

case, means going up to 40 percent of the excess cost.

Mr. Speaker, we began this discussion 26 years ago when we agreed with States and local education agencies that we should provide a free and appropriate education to every child who has a disability. We knew this was going to require a large investment, not only by the States and local school districts, but by the Federal Government as well. The Federal Government made a promise. They said, we are going to pay up to 40 percent of the excess costs for every student. However, we have not done that. In fact, this year we are doing the most we have ever done, and we are up to less than 15 percent.

I participated in a lot of conversations regarding full funding of IDEA in the past couple of months with my colleagues, committee staff and leadership. Full funding is a large investment, I understand that, and it raises some concerns. One of the concerns I have heard is that if we increase the amount of money going to the States to educate children with disabilities, that the school districts will over-identify these children to get more money. Well, I want to tell my colleagues that that is simply not true. Let us talk about the real situation that is happening in our schools.

Again, the Federal Government right now is giving a little over one-third of the money that they promised 26 years ago; and as a result of this underfunding, what has happened is schools have had to pull money out of other programs to make up for it. They have had to pull money out of textbooks and after-school programs and additional teachers. As a consequence, what we are seeing is an under-identification of children with disabilities. School districts hesitate to label a child with learning disabilities or behavioral problems or mental disorders because they cannot afford to provide them the services they need. Fully funding IDEA will not result in a mass frenzy of school districts to label as many children as they can with disabilities. In fact, just the opposite will happen. If we can get young children the services they need early on, we may prevent a need for more drastic intervention later on.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced bipartisan legislation with the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) and many of my colleagues here today. Our bill would authorize funding to bring the Federal Government's share of educating children with disabilities up to the 40 percent mark by 2006, so we are trying to do it over a period of time. It is expensive. This increase will cost about \$3 billion a year. It is a large investment, but we must remember, if we do not pay our fair share of the cost, our share does not just go away; someone else is covering for us.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we kept the promise that we made to our children 26 years ago and invest in the education of every child.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HONDA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REINTRODUCTION OF SPOUSAL REUNIFICATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask that my colleagues join me in supporting legislation that I reintroduced today that would permit the admission into the United States of nonimmigrant visitors who are the spouses and children of permanent resident aliens residing and working in this country.

This legislation is intended to fill a void in our current immigration policy that has resulted in permanent resident aliens, people who have come into this country legally and who are gainfully employed, being separated from their spouses and children often for periods of several years. This bill would simply make it easier for family members to come to the United States on a temporary basis with provisions to penalize those who overstay their visas. Its goal is to alleviate the human hardship of prolonged family separation.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation would eliminate the implication that the existence of a petition for permanent residence implies that an applicant will not return to his or her home nation and would remain in the United States after the expiration of a temporary visa. This equitable solution simply grants to immigrant family members the same opportunity to visit the United States as all others desiring to come here as visitors or students. The legislation anticipates the possibility that some may violate the terms of their visas by overstaying the period for which the visa provides. It penalizes spouses or children of permanent residents who overstay their visas by allowing the Secretary of State to delay their permanent visa petitions for one year if visa durations are violated.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues may remember, last year in the Omnibus Appropriations bill, Congress took a step in alleviating this hardship. The Omnibus bill created a new V nonimmigrant visa category. This new visa would be available to spouses and minor children of legal permanent residents who have been waiting 3 years or more for an immigrant visa. The recipients of this temporary visa would be protected from deportation and granted work authorization until immigration visa or adjustment of status processing is completed.

However, while this new program has good intentions, Mr. Speaker, 3 years is still too long to be apart from one's loved ones. My bill would immediately

expedite the process in allowing foreign-born immigrants to see their family for a short period of time before they are eligible for the V visa. My legislation would not nullify the V visa, but rather provide for temporary visas in the interim.

Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that this proposal will receive strong support from Members of Congress, particularly members of our Caucus on India and Indian-Americans, and other Members who agree with the need to address this inequity. The issue of spousal and child reunification has been identified as one of the top domestic priorities of the Asian-Indian community in the United States. With the India caucus members working together, enactment of this bill would be an opportunity for the caucus to make its presence felt in another substantive way. Furthermore, this proposal has already received significant support from some of America's major corporations, particularly in the information and communications sectors, who recognize the importance of allowing their valued employees to have greater contact with their families.

The bill is, by its very nature, an interim measure in order to allay some of the misunderstandings that may arise. It should be pointed out that the legislation will not result in an increase in the number of immigrants admitted annually. It will not have an impact on the labor market, and it will not have any adverse effects on any government social programs since the spouses would not be entitled to these benefits. It is a very modest proposal intended only to bring some relief to families separated by unfortunate administrative delays.

SUPPORTING FULL FUNDING FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise here today to support full funding of special education, not next year, not the year after, not 10 years from now, but this year. I want to begin with a few comments that should be obvious.

First, the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act of 1975 authorized Congress to cover 40 percent of the cost of special education in order to provide students with disabilities a free and appropriate education.

□ 1300

That was in 1975. It has been a long time, but we have not come close to fully funding special education.

The points I want to make at the beginning are these:

First, the mandate to provide a free and appropriate education to students with disabilities was a Federal mandate. It was passed by this Congress, and it required the States and local school districts to spend more than