

Mr. Speaker, development of a National Drought Policy Act is long overdue. I am pleased that H.R. 3035 addresses this problem and urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, let the RECORD note that the author of the bill the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) is chairing a subcommittee meeting with the Committee on Appropriations and is not able to be here with us today.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3035 which would establish an advisory commission to provide advice and recommendations to help create a coordinated federal drought mitigation and response policy. Currently, droughts tend to receive minimal advance attention and are primarily addressed ad hoc in a crisis management mode.

The commission established by the bill would recommend ways to coordinate the numerous federal agencies that have a role in droughts. It would also help ensure that federal efforts would compliment state and local programs without diminishing state water rights or environmental protection.

H.R. 3035 builds upon the recent work of the Western Water Policy Review Advisory Commission and the Western Governors' Association. Both organizations have recommended the creation of an interagency task force to develop an integrated national drought policy plan that emphasizes risk-management.

I appreciate the efforts of my colleagues on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3035, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to provide extraneous material on H.R. 3035.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### URGING CONGRESS AND PRESIDENT TO FULLY FUND GOVERNMENT'S OBLIGATION UNDER INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the

resolution ( H. Res. 399) urging the Congress and the President to work to fully fund the Federal Government's obligation under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 399

Whereas Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 334 F. Supp. 1247 (E. Dist. Pa. 1971), and Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia, 348 F. Supp. 866 (Dist. D. C. 1972), found that children with disabilities are guaranteed an equal opportunity to an education under the 14th amendment to the Constitution;

Whereas the Congress responded to these court decisions by passing the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (enacted as Public Law 94-142), now known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.), to ensure a free, appropriate public education for children with disabilities;

Whereas the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act provides that the Federal, State, and local governments are to share in the expense of educating children with disabilities and authorizes the Federal Government to pay up to 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure for children with disabilities;

Whereas the Federal Government has provided only 7, 9, and 11 percent of the maximum State grant allocation for educating children with disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in the last 3 years, respectively;

Whereas the national average cost of educating a special education student (\$12,002) is more than twice the national average per pupil cost (\$5,955);

Whereas research indicates that children who are effectively taught, including effective instruction aimed at acquiring literacy skills, and who receive positive early interventions demonstrate academic progress, and are significantly less likely to be referred to special education;

Whereas, if the appropriation for part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1411 et seq.) exceeds \$4,100,000,000 for a fiscal year, a local educational agency may reduce its local spending on special education for such fiscal year by an amount equal to 20 percent of the amount that exceeds the prior year's appropriation so long as the local educational agency is not failing to comply with the requirements of part B of such Act, as determined by the State educational agency;

Whereas the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act has been successful in achieving significant increases in the number of children with disabilities who receive a free, appropriate public education; and

Whereas the current level of Federal funding to States and localities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act is contrary to the goal of ensuring that children with disabilities receive a quality education: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives urges the Congress and the President, working within the constraints of the balanced budget agreement, to give programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.) higher priority among Federal education programs by working to fund the maximum State grant allocation for educating children with disabilities under such Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) and the

gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

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

The Committee will now consider H. Res. 399, a resolution urging the Congress and the President to fully fund the Federal Government's responsibility under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. This resolution was introduced by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) and I am pleased to be an original cosponsor.

I would like to start out by recognizing the efforts of my friend and colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD). He has been a leader in helping move this resolution through our committee in a bipartisan manner. He has been a strong voice for providing fiscal relief to local communities, which not only pay their share of special education costs but most of the Federal share as well.

For those who may not be aware, in 1975, when the original legislation was passed, the Congress of the United States indicated that over several years they would fund 40 percent of the excess costs for special education. Up until 3 years ago, they were funding about 6 percent. I am happy to say that we got about a 77-percent increase in the last 3 years. But it is still a long, long way from the 40 percent that was promised for the excess costs of educating a special education child.

This unpaid Federal share means that the local school district has to do the funding. It also then means that the local school district has to take that money from all other programs in order to fund our share of special education. In many districts that is 55 percent of their entire budget. And so, I am hoping that we will continue the trend that we have had in the last 3 years.

Unfortunately, when the President sent up his budget, he level funded special education. But what level-funding really means is a dramatic cut. Because if you consider inflation and then, above all, consider the new children who will be coming into special education through increased enrollment, it means that we are going to fall way short if we would follow his budget.

I am hoping that with the program that came from my committee, dealing with literacy, with family literacy particularly, that in the long run we can find a way to eliminate an awful lot of people from ever getting into special education. Because, unfortunately, many of our special education students today are there simply because they have a reading difficulty. There is no reason for that to happen.

We know now that most youngsters can learn to read. With the family literacy program that we are including in our legislative initiative from our committee, hopefully we can eliminate an awful lot who would normally fall into special education.