

Northup	Rothman	Sununu
Norwood	Roukema	Sweeney
Nussle	Roybal-Allard	Tancredo
Oberstar	Royce	Tanner
Obey	Rush	Tauscher
Olver	Ryan (WI)	Tauzin
Ortiz	Ryun (KS)	Taylor (MS)
Osborne	Sabo	Taylor (NC)
Ose	Sanchez	Terry
Otter	Sanders	Thomas
Owens	Sandinin	Thompson (CA)
Oxley	Sawyer	Thompson (MS)
Pallone	Saxton	Thornberry
Pascrell	Scarborough	Thune
Pastor	Schaffer	Thurman
Paul	Schakowsky	Tiahrt
Payne	Schiff	Tiberi
Pelosi	Schrook	Tierney
Pence	Scott	Toomey
Peterson (MN)	Sensenbrenner	Towns
Peterson (PA)	Serrano	Trafficant
Petri	Sessions	Turner
Phelps	Shadegg	Udall (CO)
Pickering	Shaw	Udall (NM)
Pitts	Shays	Upton
Platts	Sherman	Velazquez
Pombo	Sherwood	Visclosky
Pomeroy	Shimkus	Vitter
Portman	Shows	Walden
Price (NC)	Shuster	Walsh
Pryce (OH)	Simmons	Wamp
Putnam	Simpson	Waters
Quinn	Skeen	Watkins
Radanovich	Skelton	Watt (NC)
Rahall	Slaughter	Watts (OK)
Ramstad	Smith (MI)	Waxman
Rangel	Smith (NJ)	Weiner
Regula	Smith (TX)	Weldon (FL)
Rehberg	Smith (WA)	Weldon (PA)
Reyes	Snyder	Weller
Reynolds	Solis	Wexler
Riley	Souder	Whitfield
Rivers	Spence	Wicker
Rodriguez	Spratt	Wilson
Roemer	Stark	Wolf
Rogers (KY)	Stearns	Woolsey
Rogers (MI)	Stenholm	Wu
Rohrabacher	Strickland	Wynn
Ros-Lehtinen	Stump	Young (AK)
Ross	Stupak	Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—12

Borski	Cubin	Kennedy (RI)
Brady (PA)	Gansler	Kilpatrick
Condit	Gilman	Largent
Cox	Hunter	Lucas (OK)

□ 1232

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 124, I was speaking at a Liberian rally and could not make it back in time. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I was unavoidably delayed. Accordingly, I was unable to vote on rollcall Nos. 122, 123, and 124. If I had been present I would have voted "yea" on all. I ask unanimous consent to have my statement placed in the RECORD at the appropriate point.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1, NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 143 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 143

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) a bill to close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 143 makes in order the bill H.R. 1, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, under a structured rule. The rule provides 2 hours of debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. It makes in order only those amendments printed in the Committee on Rules report accompanying the resolution, debatable for the time specified, equally controlled by a proponent and opponent. These amendments shall not be subject to amendment or demands for a division of the question.

The Committee on Rules worked very hard to ensure that the amendments made in order reflect the variety of views in this House of Representatives on education policy. I think the result is a balanced rule that gives the House the opportunity to work its will on a variety of issues related to the education of our children. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill as well as the amendments printed in the report. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, today we take a historic leap forward on behalf of our children, parents, and teachers across this great Nation. Lately, the attention of Americans has been drawn to the problems of high gas prices and sustainability of our resources. America, it is time to focus that attention on our Nation's most precious resource: our children. H.R. 1, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, does just that.

We understand that the future of this great Nation lies in a global economy, and H.R. 1 recognizes that investing in our children today will prepare them and our country for the challenges of tomorrow. The Committee on Education and the Workforce was assigned the arduous task of reforming our Nation's failing Federal education policy. Although there have been many bumps in the road, 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 no child is left behind.

During testimony in the Committee on Rules, we heard time and time again, from both Republicans and Democrats, that H.R. 1 represents the most sweeping comprehensive education legislation to be brought before the House during our tenure. It has been a long time in coming and this bill is truly historic. The education of our Nation's children is the number one concern of Americans, and H.R. 1 is the number one priority of our President.

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

Despite a decade of economic growth and a Federal outlay of more than \$130 billion in the last 25 years, 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 cannot be the vehicle for change in our public schools. It is time for accountability, it is time for reform, and it is time for a commitment to our children.

We must start by 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 provide Federal funds to aid them in that task. It also explicitly prohibits federally sponsored national testing or curricula.

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

As passed out of committee, H.R. 1 provides immediate public school choice for children in schools identified as failing after just 1 year. That is public school choice. This provision will give parents the freedom to choose a better-performing public or charter school to educate their children. The bill also allows parents to seek supplemental educational services, such as tutoring, after-school services, and summer school programs for their children if they are enrolled in a school that has been identified as a failing school for more than 3 years. This measure will act as a necessary safety valve to allow students to seek outside educational support for any state-approved provider using Federal title I dollars.

Now, 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. This decentralized approach will allow agencies to better target resources to fit the needs of their own communities.

Mr. Speaker, since the creation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965, numerous programs and restrictions have been piled and piled upon 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 or eliminating 34 programs under ESEA and cutting the Federal education bureaucracy in half. At the same time, the bill will target effective proven methods of reading through the implementation of the President's Reading First initiative.

Mr. Speaker, we know that over 60 percent of children living in poverty are reading below the very basic level.

We cannot expect these children to exceed with this handicap. At the same time, we destine these children to academic underachievement by our failure to teach them to read; we are denying them access to the world that may be opened up to them only through books. The President's Reading and Early Reading First programs will introduce a scientific-based, comprehensive approach to reading instruction and will serve to refocus education policy on this most 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 without the math and science knowledge that has made us a leader in technology and scientific discovery. I am very 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 opportunities to local education agencies with a high need.

Mr. Speaker, the 1,000-plus pages of H.R. 1 are 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. It encompasses the education plan laid out by our President and provides us with the most important change in Federal education policy in over 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, every Member in this House has a vested interest in the education of our children as the Nation's most precious resource. We cannot stand idly by or be timid in fulfilling our responsibility to ensure that every child, rich or poor, white or of color, gifted or disabled have 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. As we debate this historic legislation, I urge my colleagues to keep the children at the forefront of their minds. I urge Members to support this rule and the historic underlying legislation.

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

□ 1245

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and 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 oppose this rule. I oppose the process it represents, and I oppose the duplicity by which this rule came about. Nearly 150 amendments were submitted for this major legislative initiative, and only a handful have been made in order.

Furthermore, many members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce withheld offering amendments in that committee because of assurances by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the chairman, that they would be given an opportunity to do so on the floor. That did not happen. Cut out of the process were numerous good-faith efforts to build and improve on the underlying bill.

My colleagues relied on the good-faith assurances of the Republican leadership, and learned a hard lesson instead. This is not a tone in Washington for which so many of us had hoped. For instance, this egregious rule will block consideration of an amendment by the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS). The gentleman's amendment would have provided \$20 billion for needed school renovation, repair, and construction. Our schools are crumbling before our eyes.

Mr. Speaker, at the basic level, surely we can all agree that schools should provide a safe and secure environment for learning and instruction with classrooms, libraries, laboratories, and other resources necessary for learning. In the same manner, the rule blocks my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU), from offering an amendment to maintain a separate stream of funding for the class size reduction program.

Overcrowded classrooms remain the number one obstacles to quality education in many communities. This rule does nothing to alleviate the problem. The process for this education bill began with a lot of promise.

In recent days, the House Committee on Education and the Workforce approved, on a true bipartisan basis, a major education reform bill which will hold public schools accountable for improving children's education while offering a substantial increase in Federal funds to help them accomplish that goal.

It reflected a significant agreement between Democrats and Republicans to improve education for all children in our country regardless of their economic, social, or racial background; in other words, leaving no child behind. It provided substantial new resources, \$4 billion more for elementary and secondary education for next year, compared to what the Federal Government is spending this year, in exchange for higher standards and tough accountability rules.

But then the process began to break down. Last week Congress failed to include in the budget conference the new funds for education that were called for in today's underlying bill. The disparity between education funding in the budget and education funding in this reform bill raises real questions about whether Congress is serious about improving schools.

Furthermore, this week we have come to learn that the bipartisan bill has been hijacked by extreme elements of the majority's party, elements intent on undermining the bipartisan

agreement reached by the Committee on Education and the Workforce. These elements are intent on reinserting vouchers into the underlying bill, a move that would undermine public education. Moreover, efforts to block-grant Federal money, a proposal referred to as Straight A's, are underway and would also undermine the specific targeting of poor school districts that exists in Federal law.

I am at a loss to explain to my colleagues how so carefully crafted a bill has come under attack. The underlying bill was one this body could have been proud of, but its success is now in jeopardy. We must not let that happen. I urge the defeat of this rule to take care of these deficiencies.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) for yielding me this time. And I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) who worked so hard on this. It was a pleasure working with him. And I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON). I also thank the Members on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), whose interest in education is great, as well as gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), and many others.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a good bill. I believe that President Bush deserves a tremendous amount of credit for his emphasis in terms of what he is doing in education. I will be the first to say if any one of us out of 435 had prepared this particular rule, we would have prepared it differently. This rule is a compromise rule, taking 135 amendments or so and trying to determine how we could best represent the interest of various Republican and Democrat parties in terms of bringing it to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I personally oppose a number of things in the rule. I would have liked to have seen them out of the rule. I think there are people who would have liked to see things in the rule that are not in the rule. I understand some of the opposition to it and I will oppose, as vehemently as any Member, certain aspects of this particular rule.

Mr. Speaker, just to cite one, the amendment by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) dealing with assessments absolutely guts the basic bill, and it is one that I would have a great deal of trouble with.

But this is a rule. It is something that we have to move forward with. It is my determination that we should pass the rule, go on to the debate on

the various amendments, and let them fall where they may.

Mr. Speaker, why is this a good bill? It is a good bill because it is the first major piece of legislation in decades in this country, perhaps since the creation of the Department of Education, which essentially reevaluates the role of the Federal Government and makes a determination that we have to start at a very young age, particularly with kids in lower-income circumstances, and teach them how to read by the end of second grade. And in grades 3 through 8, we have to pay attention to how kids are doing. That is what the testing is all about, in order to give them the opportunity to determine if they are not doing as well as they should, and then providing for that opportunity.

We do have some consolidation into block grants to give flexibility. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) was very helpful in creating local flexibility so that various people who are running the local districts could make decisions in terms of how to expend money at the local level. This gives the greatest flexibility of any legislation ever coming out of Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, essentially what the President and others have done, and this is a very bipartisan bill, is that they have sat down and made the decision that the ultimate goal here is to help kids with their education and where they are going. So even if you do not agree with everything that is allowed for in the rule, as I do not, I would still urge people to support the rule.

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

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill before us today reflects the culmination of a lot of work and effort by all of the members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. I particularly want to thank the members of our committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), who are part of the working group. But I want to extend that thanks to every member of the committee, all of whom had to stretch to try to bring this legislation together to try to create sound educational reform and improvement along the lines that so many Members of Congress have spoken about in our various debates, in our campaigns, talking to children and parents to try to make the American education system a better place for all of our students so they can acquire the skills necessary to participate to the fullest extent in American society.

I believe that this legislation does that. It does that because of the kind of cooperation that we received. However, I must say that I am very disappointed in the rule because I am very concerned that very crucial items for debate within the discussion of the American education system, those amendments were not allowed in order: Amendments offered by Members on this side of the aisle to deal with the issues of smaller class size, to make sure that in fact we have an environment in which teachers can teach and children can learn; to have modern and safe schools; to renovate the unsafe schools and improve schools through school construction grants; to make sure that we have adequate counselors in schools so if we see violence break out in some of our campuses, even to the extent of killings through gun violence and other forms of violence, that we have people in place who can deal with these student populations, in many cases in very difficult situations; and clearly the need for full funding for IDEA.

Mr. Speaker, this is important to all of us on both sides of the aisle to make sure that funding is there. For that reason, I would ask Members to vote against this rule so that perhaps those amendments could be made in order.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), my distinguished friend and chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, whose hard work, along with his ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), has led us to this historic day.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), and members of the Committee on Rules, for their long hours last night in putting this together.

Mr. Speaker, let me also congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for the portrait that was unveiled yesterday, and congratulations to him and hopefully his health continues to improve.

Let me, like my colleagues before me, thank the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), my partner in this process, along with those members of the working group, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER); and on the Democratic side of the aisle, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), and the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) who have spent months looking across the table at each other, trying to develop a bipartisan bill that follows the path that the President outlined.

As the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) pointed out, we really owe a debt of gratitude to all members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce on both sides of the aisle who had their moments of disappointment, their moments of happiness, but a willingness all of the way through the process to see us produce a bipartisan bill.

Mr. Speaker, I can say that in the 10 years that I have been here in Congress, the method in which we moved the bill through the committee and the cooperation of all of the Members was absolutely stunning. We had not one ill word said in the committee. We worked together, even when we were disagreeing, to try to produce a bill that will help children in America. I want to thank my colleagues.

As the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) pointed out, this is an historic opportunity. President Bush has made education reform his top priority, and now the House has the opportunity to deliver on the President's promise. There are four main components of this bill. Four key principles that the President outlined during the campaign and has talked about all year: holding schools accountable to American parents; providing State and local school districts with unprecedented new flexibility; giving new choices to parents and students who are trapped in failing schools; and ensuring that student instruction is based on sound, scientific research.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1 that we have coming before us embodies each of those principles and closely tracks with the President's education reform plan. We are on the threshold of the first serious overhaul of Federal education policy since it was created in 1965. There is a lot of discussion that we will have about this bill when we get to it. First, however, we have to pass the rule that is before us.

Mr. Speaker, I know there is some disappointment, disappointment on the Democratic side of the aisle and disappointment on the Republican side of the aisle on some amendments that were not made in order. However, we have produced a rule that is fair: fair for the Members, fair for the country, and fair for this bill. All of us know we have a very delicately balanced bill. The only way we are going to produce a solid, bipartisan bill is to keep a delicately balanced bill.

Mr. Speaker, there are amendments that Members would like to offer, but I think that we have a fair representation embodied in this rule, and I would urge my colleagues to support the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1 is a good bipartisan bill; but I oppose this rule for several reasons, one of which is the denial of any Democratic amendment on school construction.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has spent millions and millions of

dollars on State and local prisons during my time here in Congress, and virtually nothing on public school renovation and construction. About 15 years ago, a Federal judge in Flint, Michigan, my hometown, ordered the closing of our county jail, built in 1930, stating that it was unfit for human habitation. A few years later, we blew that jail up in compliance with that court order.

□ 1300

That jail was newer and in better condition than many schools in my congressional district, including Homedale Elementary School in my own neighborhood which is in deplorable condition. We should really be ashamed when we spend money on prisons and find some reason not to spend money on school construction and renovation. Let us at least have the opportunity to vote on school construction. It is a very nonintrusive way to help our schools, school construction and renovation. What are we really afraid of?

We have crafted a reasonable bipartisan education bill. Let us have a reasonable rule for floor action.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON).

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce would engage with me in a colloquy.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOEHNER. I would be happy to.

Mrs. WILSON. As the gentleman from Ohio knows, I had filed an amendment with my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), on public school choice. That amendment would have provided parents and children a better education through the public schools by eliminating barriers to full choice within public school systems. My amendment would have provided transportation expenses in public schools and creative funding mechanisms for charter school facilities, whether those facilities are leased or purchased.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio and I worked together yesterday on a version of this amendment that would be in order and that the committee could accept. That amendment would have authorized \$400 million in Federal matching funds for States to level the playing field in the area of facilities funding for charter schools and traditional public schools. Charter schools often have to choose between paying their rent and paying their teachers.

Mr. BOEHNER. Yes, I am very familiar with the gentlewoman's amendment.

Mrs. WILSON. I understand the gentleman supported making this amendment in order and that it was inadvertently left out of the amendments that we will consider on this bill.

Mr. BOEHNER. The gentlewoman is correct. I strongly support public school choice and eliminating the barriers for charter schools to educate children. The lack of funding for space is one of the biggest hurdles they face. We need to create incentives for States to provide funding mechanisms for charter schools without taking funds away from public schools. The gentlewoman has been a leader in these efforts to improve public education, and particularly crafting innovative financing mechanisms for schools. I was looking forward to working with the gentlewoman from New Mexico and the gentleman from Indiana to debate that issue on the floor. Unfortunately, the amendment was not made in order.

Mrs. WILSON. Would the gentleman agree to seek to include the per-pupil facilities aid program amendment in the conference committee on H.R. 1?

Mr. BOEHNER. As the gentlewoman is aware and the gentleman from Indiana is aware, similar language is in the Senate version of this bill. I will pledge to work with the gentlewoman from New Mexico and the gentleman from Indiana when we get to conference on trying to secure this language in the final version of the bill.

Mrs. WILSON. I thank the gentleman from Ohio. I thank him for his leadership. I look forward to continuing our work together.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico, someone whom I have enjoyed working with on public school choice. I just want to say that as we debate this bipartisan bill over the next several days, we are going to be dealing with issues of reform and accountability and testing. And we are going to be dealing with issues of when children do not do very well, that they have more options to get into new schools and out of failing schools. Certainly this amendment that the gentlewoman and I have worked on expands public school choice, expands options for parents to get into charter schools and magnet schools, and does it earlier than waiting 3 or 4 years for a school to fail. We have put this amendment together. It is a bipartisan amendment on the Senate side with Senator GREGG and Senator CARPER. We hope that this would be accepted in conference.

Mr. BOEHNER. I would be happy as I mentioned to the gentlewoman, if she will yield further, that we will work together in conference to try to secure this language. I share their commitment to increased public school choice and to the growing movement of charter schools that are providing help for children in very needy communities.

Mrs. WILSON. I thank my colleague from Indiana for his strong work on this and we will continue to work together. I thank the chairman for his leadership as well. I looked forward to working with him.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

(Mrs. MINK of Hawaii asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to serve on the working group representing the minority was a tremendous experience. I must say that going into this, I did not expect to be able to reconcile all the various differences that we held on the majority and the minority side. It took an amazing amount of work on the part of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) to put this together. In the process of reconciling many of our differences, one of the salient points that made it possible in my opinion for us to come forward with this bipartisan bill was the assurance that many of the amendments that the Democrats wanted to offer to be included in the major legislation would be given an opportunity to be debated on the floor. With that assurance, we gave up the opportunity for major debate on these items in the committee as we deliberated on the consensus bill. So I cannot begin to describe my huge disappointment that the Committee on Rules did not permit two of the most important Democratic amendments that we have been talking about for years.

Now, this is the world-renowned legislative body that everybody looks to in terms of being able to come to grips with the major issues of our times and to debate them on both sides of the aisle. We are being deprived of that opportunity by this rule which prevents the minority from presenting these two amendments having to do with school construction and class size, the two most important issues that affect almost all of our school districts.

So it is with great disappointment that I come to the floor today, in spite of all the efforts that we made in our committee, to ask the Members of this body to vote down this rule so that we may have the opportunity to offer these two important amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express disappointment that the rule for consideration of H.R. 1 does not permit me to offer an amendment to hire 100,000 additional counselors in our schools.

The amendment would have provided 100,000 resource-based staff for our public schools to help students cope with the stress and anxieties of adolescence. The amendment is similar to H.R. 466, which I introduced on February 6, 2001.

None of us will forget the roster of incidents of school violence. Only yesterday a 14 year old was convicted of second degree murder for killing a middle school teacher. What could make a seemingly typical child turn so violent?

Substantive preventative measures have their place. Security guards, metal detectors, and expelling violent students all have their place in addressing this problem. But they do

nothing to address the child's anger, rage and frustration that leads him or her to commit a violent act.

My amendment would enable schools to work with children to ensure they can handle their anger and emotions without resorting to violence. Many of our children enter school with emotional, physical, and interpersonal barriers to learning. We need more school counselors in our schools, not only to help identify these troubled youths, but to work on developmental skill building. Children do not check their personal and home problems at the schoolhouse door; the problems come in with them.

Surgeon General Dr. David Satcher has said that appropriate interventions made during or prior to adolescence can direct young people away from violence toward healthy and constructive lives. The window of opportunity for effective interventions opens early and rarely, if ever, closes. Thus, prevention is the best guard against youth violence.

We have no real infrastructure of support our kids when it comes to mental health services in our schools. The most recent statistics indicate that there are 90,000 guidance counselors for approximately 41.4 million students in our public schools. That translates to 1 counselor for every 513 students. In Hawaii, we have only 1 counselor for every 525 students. In California, there is only 1 counselor for more than 1,000 students.

That is simply not enough. The Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences recommends that there be at least one counselor per 250 students, especially beginning in middle school.

With current counselors responsible for such large numbers of students, they are unable to address the students' personal needs. Instead, their role is more often administrative, scheduling, and job and college counseling. The child is forfeited for different goals.

My amendments would put 100,000 new resource staff in our schools to focus on the mental health needs of students. It authorizes \$2.8 billion for fiscal year 2002. While that may seem a large sum, it is only \$28,000 per counselor.

This resource staff will be hired to address the personal, family, peer level, emotional, and developmental needs of students, enabling them to detect early warning signs of troubled youth. They will improve student interaction and school safety. In a nutshell, they can help save children's lives.

The resource staff can also consult with teachers and parents about student learning, behavior, and emotional problems. They can develop and implement prevention programs and deal with substance abuse. They can set up peer mediation, and they can enhance problem solving in schools. Resource staff will provide important support services to students, and to parents and teachers on behalf of the students.

In addition, my amendment makes counselors eligible for professional development training.

If we really are serious about addressing school violence, we must address prevention and that means having the available personnel to address the mental, emotional and developmental needs of the children.

I regret that the Rules Committee did not permit me to offer this very important amendment.

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

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee, I rise in strong support of the rule. Actually I thought we were going to continue that spirit of bipartisanship that we had on the Committee on Education and the Workforce with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER). But unfortunately that seems to be dissipated here. I am very unhappy about it and I do not understand it at all, because in my assessment of the rule, it seems as though we have continued that bipartisanship and we have really focused on the issues of genuine concern to all that divided us. I am deeply disappointed to hear that the partisanship that we put aside in the committee deliberations is unfairly raising its head on this rule debate. I believe that we have considered all of the issues that genuinely were the core of the education program and that, in the tradition of our fine democracy, they are included in this rule.

For example, I was one who was against vouchers as part of this bill. I was one in the committee that led the fight against vouchers in this bill. But appropriately, since it is an issue of great interest to a core group of people on both sides of the aisle, it is in the rule and there will be a full and open debate. That is the way this democracy should be working in this House.

Now, there are other issues in the bill, of course; the flexibility in local control. Another point I should make that both in the bill and in the rule, we do put the focus on State and local control, as it should be. We are not going to let the Department of Education as bureaucrats run these schools for our children. But let me also point out, because it is very important to many Members on both sides and it seems to me that it is being misunderstood, and, that is, the question of accountability and results, and that is the accountability. This does not dictate national tests. I know that there are many that are using that against the rule and against the bill. I want to repeat, it does not dictate national tests. The funding is awarded to the States and to the schools, the local schools, for the testing as well as the corrective action.

Then I might finally just allude to my amendment on the mental health counseling which was very well included in the bill. But I guess in conclusion I have to say I am confident that the controversial measures that under this rule and these amendments that will be brought up will be defeated and that we will be consistent with reaching out on a bipartisan basis and supporting the President's vision for education reform, leaving no child behind.

As a member of the Committee I rise in support of the Rule. This is a fair Rule and this has been a fair process. This Rule continues the spirit of bipartisanship we had in the Education Committee. It allows an open debate on the important issues on which we genuinely disagree.

I commend the Education and Workforce Committee Chairman BOEHNER and Ranking Member GEORGE MILLER for their leadership, hard work, and diligence. Also, I thank Congressmen CASTLE, MCKEON, and ISAKSON for their work with key Democrats to form this compromise.

This Rule and this bill are truly examples of bipartisanship. Make no mistake—this was not an easy process. There were many hurdles along the way—and many times we all thought an impasse had been reached. But each time, the sides returned to the negotiating table and found a way to achieve a compromise. No one on either side ever lost sight of the goal—to ensure that every child, regardless of situation, in every public school in America receive a quality education.

This is the way the process is proposed to work—partisan politics have been set aside to make way for a meaningful debate on the issues that matter to America and our children. This process has not been about politics—this process has been about the education of our children. I am deeply disappointed to hear that partisanship is unfairly raising its head on The Rule debate. This Rule deserves to be adopted because it is fair and right for this debate. In the Committee we debated many of these issues. This Rule allows the whole House to genuinely debate the issues in education that in the tradition of our democracy.

For instance, in the Committee we decided against allowing vouchers to be part of this bill. Although I oppose vouchers, I agree with my colleagues that this issue deserves a genuine and legitimate debate by the whole House. This Rule allows the House to work its will. It is not just vouchers. Other issues that divide us, such as testing and accountability, will receive a fair and honest hearing through this Rule. These subjects will be fairly debated under this Rule. All Members, because of this Rule, will have the opportunity to make their case for or against these important issues. In addition to this Rule allowing us to debate the issues, it allows Members from across both sides of the aisle to have their amendments heard. The Rule strikes the appropriate balance by allowing a number of bipartisan amendments.

This Rule focuses debate on the most important and contentious issues of education reform. It is fair, it allows genuine debate, and at the end of the day the will of the House will be heard.

I am pleased that the bill before us today is bipartisan and is reflective of President Bush's vision for education reform.

Specifically: H.R. 1 provides unprecedented flexibility and local control.

It is vitally important to cut federal education regulations and provide more flexibility to states and local school districts. We should give our educators the flexibility to shape federal education programs in ways that work best for our teachers and our children not for bureaucrats at the U.S. Department of Education. Children should be put ahead of federal regulations. Washington does not know

best and Congress should not serve as a national school board. While there indeed is a role for the federal government in education, we must be cautious of the Department of Education becoming a dynasty. I believe that by reversing this trend we will be well on the way to creating the best education system for our children.

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 school districts in two ways: (1) through allowing school districts to transfer a portion of their funds among an assortment of ESEA programs as long as they demonstrate results (2) and through the consolidation of overlapping federal programs.

Very important to many of our members and this President, H.R. 1 enhances accountability and demands results.

As we deregulate federal education programs and 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 Congress 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. States will be required to test students in grades 3–8. It is important to emphasize that the states will develop their own standards and assessments. This bill does not dictate a national test. What the bill does is say that if you are going to accept federal education funding, then you are going to be held accountable for results. We reward states and schools that improve. Those that do not improve will undergo corrective actions.

H.R. 1 ensures that our schools are safe. An important element included here is ensuring that mental health screening and services are made available to young people. In addressing school safety, we must ensure that children with mental health needs are identified early and provided with the services they so desperately need. Many youth who may be headed toward school violence or other tragedies can be helped if we identify their early symptoms. The nation is facing a public crisis in mental health for children and adolescents. While 1 in 10 children and adolescents suffer from mental illness severe enough to cause some level of impairment, fewer than 1 in 5 of these children receive needed treatment.

I am pleased that this bill includes school-based mental health services language in addressing school safety and substance abuse.

While I am confident the controversial measures that would erode bipartisanship and move us away from the President's vision for education reform will be defeated, I am also confident that by the end of this process we will have a solid, strong education package that is good for our nation's children.

I believe in this bill. But these issues deserve full debate and this Rule grants us that

debate. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Rule.

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

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask my colleagues to vote no on this rule and to give every child the first-rate public education that he or she deserves. I believe, and I think most Members believe, that education is the challenge of our time. And after the early promise of a bipartisan accord on education, before getting sidetracked by a partisan tax cut bill, we are on the floor with probably the first truly bipartisan effort of the Bush administration. I congratulate the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) on bringing this truly bipartisan bill to fruition.

This, in our view, is real compromise. It is real bipartisan legislation. It is the product of two sides coming together for the sake of something larger. Democrats did not get everything that we wanted. Republicans did not get everything that they wanted. But both sides were able to forge agreement on more accountability, better-trained teachers, high-quality teachers, and after-school programs which we know make schools safer.

That is why Democrats are deeply disappointed with the rule that the Republicans have put forward today. This rule prevents us from offering amendments that we believe are critical to an excellent public education in the Information Age. It squelches debate on the most important issue that we know, preventing us from bringing two key amendments; to modernize public schools and help get smaller class sizes for our children.

Something clearly happened between the goodwill in committee and bringing this bill to the floor. Instead of building on what was an honest compromise in the committee, the Republican leadership has backed away from the promise of education reform and opening the door to reducing resources for after-school and other critical programs. It has opened the door to undoing school accountability, an issue where the President and all of us on the Democratic side agree. And it is revisiting the flawed voucher scheme that will not turn around failing schools, will leave children behind, and that Members of both parties have rejected.

Now, we need to improve public education for children by building new schools and repairing school buildings, something that both Democrats and Republicans have proposed. By ensuring smaller class sizes, by hiring new teachers, by providing new resources, not less, we live up to the true promise of education reform that truly would leave no child behind.

We believe with all our hearts that bipartisan amendments on building

new schools, on repairing and refurbishing schools and allowing for smaller classroom size would command bipartisan majorities in this House today and next week when we take up this bill.

□ 1315

We ask Members to turn down this rule and give us a rule that will yield a real, real bipartisan education bill for the American people.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I support this rule, but strongly oppose this bill, reluctantly, after having worked with it for much time and even the last couple of years in committee.

The amendments being offered today are a mixed bag. Some are good and could restore this to a Republican Bush bill, but most likely they are going to be left behind in the leave-no-Democrat-behind bill and it will remain a Kennedy-Miller bill.

This bill, in my opinion, is worse than current law. Most moral concerns that many of us had and worked with were stripped out in compromises. I understood the process, but did not expect it to go so far.

I am disappointed that religious denigration discrimination amendment is not in the bill. I am disappointed that we could not get charitable choice. In fact, that was negotiated out in the Senate and there was no point in coming further on the House floor with it. It was taken out of our bill, which was in it in the past. Every concern of moral Christians that we had in trying to put protections in this bill are gone.

This bill is spending far more money than any conservative can possibly live with. The national testing is a standard that we have fought. The Republicans fought even President Clinton's State standards, yet alone Federal standards.

This bill is unacceptable to Rush Limbaugh, to Dr. Dobson, to over 50 conservative groups in this country. It is unacceptable to Bill Bennett and Chester Finn, who are original people who are doing this. Every major conservative in this country is opposed to it, and some conservatives in Washington need to stand up and say we cannot go there.

I very much respect accountability and the principle of accountability. I am an MBA as well. I believe you need to have measures. I do not believe the problem right now is that there are not tests. I fear one national test, and inevitably this test will control not only public schools and lead to curriculum controlling, it will control homeschoolers and private schools, because once schools become punished by not meeting a standard and the parents have no escape, there will be a manipulation of that standard.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ 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 rise deeply disappointed with this rule, but strongly supportive of this bipartisan bill.

There is an old saying about partisanship being left at the water's edge with regard to foreign policy. Well, bipartisanship should not be left in the Committee on Rules when we have worked so hard for a bipartisan bill.

We have worked going back to December with meetings that many of us had, Republicans and Democrats alike, with then President-elect Bush in Austin; and we built on that negotiation and that discussion to put a bill together in our committee, working with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON), the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFER), and on our side, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), and the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), we put education reform and children over bickering and politics.

We have also worked on trying to combine some very important elements, the elements of a fair locally devised test with remediation and resources to help poor children that are not passing some of those tests.

We are going to have some key votes and some key amendments coming up, and I hope that we can keep this bipartisanship together that is so fragile and delicate but so important to convincing the American people that we can do the people's work with common sense, with civility, and good will.

I have great disappointment in this rule, but urge strong support for this bipartisan underlying bill.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of the rule and urge for its adoption, because the rule allows for a number of amendments that I view to be critical and important.

Our President proposed in this document his education vision for America. He also has proposed in other documents subsequent to his Presidency called Leave No Child Behind a bold education plan which represented an important balance in education reform. That balance included school choice, it included accountability, and it included flexibility.

The school choice provisions of the bill, however, have been ripped out of the legislation at the committee level and they remain outside of that legislation today. That was a painful defeat for the White House and I think for conservatives and for Republicans in

general who believe that provision of the President's bill is essential and is important.

The committee also stripped out of the legislation the language dealing with flexibility known as Straight A's, or, as the President called it in his plan, Charter States. This rule allows for the opportunity for those two provisions in the President's plan to be reconsidered on the floor, and it gives all of us, Mr. Speaker, a chance to restore the President's bill to his original vision.

Absent those two core provisions of the President's plan, there really is very little left of what the President initially proposed in his plan that helped bring him to the Presidency and his plan that he brought to the Congress to leave no child behind.

This rule is important because it makes those rules in order. We have commitments from our own leadership and from our own chairmen with respect to the Straight A's provision, that that will be restored here on the floor before that bill goes on to the conference committee, and those are important elements in restoring the President's vision.

The rule is necessary, and I urge its adoption.

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

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

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to this rule. The President, on a number of occasions, has made it clear that education is supposedly his number one priority, and that is exactly how it should be. What deeply troubles me is the heavy-handed way in which the majority is preventing the full House from debating some of the most crucial elements of this concept.

While ostensibly one of the more important factors for this bill for the President and others is testing, yet this rule allows only one amendment, and that would completely strike a proposed new test. No other amendment on the validity or concept of testing would be allowed if this rule passes, not even one.

If it passes, there will be no real consideration as to whether we provide sufficient resources to schools to administer fairly and comprehensively these tests. There will be no real debate about whether or not this type of testing is even good for our students or, if it is, what is the best way to administer them.

We are going to hear a lot of reasons why it could not be done, and chief amongst them is you allowed us some amendments. Well, 28 out of 158 is hardly enough. You are going to say there is not enough time to do all of this. Well, we are going to be going

home in a little while and we are not coming back tomorrow, so that does not carry any water. The fact of the matter is a good public policy debate is exactly what we need, especially on this bill, and we all ought to be here to engage in it.

One amendment that I would propose would address perhaps the biggest flaw in this debate. The bill dramatically increases the scope and frequency of standardized tests by requiring States to begin testing students each year in grades 3 through 8. That is on top of current requirements. As a result, children will sit for standardized tests by the time they reach the age 9, and in some fourth grade classrooms in fact children still sit three times in a given year.

What clearly is unfair is the anemic funding that this bill proposes. The Congressional Budget Office says it will cost \$650 million each year for States to design, administer, review and revise the tests required by H.R. 1. That is way more than is expressed in this bill, and there is no way of telling how the States intend to make up the difference, other than by depriving other important educational programs.

For this reason I submitted an amendment that would require annual appropriations to reach \$600 million before those provisions could go into effect. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, it seems the majority cannot see the millions of students through the trillions in tax cuts.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR).

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill says a lot. It could say a lot more. I rise today to argue the point that the Members of the Committee on Education and Workforce, at least on our side of the aisle, were told to keep this bill together, we are working cooperatively. When you get to the floor, you are going to have a chance to do what you want to do with amendment. You are going to be able to deal with the class size issue, you are going to be able to deal with school modernization and school construction.

Well, lo and behold, the rule comes down, and no classroom modernization amendment, no class size amendment, are made in order. Overcrowded classrooms, the fact that teachers are required to instruct so many students that children are not getting the attention they deserve, the attention they desperately need, this is a huge issue, a huge issue.

Right now in Michigan, we have some of the most qualified teachers in the country. Ninety-nine percent of our teachers in public secondary schools hold teaching certificates in their main teaching assignment. Forty-eight percent have masters degrees. Yet with all that talent and all that skill, all of that is undermined by the fact that, on average, they have bigger class sizes,

these teachers in my State, bigger class sizes than they do in 44 other States.

Yet under this rule, as I suggested, we are not presented with the opportunity to go forward with the 100,000 teacher program, to put more teachers in our classrooms, reduce that size, get more discipline, more attention to those students.

A lot of folks these days talk about modern classrooms, about connecting the schools with the Internet, and that is critically important and we need to do that. But we also cannot forget that there are literally thousands of schools in this country that are in desperate need of repair; schools with broken plumbing systems, schools that were too hot in the summer and too cold in the winter, schools where children sit in rundown classrooms with broken windows and peeling paint and asbestos hanging from the ceilings. If it is an environment that none of us would choose to live in, how can we say it is an environment where our children should struggle to learn in?

Well, today, Michigan, like on the other issue of class size, we have a very bad statistic with respect to school modernization. We have the sixth highest percentage of school districts in America reporting at least one building in inadequate condition.

So, this rule denies us the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to address those issues. They are primary issues, they are important issues, and I hope my colleagues as a result of that will vote against this rule, and hopefully the committee will go back and make them in order, so at least we can have a debate on these issues and move forward on class size and school modernization and make sure our kids have the kind of place we want them to learn in.

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

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. In negotiations, we were pretty much assured that Democratic amendments would be included on the floor. Good Democratic amendments, such as my amendment to create safe havens at or near schools, and my amendment to bring more females into the high-tech and science workforce, should be part of today's debate, and we should be talking about school construction.

But these ideas were, obviously, inadvertently left out. Instead, Republican amendments that will destroy our bipartisan effort by taking funds from the students and the schools that need them the most are being considered.

This rule definitely fails the fair play test. Let us vote it down. Let us give the whole issue back to the House, so that some day soon we can pass a real bipartisan bill that will debate all of the issues that are important to this

House in general on both sides of the aisle.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, the rule considering the No Child Left Behind Act still leaves many children behind. It fails to address national concerns, such as the desperate need to repair and modernize our schools, to reduce class sizes and to hire counselors so that our children learn in the best possible environment.

It treats limited English proficient children unfairly. With one hand the majority tries to court Hispanic voters, but in this bill it places new and undue burdens on Hispanic children.

Democrats have made this bill enormously better, but it is too bad that the Republican budget resolution would not fund many of these initiatives. The majority showed its priorities last week and decided to leave education behind.

The bill has the wrong answer on mandatory testing. At a time when the majority is quick to pass provisions ordering the National Academy of Sciences to study ergonomic standards before implementing rules and the effects of dredging the Hudson River to remove contaminants, it is remarkable that it is going to allow mandatory multiple testing of children from the third to eighth grade without allowing the National Academy of Sciences to study the proposal.

The rule we are considering today does not give us the opportunity to correct those mistakes and improve the bill. The rule shuts the door on initiatives that American people care about, while opening the door to proposals the American people have rejected.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time, and I rise in opposition to the rule.

Let me just give one example of how the promise to have debate on the floor has been broken.

□ 1330

Science education. Science is not just another subject, it is fundamental, like reading and math. For the past year, the National Commission on the Teaching of Math and Science, the so-called John Glenn Commission, met and made a number of recommendations. Some of those recommendations, such as one that would call for a network of national academies, training academies for science teachers around the country, were included in the report, but were not allowed for debate in the committee because, they said, we were told it would be allowed on the floor.

This is critically important. We face a crisis in science and math teaching. The title of our report says it well: before it is too late. Senator Glenn, the



head of Intel, the head of State Farm insurance, a number of other leaders in industry, education and business around the country say that we need these recommendations. We should at least have a debate on them on the floor.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. I rise today in opposition to this rule for one particular reason: there are too many children being left behind. Time after time this year I have asked that we finally have a discussion about the Federal Government's underfunding of the Individuals with Disabilities Act.

Mr. Speaker, 26 years ago, the Federal Government made a promise to children with disabilities, their parents, their teachers and their schools, that we would pay 40 percent of the excess cost to local school districts to educate children with disabilities. I do not know about the rest of my colleagues, but I grew up in a family where when one made a promise, one kept that promise. Today seemed like the perfect opportunity to have this discussion.

As I did earlier this year in the Committee on the Budget, I proposed an amendment that would have finally made sure the government kept its promise. This time, I was joined by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), who is on the Committee on Education and the Workforce. I am sad to report that we were denied even the opportunity to bring this amendment to the floor.

Once again, we are sending the message to our students that this legislation leaves no child behind, except for those with disabilities. I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time and for her extraordinary leadership on this issue.

I rise today to oppose this rule which eliminated many good amendments that should have been at least debated. For example, I submitted an amendment that would have established a formula grant program to ensure that all States could receive funding to allow them to hire additional school counselors, social workers, and psychologists. At a time when our children are dealing with suicide, substance abuse, school shootings, and other very grown-up problems, these mental health personnel are vital to the health and well-being of our students. The average student-to-counselor ratio is 1,100 to one in my State of California, although the recommended ratio is 250 to 1.

Now, as a trained clinical social worker, I know firsthand how counseling and effective treatment can re-

duce violent behavior. Early detection of troubled youth by mental health counselors prevents school violence. We need mental health school counselors in all of our schools. We need school construction. We need smaller class sizes. We owe this to our children. I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I am a proud supporter of the underlying bill, H.R. 1. I am glad to see we finally have legislation that recognizes the number one issue, the number one priority of the American people: education improvement in this country.

I am, however, extremely disappointed in the rule. I think it is shameful that the only amendment that was offered dealing with special education in this country, IDEA, is how we can better punish special education students rather than how we can help them.

A couple of days ago I offered an amendment in the Committee on Rules with the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) that would allow a debate as to how we can increase funding on special education costs so the Federal Government lives up to our 40 percent cost share. We are only at 15 percent today. If there is one issue that is having a devastating financial impact on local school districts from district to district across the country, it is the inability of the Federal Government to live up to our responsibility, our obligation to fund special-education expenses. Our amendment would have at least allowed a discussion of that in the context of the elementary- and secondary-education bill. Because it was not made in order, I would encourage my colleagues to oppose the rule and give us a chance to discuss this important issue.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and ranking member for their work on this very important issue, the issue of education. I am disappointed that like the collapse of a real energy policy for the American people, we are about to verge on a collapse of this legislation.

I offered two amendments that I thought would be very important to deal with the high degree of suicide and the difficulty that our young people are having today; to provide grants to ensure that we would have local funding and assistance for drug and violence prevention, and also to reduce the risk of children; to identify health risks for our children that play on

playgrounds where there is an exposure to tin, zinc, mercury and lead, that would have helped enhance the educational facilities that we have.

Finally, I think it is very important that we have additional resources for mental health services where there are those kinds of resources in the schools so that there is no stigma, and we can refer the children and their families to therapy and counseling and psychiatric health care.

As well, on this whole issue of testing, can one imagine testing a little 8-year-old all the time, focusing the teacher's resources on testing? We need to reconsider that, and we need more school construction. We could have done a better job on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask opposition to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in the support of education for all of our nation's children. I would like to thank and commend the work of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce in their effort to present a bipartisan bill for our consideration.

I am disappointed that the Rule for this bill does not take into consideration several points that I feel should be part of this effort to not leave any child behind. These are real problems with America's schools, but the fault is not isolated to one source, but are multiple in nature. We know that children are acting out a level of rage that challenges our ability to educate our children in a safe and nurturing environment.

The children of our nation are our country's greatest asset and should be the top priority of the Congress and the Administration. The lack of will to make critical and sometimes difficult decisions on children and education issues has damaged the ability of the United States to guarantee that the next generation will achieve a higher standard of living than their parents.

We must make sure that this bill to reform our nations education system truly does not leave any child behind. This bill reauthorizes federal elementary and secondary education programs (including the Title I compensatory education, teacher training and bilingual education programs) for five years (through FY 2006) and includes changes to current laws intended to improve the effectiveness of public schools and hold schools accountable.

The measure reported by the Education and the Workforce Committee has provisions intended to hold public schools accountable for improving the academic achievement of their students. It requires annual testing, flexibility in spending at the local school district level, as well as a new system that would require poorly performing public schools to improve or face consequences, which could include the removal of staff or the transfer of some of their students to other public schools.

As the founder and Co-Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I have a strong interest in the well being of our nation's children and would like to offer the following amendments for the committee's consideration as it prepares the rule for consideration of this historic legislation.

The Houston Independent School District (HISD) is the largest public school system in Texas and the seventh largest in the United

States. Our schools are dedicated to giving every student the best possible education through an intensive core curriculum and specialized, challenging instructional and career programs. HISD is working hard to become Houstonian's K-12 school system of choice, constantly improving and refining instruction and management to make them as effective, productive, and economical as possible.

HISD has become a leader in restructuring public education, most recently by establishing unprecedented new standards that every student must meet to earn promotion from one grade to the next. HISD's balanced approach to the teaching of reading has garnered national attention, and Project CLEAR, a comprehensive initiative to align curriculum with fundamental knowledge and skills expected of all students, is contributing to a steady rise in scholastic performance. HISD is bringing its school buildings up to high standards and building 10 new schools through Rebuild 2002, a \$678-million capital improvement program. In addition, HISD opened two new state-of-the-art high schools that were built thanks to the creation of tax increment zones that allow HISD to derive revenue from increases in property value through redevelopment. HISD is demonstrating the utmost managerial accountability through contractual arrangements with specialists in budgeting, purchasing, payroll, personnel management, food services, and maintenance that enable the school district to devote more resources directly to the classroom.

The 18th Congressional District of Houston serves a very diverse group of young people, 52 percent are Hispanic, 34 percent are African American, 10 percent are white, nearly 3 percent are Asian/Pacific Islander, and just under one percent are Native American. The district manages 295 campuses and educational programs: twenty-nine are high schools, 34 are middle schools, 186 are elementary schools, 19 are charter schools, 9 are community-based alternative programs and 18 are combined-level or other programs.

The heart of HISD are its teachers, principals and administrators, librarians, nurses and psychologist, support staff, parents, and board members. I can assure you that the City of Houston is extremely grateful. They have performed outstandingly and deserve special recognition; unfortunately our society does not offer the greatest financial rewards to our most valued citizens—teachers. However, the President's Award for Excellence in Elementary Mathematics and Science Teaching has become an excellent symbol of professional accomplishment as an educator.

In order that we do indeed not leave any child behind, we must first consider that not all children are the same. Their differences should not however, limit their opportunity for a good education in our nation's public schools.

As long as there exist a disparity in funding among school districts within states, and a disparity of education funding K-12 among the states there will continue to be disparities in the education of disadvantaged youth especially taking into consideration the socioeconomic limitations of these communities to augment the educational experience of their children. This must and should be acknowledged by the education reform legislation that we pass and send to the President's desk. We know the realities of education in the United

States are that many children are left behind, not at the discretion of the teacher, school district, parent or child, but under the pressures presented by a lack of adequate funding.

We must fully fund the Individuals with Disabilities Act when it comes up for reauthorization next year, but in the mean time there are thousands of children who are denied access to assistance because of the difficult decisions school districts are forced to make in the absence of adequate funding.

Speech and language difficulties affect children of all races in our nation. When a child cannot be understood then their opportunity for a good basic education is greatly diminished.

Because of the lack of funding going into IDEA, children like Jonathan Adam Roumo, who is three year's old Houstonian with a speech delay problem. School districts across our nation struggle with the few dollars provided by the federal government to provide services with children with disabilities.

Jonathan unfortunately is being left behind by the current state of affairs in our nation's education funding. Jonathan is a bright, intelligent little boy who is inquisitive and a challenge to his mother and father because of his interest in everything about his world.

Unfortunately, Jonathan also has difficulty being understood because the muscles along his tongue are too weak and affect how he says words. The tongue is an important organ of speech in human beings and as such is critical to being understood.

The muscles along Jonathan's tongue are at a stage in development that would equate with that of a much younger child, which means that although he has the innate intelligence and stimulation in his environment to speak, his physical ability to be understood is greatly hindered.

Because his parents were concerned about Jonathan's inability to make himself understood, they educated themselves about what was available in the public school system to help Jonathan. They learned about a speech-testing program in their local school district, and saw that Jonathan was tested. Jonathan did well in all areas of the test, which established that he did not need occupational therapy or physical therapy, but he needed speech therapy.

He was enrolled into a speech program in August of 2000 and made excellent progress. Unfortunately, Jonathan's mother was told that he could not go to pre-kindergarten, where he would continue to receive help because he did not have other types of disability associated with his speech limitations. To compound this situation his parents were told that they failed to meet income requirements, which prevent Jonathan's parents from getting him the help that he needs through the public school system.

There are thousands of Jonathans in our public schools who have the potential to do very well, with only a little support in speech development. Under current law Jonathan can receive thirty minutes of speech each week, but that is not enough to make sure that this child is not left behind.

Another serious area which must be addressed is mental health resources available to children and their parents in public school. I have introduced H.R. 73, a bill requiring the Secretary of Education to conduct research on children with dyslexia in the public school sys-

tem throughout our nation. Dyslexia is identifiable and treatable in children at an early age. For this reason, all children kindergarten through third grade must be given tests that measure the following knowledge skills: print; book; phonological awareness, phonics, and writing. These areas have been identified by child psychologist to be key to recognizing learning disabilities in very young children so that they may receive the proper help to insure that they are not left behind.

Further, I would offer that we should rethink what language programs should be used to accomplish. If a child with a speech impediment such as stuttering, lisp, or other delayed speech cannot be understood by a teacher or fellow students, then that child's ability to succeed in the classroom is limited. Today, we consider that child to be disabled and the rules governing the role of schools to provide proper instruction are not uniform. I would offer that if a child cannot be understood that their language barrier be addressed as early and aggressively as possible by removing all economic requirements for that child to get help through the public school system at as early an age as possible. Violence in public schools have cast a chilling shadow through the halls of education in our nation.

The reality of children's lives today are far removed from the experiences of previous generations. They are killing each other and killing themselves at alarming rates.

Currently, there are 13.7 million children in this country with a diagnosable mental health disorder, yet less than 20 percent of these children received the treatment they need. At least one in five children and adolescents has a diagnosable mental, emotional, or behavioral problem that can lead to school failure, substance abuse, violence or suicide. However, 75 to 80 percent of these children do not receive any services in the form of specialty treatment or some form of mental health intervention.

The White House and the U.S. Surgeon General have recognized that mental health needs to be a national priority in this nation's debate about comprehensive health care.

Suicide is the eighth leading cause of death in the United States, accounting for more than 1 percent of all deaths.

The National Mental Health Association reports that most people who commit suicide have a mental or emotional disorder. The most common is depression.

According to the 1999 Report of the U.S. Surgeon General, for young people 15-24 years old, suicide is the third leading cause of death behind intentional injury and homicide.

Persons under the age of 25 accounted for 15 percent of all suicides in 1997. Between 1980 and 1997, suicide rates for those 15-19 years old increased 11 percent and for those between the ages of 10-14, the suicide rates increased 99 percent since 1980.

More teenagers died from suicide than from cancer, heart disease, AIDS, birth defects, strokes, influenza and chronic lung disease combined.

Within every 1 hour and 57 minutes, a person under the age of 25 completes suicide.

Black male youth (ages 10-14) have shown the largest increase in suicide rates since 1980 compared to other youth groups by sex and ethnicity, increasing 276 percent.

Almost 12 young people between the ages of 15-24 die every day by suicide.

In a study of gay male and lesbian youth suicide, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services found lesbian and gay youth are two to six times more likely to attempt suicide than other youth and account for up to 30 percent of all completed teen suicides.

We must also be prepared and capable of protecting children from other sources of harm that are present in their environment, such as lead, zinc chloride, tin, and mercury.

I appreciate the work done by the Committees to bring this measure before the House for consideration, but I feel that is lacking in a complete and balanced approach to meet the needs of educating all of our nation's children.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me this time.

I rise in opposition to the rule. The bipartisanship on our committee on this education bill taught us a lesson on how to get along and work in a bipartisan fashion. It is a lesson that the leadership of this House has not learned.

Here is what is wrong with this rule: it is a delicate compromise between the Democrats and the Republicans. There are many Republicans who believe that block grants called Straight A's should be included, and they will have their chance to make that argument on this floor. There are many Republicans who believe that private school vouchers should be included, and they will have their chance to make their argument on this floor. But there are many Democrats who believe that an extension of the class size reduction program ought to be included, and we will not have our chance to make that argument on this floor. There are many of us who believe that a school construction program should be added, and we will not have our chance to make that argument on this floor.

The lesson of bipartisanship that was taught by the committee has been ignored by the House majority leadership. Their rule should be rejected.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the proposed rule on H.R. 1, No Child Left Behind Act. Because education is such an important issue, I feel that rules must be introduced on the floor so that all people can express their opinions in the general debate. The Committee on Rules only allowed one amendment from the Democratic side, and that is wrong.

I went before the Committee on Rules and asked that my amendment, which would keep the title I monies at a 50 percent level, be included. When title I began, 75 percent of the money

was targeted for poor children. It was the Federal Government saying, we need to assist these schools where there is an imbalance in funding. The imbalance still is there; but it was reduced from 75 percent of poverty to 60 percent of poverty, to 50 percent of poverty, and now it is 40 percent of poverty. On the other hand, some of the people on the other side of the aisle say, we have a 25 percent amendment coming up at you next time.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to leave every child behind. I ask for the rejection of the rule.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), my distinguished colleague and a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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

I would like to urge strong support for this rule. It is a fair rule. It will allow us to vote on amendments which will restore the President's plan.

The President's reform plan for education was a delicately balanced approach, providing more flexibility to the States, a program to empower parents by allowing them to make more choices in their children's education, and holding schools accountable for the results that they would deliver; a delicate balance of saying, we are going to give States more process freedom. We are no longer going to hold them accountable for the process by which they spend their money, but we are going to make sure that every child goes through and achieves the learning that we want. We are going to focus on results accountability.

This rule allows us to have a vote on restoring State flexibility, which was ripped out of the committee mark. It allows us to build on the local flexibility and parental empowerment that are so critical to the President's plan.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

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

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the ranking member and the chairman for their commendable efforts at crafting a commonsense, bipartisan education bill. But I am going to ask my colleagues to vote against this rule which brings partisanship and prevents the bringing of commonsense amendments which would improve this bill.

Our efforts at keeping class size reduction as a separate source of funding, maintaining our national priority on bringing smaller class sizes to schools across this country was not permitted to be brought to the floor. Our efforts to bring school construction to the floor in order to be fully debated were not permitted to be brought to the floor. Class size reduction and school construction are two priority issues in American education; and yet we will

not have a chance to discuss these bipartisan, commonsense issues. I regret that very much, and I ask my colleagues to vote against this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), and I know he will use it well.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of talk about accountability, holding students accountable and teachers and schools. There is one entity that is never mentioned, even though States are responsible for the certification of teachers, the setting of curriculums, the entire determination about how schools are going to be provided resources. There is nothing anywhere about trying to get States to be responsible once and for all for the education of poor children.

The Congress, in 1965, 35 years ago, passed the title I law, which we are getting ready to reauthorize, and since then, still, States have failed poor children.

I would hope that we would have a rule that would allow us to seek more accountability. I think there could be consensus between Democrats and Republicans on that point.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), my distinguished colleague.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I support the rule. I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), but I must agree with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) that an America that builds prisons, but not schools, is headed in the wrong direction.

I am asking the Republican leadership to take a good look at the position of the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), and when we go to conference, consider putting some construction money in for schools. But I am inclined to support the bill, and I thank the Republican Party for giving consideration to the request of the gentleman from New York.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield my remaining 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

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

I rise in opposition to this rule.

□ 1345

This is a rule for education, yet it is not a very smart rule, because it does not allow us to have the debate and vote on school construction and school modernization.

Mr. Speaker, all of the science tells us that children do better in smaller classes, and indeed, in smaller schools, in some cases. Children are smart. We cannot tell them that education is important to them, that it is about their self-fulfillment, about their way to earn a living and our competitiveness

internationally, and yet send them to schools that are in disrepair, instead of sending them to smaller classes where they will get the attention they need and classrooms which are wired for the future.

Children are smart. They see the contradiction. If education is so important, why then is it not important to the Democrats and to the Republicans, to the Congress of the United States?

That is why I cannot understand for the life of me why an education bill would come to this floor, after all the science this Congress has paid for and told us that children need smaller classes, and this Republican Party will not even allow us the opportunity to debate that amendment on the floor.

I urge our colleagues to vote no on this very unsmart rule on the education bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. I am disappointed that the Andrews-Saxton-Maloney-Horn amendment was not made in order.

Our amendment would have provided much-needed Federal grants to organizations so that they can teach today's youth about the Holocaust.

Unfortunately, many schools and communities around the country have not learned about the Holocaust because their schools do not have the funds or tools to each about this tragic event in world history.

There is no question: teaching children about the horror and tragedy of the Holocaust will create a generation of youth in America who are less likely to commit hate crimes, and who are more likely to mature into adults who will envision and work toward peaceful world relations.

This is exactly why the Andrews-Saxton-Maloney-Horn amendment is so important.

We need programs in our schools that teach the consequences of intolerance and hate.

In denying the House a vote on our amendment, the majority is denying our children a chance to learn about one of the most tragic events in history.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), who has been such an integral of this effort.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) is recognized for 2½ minutes to close.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Committee on Rules for a fair rule.

I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER), and the members of our committee for a fair and open debate and a bipartisan bill.

However, Mr. Speaker, as we close this debate, if we think about our red or green vote, I want Members to look at what we are really talking about. To

my left is a chart which shows that over the history of funding for public education in Title I, while the gold bars which represent money have gone up astronomically, today, the same as it was 25 years ago, reading proficiency remains at the bottom. It is time for true reform.

On the issue of building schools, they will not tell us that America's unmet need at the local level, and it is their responsibility, is \$300 billion. They also will not tell us that represents 2.5 times more money than has been spent on Title I since it began.

This is not about building buildings, this is about building and changing the lives of America's most disadvantaged children. It has been said that our children are a message we send to a time we shall never see. I am proud we have a committee and I am proud we have a President that has laid it on the line.

When Members get ready to vote red, I want Members to look in the eyes of a disadvantaged poor child in Members' rural or urban districts and ask what kind of message they want to send to a time they will not see.

As a politician, I want Members to think about how much they would respect a President who brings a bill forward with accountability that will allow us to measure our progress within his term of office.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not a promise, it is a hope. It is a hope for the future, not of buildings and inanimate objects, but of the sacred treasure of the lives of America's youngest and most disadvantaged children.

The Committee on Rules will allow competitive debate over controversial issues, and in the end I hope Members' green vote on this rule results in a green vote on this bill that leaves no child behind, and sends a message to our future that we would love for our future to see.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule for H.R. 1, the Elementary and Secondary Education Reauthorization bill. This rule prevents Democrats from offering key education priorities as amendments to the bill—including School Modernization and Class Size Reduction. In addition, I am troubled that an amendment I offered in the Rules Committee to establish a program in the Department of Education to help school districts produce "high performance" school buildings was rejected.

The amendment I offered in the Rules Committee—the "High Performance Schools Program"—takes the concept of "whole buildings" and puts it into the context of our schools. My amendment would have established a program in the Department of Education to help school districts produce "high performance" school buildings. It would provide block grants to state offices of education that would then be allocated as grants to school districts for building design and technical assistance. These grants would be available to school districts that are faced with rising elementary and secondary school enrollments, that can't afford to make major investments in construction or renovation, and that commit to work with the state agencies to produce school facilities that

incorporate a "high performance" building approach.

We wouldn't dream of putting only manual typewriters in new school buildings—we would install today's computer technology. Nor should we build yesterday's "energy inefficient," non-sustainable, and less effective schools. Our kids are our country's future, and they should have the best school facilities, especially if they will cost less and benefit us all in other ways.

As the Congress begins debate on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the important legislation that governs our nation's education priorities, I fear the House Rules Committee has missed a golden opportunity. I am especially disappointed that today—a day when Congress is focused on energy issues because of the release of the administration's energy plan—the Rules Committee chose to overlook this opportunity to take care of our children and our environment at the same time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

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.

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 201, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 125]  
YEAS—219

Aderholt	Crenshaw	Gutknecht
Akin	Culberson	Hansen
Armey	Cunningham	Hart
Bachus	Davis, Jo Ann	Hastert
Baker	Davis, Tom	Hastings (WA)
Ballenger	Deal	Hayes
Barr	DeLay	Hayworth
Bartlett	DeMint	Hefley
Barton	Diaz-Balart	Herger
Bass	Doolittle	Hilleary
Bereuter	Dreier	Hobson
Biggert	Duncan	Hoeksstra
Bilirakis	Dunn	Horn
Blunt	Ehlers	Hostettler
Boehlert	Ehrlich	Houghton
Boehner	Emerson	Hulshof
Bonilla	English	Hutchinson
Bono	Everett	Hyde
Brady (TX)	Ferguson	Isakson
Brown (SC)	Flake	Issa
Bryant	Fletcher	Istook
Burr	Foley	Jenkins
Burton	Fossella	Johnson (CT)
Buyer	Frelinghuysen	Johnson (IL)
Callahan	Gallely	Johnson, Sam
Calvert	Gekas	Jones (NC)
Camp	Gibbons	Keller
Cannon	Gilchrest	Kelly
Cantor	Gillmor	Kennedy (MN)
Capito	Gilman	Kerns
Castle	Goode	King (NY)
Chabot	Goodlatte	Kingston
Chambliss	Goss	Kirk
Coble	Graham	Knollenberg
Collins	Granger	Kolbe
Combest	Graves	LaHood
Cooksey	Green (WI)	Largent
Cox	Greenwood	Latham
Crane	Grucci	LaTourette

Leach	Pryce (OH)	Smith (TX)
Lewis (CA)	Putnam	Souder
Lewis (KY)	Quinn	Spence
Linder	Radanovich	Stearns
LoBiondo	Ramstad	Stump
Manzullo	Regula	Sununu
McCrery	Rehberg	Sweeney
McHugh	Reynolds	Tancredo
McInnis	Riley	Tauzin
McKeon	Rogers (KY)	Taylor (NC)
Mica	Rogers (MI)	Terry
Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher	Thomas
Miller, Gary	Ros-Lehtinen	Thornberry
Moran (KS)	Roukema	Thune
Morella	Royce	Tiahrt
Myrick	Ryan (WI)	Tiberi
Nethercutt	Ryun (KS)	Toomey
Ney	Saxton	Traficant
Northup	Scarborough	Upton
Norwood	Schaffer	Vitter
Nussle	Schrock	Walden
Osborne	Sensenbrenner	Walsh
Ose	Sessions	Wamp
Otter	Shadegg	Watkins
Oxley	Shaw	Watts (OK)
Paul	Shays	Weldon (FL)
Pence	Sherwood	Weldon (PA)
Peterson (PA)	Shimkus	Weller
Petri	Shuster	Whitfield
Pickering	Simmons	Wicker
Pitts	Simpson	Wilson
Platts	Skeen	Wolf
Pombo	Smith (MI)	Young (AK)
Portman	Smith (NJ)	Young (FL)

## NAYS—201

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Meek (FL)
Ackerman	Gordon	Menendez
Allen	Green (TX)	Millender-
Andrews	Gutierrez	McDonald
Baca	Hall (OH)	Miller, George
Baird	Hall (TX)	Mink
Baldacci	Harman	Moakley
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Mollohan
Barcia	Hill	Moore
Barrett	Hilliard	Murtha
Becerra	Hinchev	Nadler
Bentsen	Hinojosa	Napolitano
Berkley	Hoefel	Neal
Berman	Holden	Oberstar
Berry	Holt	Obey
Blagojevich	Honda	Olver
Blumenauer	Hookey	Ortiz
Bonior	Hoyer	Owens
Boswell	Inslee	Pallone
Boucher	Israel	Pascarell
Boyd	Jackson (IL)	Pastor
Brown (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Payne
Brown (OH)	(TX)	Pelosi
Capps	Jefferson	Peterson (MN)
Capuano	John	Phelps
Cardin	Johnson, E. B.	Pomeroy
Carson (IN)	Jones (OH)	Price (NC)
Carson (OK)	Kanjorski	Rahall
Clay	Kaptur	Rangel
Clayton	Kennedy (RI)	Reyes
Clement	Kildee	Rivers
Clyburn	Kind (WI)	Rodriguez
Conyers	Klecza	Roemer
Costello	Kucinich	Ross
Coyne	LaFalce	Rothman
Cramer	Lampson	Roybal-Allard
Crowley	Langevin	Rush
Cummings	Lantos	Sabo
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez
Davis (FL)	Larsen (CT)	Sanders
Davis (IL)	Lee	Sandlin
DeFazio	Levin	Sawyer
DeGette	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
Delahunt	Lipinski	Schiff
DeLauro	Lofgren	Scott
Deutsch	Lowey	Serrano
Dicks	Lucas (KY)	Sherman
Dingell	Luther	Shows
Doggett	Maloney (CT)	Skelton
Dooley	Maloney (NY)	Slaughter
Doyle	Markey	Smith (WA)
Edwards	Mascara	Snyder
Engel	Matheson	Solis
Eshoo	Matsui	Spratt
Etheridge	McCarthy (MO)	Stark
Evans	McCarthy (NY)	Stenholm
Farr	McCollum	Strickland
Fattah	McDermott	Stupak
Filner	McGovern	Tanner
Ford	McIntyre	Tauscher
Frank	McKinney	Taylor (MS)
Frost	McNulty	Thompson (CA)
Gephardt	Meehan	Thurman

Tierney	Velazquez	Wexler
Towns	Visclosky	Woolsey
Turner	Watt (NC)	Wu
Udall (CO)	Waxman	Wynn
Udall (NM)	Weiner	

## NOT VOTING—13

Bishop	Ganske	Moran (VA)
Borski	Hunter	Thompson (MS)
Brady (PA)	Kilpatrick	Waters
Condit	Lucas (OK)	
Cubin	Meeks (NY)	

□ 1409

Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HOFFEL and Mrs. MEEK of Florida changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GREENWOOD changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

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 against:

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 125, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire about next week's schedule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that there will be no further votes in the House for the week.

The House will next meet for legislative business on Monday, May 21 at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The House will consider a number of measures under suspension of the rules, including the following bills:

H.R. 1831, the Small Business Liability Protection Act; and

H.R. 1885, the 245(i) Extension Act of 2001.

A complete list of suspensions will be distributed to Members' offices tomorrow.

On Monday, no recorded votes are expected before 6 p.m.

On Tuesday through Thursday, the House will consider the following measures:

H.R. 1, the No Child Left Behind Act; and

H.R. 1836, the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act Conference Report.

On Friday, the House will not be in session for the start of the Memorial Day district work period.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that explanation.

If I might inquire further, many Members, of course, have travel plans for next Thursday evening, does the gentleman anticipate any event that would prevent our departing at least by 6 p.m. on Thursday?

Mr. MCKEON. If the gentleman will continue to yield, we hope to get the

tax conference report back by Thursday so that we can get that passed Thursday, but we do not have a guarantee of that.

Mr. DOGGETT. Of course, the conference has not been convened because the Senate has not acted. Is the gentleman saying in the event the tax reconciliation conference report, if that is not available by Thursday night, we might be facing some interference with the Memorial Day weekend?

Mr. MCKEON. Our goal is to finish that up on Thursday, and we cannot guarantee that, but that is our goal.

□ 1415

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, backing up to Monday, does the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) anticipate that there will be any business other than suspensions on Monday evening?

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we may start the general debate on the education bill.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it had been my understanding that was beginning on Tuesday, but there is a possibility of general debate, not amendments on Monday night?

Mr. MCKEON. There would be no education votes, but there is a possibility that we would have the general debate begin.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, because there is such interest in the education bill, is the gentleman from California informed as to what days we would be considering the education bill next week?

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, we hope to finish it Tuesday, but it could spill over into Wednesday.

Mr. DOGGETT. The gentleman mentioned both H.R. 1831 and H.R. 1885. Does he know on which days those are most likely to be considered?

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, those will be Monday under suspension and voted on after 6 o'clock.

Mr. DOGGETT. All right, Mr. Speaker. Then on H.R. 1 and H.R. 1836, when might they be considered?

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1 will be Tuesday and Wednesday and hopefully H.R. 1836 on Thursday.

## NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 143 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1.

□ 1416

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.