6 years in roughly 8 percent a year increments. Next year, for example, Puerto Rico's Title I funds will increase by over \$60 million, more than a 20 percent addition. But that is not all.

Under this legislation and the upcoming appropriation bill, Puerto Rico will also enjoy expanded funds for the teacher quality program which will increase by \$38 million, or 58 percent, the technology program which will increase by \$10 million, or 67 percent, and the Bilingual Education program which will grow by \$1 million, or 69 percent.

However, Mr. Speaker, despite endless negotiations between people of good faith, I have to admit that I am disappointed that the conferees did not omit the so-called "County Provision." The County Provision states that if a local education agency (LEA) contains two or more counties in its entirety, then each county is treated as if it were a separate LEA for the purpose of calculating Title I grants. The provision singles out New York City for different treatment than any other local education agency in the nation (other than Hawaii) in determining the allocation of Title I funds. The counties of Kings (Brooklyn), Manhattan, Richmond (Staten Island), Queens, and the Bronx are treated as if they are five distinct LEAs; despite the fact that under New York State law the New York City Board of Education is the only LEA in New York City. As a result, Title I funds are now distributed based on each borough's percentage of New York City's federal Census poverty count. In short, poor children in different boroughs receive differing amounts of federal education funding. Retention of this provision continues to promote inequity in funding among the counties within New York City.

This funding disparity occurs even though New York City Title I schools, regardless of their location, have almost identical costs for personnel, materials, equipment, and mandated costs to educate youngsters. I hope that we will somehow find a way to strip this inequitable provision so that needy children will receive the same level of funding without regard to where they live.

Finally, Mr. Speaker I am pleased that the Conference Committee on H.R. 1 has produced a bill that strengthens our commitment to closing the achievement gap between rich and poor, minority and non-minority students,

improves targeting of funds to low-performing students, improves teacher quality, preserves the After-School program and key civil rights safeguards, and expands local flexibility in the use of certain federal education funds. And this bill contains the high levels of authorizations needed to assure that adequate resources will be provided to carry out the mandates of this new law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1, the Better Education for Students and Teachers Act, which provides for increased funding for our nations school system. This bill improves current law by holding our schools accountable for providing quality education, enhancing teacher training and targeting funds to underprivileged students.

H.R. 1 makes a strong bipartisan effort to narrow the gap between the academic achievement of poor children and their more advantaged peers. It encourages schools to do a better job of educating our most vulnerable citizens. By helping disadvantaged children read and understand math, it starts them along the path to a better future. By ensuring that low performing schools are provided additional assistance, fewer underprivileged children will be ignored or allowed to be the victims of low expectations.

This bill provides accountability in public education. In the process, it makes sure that funding is available for teachers to receive high quality professional development. H.R. 1 targets schools that need extra help and also offers additional funds for educating poor children. The bill recognizes that some of our newest citizens may have limited English proficiency and makes sure they are provided the extra help they need. The state based testing system makes sure that we can more strategically direct efforts to improve the performance of children. Schools that do well will be recognized and schools that need help will be provided the assistance they need. There is much in this bill that merits our broad support.

I am also pleased with the things left out of this bill. I am pleased that Congress made the wise decision to reject private school vouchers. At the moment, public schools are under funded. Keeping money from public education does not address the problem in our schools, it exacerbates it. Vouchers assist a small proportion of children at the expense of the rest of the student population.

While there is much to support about H.R. 1, I am disappointed that the bill does not do more to improve special education. We must make sure that the needs of disabled children are fully addressed before we can truly say that no child is left behind. I look forward to future bipartisan efforts to fulfill our promise to meet the needs of children with disabilities.

In this paralyzed Congress, enactment of this solid bipartisan bill is a great accomplishment and will improve our nations educational system. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of Elementary and Secondary Education Act. H.R. 1 is a giant step forward in improving schools for our children.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the conference report for H.R. 1, the Leave No Child Behind Act. This bill is a great improvement over the legislation passed by the House earlier this year, both in terms of policy goals and adequate funding authority. While this legislation is not

perfect, we should not let the perfect be the enemy of the good.

As a father and grandfather, I take the future of our education system very seriously. I have always believed that the federal government is an important junior partner in creating education policy. As such, I believe sound federal education policy must include targeted help for low-income kids and struggling schools, as well as local control, flexibility and support for school officials and teachers.

Following House passage of H.R. 1, I wrote to the conferees and requested that the conference committee meet minimum standards to ensure my support of the bill. I believe that they have met my requirements, and I will support the conference report.

Not only is education key to our country's economic success in the twenty-first century, the right to a high quality public education goes to the very core of the American values of fairness, opportunity, hard work, and democracy. Ensuring that all American children can get an adequate education, despite their family income, race, or accident of geography, will pull families out of poverty and make our country stronger. This conference report goes a long way towards targeting funding and assistance to the schools and the kids that need it most. The bill improves targeting of federal funds to low-income schools districts. It also establishes a new, formula-driven Bilingual and Immigrant Education program to provide services to English-language learners that most need them. Additionally, the conference report restores after-school and violence prevention program funding that was eliminated from the original House bill.

I have made a commitment to parents and students in my district that I will oppose any legislation that uses vouchers to siphon public money into private schools. The conference report provides public school choice for children in consistently failing schools. The bill also includes provisions that help local school districts address the practical matter of school choice, such as transportation costs. Furthermore, the bill does not include block grants that undermine the targeting of funds to students that need them the most.

Schools in my own Third District of Kansas are in severe need of repair and reconstruction. Seventy-six percent of American schools are currently in disrepair. Yet, the original House-passed H.R. 1 did not include funding for locally-controlled school construction. The conference report authorizes funding to continue the vital school construction program created by President Clinton.

More, than ever, we need to ensure that low-income children get the quality teachers certified in their area of instruction. The conference report doubles President Bush's proposed funding for teacher quality and will give teachers the support, mentoring and salary incentives they need to ensure that we continue to have a strong, professional teaching force.

Since taking office, superintendents and principals in the Third District have told me that Congress needs to step back and allow them to do the jobs they were hired to do without excessive red tape, bureaucracy and federal micromanagement. This conference report reduces the number of federal programs and significantly increases state and local control of education decisions. It allows local school districts to transfer up to 50 percent of funds between programs and gives states ad-

ditional flexibility to transfer funds between programs as long as they demonstrate results.

The report gives the states the flexibility to design and select their own tests for math and reading and has made a "commitment" to states to cover the costs of administering the test. I am supporting this legislation today, in part because I fully expect the House to fulfill this funding commitment, as promised by the conferees, this year. As I have long worked to fully fund the federal government's commitment to special needs kids through IDEA, I will not support creation of another unfunded mandate.

Additionally, the bill provides a national benchmark to ensure the rigor of state tests without crating a new, overly burdensome national test. The bill allows states to use their own report cards, so parents will know their child's school measures up.

Although I was disappointed that the Class Size Reduction program and the Eisenhower Professional Development programs were combined into one grant, I am satisfied by the fact that funds were not cut for the programs and school districts will be held harmless and receive at least as much funding as they received in FY 2001.

Finally, I want to send a clear message to my colleagues regarding funding of our national education priorities. It is critically important that states and local school districts get the funding they need to implement these new policies. Many promises have been made in this bill, and as a Member of the Budget Committee, I will make every effort next spring to ensure that these promises to fund these new priorities are kept. I had hoped that the conferees would take a stronger stand and make a commitment to fully fund IDEA and not put this important job off until next year. Nevertheless, my commitment to adequate funding for IDEA and other national education priorities, both new and old, remains strong.

Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend my colleagues that worked together to bring this Education conference report to the floor. This legislation is good to every child in America. The President stated that "no child be left behind," with this legislation Congress makes sure that the expression "no child" would include the Puerto Rican children.

In the area of Title I, Puerto Rico's funding was capped at 75 percent of what other U.S. jurisdictions received. Puerto Rico has operated under this unfair formula even though the Island must meet all Title I program requirements.

Language in this report corrects the unfairness by increasing Puerto Rico's Title I funds from 75 percent to 100 percent of our fair share over a 6 year period. This is the most important federal legislation for education that has been approved for Puerto Rico in the last 30 years.

In addition, Puerto Rico will benefit from other programs included in the federal legislation, such as increased funds for reading and math tests for students in the third through eighth grades; teacher training programs, after school tutoring and technology programs.

In these times of economic hardship, the best investment we can make is in the education of our children. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation, and to reaffirm to the American people that education is still a top priority.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my reluctant support of the conference report on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. While this legislation makes a significant strides in the field of education reform, it fails to honor an important commitment to our nation's children.

Over the last quarter century, Congress has been shortchanging the federal commitment to education by grossly underfunding the Individual with Disabilities Education Act, or IDEA, in its annual appropriations process. This failure on the part of Congress has hurt local school districts in their efforts to fulfill their education mission, as they struggle to meet the mandates of IDEA without sufficient federal support. Earlier this year, I sent a letter signed by one hundred and thirty-four Members of Congress urging support of mandatory, full funding of IDEA. Despite the support of a bipartisan group of Members and education groups across the country, this bill fails to fully fund the federal share of IDEA. Congress made a promise to our nation's children, and I will continue to fight to make sure this commitment is met in the future.

Mr. Speaker, while I am disappointed that Congress failed to provide this critical resource, I am pleased that this legislation establishes a promising framework for raising student achievement. This legislation will provide greater opportunities for our nation's disadvantaged children and will hold schools accountable for the academic achievement of students across this country. The bill will help schools in need, rather than instantly punishing them; it will give greater flexibility to local schools who make the day-to-day decisions about our children's education; and it will dramatically expand and increase support for locally-designed approaches to help students learn English and achieve academically. I am particularly pleased that the bill increases funding for teacher training, requires states to develop plans to ensure that all teachers are provided professional development to become fully qualified in four years, and does not require mandatory testing of veteran teachers.

Mr. Speaker, as a former teacher and principal, I understand that accountability is a two-way street. Education reform will only succeed when it is adequately funded. Our nation's schools cannot be expected to provide a top-quality education if they do not have the resources to do so. This legislation is an important first step in improving our nation's educational system, but it is not the last. Congress must continue to commit the necessary resources to make reform a success. Only then will we truly leave no child behind.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the reauthorization for arts in education in the Conference Report of H.R. 1, the Elementary and Secondary Education Authorization Act. I applaud the efforts of my colleagues in developing consensus on this measure to improve elementary and secondary education for our children—our future. According to the Conference Report, Subpart 15, Section 5551, "the purposes of this subpart are the following: (1) To support systemic education reform by strengthening arts education as an integral part of the elementary school and secondary school curriculum. (2) To help ensure that all students meet challenging State academic content standards and challenging State student academic achievement standards in the

arts. (3) To support the national effort to enable all students to demonstrate competence in the arts." I have long been a champion of arts and music education in our schools. The investment in these initiatives is one I remain committed to achieving.

H.R. 1 authorizes structural changes that will improve our country's education system. As we implement these changes, we must continue to provide opportunities in arts and music education programs for our children. Arts in our school make a difference. The students who pick up a saxophone, a paintbrush, or a pen channels their energies into positive action. Affording children access to the arts through education yields dividends to our society as they develop into productive adults. Children who are involved in arts and music programs have reduced criminal tendencies, increased academic success, concentration, and self-discipline. These characteristics need to be emphasized in our children. The provision of arts in education programs is integral to the development of these qualities in our nation's youth.

It is because of the documented benefits of arts and music education that these programs should receive increased funding in the appropriation process. While a start, merely authorizing these programs is not enough. We must provide federal funding so that every child in every school has the ability to access arts and music education programs or we fail to allow children to utilize their full potential. The structural changes authorized today will not be as successful if we neglect the creative side of education. Arts and music education allow children to flourish, not only in music, art, and drama, but also in math and science and social skills.

I commend the conferees on their continued dedication to arts in education and their commitment to enhancing the education of our children through this comprehensive measure. I strongly support increased resources in the upcoming Appropriations process and adoption of this Conference Report.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I submit this statement today in support of the Conference Report for Elementary and Secondary Education Authorization Act. Although I could not be here today during this debate because of a death in my family, I want to say for the record that the bill before us today is the end result of a year-long process between leaders in both parties to achieve compromise on what is surely one of the most important issues on the national agenda: the education and development of our nation's future, our children.

It is no secret that America has long recognized that its long-term strength and security, and its ability to recover and sustain high levels of economic growth, depends on maintaining its edge in the quality of its workforce, its scientific achievement and the technological innovation it produces. Biomedical advances have permitted us to live longer, healthier, and more productively. Advances in agricultural technology have permitted us to be able to feed more and healthier people at a cheaper cost, more efficiently. The information revolution can be seen today in the advanced instruments schools are using to instruct our children and in the vast information resources that are opened up as a result of the linkages created by a networked global society. Our children today can grow up to know, see, and

read more, be more diverse, and have more options in their lives for learning and growing. Some emerging technologies—such as nanotechnology and biotechnology—have untold potential to make our lives more exciting, secure, prosperous, and challenging.

Many countries also recognize this and they, therefore, focus their industrial, economic, and security policies on nurturing and developing an educational system that responds to the needs of its citizens and their societies. Countries that follow this path of nurturing educational achievement focus their efforts into ensuring that a pipeline which pumps talented and imaginative minds and skills is connected to the needs of the country's socio-economic and security enterprise.

Yet here in this country, this pipeline is broken, threatening the competitive edge we enjoy in the business of personal and economic growth, and technological innovation.

The only acceptable course of action for a country that wishes to maintain its edge in the global system is to have a long-term educational policy that responds to the challenge of a declining public school system with vigorous and renewed effort and commitment. That is why this bill before us today is truly historic.

This bill strengthens education in this country by enhancing accountability of our public schools, increasing overall funding for education for disadvantaged students, for science and math education, and for technology programs.

I am heartened that the bill would provide nearly \$1 billion for a new program aimed at having all children reading by the third grade. It would require states to develop a plan to have a qualified teacher in every classroom within four years. It also would give local school districts greater flexibility in spending federal money.

The bill increases federal funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act by \$3.7 billion. Funding for Title I, the federal government's main education program for the disadvantaged, would increase by \$1.7 billion under the law and technology programs would be increased by about \$150 million.

But the bill is not perfect however. Currently, the federal government does not meet the financial obligations for special education it committed to in 1975 when the Education for all Handicapped Children Act (renamed Individuals with Disabilities Act in 1990) was first passed by Congress. This shortfall places an onerous financial burden on local communities who must find alternate resources, such as higher property taxes, to fund special education. The bill before us today does not address this injustice.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is a civil rights statute that provides funding to states and helps states fulfill their constitutional obligation to provide a public education for all children with disabilities. IDEA serves more than six and a half million children today. Underlying IDEA is the basic principle that states and school districts must make available a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) to children with disabilities between the ages of 3 and 21, and must be educated with children who are not disabled "to the maximum extent appropriate."

Since 1975, Congress has authorized a federal commitment to special education funding at a level of 40 percent of the average per

pupil expenditure (APPE) on special education services. However, Congress has only appropriated funds to meet between 5 and 14 percent of APPE, with FY 2001 appropriations setting a record at 14.9 percent, or about \$7.4 billion. But that is still only little more than third of the, so far embarrassingly unfulfilled, Federal commitment to our children.

As a former teacher, member of a school board, State Senator, and now Congressman, I have constantly heard a clear message from local educators and administrators that more resources must be committed to provide fair and adequate educational opportunities to children with special needs, and that the federal government must meet its commitment under IDEA. In the past, "fully funding" IDEA (meeting the 40% authorization) has generally been a theme for a handful of Republicans, but with the trade-off that other educational programming must be sacrificed.

Let me be clear, this is a constitutional right. Local school districts do not have the discretion to not fulfill their obligations to children with special needs. Where does the approximately \$10 billion in unfulfilled Federal pledges to the States come from? It has to be made up somewhere and will most likely come from other important, but not constitutionally mandated, priorities. This is the real cost of our inaction. It is either a tradeoff in spending or a property tax increase. It does not have to be this way, of course. And I believe the American people deserve better from us.

Still, failure to include this important provision will not stop me from fully supporting the underlying bill. It is a very good bill and I support it for the opportunity—the hope—that it represents for this country: commitment to our education system and a good start. And since I see as merely a start, I will not stop my efforts to enact legislation—such as my bill, H.R. 1829—that would fulfill our commitment to our children, to our communities, and to our public schools by fully funding IDEA—and together with the bill before us today, our promise to the nation.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a product of the Los Angeles public school system, I know the value of public education.

As a businesswoman, I also know the value of flexibility to allow our schools to develop innovative solutions to the problems our public education system faces today.

Too many of our schools today are starved for funding, frustrated by regulations that hamstring their ability to create the programs they know will help students, or held unaccountable for providing a substandard education to students.

The status quo for public education is unacceptable. Thoughtful reform that improves opportunities for all students is the only path that builds an exceptional education system.

By improving our public education system, we reduce inequalities between individuals of different economic and racial backgrounds. I firmly believe that a quality education for all students is the best affirmative action program for our nation.

To achieve this goal, elementary and secondary education must provide students the skills they need to excel in the new economy. This means first and foremost an emphasis on basic skills—schools cannot graduate students without strong reading, writing, and analytical skills. But we must also ensure that students are well versed in the latest technologies and

have the opportunity to develop their full potential in the arts, sciences, or literature.

The Conference Report helps us take the first step toward reinvigorating our public education system—and provides schools the resources they need to implement reform.

This legislation will require an unprecedented testing regime to hold schools accountable for improving the achievement of all students. Schools that fail to make the grade will at first receive more federal assistance to improve their curricula, then if they continue to fail, will have to provide funds to their students for tutoring or to travel to another public school.

The bill provides funds to local school districts to implement these reforms. It increases federal education funding by 20 percent—an increase of almost \$4 billion—to allow schools to develop accurate tests, improve the training and recruitment of teachers, buy computers, and develop afterschool programs. It targets these funds at the school districts that need it most—those with a large number of low income students—while allowing all school districts more flexibility in how they use federal funds.

I am however, deeply disappointed that this Conference Report did not increase federal funding for special education. Special education remains the biggest constraint on the budget for school districts in my district and the federal government must live up to its commitment to pay 40 percent of the cost of educating students with special needs. I will continue to fight for increased appropriations for special education while I am in Congress. There are legitimate arguments for why this program needs reform, but these concerns cannot be an excuse for not meeting our federal obligation on special education.

I support this Conference Report as a strong and significant step toward an education system for the 21st century.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. This legislation fulfills President Bush's promise to provide every child the opportunity to learn and to hold schools accountable to parents, and I commend the President and my colleagues, particularly Chairman BOEHNER, for all of their hard work on this important legislation.

First, Mr. Speaker, our local schools will immediately have additional resources at their disposal as a result of this legislation's requirement that 95 percent of federal education dollars go directly to America's classrooms. Currently, as a result of 40 years of Democratic control of this body, the federal education system takes more than 30 cents of every education dollar to support its own administrative bureaucracy, rather than the needs of our children. This sad situation will end because of the legislation we are passing today; almost all of the funding now will go to provide our teachers with the technology, textbooks, and training they need to help our students succeed.

Having taught in the California Community College system for 10 years before being elected to the California State Assembly, I want to address what enactment of H.R. 1 will mean for America's teachers. Our teachers face an enormous task every day to provide our young people with the tools needed to succeed in the 21st Century world. Teachers make sacrifices often at the expense of their

own time, and in some cases, their own funds. Furthermore, our current educational system has for too long fostered mediocrity and stifled creativity. This legislation will give teachers the resources they need and will financially reward them for their excellence when their students make significant achievement gains.

Of great importance, the No Child Left Behind Act will also give teachers the help they need to control their classrooms by directing schools to develop policies which will discipline disruptive students and control classroom behavior. Finally, the Act will make it easier for school districts to recruit and train qualified teachers, and encourages school districts to hire secondary teachers who have advanced education in the subject they will teach.

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is good for America's teachers, America's parents, and most importantly, America's children. Thus, I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting the No Child Left Behind Act.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this conference report which reauthorizes and reforms the Elementary and Secondary Education Act H.R. 1. I am pleased that the House and Senate conferees have drafted a bipartisan bill which will bring about the most significant federal education reforms in a generation, providing local school districts with the opportunity to use federal funds for a variety of programs that will benefit both educators and students.

This measure provides states and local school districts the authority to participate in state and local flexibility demonstration projects, to ensure that federal education funds are used most effectively to meet the unique needs of our students. Moreover, the conference report consolidates and streamlines programs and targets resources to existing programs that serve poor students and it also allows federal Title I funds, approximately \$500 to \$1,000 per child, to be used to provide supplemental educational services—including tutoring, after school services, and summer school programs—for children in failing schools.

The conference report also helps school districts with the evergrowing teacher shortage problem by giving local schools new freedom to make spending decisions in up to 50 percent of the non-Title I federal funds they receive. With this new freedom, a local school district can decide to use additional funds for hiring new teachers, increasing teacher pay, improving teacher training and development or other uses. This measure will make it easier for local schools to recruit and retain excellent teachers. It also consolidates current programs into a new Teacher Quality Program which allows greater flexibility for local school districts. In addition, the report includes Teacher Opportunity Payments, which provides funds for teachers to be able to choose their own professional development activities.

I am particularly pleased that language from the Foundations for Learning Act, which I worked on with Representative and Co-Sponsored PATRICK KENNEDY and Senator TED KENNEDY is included in this conference report, allowing local school districts to use federal funds to establish or contribute to existing pre-kindergarten programs. These programs will help our children to be better prepared for kindergarten by focusing on social and emotional growth, in addition to educational instruction.

By preparing these children for kindergarten, they can enter school at higher social and emotional levels. They will know how to work with their classmates and will be accustomed to the basic rules of a classroom setting. This will allow teachers to focus more of their attention on actually teaching the class rather than working on acceptable social behaviors.

Moreover, this legislation includes funding for youth violence prevention and before and after school activities, two issues in which I have spent a great deal of time working on over the past 5 years. By providing children with options during non-school hours, we are giving them the guidance and tools they need to reject violent and destructive behaviors and giving them the chance to grow up and mature into productive and happy young adults. With many single parent families and families with two working parents, millions of children need a place to go to before and after school. By allowing school districts to use federal funds for these programs, many children across the nation will not be sitting home alone or getting involved with a bad crowd while waiting for their parents to get home from work.

Although this bill does not address the issue of fully funding the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, it does lay the groundwork for important reforms in the program, which will be the next major education reform project the Congress should address. I look forward to working on legislation that will finally fulfill the federal government's commitment to fully fund IDEA.

I commend my colleagues who have spent the last few months working on this conference report, especially the gentleman from Ohio, the distinguished Chairman of our Education and Workforce Committee, Mr. BOEHNER. Accordingly I urge my colleagues to support this conference report which will improve the nation's education system, ensuring that we "Leave No Child Behind."

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, which provides for reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. H.R. 1 provides for a reform of the basic federal laws that support America's elementary and secondary public schools. Passage of this legislation will help return our school system to the original goals of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act—to ensure that all children have an opportunity to learn regardless of income or background.

I applaud the work of the conferees on this legislation, who have produced a bill that strengthens our commitment to closing the achievement gap between rich and poor students, improves targeting of funds for low-performing students, improves teacher quality, preserves critical after-school programs and expands local flexibility in the use of federal education funds. With respect to overall funding levels, this conference report provides a significant increase in funding for assistance to school districts to help improve student achievement, including a 57 percent increase in Title I resources, which are targeted for economically disadvantaged students. The agreement also reauthorizes most federal elementary and secondary education programs, bilingual education, teacher training and safe-school programs for six years. Perhaps most importantly, this bill contains the necessary authorization levels to assure that adequate resources are provided to carry out the mandates provided under this new law.

I am also pleased that the Conference Agreement contains language included in the original House bill that establishes annual student testing in grades three through eight in math and science. The testing provision is designed to better inform parents and school officials about students' academic progress. For students in low-performing schools, the agreement requires districts to implement certain corrective actions, and if adequate progress is not achieved after one year, school districts would have to allow students to transfer to other public schools, and assist parents with the associated transportation costs. Rightly, this agreement does not mandate or impose a federal testing provision. Instead, under H.R. 1, states will design and select their own tests, and allows states 4 years to develop and implement the tests for every child in these six grades.

Along with annual testing, this legislation includes a number of accountability provisions intended to help hold schools reach high levels of academic achievement for their students, including state, school district and school "report cards" to parents and the public on school performance and teacher qualification. These provisions are critical to ensure that while we are asking much of our students academically, we are asking schools to maintain a high degree of professional standards and excellence. For the first time, this legislation establishes a federal law that teachers must be qualified in their subject area within four years. And this measure provides them with the resources for training, support and mentoring that they need to reach that goal.

The conference report also provides a significant new commitment to bilingual and immigrant education. For the first time in federal law, this measure establishes a formula that will target federal aid to where the greatest need in bilingual education exists. Under this provision, the Department of Education would distribute the funds to states according to a formula based 80 percent on the number of children with limited English proficiency in the state and 20 percent on the number of immigrant children in the state. Further, the agreement eliminates the existing requirement that 75 percent of the funds be used to support programs in which the child is taught in his or her native tongue, and allows local school districts to determine the best method of instruction to teach children with limited English proficiency. As a representative of Texas, a border state, I strongly support these provisions, which will provide school districts with expanded resources and flexibility to assist students with limited English proficiency.

While on balance, this bill is an important achievement, I am disappointed that the conferees did not include a provision to convert the special education programs from a discretionary spending program into a mandatory spending program. Earlier this year, with my colleague CHARLES BASS (R-NH), I introduced legislation (H.R. 737) that would make IDEA funding mandatory. Under H.R. 737, the federal government would be obligated to increase its share of funding by 5 percent a year for the next five years until full funding for IDEA is reached in 2006. It is important to point out that since its enactment in 1975, IDEA committed the federal government to fund up to 40 percent of the educational costs for children with disabilities. However, the federal government's contribution has never ex-

ceeded 15 percent, a shortfall that has caused financial hardships and difficult curriculum choices in local school districts. I believe Congress must abide by its commitment and provide the financial resources to help local school districts provide a first rate education to students with disabilities, and I am hopeful that the leadership of the House and Senate, as well as the Administration will address this issues next year when we consider reauthorization of IDEA.

Like many of my colleagues, I have long sought many of the key provisions of this bill, including enhanced teacher quality, parental notification, school accountability, and new and better targeted resources. Given the broad support this legislation enjoys, it is clear that a bipartisan majority in the Congress support these critical provisions. H.R. 1 offers the right combination of accountability and resources and I am proud to support its passage today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, although I rise in strong support for the Elementary and Secondary Education bill, I am disappointed that it does not fully fund the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The basic principle of IDEA is that a free and appropriate public education should be provided to children with disabilities between the ages of 3 and 21, and that these children should be educated with children who are not disabled "to the maximum extent appropriate."

In the 1975 law, Congress pledged to provide up to 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure on special education services. However, we have not kept our promise. Congress has appropriated only funds to meet between 5 and 14 percent of the average per pupil expenditure with FY2001 appropriations setting a record at 14.9 percent.

Since Congress has not fully funded IDEA, our schools must spend more of their own money to meet the regulation of providing free and appropriate education to children with disabilities. Mr. Speaker, when everyone in government is finally making education a top priority, we must provide our schools with the funding we promised them.

As I meet with my schools each week, I've been hearing a clear message from my superintendents and principal that more resources must be committed to provide fair and adequate educational opportunities to children with special needs, and that the federal government can help in a dramatic way by moving towards the maximum authorization level.

In the past, "fully funding" IDEA (meeting the 40 percent authorization) has generally been a trade-off that for sacrificing other educational programming.

And although today I believe we have missed a historic opportunity to meet our federal commitment to local schools this year, I believe in Chairman BOEHNER'S commitment to passing this legislation next year.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Education and Workforce Committee to fully fund IDEA when we reauthorize the program next year.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on H.R. 1.

This bill represents a major step forward in education policy. For the first time, federal funding will be tied to results, to actual student achievement. The system of accountability and standards implemented by H.R. 1 is long past due.

Results cannot be achieved without resources—for good reason, the consideration of H.R. 1 has been linked to substantial increases in appropriations. For decades, the federal government has made promises to local schools that we will provide them with the resources they need to raise student achievement.

Now, we are imposing accountability measures requiring schools to perform. So it is absolutely crucial that the resources be there. And we are providing substantial increases for ESEA funding to school districts.

That said, this legislation, by itself, cannot fulfill some of the claims that have been made. Calling it the "No Child Left Behind Act" exaggerates what we are doing here, and I fear it makes false promises to the children who will still be left behind.

This week, this Congress passed up a historic opportunity to make good on a commitment we made to children with disabilities in 1975 with the passage of IDEA. With IDEA, the federal government promised to fund 40% of the costs to states of providing a quality education for children with special needs.

But year after year, Congress has fallen well short of making good on that promise. This week, we fell short once again. We owe it to children with disabilities—and to all of our children—to come back here next year and ensure that IDEA is fully funded.

Another shortcoming of this legislation is its silence on school construction and renovation. Millions of students, including thousands of children in my district, attend schools that are in desperate need of extensive repair or outright replacement. This problem has not gone away. Our children deserve safe, comfortable, modern schools.

And while this bill dramatically raises authorization levels, it provides true funding increases only for fiscal year 2002. I recognize that compromises had to be made to gain the broad bipartisan support that this bill enjoys. But if we are serious about leaving no child behind, we have to continue our commitment to education funding next year, and every year.

This conference report represents a large step forward for education. I commend Chairman BOEHNER, Ranking Member MILLER, and the conferees for working hard over many months to produce this bipartisan legislation. We have lifted the hopes and brightened the futures of million of children.

However, to close the achievement gap, to improve our schools, to give every American child the same opportunities to succeed in the 21st century workforce—our work is far from done.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today I will vote in favor of H.R. 1, the Leave No Child Behind Act. Since coming to Congress my goal has been to ensure that the Federal Government is a better partner in building more livable communities. Access to quality public education is a key component of a community that is safe, healthy and economically secure.

While not perfect, the final version of H.R. 1 represents a bipartisan agreement that will move us in the right direction by providing more support and investment for public education. This bill establishes clear goals and a timeline for narrowing the achievement gap and targets federal dollars toward the neediest children. It sets a four-year goal for ensuring that all teachers are qualified to teach in their

subject matter and provides resources for mentoring, training and salary enhancements to help us meet this critical four-year goal. It helps bilingual education and eliminates the highly punitive elements of the President's original plan. Also important is what is not in the bill, efforts to repeal after-school program funding or divert money away from our public schools were rejected. I applaud the addition of a section dealing with school construction.

I support the overall framework that the bill provides, but I have concerns about imposing new multi-year mandates without matching multi-year funding, failing to help local communities deal with their growing education budget shortfalls in the wake of September's events and the lack of full funding for special education.

The federal government should lead by example in offering the best possible public education to our nation's children. H.R. 1 is a good start and it will certainly help return our school systems to the original goals of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act and ensure that all students have an opportunity to grow academically.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member wishes to add his support for the H.R. 1 conference report, and his appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER], the Chairman of the House Education and the Workforce Committee, and the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], the ranking member of the House Education and the Workforce Committee, for bringing this important legislation to the House Floor today.

This is the most important action we have taken regarding elementary and secondary education since this Member first came to Congress. The H.R. 1 conference report, makes states that use Federal dollars accountable for improving student achievement, grants unprecedented new flexibility to local school districts, empowers parents and provides an escape route for children trapped in failing schools.

The No Child Left Behind Act enhances flexibility for local school districts by allowing them to transfer up to 50 percent of their Federal education dollars among an assortment of ESEA programs as long as they demonstrate results. In addition, the H.R. 1 conference report consolidates a host of duplicative programs to ensure that state and local officials can meet the unique needs of students. The legislation also gives low-performing schools the chance to improve by offering necessary financial and other technical assistance.

In addition, the No Child Left Behind Act provides a "safety value" for children trapped in failing schools. The conference report provides that if a school fails to make adequate yearly progress for two consecutive years, then a district would have to offer to the student in that school the opportunity to transfer to another public school. The legislation also allows children in failing schools to obtain supplemental education services, such as tutoring.

Furthermore, the conference report for H.R. 1 continues and updates the authorization for the National Writing Project. The legislation supports the Center for Civic Education and its education program that encourages instruction on the principles of our constitutional democracy, the history of the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The measure also supports

annual competitions of stimulated congressional hearings for secondary school students. This Member is pleased that the conference report also includes reauthorization of the Close Up Program.

When the House initially considered H.R. 1, this Member voted against an amendment that required states to annually test students in grades 3–8 in reading and math. This Member believes that the Federal Government's role in education should be to support proven state and local reform efforts rather than to create additional requirements for out local schools. By mandating new testing requirements on every child, every year from grades 3–8, as is provided in the H.R. 1 conference report, this measure will take teachers and students out of class, take dollars out of state and local education budgets, and undermine successful reform efforts already underway in Nebraska. This Member is also very concerned that this provision will force teachers to "teach-for-the-test." Although the conference report continues the House decision to allow states to design and select their own test, this Member continues to have these same concerns.

Mr. Speaker, this Member is also very concerned that the H.R. 1 conference report does not include a provision that would create mandatory full funding of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Only July 19, 2001, this Member sent a joint letter to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER], along with several other Members of Congress, requesting that Mr. BOEHNER work with the other House and Senate conferees on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) to improve the current ESEA reauthorization bill by including a mandatory IDEA full funding measure in the conference report. It is very unfortunate that such language was not included in the agreement.

Currently, the Federal Government is funding an average of 12.6 percent of the per pupil expenditure for children with disabilities. The other 27.4 percent of this unfulfilled congressional promise is a burden for state and local governments as they are forced into providing these funds. This Member has said, for many years now, that the one significant way that Congress could possibly help decrease property taxes for Nebraskans is to keep the congressional promise to provide 40 percent of the costs of special education, as this would enable a local school board to either lower property taxes or use such funding for other priority school needs as determined by the local school board. Therefore, this Member strongly urges this body to revisit this issue immediately in the upcoming Second Session of the current 107th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, this Member asks his colleagues to support the H.R. 1 conference report.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their hard work to reach a consensus on what we have come to know as the "No Child Left Behind Act of 2001." The Elementary and Secondary Education Act Authorization (H.R. 1) is a good bill and will improve education for millions of America's children. But Mr. Speaker we are leaving some of our children behind. I am talking about America's children in dire need of special education. I understand the agreement to deal with the funding issues posed by the Individuals with

Disabilities Education Act, also known as IDEA, when it comes up for reauthorization next year. I do hope that Congress will agree that time is of the essence and that it is time to fix IDEA.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that IDEA is one of the most important civil rights laws ever signed into law. This legislation sends a message that in America, education is not a privilege, but a fundamental right belonging to all Americans. More than twenty-six years ago, on December 2, 1975 President Gerald Ford signed the "Education for All Handicapped Children Act." This later became known as IDEA, the basic premise of this federal law, is that all children with disabilities have a federally protected civil right to have a federally protected civil right to have available to them a free appropriate public education that meets their education and related services needs in the least restrictive environment. The statutory right articulated in IDEA is grounded in the Constitution's guarantee of equal protection under law and the constitutional power of Congress to authorize and place conditions on participation in federal spending programs.

Mr. Speaker, in 1970, before enactment of the federal protections in IDEA, schools in America educated only one in five students with disabilities. More than one million students were excluded from public schools, and another 3.5 million did not receive appropriate services. Many states had laws excluding certain students, including those who were blind, deaf, or labeled "emotionally disturbed" or "mentally retarded." Almost 200,000 school-age children with mental retardation or emotional disabilities were institutionalized. The likelihood of exclusion was greater for children with disabilities living in low-income, ethnic and racial minority, or rural communities. A recent government study published by the National Council on Disability finds that 25 years after enactment of IDEA, not one single state is in compliance. States cannot afford to be in compliance. States' school boards are trying to meet the requirements of IDEA but are struggling because the Federal government has not fulfilled its commitment to provide funding at 40% of the average per pupil expenditure to assist with the costs of educating students with disabilities.

Today IDEA is funded at about 14.9% of the average per pupil expenditure—much higher than the 7 percent of 5 years ago, but this, as we all know in this room today, is not good enough. We must continue to increase funding to reach the 40 percent of the average pupil expenditure funding level mandated in law. I can tell you that the schools in my district are struggling to carry out IDEA, and my concern is that without the 40% percent federal support, we will see a backlash against those students with disabilities. Congress must fulfill its commitment assist States and localities with educating children with disabilities. Congress must ensure that the Federal government lives up to the promises it made to the students, parents, and schools more than two decades ago. Congress needs to fully fund IDEA and maintain its commitment to existing federal educational programs. We should ensure that children with disabilities receive a free and appropriate public education and at the same time ensure that all children have the best education possible.

Mr. Speaker, IDEA is a landmark civil rights law that was intended to open the doors to

education and success for more than six million American children each year. This was followed by another landmark civil rights law, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) which was signed by President Bush in 1990. It is my hope that this President will follow these former Presidents and show our Nation that indeed no child will be left behind and that when IDEA comes up for reauthorization that he too leaves a legacy for protecting the rights or people with disabilities.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1, the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I support this bill because it reauthorizes a broad array of targeted programs that work toward improving public education. It focuses on maintaining high standards in every classroom, strengthening teacher and principal quality, supporting a safe, healthy, disciplined, and drug-free learning environment and improving student performance.

H.R. 1 will help to close the gap between disadvantaged children and their more affluent peers, and between minority and non-minority students. The conference report includes unprecedented targeting of Title I funds to the neediest communities. The 50 school districts with the highest percentage of poor students will receive a 10% increase in Title I funding solely as a result of proposed Title I formula grants. In addition, Title I schools will receive more funds due to increases in appropriations. Congress, and the country at-large, cannot continue to ignore the gap between rich and poor and minority and non-minority students. This bill represents a fight against the status quo.

H.R. 1 will ensure that all teachers are qualified to teach in the subject matter for which they are responsible. The bill includes an authorization of \$3.2 billion for teacher training and class-size reduction, a \$1 billion (or 46%) increase from the FY 2001 funding level. It provides new resources for mentoring, training, salary enhancement and other improvements. We are supporting teachers by giving them the resources they need to do their jobs. Our teachers will now be better prepared to give students the tools and know-how to be successful students.

H.R. 1 includes a historical 57% funding increase in bilingual education programs. For the first time ever, our education legislation has recognized that this country is growing closer and closer to our creed, *E Pluribus Unum*, "Out of Many, One". This bill will ensure that language barriers will not leave our many immigrant and bilingual children behind.

Additionally, H.R. 1 contains no vouchers, no state block grants, and no repeal of after-school programs and a section was added for school construction. The bill also kept hate crimes programs and civil rights protections. Efforts to hold schools accountable without providing the resources and protections needed to meet high standards were defeated.

I contacted major disability groups, such as, The Arc and the Easter Seal Society. These groups expressed their disappointment in the loss of IDEA funding. The NEA, AFT, and NSBA offered similar opinions on the bill. All three groups also express disappointment that Congress could not agree to fulfill its promise to fully-fund IDEA at 40 percent. Congress made a commitment 26 years ago to fund federally mandated special education programs at 40 percent of average per pupil expenditures.

By simply fulfilling our promise to fully fund our share of IDEA, Congress could improve public education three-fold. First, school districts would have substantial resources freed up for other essential or innovative educational programs. Second, we would remove the unpredictability of the annual appropriations process, replacing confusion with stability for local schools when formulating their budgets. And last but not least—we would be giving special education students the tools needed to overcome the many obstacles they face on a daily basis. Despite this shortcoming, these groups support the goals of raising achievement, increasing accountability, and improving teacher quality, and I agree with them.

I believe the education of the 21st century must change to suit different learning styles and include a wider variety of programming that focuses on the application of classroom lessons—math, science, social sciences—to real world situations. Too often, lessons are taught in a way that makes it difficult to connect book lessons to the real world; we must better bridge this gap. In a world that evolves more closely everyday, 2nd language classes should be encouraged at early ages. We simply must ensure that our education system keeps up with our world. We are in a critical transition stage; new techniques, new ideas, and new visions must be the order of the day, in order for our students to remain competitive.

We have the opportunity to uncup a wealth of human resources that lay under-appreciated and underestimated in urban and rural school districts across the country. The next generation of great thinkers, writers, scientists, doctors, educators, actors and lawmakers, are waiting for us to activate and motivate them. It is our responsibility to devise a new definition of success. We must let our students know that our future is nothing without them. It is our responsibility to show them that there is a world that they can—not only be a part of—but also change and improve. If we invest in our students, we invest in a future of innovation and growth. The H.R. 1 conference agreement is a strong, positive step toward a new education system that focuses on preparing our youth to make our world the best it can be. I urge all my colleagues to support the passage of this conference report.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1, the No Child Left Behind Act Conference Report. I commend our Chairman for his strong leadership and members of the conference committee for their tireless efforts to send a bill to the President's desk before we adjourn this session. As a scientist and former professor with twenty-two years of experience working at the K–12 level to improve math and science education, I have tried to bring my expertise to the table in the drafting of this legislation.

H.R. 1 encompasses the four elements of President Bush's education reform plan: demanding results from states and schools, providing flexibility in the use of federal funds, reducing the red tape in federal programs, and expanding school choice. This legislation will do much to close the achievement gap between our nation's rich and poor students.

This legislation also addresses another achievement gap—the gap between U.S. students and their international peers in science. International tests place our students in the bottom third of industrialized nations in their

performance in science, and dead last in high school physics. Recently, the Department of Education released results from the 2000 NAEP and found no improvement in science literacy in grades 4 and 8, and a decline in science performance in grade 12 since 1996. Science education is vitally important to our country's economic and national security, and we must hold states and schools accountable for student performance in science, as well as reading and math.

The conferees recognize the importance of science education by requiring states to set standards in science by the 2005–2006 school year. I am pleased that the conference report also includes my amendment to H.R. 1, which requires states and schools to test students in science by the 2007–2008 school year.

Such testing requires that teachers be knowledgeable in—and skilled in the teaching of—science and math. Professional development for science and math teachers is vitally important, and I am pleased to see the conference report incorporate my legislation to create summer professional development institutes in the math-science partnership program. These math-science partnerships of higher education institutions, states, and schools will provide sustained, high-quality professional development through these institutes for our Nation's math and science teachers. I am hopeful that the conference report authorization of \$450 million for this crucial program will be fully funded. While this bill will do much to improve our nation's math and science education, work remains to ensure that sufficient resources are made available in the appropriations process for math and science professional development. I encourage my colleagues to finish the job and fully fund the math and science partnerships for fiscal year 2002.

Again, I would like to thank the Chairman for working with me to incorporate my science education provisions into the conference report and I again thank the conferees for producing this excellent compromise legislation. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, "The Leave No Child Behind Act." I thank the leadership from both sides of the aisle, Chairman BOEHNER and Ranking Member MILLER, for their diligence and commitment in constructing a bipartisan bill that represents a promising framework for our public educational system. The promise of a brighter future for all our nation's children through excellence in education should be the most important goal for Congress.

This Conference Report contains promising steps to improving education for our nation's students by providing significant increases in educational funding for key programs. The increase in Title I funding will help to close the achievement gap that currently exists between low-income, disadvantaged students and their more affluent peers. It provides funding for after-school programs that ensure our children have access to quality, enriching programs during non-school hours. It provides funding to improve teacher quality in our nation's classrooms and gives States and local districts flexibility over the use of federal funds in order to improve the level of achievement for all students. The Conference Report also includes funding for school construction, strong civil rights protections and funding for hate-crime prevention, which Democrats fought hard to

include. This bill also affords parents the tools they need to ensure that their children are receiving a quality education.

However, as I do rise in support of this bill, it is not without reservation. In a year where the President and Congress have pledged to "leave no child behind," we, unfortunately, do not fulfill this commitment to those children with special education needs. Congress needs to make funding for special education mandatory, so that schools, teachers, and students with special education needs will have the tools they need to perform successfully. Congress also needs to continue its commitment to excellence in education and realize the need to provide more funding in the years ahead to ensure that our nation's public schools are able to meet the requirements laid out in this bill and face the challenges ahead of them.

I am hopeful that this bill puts us on the right track to meeting the educational needs of all of America's students. I urge Congress to commit to providing additional resources for educational programs and providing full funding for special education. This will ensure that we meet the goal of educational excellence for all our nation's youth.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, today the House takes up historic legislation. We will consider the conference report for H.R. 1, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, which will provide the most significant education legislation since Congress enacted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965 and I am very proud to be a cosponsor of the original legislation and to play a small role in the landmark reforms the legislation enacts.

As we all know, the cornerstone of H.R. 1 is increased flexibility for local schools in exchange for greater accountability for student progress. Every school and every school district is different and has different needs. For the first time, states and local school districts can target funds where they are needed most. For example, in my home state of California, we have already begun to lower class size. Under H.R. 1, we can use these funds in other areas where we desperately need resources, such as teacher training or special education. Title I funds are protected, ensuring that the needs of disadvantage students are met. Spending decisions are made by state and local officials, who are the most familiar with the particular strengths and needs of their schools, and can best decide how to spend federal funds.

H.R. 1 also helps schools help themselves. If a school fails to demonstrate adequate yearly progress, it is given the assistance it needs to turn itself around. At the same time, students can transfer out of that school. They are not stuck in a school that cannot teach them what they need to know. Additionally, students in schools that chronically fail to demonstrate progress are given the supplemental education services they need to catch up with their peers in better performing schools.

I am particularly pleased with the "Reading First Initiative" created by H.R. 1. Today, almost 70 percent of fourth graders in our poorest schools cannot read. If a student cannot read by the fourth grade, he or she will continue to fall further and further behind his or her peers. Obviously, we must do something to make sure that these children develop the skills necessary for a successful academic career and a productive life. H.R. 1 triples fed-

eral funding for scientifically based literacy programs to a total \$900 million for next year. This "Reading First" initiative will ensure that every child, no matter his or her background, can read by the third grade. Addressing reading problems early will also prevent children from being mistakenly classified as special needs and entering an already over-taxed and underfunded special education system.

H.R. 1 demonstrates our bipartisan commitment to improving educational opportunities for every child. This is our chance to radically reform education for all students. They deserve nothing less. I urge my colleagues to support the conference report and make sure that no child is left behind.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). All time for debate has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1 will be followed by a 5-minute vote, if ordered, on the question of adopting H. Res. 314.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 381, noes 41, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 497]

AYES—381

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggart
Billakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boozman
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (SC)

Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt

DeLauro
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham

Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslie
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey

Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender
Holden
McDonald
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Miller, Jeff
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Issa
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Platts
Pomboy
Pomboy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ross
Rothman

Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traffant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—41

Akin
Bartlett
Burton
Capuano
Crane
Culberson
DeLay
Duncan
Filner
Flake
Frank
Gilchrest

Goode
Gutknecht
Hefley
Hoekstra
Jones (NC)
Kennedy (MN)
Kerns
Lewis (KY)
Manzullo
McCollum
Moran (KS)
Paul

Pence
Peterson (MN)
Pitts
Ramstad
Rohrabacher
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanders
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions

Shadegg Tancredo Tiahrt
Stearns Taylor (NC) Weldon (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Brady (TX) Hostettler Oliver
Brown (OH) Larson (CT) Ros-Lehtinen
Cubin Luther Waters
Gonzalez Meek (FL) Young (AK)

□ 1442

Messrs. SESSIONS, AKINS and CRANE changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mrs. NORTUP changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I unfortunately was required to attend a funeral in my Congressional District today and missed rollcall Vote No. 497. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted “aye”.

PROVIDING FOR MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The pending business is the question de novo on agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 314, on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 306, noes 100, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 498]

AYES—306

Abercrombie Boswell Crane
Ackerman Boucher Crenshaw
Aderholt Boyd Culberson
Akin Brady (PA) Cummings
Allen Brown (SC) Cunningham
Armey Bryant Davis (FL)
Bachus Burr Davis, Jo Ann
Baker Burton Deal
Baldacci Buyer Delahunt
Ballenger Callahan DeLay
Barcia Calvert Dicks
Barr Camp Dooley
Bartlett Cannon Doolittle
Barton Cantor Doyle
Bass Capito Dreier
Bentsen Cardin Duncan
Bereuter Carson (OK) Dunn
Berkley Castle Edwards
Berman Chabot Ehrlich
Berry Chambliss Engel
Biggert Clay English
Bilirakis Clement Eshoo
Bishop Clyburn Evans
Blagojevich Coble Everett
Blunt Collins Fattah
Boehlert Combest Ferguson
Boehner Cooksey Flake
Bonilla Costello Fletcher
Bono Cox Foley
Boozman Coyne Forbes
Borski Cramer Ford

Fossella Lee
Frelinghuysen Lewis (CA)
Frost Lewis (GA)
Ganske Lewis (KY)
Gekas Linder
Gibbons Lipinski
Gilchrist LoBiondo
Gillmor Lucas (KY)
Gilman Lucas (OK)
Goode Maloney (CT)
Goodlatte Manzullo
Gordon Mascara
Goss Matheson
Graham McCarthy (MO)
Granger McCarthy (NY)
Graves McCrery
Green (TX) McHugh
Green (WI) McInnis
Greenwood McIntyre
Grucci McKeon
Gutknecht Meehan
Hall (TX) Mica
Hansen Millender-
Hart McDonald
Hastings (WA) Miller, Dan
Hayes Miller, Gary
Hayworth Miller, Jeff
Herger Mollohan
Hilleary Moran (KS)
Hobson Moran (VA)
Hoekstra Morella
Holden Murtha
Hooley Myrick
Horn Nadler
Houghton Nethercutt
Hulshof Ney
Hunter Northup
Isakson Norwood
Israel Nussle
Issa Ortiz
Istook Osborne
Jackson (IL) Ose
Jackson-Lee Otter
(TX) Oxley
Jefferson Pascrell
Jenkins Pastor
John Paul
Johnson (CT) Pence
Johnson (IL) Peterson (MN)
Johnson, E. B. Peterson (PA)
Johnson, Sam Petri
Jones (NC) Phelps
Kanjorski Pickering
Keller Pitts
Kelly Platts
Kennedy (MN) Pombo
Kennedy (RI) Pomeroy
Kerns Portman
Kind (WI) Pryce (OH)
King (NY) Putnam
Kingston Quinn
Kirk Radanovich
Klecza Rahall
Knollenberg Ramstad
Kolbe Regula
LaFalce Rehberg
LaHood Reynolds
Largent Riley
Larsen (WA) Rivers
Latham Roemer
LaTourette Rogers (MI)
Leach Rohrabacher

NOES—100

Andrews Filner
Baca Frank
Baird Gephardt
Baldwin Gutierrez
Barrett Hall (OH)
Becerra Harman
Blumenauer Hastings (FL)
Bonior Hefley
Brown (FL) Hill
Capps Hilliard
Capuano Hinchey
Carson (IN) Hinojosa
Clayton Hoeftel
Condit Holt
Conyers Honda
Crowley Hoyer
Davis (CA) Inslee
Davis (IL) Jones (OH)
DeFazio Kaptur
DeGette Kildee
DeLauro Kilpatrick
Deutsch Kucinich
Doggett Lampson
Etheridge Langevin
Farr Levin

Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanders
Saxton
Schaffer
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

Sabo
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Tauscher
Tierney
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)

NOT VOTING—27

Brady (TX) Gallegly Meeks (NY)
Brown (OH) Gonzalez Obey
Cubin Hostettler Oliver
Davis, Tom Hyde Rogers (KY)
DeMint Lantos Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart Larson (CT) Roukema
Dingell Luther Sanchez
Ehlers McNulty Waters
Emerson Meek (FL) Young (AK)

□ 1454

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I unfortunately was required to attend a funeral in my Congressional District today and missed roll call vote No. 498. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted “aye”.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 498 I failed to receive notice that this vote was being held. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the conference report to H.R. 1, the No Child Left Behind Act.

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

There was no objection.

DIRECTING THE CLERK TO MAKE TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS IN EN- ROLLMENT OF H.R. 1, NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 289) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make technical corrections in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 1, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 289

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 1) to close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall, with respect to the title IX that is contained within quotation marks and that immediately precedes title X of the bill, make the following corrections:

(1) Insert before such title IX the following:

TITLE IX—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

Title IX (20 U.S.C. 7801 et seq.) is amended to read as follows: