

we call transferability at the local level. In fact, I think the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER) and I agree. When it comes to the Straight A's proposal, we have a better deal in H.R. 1.

It was not a deal that I came to these negotiations with. It is not a deal that the chairman brought to these negotiations. We both had very different views about how this could be carried out to provide for the flexibility that so many of us have heard in our districts, school districts and administrators have asked for as they deal with the education of the children that they know best.

□ 1430

But out of these negotiations, with great help from the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) and others, a solution came forward to provide that kind of flexibility to the local level of school decision-making in each and every one of our States.

We have the opportunity in this legislation, as I have said, to pass a sound bipartisan education reform bill that I believe will benefit all of the children of this Nation, and I look forward over the next few days to work with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and Members on the other side of the aisle, with the members of our committee, and with the Members in the House generally to consider each and every amendment, to give it a fair hearing, and to give it our support or our opposition based on the merits and the differences that some of us have about the direction of the American education system.

As the chairman said when he started his remarks in this debate, as he did when we started our discussions in the committee, this is a debate on the merits of the education system in this country and about those proposals being put forth to reform that system, to hold that system accountable, and to get the results all of us want for all of our children. This is not about a personal political debate; this is not about attacking the motives or the integrity of any Member of Congress. Where we differ, it is on the merits.

To his credit, he kept the debate on that level in the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and for that reason we had overwhelming bipartisan support for this legislation, again, that represents the ideas on both sides of the aisle; and I would hope that this is the legislation that would emerge after we go through the markup here in the Committee of the Whole. I look forward to the continuation of the debate next week.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, the desperate need to repair America's schools is not a new issue for any of us here today. Five years ago, I conducted a survey of New York City schools and discovered that one in every four schools holds classes in areas such as hall-

ways, gyms, bathrooms, and janitors' closets. Two-thirds of these schools had substandard critical building features, such as roofs, walls, and floors. This is an outrage and a disgrace.

In response to that shocking study, I worked with the Administration to author the very first school modernization bill in 1996.

Five years later, with school enrollment skyrocketing, the need to renovate and repair our schools is even more pressing. Yet this problem is simply too big for local and state officials to handle alone. States are doing the best they can but they need federal dollars to fill in the holes. In fact, the National Education Association estimates that the unmet school modernization need in America's schools totals over \$300 billion—and that's on top of what school districts and states are already spending!

Simply stated, the need for school modernization is a national problem that demands a national response. And that's why I am so disappointed that the amendment to provide school construction funds was not made in order. Frankly, my colleagues, I think this is an issue where we will pay now, or pay later. We know that students cannot learn when the walls are literally crumbling around them. If we do not provide the resources—even this targeted emergency assistance—we will continue to undermine our students and teachers as they struggle to meet standards and achieve academically.

We can spend this money now, targeted at the most urgent repairs first, providing funding to high-need school districts for critical repairs such as sealing leaky roofs and removing asbestos, or we will pay later—in lower student achievement, ever-more burdened teachers, and potentially even accident or injury in crumbling schoolrooms.

America's children need us to make the right choice now—to use the opportunity we have in this time of unprecedented prosperity to rebuild their schools and lift up the quality of their education. And, if we fail as a Congress—once again—to take action to meet our school modernization needs—we will pay later.

I urge my colleagues to join me to acknowledge the shameful physical condition of our schools and to do something about it. We cannot give our students a 21st century education in 19th century schools.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a couple of minutes to speak in favor of the provision in H.R. 1 that expands and improves the Troops-to-Teachers program. Our military is a great reservoir of potential talent, particularly in the area of math and science, and this program taps into that talent by encouraging members of our Armed Forces to become teachers after they leave the military.

Many have warned of an approaching teacher shortage in this country. According to some estimates, we will have to find somewhere between 1.6 and 2.6 million new teachers merely to replace teachers scheduled to retire. The Troops-to-Teachers program has already been a great help to meet this shortfall, and I believe that it can be ever more useful in the future.

Several thousand members of the military retire each year, often at ages young enough that they are searching for new careers. We

want to make it as easy as possible for these men and women to take the leadership skills and character that they have gained during their military careers and try to instill these traits in our young people.

In H.R. 1, we have improved the existing Troops to Teachers program to authorize stipends for soldiers participating in the program, and bonuses for soldiers who agree to teach in a high need school.

We have also expanded the category of soldiers eligible to participate in the program. Under current law, when a soldier completes active duty and decides to be a teacher, he or she has to go through a teacher training program that can take up to a year and a half. Because of this delay, many are discouraged from pursuing a teaching career.

H.R. 1 eliminates this roadblock by expanding eligibility so that an active duty soldier nearing retirement can participate in the program.

Mr. Chairman, this is a great program that enjoys bipartisan support, and it will bring many more qualified, excellent teachers into the profession that we so desperately need. I applaud its inclusion in H.R. 1 and I trust that in improved version of Troops-to-Teachers will be enacted this year.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) to close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind, had come to no resolution thereon.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO CANADA-UNITED STATES INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d and clause 10 of rule I, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Canada-United States Inter-parliamentary Group in addition to Mr. HOUGHTON of New York, chairman, appointed on March 20, 2001:

Mr. GILMAN of New York;
Mr. DREIER of California;
Mr. SHAW of Florida;
Mr. STEARNS of Florida;
Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota;
Mr. MANZULLO of Illinois;
Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania; and
Mr. SOUDER of Indiana.
There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 21, 2001

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the