

Miller (FL)	Reyes	Snyder
Miller, Gary	Reynolds	Solis
Miller, George	Rivers	Souder
Mink	Rodriguez	Spratt
Mollohan	Roemer	Stark
Moore	Rogers (KY)	Stearns
Moran (VA)	Rogers (MI)	Stenholm
Morella	Rohrabacher	Stump
Nadler	Ros-Lehtinen	Sununu
Napolitano	Ross	Sweeney
Neal	Rothman	Tanner
Nethercutt	Roukema	Tauscher
Ney	Royal-Allard	Tauzin
Northup	Royce	Taylor (NC)
Norwood	Rush	Terry
Nussle	Ryan (WI)	Thomas
Obey	Ryun (KS)	Thornberry
Olver	Sanchez	Thune
Ortiz	Sanders	Thurman
Osborne	Sandlin	Tiberi
Ose	Sawyer	Tierney
Otter	Saxton	Toomey
Owens	Scarborough	Towns
Pascarella	Schakowsky	Traficant
Pastor	Schiff	Turner
Paul	Schrock	Upton
Payne	Sensenbrenner	Velazquez
Pelosi	Serrano	Vitter
Pence	Sessions	Walden
Peterson (PA)	Shadegg	Walsh
Petri	Shaw	Watkins (OK)
Phelps	Shays	Watson (CA)
Pickering	Sherman	Watt (NC)
Pitts	Sherwood	Watts (OK)
Platts	Shimkus	Waxman
Pomeroy	Shows	Weiner
Portman	Shuster	Weldon (FL)
Price (NC)	Simmons	Weldon (PA)
Pryce (OH)	Simpson	Wexler
Putnam	Skeen	Whitfield
Quinn	Skelton	Wilson
Radanovich	Slaughter	Wolf
Rahall	Smith (MI)	Woolsey
Rangel	Smith (NJ)	Wynn
Regula	Smith (TX)	Young (FL)
Rehberg	Smith (WA)	

NAYS—47

Aderholt	Kennedy (MN)	Scott
Borski	Kucinich	Strickland
Brady (PA)	Larsen (WA)	Stupak
Capuano	LoBiondo	Taylor (MS)
Costello	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
English	McNulty	Tiahrt
Filner	Menendez	Udall (CO)
Fossella	Moran (KS)	Udall (NM)
Gutierrez	Oberstar	Visclosky
Gutknecht	Pallone	Wamp
Hefley	Peterson (MN)	Waters
Hillenary	Pombo	Weller
Hilliard	Ramstad	Wicker
Johnson, E. B.	Sabo	Wu
Jones (OH)	Schaffer	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—13

Crane	Istook	Riley
Culberson	Maloney (CT)	Spence
Gibbons	Murtha	Young (AK)
Goss	Myrick	
Hutchinson	Oxley	

□ 1048

Mr. OBERSTAR changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON
H.R. 1, NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND
ACT OF 2001

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule XXII, and by direction of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I move to take from the Speaker’s table the bill (H.R. 1) to close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind, with a Sen-

ate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), for him to control under this debate.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has been involved in education policy since 1965. Thirty-six years later we are finally getting serious about demanding results for our Nation’s children.

As the Chicago Tribune noted recently, “Congress has spent the last four decades appropriating massive amounts of money to try to even out the educational experiences that disadvantaged children receive compared to their more fortunate peers. And in return for that long-term multi-billion dollar investment, we have gotten more disappointment. Most states show continuing gaps in achievement between poor and middle-class kids, and between white and minority students. Meanwhile, our students have fallen behind those of other countries.”

Washington finally seems ready to put an end to this era of lost opportunity, thanks to President Bush and reform-minded legislators on both sides of the political aisle.

The No Child Left Behind Act, H.R. 1, passed this House on May 23 by a vote of 384 to 45, and reflects each of the four pillars of President Bush’s education reform plan: accountability and testing, flexibility and local control, funding for what works, and expanded parental options.

H.R. 1 embodies President Bush’s vision for education in America. That vision says a number of important things.

It says that when States use Federal education dollars, they should be accountable for getting results.

It says that parents should be empowered with data about the schools their children are attending, the qualifications of the teachers teaching their children, and their children’s academic progress.

It says Federal education resources should be focused on helping students who are in the most need of help. We should increase for what works and ensure Federal education dollars are targeted to where they will make the biggest impact for our neediest children.

It says that to meet the tough new accountability standards, teachers and local school officials should have greater flexibility to decide how to address their students’ unique needs.

And it says the parents want to choose the best education possible for their children, regardless of income level and/or their ethnic background.

The bills passed by the House and Senate have much in common, but there are some important differences that must be resolved.

We differ from our colleagues in the Senate on the issue of targeting resources to our most disadvantaged students, a goal that I think the House version embraces. We do believe that Federal education resources should be targeted to helping the most disadvantaged of our students and helping them to learn to read, to learn English, and to learn math skills. Accordingly, we passed a bill that focuses funds toward our poorest students, streamlines bureaucracy and refocuses Federal education dollars towards students who need help the most.

The Senate bill, by contrast, actually expands the overall number of programs significantly. It creates many more new programs than does the House bill, and the overall number of programs is significantly higher. According to the Congressional Research Service, there are 55 currently funded elementary and secondary education programs, and the Senate bill would increase that number to 89.

Many new programs added by the Senate may have merit. But the more programs we create, the harder it becomes to target Federal resources to the very students that we are trying to help. The more programs we add, the more we force disadvantaged students to compete for available funds.

The fact of the matter is that these students already have enough to compete against. Life’s circumstances are competition enough for most of them. They should not have to compete for the opportunity to learn to read, to learn English, or to learn to add and subtract and multiply.

There are other areas where we are going to need to address issues as well:

We must assist on real accountability. Parents should be empowered with data, and States should be required to demonstrate that they are using Federal resources to close the achievement gaps that exist between disadvantaged students and their peers.

We must give States and local school districts the flexibility they need to address their students’ unique needs and meet the higher expectations that we are placing on them.

And we must ensure that there is an escape route for students trapped in dangerous, failing schools that just do not change. The House bill provides for immediate public and charter school choice to parents with children in failing public schools. We hope our Senate colleagues will join us in embracing this new option for parents.

We look forward to taking the final step in what has been a very long process this year. We are looking forward to sending to the President an education bill that reflects his principles and begins making an immediate impact for students in schools all across America.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.