

would allow the gentlewoman to go ahead and run down her time that I might close.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would allow the gentlewoman, with the permission of the Speaker, to go ahead and make her closing.

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

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this open rule. I look forward to hearing the debate on this legislation to reform Federal Deposit Insurance, and am hopeful that we can pass this legislation today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, today for the first time, I have had an opportunity now after being on the Committee of Rules for 8 years to have the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) present the rule where we have worked together. I enjoyed this very much. I appreciate the gentlewoman working with us.

Mr. Speaker, I support this common sense legislation to improve the Federal Deposit Insurance system, and encourage reinvesting in our country's local communities.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this open rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 366, VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION FOR THE FUTURE ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 254 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 254

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. 366) to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998 to strengthen and improve programs under that Act. 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 one hour 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. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, 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 or 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. ISSA). The gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 254 provides for the consideration of H.R. 366, the Vocational and Technical Education for the Future Act, under a structured rule. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, and provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

The rule makes in order the amendments printed in the Rules report and provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand before the House today in support of this rule, and for the underlying legislation, H.R. 366, the Vocational and Technical Education for the Future Act.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the Chairman and the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the subcommittee chairman, the original sponsors of the bill and many other committee members on both sides of the aisle, have put forward a bipartisan reauthorization of the Perkins Vocational Education Funding Programs, which have helped and will continue to help our Nation's young people, as well as older workers, attain the real-world technical skills that are vital in today's highly competitive world marketplace.

I make special note that this legislation was reported out of the full Committee on Education and the Workforce unanimously on a voice vote, and with no surviving opposition. This legislation reauthorizes the Carl Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act through fiscal year 2011, and it would authorize \$1.3 billion for grants to the States in fiscal year 2006, and ensure that all States are held harmless, and receive at least at a minimum the amount of vocational education funding as was in fiscal year 2005.

Mr. Speaker, this is a program that has been funded in one way or another from Congress since 1917. In talking to some educators from Utah who happen to be with me today, and I was meeting with today, to find out how this works in the real world, this particular program in one district in Utah, provides for a student center coordinator and a workforce coordinator within the district, a separate student counselor within the alternate learning program, and English as Second Language language assistance to help those trying to gain these skills to improve their ability to communicate within the language.

All of these programs come from this money. All of these programs could have been there without this money, but it would mean that other programs essential in the education community would have to be cut to compensate for that.

This bill goes beyond reauthorization and incorporates several changes to the past Perkins programs. Among those improvements is the combining and streamlining of two existing funding streams, the traditional State grant funding with a tech prep funding, and encouraging the States to apply the higher educational goals of the tech prep program in mathematics and science to all of the recipients.

At the same time, it would also give States and local recipients critical flexibility in customizing their implementation plans for incorporating tech prep education goals based on local needs and local concerns.

Mr. Speaker, this approach taken by this legislation increases local accountability for the use of these funds, and, according to the Congressional Budget Office review of H.R. 366, as published in the committee report, the bill does not contain any unfunded Federal mandates on State and local governments.

The bill does recognize that State and local communities shall have the final say as to what is taught in local schools and explicitly rejects the one-size-fits-all Federal standard for curriculum or academic content.

And, finally, Mr. Speaker, this bill reduces the amount of funding that can be consumed in administrative overhead from 5 percent to 2 percent, and instead pushes these extra cost savings out to the local recipients, actually resulting in more funding available on the local level for more student and better student programs.

This rule makes some very important amendments in order. The rule is fair. The rule allows this legislation to move forward.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I would urge adoption of the rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 366, the Vocational and Technical Education For the Future Act, is a good news/bad news piece of legislation. The good news is that this is a bipartisan bill. And the Republican majority in the Education and the Workforce Committee supports these important vocational programs, and were determined to bring this reauthorization bill to the House floor.

The bad news is that these same Republican leaders voted just last week for a budget resolution that eliminates all funding for these programs in fiscal year 2006. The good news, which we will no doubt hear from some of our Republican colleagues today, is that they are determined to restore some of the funding for the Perkins Vocational Education Programs when the House starts moving forward individual appropriations bills, and that there is room to fund these programs under the budget education numbers.

The bad news is that the education funding in the budget resolution is so limited that it already requires deep cuts and even elimination of many other critical education programs. So to restore the \$1.3 billion for vocational, career and technical education and training programs that the Republicans just voted to eliminate from the Federal budget, will require cutting even deeper an additional \$1.3 billion from all the other education programs.

Moving on, Mr. Speaker, the good news is that H.R. 366 increases State and local accountability for these programs and they are funded. The bill requires each local recipient to establish levels of performance for high school and post secondary students in core skills and knowledge. This is an important new responsibility for local educators, and for the States that must negotiate and monitor these accountability measures.

The bad news is that this bill does not authorize, let alone provide, additional funding or resources to ensure that local schools and States can successfully carry out these new responsibilities and requirements.

We have all seen this before, Mr. Speaker. We have seen this in the No Child Left Behind Act where the law mandates new responsibilities, new accountability measures, and new administrative tasks, but fails to provide the necessary resources to ensure their success.

At least in No Child Left Behind, Congress authorized the funding to support these new mandates, even though the President and the Republican Congress failed to provide the funding to carry them out successfully.

H.R. 366, does not even pretend to authorize additional resources. It just requires this additional workload happen. In fact, H.R. 366 actually reduces the setaside for State administrative funds while State responsibilities are being increased. Mr. Speaker, we used to call these unfunded mandates by the Federal Government, but I guess times have changed.

Finally, this bill consolidates into one block of funding both the Perkins State grant program for vocational education, and the tech prep program that prepares students and current worker for highly skilled technical occupations.

The good news is that this is an effort to save the tech prep program. The bad news is that history has shown us that when programs are rolled together into one block grant, they inevitably end up receiving less funding over time than they would have if they remained separated programs.

While this authorization requires the consolidated grant programs to ensure that fiscal year 2006 tech prep presumes received the same level of funding as in fiscal year 2005, it authorizes no such assurances for fiscal years 2007 through 2011.

But what does it matter, Mr. Speaker? There is no money for these programs in the 2006 budget resolution. So why quibble over the details of the authorization, when it is all window dressing anyway?

Mr. Speaker, Federal support for career and technical education is a critical means of ensuring that our students and our future workforce are well trained for the jobs of the present and the future. The career and technical education programs funded under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Education Act, and reauthorized by H.R. 366, provide the training and the skills for high school and community college students to prepare for their post secondary education and employment and ensure their future financial success.

□ 1115

It is shameful, then, that President Bush and the Republican-controlled Congress have undermined these critical programs by presenting budgets and approving budget resolutions that eliminate their funding.

America has lost over 1.7 million private sector jobs since the start of the Bush administration, and hundreds of thousands of American jobs have been outsourced to other countries. The Republican response has been to short-change our students and workers instead of investing in them.

Businesses and rapidly growing industries face the prospect that many high-skilled, high-wage jobs will go unfilled or be outsourced because they

cannot find enough qualified American workers. At the same time, millions of young adults ages 16 to 24 lack the skills needed to secure jobs that pay more than poverty-level wages.

Rather than invest more funds in career and technical education and training in our high schools and community colleges, President Bush and the Republican Congress have chosen to terminate the entire \$1.3 billion Federal investment in these programs. Nearly half of all high school students and one-third of college students who take vocational courses will be denied funding, leaving many schools and communities unable to prepare these students to successfully enter the workforce.

Mr. Speaker, in Worcester, Massachusetts, the city has invested in constructing a modern vocational high school to serve over 1,000 students, recognizing the importance of training these students to enter the manufacturing and high-tech companies of central Massachusetts. Currently, several students at Worcester Vocational High School have received Skills USA Awards to the Vocational Industrial Clubs of America; and one student, Christopher Bradley, placed third in national competitions.

Just recently, three other vocational students, Amanda Niquette, Alicia Sheperd and Amy Trujillo, received an award for their work in raising community awareness about hunger. They created public service ads on hunger, appeared on local talk shows, and organized a breakfast that raised over \$3,000 for the Worcester Food Bank.

Mr. Speaker, these students and tens of thousands of students just like them across our Nation deserve the support of this Congress. But the Republican majority is turning its back on these young men and women and their hopes to contribute to our communities and our national economy.

While it is important to reauthorize these programs, it is just as important to make sure that they are fully funded.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority cannot declare with a straight face that it supports these programs by passing H.R. 366 this week, when just last week in a rush to the House floor it approved a budget based on eliminating all funding for these programs.

I recognize that authorizations and appropriations are different bills; but they are all part of the same process, namely, the budget process. In fact, the budget resolution is like the mother of all authorization and appropriations bills. Mr. Speaker, despite what I expect to be widespread support for this bill, and I will vote for this bill, I do not want my colleagues on the other side to mislead the American public by claiming that this is a good and fair rule.

Yes, two of the three amendments made in order are Democratic amendments, but the Republican leadership denied five other amendments from being offered on the floor today. My

friends on the other side of the aisle will say it is a good thing that two-thirds of the amendments made in order are Democratic amendments. Let me respond right now. Denying five of eight amendments, a total of two-thirds of the total amendments offered before the Committee on Rules, is undemocratic and it is one more example of Republican leadership trying to stifle debate in this country on very important issues.

Of those amendments not made in order today, Mr. Speaker, the one that is most troublesome is the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member on the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

The Miller amendment is simple. It prohibits the Department of Education from using Federal funds to pay journalists or media commentators to engage in publicity or propaganda. It also would have required prepackaged news segments paid with Federal funds to disclose such funding in the segment. This is a simple and straightforward amendment. Republicans and Democrats in this body and the Senate have publicly condemned the way President Bush paid Armstrong Williams and other journalists to publicly support partisan and controversial administration policies.

This amendment does not blame anyone. It just says that no administration now and in the future can use journalists to act as paid ambassadors for administration policy. Why would the Republican leadership deny this amendment? Why should this administration's actions be condemned but not prohibited?

My Republican friends, I am sure, will not answer these questions; but let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that this is just one more case of the Republican leadership's actions not matching their rhetoric.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments from the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN). If I could go through the speech itself and divide it into two halves of it, the points that the gentleman made under "bad news" basically are not germane to this particular bill and are issues that will be addressed in other positions that will be coming through at another time and another place. I am sure when we do address those particular issues on relevant pieces of legislation, the comments that the record number of Federal money that has gone into education over the last 5 years will be clearly made and clearly understood.

However, I also do appreciate his good points that he said because each of those good points did, indeed, deal with this particular bill, this particular program and they were laudatory; and I am assuming that that

means that this particular bill has some positive aspects that are within the gentleman from Massachusetts' (Mr. MCGOVERN) purview.

I appreciate the gentleman bringing up what I think is one of the strengths of this particular bill which deals with the administrative costs and realizing fully that when we are talking about education there are two funds that will drive education. One is program costs. The other is the maintenance and operation costs. Within a traditional education program, once the maintenance and operation is there, that becomes a standard cost and standard form and everything else is driven by the program aspect which is almost always salaries. To tie administrative costs to that as a clear percentage makes a lot of sense.

In this particular area when you are dealing with a system that has both programs as well as the operational costs that are separate, but while the program costs may be constant, the operational costs, therefore, come in uniquely motivated fashion, which is high front end. To try to put a percentage on that and drive that automatically skews the entire area that deals with administration. That is why it is one of the bright parts of this particular bill, to try and scale back that so that more money can go into the programs and directly help kids and people trying to get jobs, as opposed to just simply the administration.

And I agree once again with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) that at least without this bill, nothing goes forward as providing vocational, technical, agricultural training. And there are high-paying jobs out there begging for this kind of technical training that we need. I have seen them. I have seen the programs that do that.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, before I introduce our next speaker, let me respond to the gentleman. When he mentioned the fact, I think he used the word that some of these amendments were not germane to the bill, it is my understanding that all eight Democratic amendments were cleared by the Parliamentarian of this House as being germane. And if we had an open rule, every single one of them would have been germane to this bill and could have been offered. So, again, it is puzzling to me why some of these amendments were denied.

I would also say to the gentleman, the point I was trying to make is that while there is a lot in this reauthorization bill that is good in terms of reauthorizing programs, it seems inconsistent with the budget resolution that the Republican leadership passed just last week that eliminates a significant amount of funding from the education budget.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I have concerns about this bill which I hoped would be addressed in the full House today and during conference with the Senate, because this bill is the result of a bipartisan process in our subcommittee and the committee as a whole.

I believe, however, that to continue that bipartisan process, the full House should have been able to consider this bill under an open rule. At the very minimum, I think the rule should have included all eight of the Democratic amendments that came before the Committee on Rules last evening.

The Miller amendment, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is our full committee ranking member, was submitted as an important amendment that is designated to halt the abuses that we saw in the Armstrong Williams contract with the Department of Education. It simply says you cannot hire journalists and media commentators to do agency propaganda. And it requires that any prepackaged news pieces prepared with Department of Education funds fully disclose that fact in their piece. His amendment was not allowed.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) submitted amendments to address drop-out rates and school construction, respectively. They were not allowed.

The Holt amendment to improve the skills of manufacturing workers was not allowed.

These are very important amendments, and once again the rule we are going to vote on today did not include them.

The amendment that I submitted would have authorized grants to school districts to help them increase girls' interest in studying for careers in science, math, engineering, and technology.

Mr. Speaker, girls and women continue to be underrepresented in these fields both in high school where my amendment is targeted and in college.

A recent GAO study found that men still outnumber women in nearly every field in the sciences. Women make up only 37 percent of scientists, 33 percent of mathematicians, and 14 percent of engineers. More important, this underrepresentation is tied to barriers that female students continue to face in school.

For example, in 2002 in testimony before the Senate Committee on Commerce, the National Women's Law Center cited a study that found that 70 percent of male teachers thought that boys were more interested in computers than girls. Not that they are more interested in computers than they are interested in girls. More interested in computers than girls are interested in computers.

That may be one reason why from 1984 to 2000 the percentage of women

awarded bachelor's degrees in computer science dropped from 37 percent to 28 percent. Another study showed that ineffective high school career counseling reduced women's entry into university science and engineering programs. My amendment would directly address that issue.

A 2001 investigation showed that none of New York City's vocational high schools that were predominantly female offered advanced placement courses in calculus, statistics, or computer science. And instead of focusing on high-tech careers, these schools tended to focus on careers like cosmetology and clerical support, not careers that pay a competitive wage with the technology careers.

My amendment would specifically address situations like that as well.

If we as a country do not address this issue, we will participate in the global 21st century economy with literally one hand tied behind our backs. It will be impossible for our country to have a highly qualified workforce as long as more than half of our population is steered away, intentionally or not, from studying and working in some of the most critical fields. This will have implications not only for our economic security as a Nation but for our national security as well because both depend on scientific innovation.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed in this rule and I would ask my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JINDAL).

Mr. JINDAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support not only of the bill but also this rule.

I can think of almost no issue more important than economic development and quality of life in my home State of Louisiana.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has said 75 percent of employers reported extreme difficulty when trying to hire qualified workers. Forty percent of employers say that applicants are often poorly skilled. Thirty percent say applicants have the wrong skills for the available jobs. The numbers are even worse in Louisiana.

I was privileged to serve as the president of the University of Louisiana system, a system comprised of eight 4-year universities and at one time some community colleges as well. In our State we see a disproportionately high number of students trying to continue their studies after high school in a 4-year college setting.

Now the result of that is, whereas a majority of high school graduates that continue their education in Louisiana start in a 4-year setting, that is not the norm across the rest of the South or the country. Across the South, 50 percent of most students that continue their education, 50 percent of those students continue in a 4-year setting. In California the numbers are exactly reversed. The majority continue their education in a community or technical college setting.

□ 1130

Because of Louisiana's unique numbers, one of the results is we have got a much lower graduation and retention rate than our colleague States. We do not do students any favors. We do not serve students well by putting them in a 4-year college setting where they may not be ready or interested in that particular program.

Indeed, at the same time, we have more students dropping out, many times with large amounts of college debt. We also have manufacturing and other employers with jobs that cannot be filled in Louisiana right now.

We have got a huge demand for welders in our shipyards. We have a huge demand for P-tech operators in our petrochemical plants. Indeed, we have got a generation of workers who are about to reach retirement age. We are going to need to have thousands of skilled workers. We are talking about good jobs, with good pay and good benefits, and this is the only State in the South that is losing population from people moving out faster than they are moving in, the only State in the South to consistently have more people leave faster than they are moving in, for one reason and one reason only, because of a lack of economic opportunity.

So I stand in support not only of the rule, but of this bill. It is a good investment, not only in our community and technical college system. It is a good investment in our children and in our economy and in our future. This bill is good for Louisiana. It is good for our Nation's economy. Most importantly, it is good for those students.

As I look at the things that we might do as a Congress, that will help to move my State forward, I can think of cutting taxes, reforming our legal system. I can think of some of the other regulatory relief measures we can pass, but other than that there is nothing more important than investing in workforce training. There is nothing more important than making sure that Louisiana students are ready for the jobs that are waiting for them.

I rise in strong support of the rule. I rise in strong support of the bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I once again yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to note the passing of Cindy Marano.

Ms. Marano was a founder of the National Displaced Homemakers Network, now known as Women Work! For 12 years, Cindy was executive director of Wider Opportunities for Women, which we call WOW.

Her work to improve opportunities for women, including displaced homemakers, who are specifically helped by this bill, was invaluable, and we will miss her. We will miss her vision and we will miss her leadership greatly.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this rule and H.R.

366, the Vocational and Technical Education for the Future Act of 2005.

This bill, introduced by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), my colleague, authorizes the Carl D. Perkins Act through fiscal year 2011.

H.R. 366 highlights student achievement, increases accountability, and strengthens cooperation between secondary and post-secondary vocational and technical education programs.

This bill responds to the needs of employers and future employees by emphasizing both academic and technical education in curriculum planning. It helps schools identify those students who wish to pursue specialized technical training and assists those schools in setting up a course of study that will best help those students receive that training.

Since its inception, the Perkins Act has provided many students in my district with the ability to continue to enhance their skills and their education.

Perkins equips students with the ability to proceed with post-secondary education or pursue other post-secondary opportunities.

I believe it is essential for our economy to strengthen the Perkins program.

Through Perkins, one of the largest technical schools in my district and in Pennsylvania, the Lehigh Career and Technical Institute, was able to upgrade its equipment. This new, high-tech equipment allows students to improve their skills and, hence, makes them more marketable in a work environment that stresses technology and innovation.

H.R. 366 would also allow local facilities to offer information on supportive services so students can address their transportation and child care needs while in school.

Lehigh University in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, which is also located in the 15th Congressional District, has many students pursuing engineering and other degrees in the hard sciences who would not be able to graduate on time absent Perkins assistance. Without the money these programs provide, these students would have to secure full-time employment while completing their degrees. This leads to more student debt, more time in school, and ultimately, more taxpayer expenditure.

As the workforce continues to expand, we must continue to provide resources for Perkins, not cut or zero out this important program.

The Perkins program is extremely important, not just for the numbers of students it serves, but for the communities that benefit from the better prepared workforce that results from these programs.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation and support the rule.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), someone who

has a unique insight into the needs of education.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time, and I rise to support the reauthorization of the Vocational and Technical Education for the Future Act and the underlying rule.

One of our Nation's greatest needs at the present time is a well-trained, competent workforce with specific skills. As most people in our country realize, at the present time, our educational system is not producing enough of these people to meet our needs, and therefore, we are bringing in people from overseas to fill highly skilled jobs, and Perkins is one solution to this dilemma.

Currently, the Perkins program trains 10 million Americans for specialized jobs requiring specific skills.

As has been stated previously, this reauthorization provides greater flexibility and more control at the local level. So each local entity that controls the educational endeavor at that point can decide how to best structure the Perkins program. It increases academic rigor, improves accountability and provides for a better transition from high school to post-secondary schools.

One thing that I would like to point out at this time is that in rural areas our greatest challenge is the loss of young people. We are depopulating our rural areas, and one reason for this is that farms are getting bigger and it is crowding people off the land. So one allowable use of the Perkins grant is to provide entrepreneurial training, and we find that in rural areas that the young person can be taught how to write a business plan, how to access capital, how to write a grant, how to market, how to create a Web site. This is the best alternative we have, the best way we have to keep young people employed in rural areas.

In some areas, we are losing 75 percent, 80 percent of our graduates. It costs \$85,000 to educate them K through 12, and they are taking off. So we think that these Perkins grants can be used in this way and in a very effective way.

So I think vocational and technical education may be the most important, yet least appreciated, segments of our educational system. I certainly support the bill and the rule.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman have any more speakers on his side?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I have two more speakers.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). The gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) who spends much time working in this particular area, is very knowledgeable, and has a great

deal of respect for the education system in all the States, including my own, the chairman.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Utah for his kind words, and Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule which will allow for debate on an important piece of legislation, the Vocational and Technical Education for the Future Act.

The Vocational and Technical Education for the Future Act is a bipartisan bill that helps States and local communities improve educational opportunities for their students. This bill was crafted in cooperation with Members on both sides of the aisle, and with the support of numerous vocational and technical education leaders.

I am going to applaud the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) for producing this bill in a bipartisan manner and with the support of educators around the country. This bill fulfills our principles for reform by focusing on academic achievement for students and by preserving local control for States and communities.

H.R. 366 will improve vocational and technical education by focusing on academics without expanding the Federal role in education.

We streamline bureaucracy and give more money to local communities. We also streamline funding by consolidating the Tech-Prep program with the basic State grant.

Like other important education reform efforts, including No Child Left Behind and the Individuals With Disabilities and Education Act, the bill ensures equitable treatment for private school students. We ensure students and families are not denied access to programs because they choose to attend a private school.

Above all else, the bill recognizes the importance of maintaining local control. We are continuing to move away from the so-called "School to Work" model of the past, and we are maintaining our commitment to ensuring States and local communities have the final say when it comes to educational choices for their students.

The bill was approved by the Committee on Education and the Workforce by a voice vote. I look forward to similar bipartisan support for this legislation today.

Vocational and technical education is a vital component of our Nation's educational system. State and local communities use Perkins funding to help prepare youth and adults for the future.

Each year, millions of students enrich their secondary and post-secondary educational opportunities through participation in vocational and technical education. In fact, nearly all students, 96 percent, leave public high school having taken some vocational education courses. Further, nearly half of all high school students and about one-third of college students are involved in vocational programs as a major part of their studies. Perhaps

as many as 40 million adults, one in four, engage in short-term, post-secondary occupational training.

The bill before us will build on the framework of the Perkins program by protecting the role of States and local communities, and asking for results in exchange for the money that we are already spending at the Federal level.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule. I support the underlying bill. I believe that H.R. 366 will help States and local communities to strengthen opportunities for their students and improve vocational and technical education programs. I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on passage of this important piece of legislation.

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

I want to close by again expressing my disappointment that this is not an open rule, and that if they did not want to give an open rule, they should have made at least all eight amendments in order.

Five Democratic amendments were not made in order under this rule, notwithstanding the fact that, according to the parliamentarian, they were germane. These amendments were thoughtful. They certainly would not have disrupted the debate on this bill. They could have been dealt with in a short period of time, but I think my friends on the majority side are so addicted to denying amendments and stifling debate and closing rules that it is hard for them to break the habit.

So I express my regret and I hope that in the future, that they will be more forthcoming with allowing Members to have their say on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

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

I appreciate this opportunity because the reauthorization of the Perkins vocational funding is a fundamental part of the educational funding of this Nation, as well as American competitiveness.

This bill will help provide both the public and private sector of our economy with an educated, capable, highly trained skilled workforce, which is essential for our economy to grow and be competitive in our environment.

This is a good, well-balanced and bipartisan, I emphasize that word "bipartisan" bill that deserves its vote on final passage.

I am appreciative that the words that were said here today, talking specifically about this particular bill, have all been positive. We may have differences on other educational concepts and issues at other times, that will be the point at other times and other places, but for this particular bill it moves us forward.

With that, I urge the adoption of the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.
The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1145

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 366.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION FOR THE FUTURE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 254 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. 366.

The Chair designates the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) as chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1146

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. 366) to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998 to strengthen and improve programs under that Act, with Mr. ISSA (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Vocational and Technical Education for the Future Act. The bill has received strong support from educators, school administrators, principals, and vocational and technical education advocates around the country. In this bill, we are protecting the role of States and local communities, and we are asking for results in exchange for the money we are already spending at the Federal level.

The gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) wrote a good bill and deserves great credit for his commitment to this issue. He produced a bill that has received bipartisan support in the committee while still fulfilling our principles for reform.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for their hard work and cooperation in bringing this bill forward today.

This bill will improve vocational and technical education by focusing on academics without expanding the Federal role in education. We streamline bureaucracy and give more money to local communities. H.R. 366 reduces the share of funds going to State administrative activities and targets more funding to the local level. We also streamline funding by consolidating the Tech-Prep program with a basic State grant.

The bill also focuses on success at the local level. Under the bill, local communities will establish achievement targets; and to reward increased academic achievement, States and local communities can receive incentive grants for success. Above all, we maintain local control. The bill continues to move away from the so-called "School to Work" model of the past and maintains our commitment to ensuring that States and local communities have the final say when it comes to the educational choices for their students.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this legislation, which will help States and local communities strengthen and improve vocational and technical education and help ensure academic success for students. I urge my colleagues today to join me in voting "yes" on the bill.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I want to thank my committee chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), and our full ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), and always my partner, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), for working together in a bipartisan way the last Congress and this one to bring this bill to the floor.

As I have said, I have my concerns about this bill, even though it is the result of a bipartisan process. I am especially pleased that the majority has brought this bill forward, in light of the President's proposal to eliminate career and technical education. I hope that we will send a strong bipartisan signal today that we in the House believe that career and technical education is critical to our students and to our country's economic future.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do, as I said, have concerns regarding this bill. First, the bill rightly strengthens accountability for State and local programs, but at the same time it cuts by 60 percent the funds that States can use for that very purpose. I support these accountability measures, but if we do not enable the States to administer them, they will be an empty promise.

I also am concerned this bill merges the Tech-Prep program with the basic State grant. I appreciate that our Republican colleagues in the committee have maintained funding for Tech-Prep activities; but as we all know, not sending Tech-Prep funding separately to the States means that eventually States will lose their focus on those very activities we consider so crucial.

Finally, I am disappointed we are not being allowed to debate most of the amendments that my colleagues and I submitted to the Committee on Rules. I support the amendments that we are debating, but there are many critical issues that we are leaving undiscussed. The gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) all offered important amendments on government paying journalists to create propaganda, on dropout prevention, on school construction, and helping out-of-work manufacturing workers. But we are not debating any of those issues today, and I do not understand why.

Finally, we are not debating an issue that has long been important to me and I consider critical to our country's future, that is, the lack of women and girls in science, math, engineering, and technology. My amendment would have helped school districts increase girls' interest in studying in these careers and in these areas. A recent GAO study, Mr. Chairman, found that men still outnumber women in nearly every field in the sciences. In his recent article, "It's a Flat World, After All," and new book, "The World is Flat," The New York Times writer Thomas Friedman explained that America's historical economic advantages have disappeared now "that the world is flat, and anyone with smarts, access to Google, and a cheap wireless laptop can join the innovation fray," no matter what continent they are living on.

Mr. Friedman's and others' remedy is to attract more young women and men to science and engineering. But it will be impossible for our country to continue to lead the world in innovation as long as more than half our population, women, are steered away, intentionally or not, from studying and working in the fields from where that innovation would come.

Consider this, from Dr. Susan Hockfield, the president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who recently said that squandered talent, and I quote her, "is one of the key issues of women in science and engineering." All of our children, not just girls, would have benefited if we had been able to debate this issue today, and I am sorry that we are not.

But, again, Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues for their hard work on this bill, and I look forward to improving it even more in conference.

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