United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON TODAY

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

□

VOICING CONCERN ABOUT SERIOUS VIOLATIONS OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS IN MOST STATES OF CENTRAL ASIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 397, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 397, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 362, nays 3, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 66, as follows:

[Roll No. 589]

YEAS—362

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dixon
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—3

Chenoweth-Hage
Metcalf
Paul

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Kucinich

NOT VOTING—66

Archer
Bilbray
Bliley
Boehlert
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Canady
Chambliss
Collins
Conyers
Cunningham
Danner
Delahunt
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley
Dunn
Emerson
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Greenwood
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hill (MT)
Hinojosa
Hutchinson
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jones (OH)
Kasich
Kennedy
Kilpatrick
Klink
Lantos
Larson
Lazio
McCollum
McIntosh
McKeon
Meek (FL)
Mica
Mollohan
Neal
Nussle
Ose
Pitts
Salmon
Sanchez
Scarborough
Scott
Shaw
Shays
Talent
Turner
Velazquez
Waters
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Wise

□ 1243

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 159. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives.

□

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4577, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOLT moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 4577, be instructed to insist on disagreeing with provisions in the Senate amendment which denies the President's request for dedicated resources for local school construction and, instead, broadly expands the Title VI Education Block Grant with limited accountability in the use of funds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

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

I would like to speak today on why we are still in session in November and why we may have a lame duck session in front of us. In fact, I would like to speak about work not done. And I am not talking about the Patients' Bill of Rights or gun safety legislation or campaign finance reform or minimum wage legislation or workplace safety legislation or prescription medicine coverage under Medicare.

Yes, that is some of the work that is not done. But in particular I would like to talk about overcrowding in our schools and the need to provide adequate classrooms for our students so

that we may educate them for the 21st century.

□ 1245

I have visited nearly 100 schools in my district, and everywhere I go I hear from parents and teachers and administrators and students about the problems of overcrowding. It is no wonder. The number of school children is growing at a record pace. In the last 11 years, the student population of South Brunswick in my district has doubled from 3,500 to 7,000 students. In Montgomery, total enrollment has more than doubled in the past 6 years from 1,500 students to more than 4,000 students.

In some of my school districts, the number of children in kindergarten outnumbers the number of students in grade 12. One does not need higher mathematics to understand the implications of these numbers.

Our classrooms are overcrowded. To alleviate this crowding, many of the schools in my district are installing trailers. Now, while trailers may be a temporary solution, they are ill-suited for classroom use. Not only are they expensive to install and maintain, but their long, narrow floor plan creates an awkward learning environment.

Moreover, in many cases they are not connected to the Internet; and of course, students get wet when it rains and they have to go to the main building. Many schools do not have a choice about whether or not to use trailers. With the cost of a new school at tens of millions of dollars, our property taxpayers can no longer afford to shoulder this financial burden alone. This is evident in the fact that a number of the school construction referenda in my district have had very close votes, some of them resulting in turning down the referendum and the inability of the school district to proceed with the construction.

New Jersey communities, as in many other parts of the country, need assistance in building new classrooms and schools. A recent report issued by the National Education Association estimates that $322 billion is needed to repair and modernize America's public schools and to construct new classrooms. Last month, the U.S. Department of Education issued its annual baby boom echo report that documents not only the record 53 million children in our Nation's schools today but projects explosive enrollment growth over the next 10 years. We cannot continue to delay on this issue. We should take care of this issue before we leave Washington.

It is time we stopped talking about improving education and actually act on it. We have bipartisan legislation that the Republican leadership has refused to act on. The President's proposal, as introduced by Representative JOHNSON and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) would provide $25 billion in new tax credit bonds to help build and modernize 6,000 schools. This new type of bond would provide interest-free financing to help State and local governments pay for school construction and renovation. There would be no Federal involvement in the selection, in the design, in the implementation of school modernization projects. The only Federal role would be in providing tax-subsidized financing under the same procedures that are currently utilized for tax exempt bonds.

In addition, the President has proposed $1.3 billion in loans and grants to fund 8,300 emergency renovation and repair projects in America's schools. This is for schools where there is a critical, immediate need such as dangerous electrical plumbing or asbestos problems.

Now, this part of what I am talking about was in the agreement for the Labor-HHS, Education appropriations agreement that fell apart after the lobbyists for special interests forced the leadership to drop it over the issue of worker safety.

Our schools should not be lost in the last-minute wrangling over these appropriations bills. Our schools must be made safe for our children. There is no logic in refusing to act on these important proposals. The Federal Government assists the States in other areas of local need. We give millions of dollars at the local level to help them build roads and bridges. We respond to emergencies.

All of these are important areas of assistance but so are our children. We have a responsibility to ensure that our children are receiving the best education possible for all children and that our students are not falling over one another in crowded hallways and classrooms.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct conferees.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just say that I have watched this debate taking place on the floor. This certainly is deja vu. This is about at least, I guess, the third time that we have had the exact same debate on the same issues. There are a couple of points that are very clear to me. One is that there are, I think, enormous problems with respect to school repairs, school construction across the United States of America. We have a growing population of school-age youth in our country, and I think we do need to address that. As a matter of fact, I think Republicans and Democrats agree on that. As a matter of fact, I think in terms of the dollars that are being allocated to this, there is agreement as well, particularly on the grant side of it, of the $1.3 billion.

The basic difference is how is that going to be done. Is it given to the local districts for flexibility, which is what the Republicans believe? Or should it be given directly from the Federal Government to wherever the schools are, which is what the Democrats believe?

There is not that much disagreement.

The other point is this: when we talk about that extent of money, we are talking about a very small percentage, less than one half of 1 percent, I think about a third of 1 percent of the total needs which are out there, even by the most minimal standards. So I think it is somewhat unfair for any of us to stand here or for the President, for all that matters, to stand before the people of America and say that this is going to solve the problems of school construction.

Hopefully, we can work something out eventually, and it is being worked on. It is in the language of the Labor-HHS Education bill that may come back before us; and when we do, we can help with the problem. But it is a fairly small contribution to the solution of the problem. I think it is something that we should do. The agreement is relatively sound. The disagreements are relatively minor, and we should go forward.

I guess until that time we will play politics with it and continue ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the chairman of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am amused by this performance again today. I am amused because, of course, our constituents, if any of them are watching, I think in New Jersey they probably have already gone back from their lunch break and in Oregon they have not gone to their lunch break yet, so I do not know if anybody is watching; but if they are, they are very fortunate because they get to see the same play that was put on on the same stage Saturday afternoon. The only difference is, they replaced the leading ladies with the leading men. So that is the only difference today. Of course, the same thing is true today that was true on Saturday. We have settled this issue. We spent days and nights with the administration, Saturdays and Sundays, to settle this very issue.

We have an agreement. They know on the other side that we have an agreement. We have an agreement on class size. They know that. So here we go through this same charade one more time. As I said, it is a replay of Saturday.

Well, I always have to laugh when somebody mentions roads and bridges. Of course that is an interstate problem. That is also a dedicated tax problem. So it has nothing relevant to do with this; but again, time and time again, I have tried to tell, particularly center

city representatives for 26 years, as a matter of fact, if they would just do something about their mandate, the special ed, can one imagine what local school districts would have been able to do with class size reduction? Can one imagine what local school districts could have done with preventative maintenance and remodeling? Well, of course, if we just look at the facts, we know. We know that Los Angeles, for instance, would get an additional $100 million every year. Multiply that by 25, and that sounds like pretty big money; New York City, $170 million extra every year. That is big bucks. Even Newark would get $7 million or $8 million, $9 million every year to do all the kind of things that they would do if they did not have to fund the Federal mandate.

When I became chairman after all of those years of sitting there on the minority trying to encourage them along with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) to do something about the unfunded special ed mandate, they were only up to 6 percent. I am happy to say at the end of this year we will probably be up to 15 percent and that is a long, long way.

It is also interesting that this issue comes up again this particular year. Why is that interesting? Well, the former majority decided that in 1995 that they would pass the School Facilities Infrastructure Improvement Act. Now that is a big title. It sounds very interesting. That was passed in 1995, and the appropriators put $100 million in at that particular time. Guess what? Somebody brought about a recession to that effort. Now, who was that somebody? Somebody sent us a notice and they said, and I quote, ''The construction and renovation of school facilities has traditionally been the responsibility of State and local governments, financed primarily by local taxpayers. We are opposed to the creation of a new Federal grant program for school construction. No funds are requested for this program in 1996. For the reason explained above, the administration opposes the creation of a new Federal grant program for school construction.''

Is that not interesting in this same administration who is now seeking for something else?

Let me again close by simply saying, I know there must be political purposes for this. There has to be some reason for it, but it has already been concluded. After lengthy negotiations, it has already been completed and agreed to by those of us who were negotiating and by the White House, as was and is the class size reduction legislation.

So again it is just an exercise in futility. I do not know what it is, as a matter of fact; but obviously, as I said, not too many people in New Jersey and Oregon will be watching this debate, and that is unfortunate because they will not get to hear, if they did not hear it Saturday, the same repeat of what we did on Saturday.

Mr. Speaker, negotiators have made substantial progress on the issue of school construction, and I am optimistic that we will soon be able to reach agreement on this issue.

I have made it clear to the administration that state and local flexibility must be a component of federal funding for classroom modernization and renovation. I would like to see a substantial portion of the funding available for other pressing needs, such as activities related to the Individuals with Disabilities Act.

I am not doing this to be stubborn. School districts across America are clamoring for help with the additional costs of educating special needs children. When Congress passed the law requiring public schools to provide educational services to these children, we promised that the federal government would help with the increased costs.

We promised to provide 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure. Here we are, 25 years later, and we are only at 13 percent—significantly less than what we promised. And we've only reached that under the Republican Congress, because that 13 percent represents a doubling of what the federal government was providing when we became the Majority.

The result of our failure to provide the promised funds is that school districts are using their own money to make up the shortfall. These are funds which could otherwise be used for school maintenance costs and other local needs. If the federal government were actually providing the 40 percent we promised, school districts across the country would receive significant funding:

New York would receive an increase of more than $170 million;

Los Angles would receive nearly $100 million more:

Chicago would get an additional $76 million;

Miami would receive an increase of $45 million; and

Newark would receive an increase of $8 million.

The primary responsibility for school construction should remain at the state and local levels. However, the federal government can provide assistance to help states and localities comply with federal laws that mandate school building modernization.

The Administration has switched positions on whether the federal government has a role in school construction over time.

The Congress under Democrat control appropriated $100 million for Fiscal Year 1995 for the School Facilities Infrastructure Improvement Act. But the President rescinded this, and subsequently, the program has received no funding.

Following the rescission of funds for FY 1995, the President's FY 1996 budget request did not include any money for the ''Education Infrastructure Act.'' In fact, Department of Education budget documents stated:

> The construction and renovation of school facilities has traditionally been the responsibility of State and local governments, financed primarily by local taxpayers; we are opposed to the creation of a new Federal grant program for school construction. . . . No funds are requested for this program in 1996. For the reason explained above, the Administration opposes the creation of a new Federal grant program for school construction.

Mr. Speaker, I again point out that this motion to instruct conferees is irrelevant given our current negotiations on the Labor/HHS/Education appropriation's legislation. As such, I oppose the gentleman's motion.

MEETING THE FEDERAL IDEA MANDATE

[Selected Cities]

City	Funds received [1]	If 40% mandate met	Additional funds needed to meet commitment of States
New York	$41,435,700	$212,316,300	$170,880,600
Los Angeles	23,145,989	118,600,048	95,454,000
Chicago	18,438,243	94,477,557	76,039,400
Miami	10,873,800	55,717,300	44,843,500
Philadelphia	7,501,863	38,439,546	30,937,600
Jacksonville	7,305,504	37,433,402	30,127,900
Houston	5,738,851	29,405,873	23,667,000
Dallas	3,881,900	19,890,700	16,008,800
Washington, DC	3,047,500	15,615,500	12,568,000
St. Louis	2,032,800	10,416,100	8,383,300
Newark	1,932,760	9,903,462	7,970,700
Pittsburgh	1,514,077	7,758,131	6,244,000

[1] 1995 data (most recent available).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), one of the leading men in this debate on school construction and classroom construction, who will explain why this has not yet been settled and why it is necessary for us to bring this up yet again today.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Holt motion. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) for his leadership on this important issue because my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), has not only been a Member representing his people but he has only been here about 2 years and he has already made a tremendous difference for his district and for this country on the issue of children.

Let me say to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), who said he was amused, I want everybody to understand that I am not amused. I do not get amused one little bit when we are talking about issues that affect children. I was the State superintendent of my school system in North Carolina for 8 years, an office to which the people elected me twice. I do not get amused when we are talking about the needs of children. I know we talk about rhetoric, and is this a political issue? Darn right, it is a political issue. Everything we do in this body is about politics. But this is the kind of politics we ought to be dealing with for the children of this country, because they cannot vote; they cannot sit in this body. If we cannot do it, then who does it?

Yes, I recognize only 7 percent of the money comes through the Federal Government, but there are places in this country where they are hurting, and they have great needs today, and we have a responsibility. Yes, we do provide money for roads; and, yes, we do provide money for prisons and a number of other things. And to say it is interstate money, the answer is, yes, it is dedicated; but there was a time when there was no money dedicated and there were those that said we ought not to be putting it in. I happen to read history, and I remember that. We can do it for our children, too, Mr. Speaker.

Let me just share a couple of quick statistics before my time runs out. In my home district, there are a number of areas, and I am in a district where we have spent a lot of money and we have raised taxes to build schools. We have 55 trailers in the small county of Franklin that is struggling now to meet their needs; 16 in Granville; 41 in my home county of Harnett; 98 in Lee; 40 in Nash County; 162 in Sampson; 76 in Wilson; a total of 530 in our capital county, and they are working hard.

□ 1300

Yes, this is an issue we ought to deal with; and yes, this Congress ought to act. I ran for this office 4 years ago because I was tired of the Republican leadership in this Congress at that time who wanted to close down the Department of Education, close school lunch programs. It was cynical against education. We have changed our rhetoric, yes; we have changed it, but there is still a deep resistance to helping public education. We should come together. We should not be here arguing about these issues. Children are not Democrats nor Republicans. They are children. And we can help. We have the resources to do it. Now is the time to act. We do not need to put it off until next year. We should not put it off until next year because if we put it off until next year, there are going to be children in cramped quarters; and we will not be able to reduce the class sizes the way we ought to to teach them properly, and I am here to tell my colleagues that children know the difference between a quality facility and a poor one.

How do we tell a child that quality education is important, and we then send them to a run-down school? They know better. No, it is not our total responsibility, but we can sure help. We can provide the leadership and show the way, and I think this Congress ought to do it. I am willing to do my part, and I ask all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the former governor of Delaware and now standing Congressman, for yielding me this time.

I too share the same passion the gentleman from North Carolina does about education. He was an elected superintendent; I was a State board chairman in neighboring States in the South. I respect the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and his comments about helping public schools, and I am sure the comments that are to come. I am not amused in one way, but I share amusement in another way with the chairman, because we are repeating a debate we did Saturday afternoon.

But just for the sake of facts, I want to take the comments we have heard from the other side so far and place them in perspective.

First of all, the conferees have agreed on $1.3 billion. The disagreement is over whether it is done one way or another way, and I will get into that in a minute. On Saturday when we had the debate, everyone agreed the unfunded school construction in the United States of America is $303 billion. The public should listen to this, that if we do $1.3 billion a year, then in 300 years we would have solved the problem. Well, that is not going to happen and that is ridiculous. As the gentleman from North Carolina said, we cannot do it all, but we can help, and therein is why everybody needs to understand the basic agreement that exists between the parties today is to do exactly that. Mr. Speaker, $1.3 billion, in which school systems can make the decision as to where best within certain parameters the Federal Government can help. Maybe it is asbestos removal, maybe it is ADA improvements, maybe it is the satisfaction of any number of Federal mandates.

But we must be clear. We cannot mislead the American people to believe that there is enough money in Washington to build the schools needed in the United States of America. The unfunded need in American schools today exceeds the budget surplus projected for the next year. So should we spend it all and not save Social Security and not save Medicare which are our responsibilities? No. Although I would love to do anything I could to relieve the property tax in my home district, the fact of the matter is that the United States of America, the dedicated tax for public education is the property tax in our local areas, because people get to vote on it. Therefore, they can have schools that are accountable. Therefore, they can spend the money wisely. If there was a pot in Washington and the belief that we would build all of their schools, New Jersey would never pass a new bond referendum to build schools; and we would have failed on a false promise, because we do not have the money.

Mr. Speaker, I respect every Member of this House, and I love children; and I support public education with all of my heart. But I do not believe, and we are on the momentary cusp of settling what is already settled in making a $1.3 billion contribution to local schools, Democrats and Republicans alike. We should not leave Washington or leave this House with the misperception that there is enough money for us to build the schools that are needed in America, that Congress can reduce local property taxes for schools. If we do that, we have offered false hope and false promise.

Instead, what we should say is we are willing to do our part on that which we have mandated; we are willing to give local schools flexibility, and we have joined together in a bipartisan effort to do that. But to leave any other false promise out there is wrong for children, it is wrong for America, and it is wrong for public education.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), my colleague, a freshman Member of Congress and an outstanding member of our freshman class, who will explain that indeed, $1.3 billion is not enough, but why we should do it and we must do it now.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me this time to speak on an issue of grave importance to my constituency. I say that because I represent a district that has the most overcrowded school district in the City of New York, School District 24, which right now is operating at 119 percent. In the year 2007, I will have three of the most overcrowded school districts, three of the top five in New York City, School Districts 24, 30, and 11, which will be operating, right now are operating at 119 percent, 109 and 107 respectively. In my district in the year 2007, every school district in my district will be operating at or above capacity. If that is not an emergency, I do not know what is.

I have a very diverse district, a district made up of many different cultures and ethnic groups. But what really, I think, New York is known for, really a melting pot, if there was ever such a thing as a melting pot, my district is it. But my children and our schools are at a severe disadvantage.

Mr. Speaker, the average school age in my district is 55 years of age. One out of every school in New York City is over 75 years of age. We still have schools in my district that are being heated by coal, heated by coal in my district.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Rangel-Johnson bill, sending $25 billion around this country to construct and modernize schools. The $1.3 billion is not enough, but if we have the $1.3 billion, where is it? We have not voted on this floor yet.

Maybe I will agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Maybe this is a waste of time. Maybe this is all a song and dance. Maybe we have been through this 100 times before. But it seems as though everything we have done here lately has been a song and dance. Committees come together and bipartisanly agree on budget bills, and then the leadership of the House determines that the bill is no good, we have to go back to the drawing board again. So it seems as though song and dance is the name of the game here lately.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think $1.3 billion is enough; but it is something, it is a start, but I would like to see it on the floor. I would like to see the $1.3 billion brought to the floor and acted on.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I just want to again remind Members that for

instance, as I said, New York City would get an additional $170,880,600, if I would have gotten some help, other than from the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), to get that 40 percent back there. Again, I repeat, we have agreed, through bipartisan negotiations with the White House, we have agreed on the $1.3; we have agreed how it should be spent and how it should be distributed. That has all been done. If we can wrap up ergonomics, it is all over.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just would like to put all of this in perspective. First, this is the fourth time that we have argued almost the exact same language on this floor. It is one of these situations in which it has all been said; but not everybody has said it, except that everyone is saying it more than one time at this point now as well. That is fine. I think it is a very important discussion. I do not mind that particularly, except that we are sort of plowing ground that has already been plowed.

There are certain basic facts that need to be pointed out, and I pointed out some of those at the beginning; but I just want to reiterate these facts. One is that the amount of money that we are talking about in this particular motion to instruct conferees is the grand total of $1.3 billion, a very large sum of public money that we have in the Federal Government to expend on this problem. But in conjunction with how much it would take in order to solve all of the problems of school repairs and construction, which is a minimum $300 billion today, and I have seen estimates as high as $500 billion, $1.3 billion is not very much. At the most, it is a little more than one-third of 1 percent, and if the numbers are higher than we think it is at $300 billion, it drops substantially below that. So we are talking about a fairly small contribution to the solution in this, setting aside of course the Rangel-Johnson thing which, hopefully, also will be resolved at some point.

Now, we in the Federal Government only put in about 6 or 7 percent of all of the dollars that go into public education in this country, and most of the money which we put in goes to specific areas that we have carved out, such as educating or helping to educate children with disabilities, for example, or individuals who are from poorer backgrounds and need additional help in a program called Title 1. That is what we do. We have not in the past really done a lot with respect to construction. But I think we agree, certainly we as Republicans agree, we have put it in the Labor-HHS-Education appropriation bill the same amount that we are talking about here today, so there is agreement on that.

A couple of other facts, for whatever they are worth. In the last 5 years, under the tutelage of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) in the Committee on Appropriations, the contribution to education by the Federal Government in the budget has been 8.2 percent, on average. In the 5 years before that which was under the control of the Democrats, it was 6 percent per year, not the 8.2 percent it is now. In this year's appropriation bill, which is a key appropriation bill that we are all waiting for around here and the reason that we debate this every afternoon, this particular issue, because it is not done, the increase for this year is 20 percent, which is a recognition I think that everyone is becoming more in tune to the fact that this is the number one issue as far as the country is concerned, a grand total for K through 12 of about $45 billion, a substantial donation to local and State governments.

So we are not talking about any differences in dollars, and we are not talking about the ability to fix up all of the problems of all of the schools of all of us who are going to stand up and say our schools have problems. That is a recognized fact. We have many good educators here, starting with the chairman, who was a superintendent, and two gentlemen here have spoken, North Carolina and Georgia, who were the heads of education in their States. I was a governor of my State and I saw the same thing. I went into every single school in my district as well, but I also fought to get some referenda passed and did other things, because I think we have to do it on a local basis.

There are slight differences, not in dollars, but in how the money would be used. In the appropriation bill which we are discussing now, before we get to the motion to instruct conferees, we as Republicans have said, let us give flexibility with respect to this money in terms of what they are going to be able to do with it. Let the local and the State people be able to make the decision. And within the Democrat proposal that is in the motion to instruct conferees, I would describe it, and some may disagree with this, but I would describe it as being more rigid in terms of how that money would be used without as much flexibility.

There are schools in this country, and I just was to two of them in the last few months in Delaware, two brand-new schools. They do not need construction money or repair money, they do not even need to reduce class size, but they would like to prepare their teachers better if they could, so perhaps they would like to use the money otherwise. My own view point of that is if we could put money in title VI, which is the flexibility of a block grant, we should do that as often as we can here in Washington, because I think it gives our local districts the flexibility in turn to be able to make the decisions to help with the education there.

So that is a difference perhaps in philosophy, but I am afraid that what we are talking about here on the floor of the House of Representatives is unfortunately the politics of all of this; and to me, there is not a lot of difference between the politics of it; It is just a slight philosophical difference, as we have here. I hope it gets worked out. I hope it gets worked out in the Labor-HHS-Education appropriation bill and maybe eventually in this tax bill as far as the Rangel-Johnson proposal is concerned.

□ 1315

But the bottom line is that we are arguing about something which hopefully would be helpful but cannot go as far as some people would like in terms of what we would do with respect to our schools.

Also, I do not think the Federal government could afford to get into $300 or $400 billion dollars. I think it is very wrong for us to stand up and suggest that we are going to solve the problems of the schools. Where there are trailers now, there are probably going to be trailers later. Unfortunately, when there are schools not in good repair, maybe they will still stay not in good repair. But I think we can help in some way so maybe we can move in that direction.

That is where we are. It is a relatively minor circumstance we are dealing with here, but it is a major problem out there in terms of what has to be done.

What I really hope is this, that we do pass something. I do not really care if Republicans or Democrats get credit for it. I hope we pass something. I hope we can use that as the initiation or the instigation of additional local and State money being put into schools to fix up schools for our children, because I think we all agree that educating our children is as important as anything we can do in this country. Obviously, we need good facilities if we are going to do that.

I just wanted to make those basic points as we go through and continue with this argument.

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), who will explain why it is necessary for us to plow this field again, if I may use a rural metaphor for a gentlewoman from an urban district, because we do not yet have it. There may be an agreement, as the gentleman from the other side said, but show us the vote.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, for yielding time to me and for the opportunity to address this body.

Mr. Speaker, I wish, as the gentleman is seated there, that he would tell me how much money is allocated for Ohio schools in the proposal that he says is about to come to the floor. I will walk over and get that information from the gentleman when we get done.

But I was a prosecutor and I was a judge. I saw what poor education can

do for children. I saw more money allocated to build prisons in Ohio and across this country than to build schools.

If we are serious about school construction, why do we not take that $4 billion that we gave the Defense Department that they did not need and build some more schools in this country? Overcrowding, aging, is a significant issue for schools in our country.

I have a specific example. In the city of Cleveland, just less than a month ago a high school roof fell in on the public school. To fix that roof, it cost $2 million. We need money in our systems to fix schools, modernize all these aging buildings where we are sending our children.

We work on modernizing our cars for emissions standards. We deal with issues of smoke detectors, checking toys for children, all kinds of other things. We know our schools are in a hazardous condition. We have children who are suffering from asthma from problems within those schools. We need to fix it.

Right now we are in one of the best economic times we have ever been in, and our children ought to reap the benefit. They should not have to wait until they are adults and seniors to reap the benefit, they should reap it now, because we will reap the benefit. Having smart children who grow into smart adults who grow into smart grandparents will make a difference in our country.

I say, Mr. Speaker, let us get the money on the table. Fund our schools, stop funding prisons. Fund our schools, stop funding the defense at the level it is.

I want to support the defense and I want the military to be ready, but give me that $4 billion and put it in public schools.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and for his leadership in presenting this motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest as our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), was talking about what is in this bill.

Indeed, there are many good things in it for education. That is why the Democratic negotiators, with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) leading our side, on the House side, were willing to agree to the compromise bill.

In recognizing all of the good provisions for education that are in the bill, it makes one wonder why the Republican leadership would pull the rug from under its own negotiators, make their words worthless in reaching an agreement, when so many good provisions are in there for education.

Of course, the reason is that they were beholden to the extreme elements in the business community who would not accept a compromise on workplace safety.

Mr. Speaker, I have five children, four grandchildren. I am glad we want smart grandparents, too. We have an expression: The children can hear us.

Children are very smart. We tell children that their education is very important to their self-fulfillment, to their ability to earn a living, and also to the competitiveness of our great country.

Yet, we send children another message when we say to them, now, you go to school in a place that is dilapidated, that is leaking, that is not wired for the future. When we say that to kids, they see the hypocrisy of it, the inconsistency of it.

The strongest message we can send children about the value of education is to send them to a place that is appropriate for them where children can learn, where teachers can teach, and where parents can participate.

So it is really quite sad that when this compromise was reached, the leadership did not respect the word of its own negotiators on the Republican side. That is what has made the motion to recommit by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) so necessary. If it is not going to be a compromise, we want the original provisions that the Democrats had been advocating for smaller classes and more modern schools for our children.

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me just make very clear with respect to what we have just heard that the whole reason that the deal fell apart with respect to the labor-HHS-education bill had nothing to do with the education dollars.

Let me make it also clear again what I have said about three times already today, but it does not seem to sink in. That is that the amount of money that is in this legislation, the $1.3 billion, is the exact same amount that is being talked about on the other side of the aisle.

Let me make it finally very clear, to the gentlewoman from Ohio as well as others, that the increase in education funding in the appropriation bill that funds K through 12 education this year is 20 percent, 20 percent, which is probably the highest percentage increase education has ever received in the United States of America.

That has been a combination of Republicans and Democrats. I am not saying Republicans deserve sole credit for that.

Let me just repeat, finally, over the last 5 years that increase has been 8.2 percent. The school construction program was never discussed before, but it is actually in the Republican labor-HHS-education bill. There is no ignoring education on this side of the aisle in any way whatsoever.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), a champion for education and adequate school facilities.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), for his leadership in offering this motion, a motion that recognizes that the Nation's competitive future in a global marketplace depends on how well this and the next generation are educated. Since the Nation's competitive future is at stake, there is clearly a Federal role to play, and a defined Federal role.

We Democrats are not as pessimistic as the view that many of our Republican colleagues have expressed here. No, this may not be all of the money necessary to rebuild all of our schools, but it is a beginning to use as a leverage for States, municipalities, school districts to join in that effort and to stimulate local resources in that regard.

Since we are talking in terms of our competitive future at stake in terms of education, it is appropriate that the Federal government say, ''We want these monies used for these purposes in order to stimulate schools and municipalities to follow in that effort.'' If we leave it wide open to discretion, they may not very well use it for school construction.

Across the country we tell children education is a value, and then we send them to schools that speak of a totally different value, like the South Street School in my district, a school built 115 years ago as a factory, a school that today is a school, a school that has no hallways. One walks up a flight of stairs, goes into one classroom off the landing on one side, the other on the other side. There are no technology connections to the future, no blackboards we can read. There are temporary units, 20 years ago they were temporary, still being used today. How do we educate a child under that set of circumstances?

What the gentleman from New Jersey is trying to say is since the Nation's competitive future is at stake by how well educated these kids are, we need to be able to have a defined Federal purpose.

Lastly, I keep hearing we have an agreement. We keep having Members say, ''We do not agree on Davis-Bacon, we do not agree on flexibility.'' That is not an agreement.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion offered by my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

The fact is that our economy has changed and education may have changed, but the connection between education and success and opportunity for the future has never changed. It is stronger now than ever. We need to

provide our youngsters with that competitive advantage that my colleague just talked about, and we do that through education.

Mr. Speaker, after years of waiting, we came to a bipartisan agreement, bipartisan. Republicans and Democrats agreed that we would deal with the needs of America's schools in the education spending bill.

We did it. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), two leaders that I have a great deal of respect for, sat down in good faith. They hammered out a bipartisan bill.

It would have made one of the greatest investments in public education in a generation. Congress would have passed that bill with bipartisan support and the President would have signed it.

But let us take a look at what happened instead. I quote today's Washington Post:

''Fierce lobbying by powerful corporate groups with considerable sway among the GOP leadership helped kill a deal sealed with Republican negotiators early Monday, led by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers. Business leaders have also bankrolled political ads over the issue that they disagreed on.''

That is what happened. We worked to get this agreement, the special interests weighed in with the Republican leadership, and they blew up the deal. Why? Because big business did not like a part of the bill that protects the health and safety of workers from crippling repetitive stress injuries.

So big business said, ''Jump,'' and the Republican leadership said, ''How high?'' And jump they did. They scuttled the bipartisan agreement. They put the whole investment in education in serious jeopardy.

The Republican leadership is telling America's schoolchildren, ''Wait, because the special interests must be served.'' That is wrong. It is wrong. It is unfair. It is an affront to the values of American families, who want their kids to be able to go to a first-class school.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of points. One is, again, we have in the basic appropriation bill that is going through, that will pass here eventually, the $1.3 billion for construction.

Secondly, it is a 20 percent increase in education for this year.

I want to look at the history of this for a moment. This is very important, because we are only talking about 5 years ago.

The Congress, under Democrat control, appropriated $100 million for fiscal year 1995 for the School Facilities Infrastructure Improvement Act. But the President rescinded this, and subsequently the program has received no funding.

Following that rescission of funds for fiscal year 1995, the President's fiscal year 1996 budget request did not include any money for the Education Infrastructure Act.

In fact, the Department of Education budget documents stated: ''The construction and renovation of school facilities has traditionally been the responsibility of State and local governments, financed primarily by local taxpayers. We are opposed to the creation of a new Federal grant program for school construction. No funds are requested for this program in 1996. For the reasons explained above, the administration opposes the creation of a new Federal grant program for school construction.''

That was the last year that the Democrats had control of the House of Representatives here, and they refused to do anything about school construction in conjunction with the President.

Now that it is a popular issue politically out there, everyone is talking about it. I do not have a great problem with that because I think we should be doing that, but it is the Republicans who have led the charge for expending more money and making sure we are helping our schools.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I wanted the gentleman to clarify his remarks about the President rescinding money for infrastructure. It was a Republican-controlled Congress that rescinded the money. They came in just after that bill was passed. It was the Senator from Illinois that led that and got $100 million into the budget, and it was a Republican-controlled Congress who rescinded that.

□ 1330

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), another champion for excellent education.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion to instruct conferees to put our children's education first by giving them modern, safe schools, and smaller class sizes.

We, as Members of the 106th Congress from both parties, could not find a more legitimate, nor a more timely, use of a proportion of our surplus than to help our communities build new schools and equip those schools with up-to-date technology. All of our public school kids deserve an equal opportunity for a good education, including those who come from communities with the highest property tax burdens who therefore cannot afford to build and repair their schools.

Mr. Speaker, the average age of our public schools is now 42 years, a third of them are in bad need of repair or complete replacement.

As only one example, in my district in Greenfield, Massachusetts, a town of 20,000 people, the middle school was closed because the walls were literally crumbling, threatening the safety of the students. Now the middle school students are crammed into the town's overcrowded high school which has a leaking roof.

Mr. Speaker, last week, the majority passed the flawed $2½ billion school construction bond program in their tax bill. In that same bill, they gave $18 billion, seven times as much in a variety of business tax breaks, including, of all things, additional tax deduction for business meals and the repeal of taxes for producers and marketers of alcoholic beverages.

Remember the three martini lunches?

Those are simply wrong priorities. We should not put tax breaks for business ahead of our schools and our children's education.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to accept this motion and thereby improve the Labor-HHS bill.

Mr. Speaker, if, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. GOODLING) has said, this issue is all agreed, then bring the negotiated Labor, Health and Education agreement to the floor, and we will take a long step toward completing our work.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, we probably said this about 10 times, we keep thinking this is the last time he is going to be on the floor, but we keep coming back. This is truly a friend of education in the United States.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a couple of minutes, because I do not think most people know what is in the agreement when I sit here listening to the discussion.

First of all, please do not use the word construction. We are not talking about construction at all. The $1.3 billion has nothing to do with construction. The $1.3 billion is renovation, modernization. The whole thing is renovation and repair, that is what the $1.3 billion is all about.

Do not get people out there thinking that somehow or another with $1.3 billion we are going to do some construction. Obviously, you cannot construct two classrooms or three classrooms with $1.3 billion, so let us make sure we have our terminology correct.

That construction business they are talking about over on bond issues and so on, but not $1.3 billion.

First of all, under the proposal, everybody understands we are talking about $1.3 billion. It does not matter whether you are the White House, whether you are Republicans or Democrats. It is $1.3 billion.

Under this proposal, we say 75 percent would be allocated to school districts for one-time competitive grants for classroom renovation and repair. A portion of the funds would be targeted to high-poverty schools and rural schools.

School districts would receive 25 percent of the funds through competitive grants for use under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act or school technology, discretion of the local agency. It goes out based on title I formula to the States, and then those grants go from that point on.

Criteria for awarding renovation grants to school districts would include the percentage of school children counted for title I grants, the need for renovation, the district's fiscal capacity to fund renovation repairs without assistance, a charter schools ability to access public financing and the district's ability to maintain the facilities if renovated.

Funds for renovation repair could be used for emergency repairs for health and safety, compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, access and accommodations provisions for the Rehabilitation Act, and asbestos. No new construction would be allowed, except in connection with Native American schools. The 25 percent would be distributed to school districts through competitive grants.

Under the $25 million, they could use that for charter school demonstration projects to determine in public schools what is the best means for leveraging the money.

Again, I want to make sure we understand what it is that the Democrats have agreed to, the Republicans have agreed to, and the White House has agreed to.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), my distinguished colleague who will explain that we do indeed understand what is stated here.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), my colleague, for this motion to instruct. On this Labor HHS appropriations bill or on another pending bill, we must address this issue of school construction. The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and Representative JOHNSON have offered a very positive proposal, as has the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), my colleague, with his particular focus on high-growth areas.

Mr. Speaker, I come from one of those high-growth areas, where thousands of students are going to school in hundreds of trailers, and we have to do something about it.

Some have portrayed this as some kind of grab for Federal control; that could not be more inaccurate. The decision about when and how and if to build would remain with local authorities, but the Federal Government would be a partner, using tax credits for bond holders to lessen the interest burden on local communities, to stretch those bond dollars further, and to relieve pressures on the local property tax.

A survey in my district recently showed that over 90 percent of our students grades K through 3 were going to school in classes of over 18. Almost one-third of the students were going to school in classes of 25 or more. We need to do better than that.

I fully expect us to approve a bond issue next Tuesday that will help in my district's largest county, but we have to stay with this challenge.

We need to recruit more well-trained teachers, and we need to build and modernize school facilities so that those teachers and their students can do their best work.

Vote for this motion to instruct. This Congress should not adjourn before we have addressed the pressing needs in our communities for school construction.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, again, I just want to repeat. We are not talking about school construction in this one $1.3 billion so everybody understands that.

But I do want to correct the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), she made a statement that it fell apart because of the Republicans. It did not fall apart because of the Republicans. It did not fall apart because of the Democrats. It did not fall apart because of the White House, although I think the White House may have known that what they agreed to was not the language that was written.

As soon as we saw the language, it was obvious what they thought they were doing they were not doing, and that all deals with ergonomics. I am sure that will be repaired. It was not Republicans. It was not Democrats. It is was not the White House. It was the language.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) for bringing up this important issue of not only construction but modernization, which we need both. It is not one issue, but it is both issues. I think it is important that we look at it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address this from California's perspective. By the year 2003, California will have to provide more new schools than the entire number of schools that exist in Nebraska. This is in the whole State of Nebraska, California will need more than the whole State, it will cost approximately $6 million to provide new buildings.

Our existing schools need to be modernized and repaired at a cost of over $10 million, and 60 percent of our public schools in California are more than 25 years old.

It is important that we look and put a high priority in education. Education is the number one priority. If we do not invest in education, we are failing America. We need to invest in our future. We need to look at our children to make sure that we create an atmosphere that is good for them. That means that they have to have the construction in the schools there.

In California, alone, we have more portable trailers than we do anything else. When we look at safety, it is important that we provide a safety environment for our children as well. If we do not have, what is going to happen to America? We need to invest in education. This is the beginning.

We need to invest both in modernization and school construction, if we need to meet the demands of our future as well. We want to make sure our children have an opportunity to learn, an opportunity and environment that is conducive like anyone else.

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

Mr. Speaker, after the funds for construction or renovation were taken away in fiscal year 1995—we are talking about 5 years ago now—the President's fiscal year 1996 budget request did not include any money for the Education Infrastructure Act.

I think it is important, and I did this earlier, but I want to put this in, this is exact quotes from what the Department of Education budget documents stated, this is President Clinton, ''the construction and renovation of school facilities has traditionally been the responsibility of State and local governments financed primarily by local taxpayers. We are opposed to the creation of a new Federal grant program for school construction. No funds are requested for this program in 1996. For the reason explained above, the administration opposes the creation of a new Federal grant program for school construction.''

It is now 5 years later the tea leaves are reading a little differently. People seem to favor education and all of a sudden we have a reversal of fortune as far as school construction is concerned from the administration and obviously from some of the people who have spoken here.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say that on this side of the aisle, we have met the needs of education from the Federal point of view, as well as we could, having higher percentages of increases, 8.2 percent for the last 5 years versus 6 percent for the 5 years before that under the Democrats. This year, in particular, the increase, Mr. Speaker, is 20 percent from last year to this year. It meets all of the requests as far as construction is concerned of $1.3 billion that the President has made.

I do not know what the arguments are, but they are relatively small time as far as any differences that can be picked upon that the Republicans have proposed to try to help with these problems and the problems of education.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) a champion for education for all.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Holt motion to instruct on H.R. 4577, because we cannot expect our children to get a first-rate education in second-rate and third-rate school buildings. A recent GAO study on the condition of America's schools found that 60 percent of schools in America need at least one major repair or they need renovation.

On top of that, and we have said it today, even though it is not part of this, on top of repairs and renovation, we also have a great need for new schools, in my home State alone, in California, more than 30,000 additional classrooms will be needed in the next 8 years.

What is the message that we are sending our young children, when their communities boast new, shiny shopping malls and new sports stadiums, while we tell them that they must try to learn in overcrowded, crumbling schools?

This is the time, Mr. Speaker, for us to show our children that they are absolutely as important as a new mall or a new stadium.

A vote for the Holt motion is a vote for this Nation's most precious resource, our children. Our children are 25 percent of our population. Our children are 100 percent of the future of our Nation.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2¼ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

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

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that both sides care about education. I think that from the bottom of my heart. But the way we get there is different. My colleagues on the other side have their interests. We have ours.

When my colleagues on the other side talk about school construction, for example, my colleagues on the other side want it to fall under Davis-Bacon which costs 35 percent more. We want to let the schools keep the money. My colleagues on the other side want it to go to the unions.

The only interests that both sides should have here is the school children, not the unions. I had a hearing when I was chairman of the Authorization Committee, some of my colleagues were here at that hearing.

□ 1345

We had 16 people from all over the country. They said they had the absolute best program in the entire world. At the end of the hearing, as chairman, I said; Which one of you have any one of the other 15 in your district? Of course, none.

We said that is the whole idea. We want to send you the money directly to the school where the parents, the teachers, the community can make those decisions on spending education dollars, not Washington bureaucrats. That way, you get more effective results.

In my opinion, that is a lot of the reason why Head Start and some of the other education programs do not work. They are underfunded, because there are too many other bureaucracies that eat up the money, and one gets very little money down to the classroom in the Federal program.

Federal education spending is only about 7 percent, yet it ties up a lot of the money at the local level. We think that is wrong. So when one talks about children, we want the money to get down to children, not the unions, not the liberal trial lawyers and special education administrators, not the bureaucracy back here in Washington; but to children, to teachers, to the community.

I would say to my colleagues, we care about education, and I believe you do. But let us both come together and get the maximum amount of dollars to the schools, not the special interests.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from New Jersey has 4¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to address the comment there, because here we go again. This has been held up. The agreement has been held up over worker safety. We have failed to get the minimum wage.

I have to remind the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) who just spoke that Davis and Bacon were two Republicans who thought that it was really unfair to have outside workers come in and, not just undercut wages, but undercut working standards. That is what we are trying to preserve here.

As I understood from the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) and the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), this was in fact agreed upon. Davis-Bacon is not the issue here.

Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, there are two very good academic studies that have been done that show that Davis-Bacon does not increase the cost of schools. In fact, the best schools and the best buildings are put up by Davis-Bacon contractors, so much so that the Fortune 500 corporations have recently decided that they prefer to hire Davis-Bacon contractors because they get the best work done in the final analysis.

We have all kinds of impediments being thrown in the way of the use of Federal dollars to solve a basic problem. In the context of a $230 billion surplus, why are we quibbling about $1.3 billion for school renovations, repair, construction, whatever one wants to say? If a coal burning furnace in the school is removed, are we going to call that renovation or repair? I do not care. Let us get the deadly fumes and the pollution of the coal burning furnace out of the schools.

We have more than 100 schools in New York that still have coal burning furnaces. Do we have to have the Federal Government do this? Obviously we do since the States are lagging so far behind. Or perhaps the Federal Government can serve as a stimulus, and by providing some of the money, stimulate and embarrass the States and the local governments into doing far more.

The estimate is that we need about $320 billion just to take care of infrastructure needs for the current enrollment, without projecting future enrollment. That is the estimate of the National Education Association. One might say they are a teacher organization, they are biased.

Well, the education commissioner recently came up with a statement that $127 billion is needed. Some years ago, 1994, the General Accounting Office said we needed $110 billion then.

The need is great. We are going to improve education. The least we can do is take care of the highly-visible infrastructure problems. It does not require the Federal Government getting involved with decision making. It is a capital expenditure.

You go in; you give help; you get out. It is the best way to spend Federal dollars, most efficient way to spend Federal dollars. Let us do it today.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the other side of the aisle spent a lot of time talking about two deceased Republican Members of Congress, Davis and Bacon. We on this side are talking about the future of the children of our communities.

My father taught all his life in public schools. He retired as a principal. Oftentimes he and many of his fellow educators would tell me, please, get rid of the burden imposed upon us by the Federal Government. Let us teach the kids. Give us the resources to do it.

In this bill we have the resources. We have spent 20 percent more than last year on education. Our construction dollars are identical to what the demands of the minority are. We are meeting in the middle to try and solve the problems for children.

The rhetoric should stop. The actions should start. The children will be able to learn if we pass this bill without some of the sentiment attached.

I can just tell my colleagues, going to classrooms every time I am in Florida, I find kids eager to learn. Yes, the conditions are poor. But I was in a portable in 1973 in high school. I was in the same conditions then, and that is when the Democrats ran this place. For 40 years, they ran it; and, finally, education is getting better, thanks to the majority party today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Each side has 1¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) has the right to close.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have not been able to make the point, I do not believe, for the membership of the Congress that we are not talking about school construction. So I guess I will now address everyone who is sitting up here and everyone who might be watching it, please do not get the idea that we are talking about school construction.

We are talking about $1.3 billion that the President asked for for renovation and repairs, $1.3 billion. That is what the President asked for. That is what the Democrat-Republican group on the Committee on Appropriations said he gets. That is what those of us who negotiated how the money goes out said, here is your $1.3 billion. Renovation and repair. A done deal.

Let me once again say, under this proposal $1.3 billion would be distributed to States under the title I formula, with a set-aside for small States. Seventy-five percent would be allocated to school districts for one-time competitive grants for classroom renovation and repair.

A portion of the funds would be targeted to high-poverty schools and rural schools. School districts would receive 25 percent of the funds through competitive grants from the State for use under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and school technology. That is what we have negotiated. That is what the President has asked for. That is what everybody has agreed will happen.

The legislation we are discussing now has not been sidetracked, as I said before, because of Republicans. It is sidetracked because, at midnight or after midnight, they thought they had language that they, the Republicans, Democrats and the White House, agreed to in relationship to ergonomics. They discovered after rereading it that it did not do what they said at all. We now have new language, hopefully, that will go forward. But it is a done deal.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their comments to the Chair.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think the speakers here have made it clear why it is necessary to instruct the conferees to depart from the Senate amendment, which denies the President's request for dedicated resources for local school construction and instead broadly expands block grants.

The other side has said we are plowing the same ground. Any farmer in my district will tell us that one can plow ground again and again. Until one plants, one cannot reap.

We want to make sure that we actually get some benefits, that the students of America can reap the benefits here. Talk is cheap. We have yet to have a vote on this. That is why it is necessary to instruct conferees so we can bring to the floor legislation that will take care of the decrepit and crumbling schools and the pressing need for construction of new classrooms.

We are not here to refight partisan squabbles of 1995 and 1996 the other side seems to want to do, about who killed what and who rescinded what. That is not the point. The point is that, today, we have a multi-hundred billion dollar need in the schools of America to provide adequate facilities so students can learn for the 21st century.

That is why it is necessary to instruct the conferees to depart from the Senate language so that we can actually, not just talk about providing these facilities for the students of America, but vote on it and see that it is done.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the motion to instruct Labor–HHS Appropriations Conferees to insist on dedicating funding for school construction.

Right now, three-quarters of the nation's schools need funding to bring their buildings into a "good overall condition."

Right now, the average age of a public school building is 42 years, an age when schools tend to deteriorate.

How can a child learn when she has to cross a courtyard to get to a temporary trailor for one of her classes?

How can a child learn when her classes are held in janitor closets?

How can a child learn when her school needs emergency repairs?

How can a child learn when her class meets in a hallway?

How can a child learn when the school is crumbling around her?

We have an obligation to do something about this problem. And our children should not have to wait.

Two hundred and thirty Members of Congress support the Johnson-Rangel school construction measure.

This bipartisan bill helps communities to modernize their current schools and construct new facilities so our children will learn in the finest facilities possible.

Mr. Speaker, it is unconscionable that while the Republican leadership can't set aside $25 billion for modernization and construction of new schools, it has no problem giving $28 billion in tax breaks to big businesses, HMOs, and insurance companies.

It is unfortunate that we are at the end of the appropriations process and the education priorities are still not taken care of.

Our number one priority must be education. And school construction funding must happen this year.

Our children are counting on us.

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

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

Mr. HOLT. 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 176, nays 183, not voting 73, as follows:

[Roll No. 590]

YEAS—176

Abercrombie	Hoeffel	Oberstar
Allen	Holden	Obey
Andrews	Holt	Olver
Baca	Hooley	Ortiz
Baird	Hoyer	Owens
Baldacci	Inslee	Pallone
Baldwin	Jackson (IL)	Pascrell
Barcia	Jefferson	Pastor
Barrett (WI)	John	Payne
Becerra	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
Bentsen	Jones (OH)	Phelps
Berkley	Kanjorski	Pomeroy
Berman	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Berry	Kildee	Quinn
Blagojevich	Kind (WI)	Rahall
Blumenauer	Kleczka	Rangel
Bonior	Kucinich	Reyes
Borski	LaFalce	Rivers
Boswell	Lampson	Rodriguez
Brady (PA)	Larson	Roemer
Capps	Lee	Rothman
Capuano	Levin	Roybal-Allard
Cardin	Lewis (GA)	Rush
Carson	Lipinski	Sanchez
Clayton	LoBiondo	Sanders
Clement	Lofgren	Sandlin
Clyburn	Lowey	Sawyer
Costello	Lucas (KY)	Schakowsky
Coyne	Luther	Serrano
Cramer	Maloney (CT)	Sherman
Crowley	Maloney (NY)	Shows
Cummings	Markey	Sisisky
Davis (IL)	Mascara	Skelton
DeFazio	Matsui	Slaughter
DeGette	McCarthy (MO)	Smith (NJ)
Delahunt	McCarthy (NY)	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	McDermott	Snyder
Deutsch	McGovern	Souder
Dixon	McHugh	Stabenow
Doggett	McIntyre	Stark
Doyle	McKinney	Strickland
Edwards	McNulty	Stupak
Engel	Meehan	Tanner
Eshoo	Meek (FL)	Tauscher
Etheridge	Meeks (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Evans	Menendez	Thompson (MS)
Farr	Millender-McDonald	Thurman
Fattah	Miller, George	Tierney
Filner	Minge	Towns
Frost	Mink	Udall (CO)
Gephardt	Moakley	Udall (NM)
Gonzalez	Moore	Velazquez
Gordon	Moran (VA)	Visclosky
Green (TX)	Morella	Watt (NC)
Gutierrez	Murtha	Weiner
Hall (OH)	Nadler	Weygand
Hill (IN)	Napolitano	Woolsey
Hilliard	Ney	Wu
Hinchey		Wynn

NAYS—183

Aderholt	Bartlett	Blunt
Armey	Barton	Boehner
Bachus	Bass	Bonilla
Baker	Bereuter	Bono
Ballenger	Biggert	Bryant
Barr	Bilirakis	Burr
Barrett (NE)	Bliley	Burton

Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chenoweth-Hage
Coble
Coburn
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Manzullo
Martinez
McCrery
McInnis
Metcalf
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanford
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Watkins
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—73

Ackerman
Archer
Bilbray
Bishop
Boehlert
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Chambliss
Clay
Collins
Conyers
Danner
Davis (FL)
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley
Dunn
Emerson
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Gejdenson
Gibbons
Greenwood
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hill (MT)
Hinojosa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Kasich
Kennedy
Kilpatrick
Klink
Lantos
Lazio
Lucas (OK)
McCollum
McIntosh
McKeon
Mica
Mollohan
Neal
Northup
Ose
Peterson (PA)
Pickett
Sabo
Salmon
Saxton
Scarborough
Scott
Shaw
Shays
Spratt
Talent
Turner
Wamp
Waters
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Wise

□ 1416

Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. WILSON, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. PORTMAN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. NEY changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 590, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed House rollcall Vote No. 590. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. SOUDER. I erroneously voted in favor of rollcall vote No. 590, the Holt Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 4577, the Departments of Labor, Health, and Human Services, and Education and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2001. I intended to vote "nay" on that rollcall vote.

□

NATIONAL RECORDING PRESERVATION ACT OF 2000

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4846) to establish the National Recording Registry in the Library of Congress to maintain and preserve sound recordings that are culturally, historically, or aesthetically significant, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and disagree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Senate amendments:

Page 2, line 13, after ''recordings'' insert ''and collections of sound recordings''.

Page 2, line 20, after ''recordings'' insert ''and collections of sound recordings''.

Page 2, line 23, strike out ''10'' and insert ''25''.

Page 3, line 4, after ''recordings'' insert ''and collections of sound recordings''.

Page 3, line 10, after ''recording'' insert ''or collection of sound recordings''.

Page 3, line 14, after ''recording'' insert ''or collection of sound recordings''.

Page 3, line 22, after ''recording'' insert ''or collection of sound recordings''.

Page 4, line 11, after ''recording'' insert ''or collection of sound recordings''.

Page 4, line 20, after ''recording'' insert ''or collection of sound recordings''.

Page 4, line 22, strike out ''recording,'' and insert ''recording or collection,''.

Page 6, line 21, after ''access'' insert ''(including electronic access)''.

Page 11, line 21, after ''TION'' insert ''OR ORGANIZATION''.

Page 13, line 5, after ''recordings'' insert ''and collections of sound recordings''.

Page 14, after line 21, insert:

(c) ENCOURAGING ACCESSIBILITY TO REGISTRY AND OUT OF PRINT RECORDINGS.—The Board shall encourage the owners of recordings and collections of recordings included in the National Recording Registry and the owners of out of print recordings to permit digital access to such recordings through the National Audio-Visual Conservation Center at Culpeper, Virginia, in order to reduce the portion of the Nation's recorded cultural legacy which is inaccessible to students, educators, and others, and may suggest such other measures as it considers reasonable and appropriate to increase public accessibility to such recordings.

Page 15, after line 7, insert:

SEC. 126. ESTABLISHMENT OF BYLAWS BY LIBRARIAN.

The Librarian may establish such bylaws (consistent with this subtitle) as the Librarian considers appropriate to govern the organization and operation of the Board, including bylaws relating to appointments and removals of members or organizations described in section 122(a)(2) which may be required as a result of changes in the title, membership, or nature of such organizations occurring after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Page 16, after line 18, insert:

SEC. 133. ENCOURAGING ACTIVITIES TO FOCUS ON RARE AND ENDANGERED RECORDINGS.

Congress encourages the Librarian and the Board, in carrying out their duties under this Act, to undertake activities designed to preserve and bring attention to sound recordings which are rare and sound recordings and collections of recordings which are in danger of becoming lost due to deterioration.

Page 16, line 19, strike out ''133'' and insert ''134''.

Amend the title so as to read: ''An Act to establish the National Recording Registry in the Library of Congress to maintain and preserve sound recordings and collections of sound recordings that are culturally, historically, or aesthetically significant, and for other purposes.''.

Mr. THOMAS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4577, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer the motion to instruct that I presented yesterday pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WU moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 4577, be instructed to insist on disagreeing with provisions in the Senate amendment which denies the President's request for dedicated resources to reduce class size in the early grades and instead, broadly expands the Title VI Education Block Grant with limited accountability in the use of funds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) and the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

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

Mr. Speaker, today I urge the leadership to keep our promise to the Nation's school children by continuing the program to reduce class size in the