in healing more in trial lawyers than they do in physicians.

Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent upon this House to pass a bill that is a help to patients, rather than a boom to the trial lawyer's lobby. Let us opt for the plan of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER) to truly help patients rather than trial lawyers.

AMERICAN FARMLAND STEWARDSHIP ACT
(Mr. PUTNAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce important legislation to assist American farmers and ranchers in achieving valuable conservation goals in the protection of our natural resources.

Today's farmers and ranchers are facing increasing challenges in protecting environmentally sensitive lands while ensuring an abundant, safe food supply. Greater access to conservation programs must be a part of our agricultural policy.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing the American Farmland Stewardship Act of 2001 which will help foster responsible care and stewardship of our natural resources by agricultural producers. The Act provides incentive-based initiatives aimed at assisting farmers in meeting environmental requirements and the protection of endangered habitat, wetlands, improved water quality and water access, treatment of discharge, deterrence of invasive species and other important environmental challenges.

The American Farmland Stewardship Act will ensure greater protection of natural resources by providing economic assistance to agricultural producers to improve and protect natural resources and assist farmers and ranchers in staying competitive in the world market.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in cosponsoring the American Farmland Stewardship Act.

ENERGY SECURITY ACT
(Mr. REHBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, we are facing an energy shortage. While our production is slowing, take natural gas is actually outstripping our consumption. While our President said just last week, we in Washington cannot make Americans love their neighbors, but we can make resources available to those who have a heart for service, but not a wallet. For too long official Washington has used strict legalism as their excuse for walking by on the other side of the road, denying recognition and assistance to the faith-based institutions who have been making a profound difference in the communities we serve for over 100 years.

Mr. Speaker, the Community Solutions Act will bring this era of discrimination to an end. It will empower Americans and institutions of faith by increasing charitable giving through tax deductions, expanding charitable choice to allow religious organizations funds on an equal footing with non-religious institutions and other reforms.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 7 and let a new era of cooperation between public and private organizations that battle poverty and social maladies to begin.

PASSING THE LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHODD). Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. MCNULTY. 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 372, nays 47, answered “present” 1, not voting 13, as follows:

(ROLL NO. 236)
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Abercrombie    Ackerman    Akin
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COMMUNITY SOLUTIONS ACT

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the well this morning in strong support of the Community Solutions Act that we will consider shortly today. As our President said just last week, we in Washington cannot make Americans love their neighbors, but we can make resources available to those who have a heart for service, but not a wallet. For too long official Washington has used strict legalism as their excuse for walking by on the other side of the road, denying recognition and assistance to the faith-based institutions who have been making a profound difference in the communities we serve for over 100 years.

Mr. Speaker, the Community Solutions Act will bring this era of discrimination to an end. It will empower Americans and institutions of faith by increasing charitable giving through tax deductions, expanding charitable choice to allow religious organizations funds on an equal footing with non-religious institutions and other reforms.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 7 and let a new era of cooperation between public and private organizations that battle poverty and social maladies to begin.
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APPPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1, NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has been involved in education policy since 1965. Thirty-six years later we are finally getting serious about de-

manding results for our Nation’s chil-

dren. As the Chicago Tribune noted re-
cently, “Congress has spent the last four decades appropriating massive amounts of money to try to even out the educational experiences that dis-

advantaged children receive compared to their more fortunate peers. And in return for that long-term multi-billion dollar investment, we have gotten more disappointment. Most states show continuing gaps in achievement be-

 tween poor and middle-class kids, and between white and minority stu-

dents. Meanwhile, our students have fallen behind those of other countries.”

Washington finally seems ready to put an end to this era of lost oppor-

tunity, the best of President Bush and reform-minded legislators on both sides of the political aisle.

The No Child Left Behind Act, H.R. 1, passed this House on May 23 by a vote of 384 to 45, and reflects each of the four pillars of President Bush’s edu-

cation reform plan: accountability and testing, flexibility and local control, funding for what works, and expanded parental options.

H.R. 1 embodies President Bush’s vi-

sion for education in America. That vi-

sion says a number of important things.

It says that when States use Federal education dollars, they should be ac-

countable for getting results.

It says that parents should be em-

powered with data about the schools their children are attending, the qual-

ifications of the teachers teaching their children, and their children’s academic progress.

It says Federal education resources should be focused on helping students who are in the most need of help. We should increase for what works and en-

sure Federal education dollars are tar-

geted to where they will make the big-

gest impact for our neediest children.

It says that to meet the tough new accountability standards, teachers and local school officials should have great-

er flexibility to decide how to address their students’ unique needs.

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

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

We differ from our colleagues in the Senate on the issue of targeting re-

sources to our most disadvantaged stu-

dents, a goal that I think the House version embraces. We do believe that Federal education resources should be targeted to helping the most disadvan-

taged of our students and helping them to learn to read, to learn English, and to learn math skills. Accordingly, we passed a bill that focuses funds toward our poorest students, streamlines bu-

earaucy and refocuses Federal edu-

cation dollars towards students who need help the most.

The Senate bill, by contrast, actually expands the overall number of pro-

grams significantly. It creates many more new programs than does the House bill, and the overall number of programs is significantly higher. Ac-


cording to the Congressional Research Service, there are 55 currently funded elementary and secondary education programs, and the Senate bill would in-

crease that number to 89.

Many new programs added by the Senate may have merit. But the more programs we create, the harder it be-

comes to target Federal resources to the very students that we are trying to help. President Bush and reform-minded legislators on both sides of the political aisle agree that we must focus on what works and expand the escape routes for students trapped in failing schools.

The fact of the matter is that these students already have enough to com-

pete against. Life’s circumstances are already more than enough for most of them. They should not have to compete for the opportunity to learn to read, to learn English, or to learn to add and subtract and multiply.

There are other areas where we are going to need to address issues as well: accountability. Parents should be empowered with data, and States should be re-

quired to demonstrate that they are using Federal resources to close the achievement gaps that exist between disadvantaged students and their peers.

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

And we must ensure that there is an escape route for students trapped in dangerous, failing schools that just do not change. The House bill provides for immediate public and charter school choice to parents with children in fail-

ing public schools. We hope our Senate colleagues will join us in embracing this new option for parents.

We look forward to taking the final step in what has been a very long pro-

cess this year. We are looking forward to sending to the President an edu-

cation bill that reflects his principles and begins making an immediate im-

pact for students in schools all across America.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to go to conference. We have a historic opportunity to come out of this conference with an education re-

form bill that will benefit America’s children. In May we passed an over-

whelmingly bipartisan bill to ensure