

enter the teaching profession often have varied backgrounds; and by creating flexible approaches that step outside the box, these individuals can become highly qualified teachers through training programs as unique as their own individual experiences.

H.R. 2211 ensures that program effectiveness can accurately be measured and places a strong focus on the effectiveness of teacher preparation and a renewed emphasis on the skills needed to meet the highly qualified standard found in No Child Left Behind.

□ 1045

The use of advanced technology in the classroom, rigorous academic content standards, scientifically-based research, and challenging student academic standards are all principles that this bill will follow.

I would like to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. The gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member; the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), the chairman of the Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness; and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), the ranking member of the subcommittee, are all to be commended for their bipartisan effort in moving this legislation forward. They have put together a bipartisan bill that makes common-sense changes to Title II of the Higher Education Act to help improve our Nation's teachers.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and to support the underlying bill today.

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

Let me just close by again reiterating my support for the underlying bill, but also expressing my great concern that what we are doing here is authorizing a program with no intention of funding the program. I find that somewhat deceptive. I personally believe that this Congress and this leadership needs to put its money where its press releases are, and rather than leave no millionaire behind, I think we should keep our promise and leave no child behind. We are not doing that when we authorize educational programs and then we do not follow up with the appropriations.

I am going to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule because while I support the underlying bill, I think this process stinks. I mean, once again, Members who have serious amendments, who have legitimate issues that they want to debate on this floor are being shut out. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATAH) had an amendment that would direct the States to reduce the gap between higher-income districts and lower-income districts by increasing the number of highly qualified teachers. He was shut out. The gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) had an amendment that allows for a bonus award to teachers who achieve technology certification according to the Computer and Tech-

nology Industry Association and the Information Technology Association. He was shut out. The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) had an amendment that would require the Secretary to collect all repayments and redirect the funds to low-income and historically low-achieving school districts. She was shut out.

Now, if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle think these are amendments that are not worth their support, then they can make that argument on the House Floor, and they can vote "no." But some of us think that these amendments are good, and that we should have the opportunity to not only debate them, but vote up or down on them. So these Members were shut out of the process, and this has become, unfortunately, a trend in this Congress.

So I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule.

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I feel that this is a very fair rule, and I would urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and for the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 438, TEACHER RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION ACT OF 2003

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 309 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 309

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 438) to increase the amount of student loans that may be forgiven for teachers in mathematics, science, and special education. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendment recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in

the bill shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative George Miller of California or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order or demand for division of the question, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for ten minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us is a fair, modified rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 438, the Teacher Recruitment and Retention Act of 2003.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. The rule also provides that all points of order against consideration of the bill are waived.

The rule provides that an amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill shall be considered as read and as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. It also provides that all points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived.

This rule allows for the consideration of an amendment printed in the Committee on Rules report, if offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) or his designee, to be considered as read and debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided between a proponent and an opponent of the amendment, which shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. Finally, the rule waives all points of order against this amendment, and it also provides for one motion to recommit, either with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report that today, by taking up and passing H.R. 438, the Teacher Recruitment and Retention Act of 2003, this Congress will address an urgent crisis facing our Nation's schools and their students. Today a shortage of highly qualified teachers in mathematics, science, and special education leaves schools all

across our country unable to provide students with the educational opportunities that they deserve. The shortage of highly qualified teachers in these subjects is a very real problem and one that disproportionately affects children from urban and rural areas. A few simple figures do a good job of demonstrating the full and overwhelming scope of this problem.

According to the National Center for Education Statistics, between 1999 and 2000, 67 percent of public middle and high schools had teacher vacancies in special education. Seventy percent had vacancies in mathematics. Sixty-one percent had vacancies in biology and life sciences. Fifty-one percent had vacancies in physical science. Two-thirds of our Nation's public elementary schools reported vacancies in special education.

Additionally, according to the Committee for Economic Development, almost a third of high school mathematics classes are taught by teachers who did not minor or major in mathematics. In biology, that level rises to 45 percent, and tops out at 60 percent for teachers of life sciences.

Mr. Speaker, the successful education of our children is inextricably tied to the quality of the teachers instructing them. Students cannot possibly be expected to fill the jobs of tomorrow if they are not getting the instruction that they need during their formative academic years today.

The answer to solving this dilemma which represents one of our Nation's greatest educational needs can be boiled down to something that is simple, and that is local schools facing teacher shortages need the flexibility to recruit and to retain the skilled teachers that their students deserve. By forgiving the student loan debts of math, science, and special education teachers at high-risk schools, we can help these schools to attract and retain the talent that they desperately need. By paying off the debts, this will allow the school districts the flexibility to go after those teachers that they need most.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, 5 years ago, Congress passed the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 and created a student loan forgiveness program for qualified teachers in return for their commitment to working in a low-income school for 5 years. This program has allowed teachers taking advantage of this opportunity to have up to \$5,000 of their outstanding loan obligation forgiven after their fifth completed year of service.

The Teacher Recruitment and Retention Act would expand the current teacher loan forgiveness available under the Higher Education Act to address our Nation's critical teacher shortages in math, science, and special education. To be eligible, teachers in these three disciplines must serve in a Title I school with 40 percent of its students at or below poverty level. The bill also increases the total loan for-

givenness to a maximum of \$17,500 for these enhanced-need subjects, while accelerating the speed of these benefits to allow them to accrue after the second year. This would allow teachers committed to serving our highest-risk schools to receive the benefits when they need them most: right in the beginning of their careers when most teachers face their most substantial financial obstacles.

In order to maintain the integrity of the program, the legislation requires teachers who fail to meet their end of their commitment to repay their loans and debts in full. It also ensures the quality of the teachers receiving this benefit by requiring that teachers applying for the increased loan forgiveness amount must meet the "highly qualified" definition before receiving any loan forgiveness.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER); and the sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) for their hard work in bringing this bill through the legislative process and onto the floor today. Both they and their colleagues on the Committee on Education and the Workforce have brought an outstanding product before the House that answers President Bush's challenge to recruit and to retain highly qualified teachers in disadvantaged schools, while addressing the critical shortage of math, science, and special education teachers now facing elementary and secondary schools. Making sure that these teachers can afford to work in our highest-risk schools is the first step in ensuring a quality education for our children.

I would also like to thank our President, President Bush, for bringing the critical problem facing our most at-risk students and schools to the attention of this Congress. I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) for rising to this challenge in addressing this problem.

I support this rule and the underlying legislation on behalf of today's students, and I urge each of my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), and the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for bringing this bipartisan bill to the floor of the House for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 438, the Teacher Recruitment and Retention Act, increases the total amount of student loans that can be forgiven for elementary and secondary schoolteachers of

math, science, and special education in Title I schools. Specifically, the measure increases the amount of student loans that can be forgiven for these teachers from the current level of \$5,000 to a maximum possible total of \$17,500.

□ 1100

The bill also limits eligibility to those who teach in a Title I school in which more than 40 percent of the student population comes from families with incomes below the poverty line.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 438 is a good first step, but I believe it should be expanded to provide increased loan forgiveness to all teachers in high-poverty schools, not just math, science and special education teachers. It should also include Head Start teachers and teachers in extremely rural school districts. Maybe if the majority had thought of these funds as a tax break rather than student loan forgiveness, they could have found the funding. Unfortunately, a teacher of American history and civics, a teacher of social studies teaching in a significantly disadvantaged Title I school, a teacher will receive no benefit from this bill.

Still, this is a good first step. This is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it. But once again, Mr. Speaker, I must voice my concerns in opposition to the process. The Committee on Rules met last night and considered 11 amendments. Of these amendments, only one was made in order. One of these amendments offered by my colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), would have made all Head Start teachers eligible for the increased loan forgiveness level of \$17,500. And three amendments by the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA) would have made school librarians in Title I schools eligible for the loan forgiveness program as well.

These are important issues and concerns, and they deserve to be heard, but the Republican leadership does not believe that Head Start teachers and librarians deserve to be included in this important legislation. I guess my hope was that if they wanted to vote against it, if they do not believe that Head Start teachers and librarians deserve this help, then have the courage to come to the floor and speak out against these amendments and vote no. But everybody in this House should have had the opportunity to debate these amendments and others and be able to cast their vote up or down.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership is stifling the debate in this House and denying the elected Members on both sides of the aisle the opportunity to freely offer amendments. I still cannot figure out the rationale and the reasoning behind disallowing these amendments and so many others. Maybe my colleague from Texas can explain this when he has his time as to why these particular amendments were disallowed.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan bill reported out of the Committee on Education and the Workforce by a voice vote. Why then do we need a restrictive rule? Why cannot the House decide whether to expand this benefit to other teachers? Why cannot we have a vote in the House on these important issues?

This institution deserves better. The elected Members of this body deserve better, and the American people deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to vote no on this restrictive rule, again, another restrictive rule. This is a trend that we are seeing in this House of Representatives, an unfortunate trend. I will urge a no vote on this rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in the 108th Congress, one of the brightest and best chairmen who serves this great Congress is a young man from Ohio. And as chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, he has sought to make sure that the issues that are before his committee and this Nation are addressed; they are addressed as a result of hands-on looking at the problems in our schools through a lot of intensive work all across this country, not just urban and not just rural schools, not just inner-city schools, not just certain types of academia looked at, but rather all of public education, and the work that the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), has put into this bill and other bills that are very apparent before this Congress, including IDEA, which is related to special education, are very apparent to the energy of this chairman.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to welcome the fabulous chairman of this committee for such time as he may consume.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my colleague for his warm words, especially that word "young" that he mentioned. And I appreciate the work that we have done together, especially when it comes to the needs of special needs children in our schools and the teachers who teach them.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule for H.R. 438, the Teacher Recruitment and Retention Act. The rule is necessary to allow the House to pass this bill in a timely manner and get the necessary support for our teachers.

I would first like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), for his leadership on this important bill that embodies the President's efforts to help needy schools retain and recruit highly qualified teachers.

H.R. 438 will provide teachers of subjects facing critical shortages with an important financial incentive to commit to teaching in high-needs schools for at least 5 years. The importance of

highly qualified teachers cannot be overstated. That is why in January of 2002 President Bush signed into law the bipartisan No Child Left Behind Act, which calls for a highly qualified teacher in every classroom by the 2005-2006 school year. We are standing behind that goal, providing significant financial resources to help teachers become highly qualified.

The fact is in the first year of No Child Left Behind, as I stated earlier, Congress provided a 35 percent increase in teacher quality grants, and the funding increases are continuing, and so it is this Congress's commitment to meeting the needs of our Nation's schoolteachers. That is why this bill is before us today and why it is so important. We are building upon the financial commitment made in No Child Left Behind to provide our teachers with yet another tool that will help them make a difference in their classrooms all across our country.

The Teacher Recruitment and Retention Act increases the total amount of loan forgiveness for teachers now provided for in the Higher Education Act to a maximum of \$17,500 for elementary and secondary teachers in math, science or special education who commit to teaching in a needy school for 5 years. Now, we know that there is critical need for these teachers, and we should concentrate on helping fill that need, and there is no debate on the critical shortages facing schools across the country in these specific subject areas. We need to do all we can to encourage highly qualified professionals to enter the teaching field and for those now in the field to stay.

Teaching can be a difficult, but always rewarding career. Teaching in high-needs schools often brings additional challenges. Despite the challenges, we also know how vital these teachers are to the future of these poor children.

H.R. 438 provides for the right incentive for motivated, talented and qualified students to not only enter the teaching field, but to also provide them with a long-term commitment to these high-needs schools in which they are teaching and, more importantly, to the students that they are teaching.

The rule also provides for an amendment offered by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), and myself, which we will support. The amendment will assist in improving the very foundation of a child's education by supporting highly qualified, State-certified reading specialists, and while staying within the budget parameters set forth in this bill. The other important part of the amendment is that it does not reduce the number of schools in which a teacher may teach and be eligible for loan forgiveness. And I support this amendment, and I want to urge my colleagues to do so as well.

What I would ask my colleagues not to do is this: We are all going to do what we can to support our teachers,

particularly teachers in subjects facing the greatest shortages. The bill before us today gives us an opportunity to do that. But I have friends on both sides of the aisle who want to extend this limited loan forgiveness to many other categories of teachers. However, to do so while remaining within the constraints of the funds that we have available, they propose to dramatically diminish the number of schools eligible for participation by increasing the required poverty level of the eligible schools. So in other words, what would happen is we would cover more teachers, but we would cover much, much fewer numbers of high-poverty schools. The poverty levels in these proposals were increased in some cases to 45, 50 and even 65 percent, and by doing this, the number of eligible schools does, in fact, dramatically decline.

We have addressed these proposals both during the subcommittee and during the full committee consideration of this bill. And I said in the committee and I will say now, we are here to make difficult decisions, and this is one of them. All teachers are very important, but we cannot at this time address the needs of every teacher. We have critical and documented shortages in the subject matters addressed by this bill, and those must be the priorities.

We have heard these numbers before. Let me refer to this chart here: 67 percent vacancies in special education, 70 percent vacancies in math, 61 percent vacancies in biology and life sciences, 51 percent vacancies in physical science teachers; and according to the Center for the Study of Teaching Policy, almost 57 percent of public school teachers are teaching physical science without a major or minor in the fields in which they are teaching.

This bill addresses the dramatic needs for highly qualified teachers facing our Nation's schools today, a need that should not be lost in trying to be helpful to a broader array of teachers. We should be reminded that this loan forgiveness that we have before us today, increasing it to \$17,500, is for math, science and special education teachers. This does not change the current program that for all teachers, new teachers going to Title I schools, they already receive a \$5,000 loan forgiveness if they committed to the 5 years in a Title I school. But for math, science and special education where we have the real need, we are trying to move the loan forgiveness to \$17,500 to attract much more highly qualified teachers to these schools and to get a commitment that they be there for 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support the rule today and to support the underlying bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, who I know worked very hard on this bill, and we are all going to support this bill

when we vote on it later today, but he cautioned Members not to expand the number of teachers who would be eligible for this loan forgiveness. He need not worry because the Committee on Rules last night dictated a process that shuts everybody out. There were 11 amendments offered last night in the Committee on Rules. Only one was made in order. Ten were shut out.

We do not have the opportunity to extend these benefits to Head Start teachers or Early Head Start teachers. We do not have the opportunity to be able to help librarians or more rural teachers. We have been shut out. There is not the opportunity. So the gentleman need not worry that this bill will be expanded because the Committee on Rules last night made sure that democracy will not have a chance to work its will on the House floor today.

I would simply again say that if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not want to help Head Start teachers or Early Head Start teachers, then they should have the guts to come to the floor and vote no on such an amendment. It is a little bit frustrating to some of us that they never have a problem when it comes to providing a tax break for a millionaire, they always have the money for that, but when it comes to helping teachers in low-income neighborhoods, somehow we do not have the money. We cannot find the money. And just to make sure that we do not find the money, you bring a bill like this to the floor under a very restrictive rule which does not allow the Members of this Congress to work its will.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY), who had a great amendment last night, along with the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), but was shut out of the process.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for yielding me time.

I want to join him in thanking the chairman for the work on this bill, as well as the ranking member, and it is a bill that will be supported for those good things that are in it. But as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) mentioned, there are other good things that could have and should have been in this bill that unfortunately have been set aside because of the self-inflicted situation where the majority in this House has chosen to take money and throw it out the door to people who are already wealthy and decide not to invest in the children of this country.

If we want to talk about future productivity, if we want to talk about a way of improving our education system in this country, then we would try to make sure that our early childhood programs and Head Start in particular would have every opportunity for success. Instead, the Committee on Education and the Workforce get a budget that is so small that they have to then

work within those constraints and come back and tell us, gee, we do not have enough money to do all the right things that we need to do. So we can look at math teachers and science teachers and special education teachers, all of which have a serious need for loan forgiveness, but we cannot go to those other areas that also evidence a strong need for loan forgiveness so we can attract in good people and keep good people in those fields and improve our education system. And we cannot do that because the Republicans, the majority in this House, decided to take that money that could be made in that investment, and instead of, because of ideology, give it to people who already have a significant amount of money in their lives.

I think that is short-sighted. We should be encouraging people to enter and stay in these fields where it is going to make a difference. There has been a national review of some 36 studies dealing with early childhood programs, and what they found is that children who participate in these early childhood programs are less likely to be held back in school, less likely to be placed in special education, more likely to succeed in school, more likely to graduate, more likely to behave well, and better able to adjust to the educational process as they go through it in school.

□ 1115

For all of those reasons, we need to make sure that we concentrate on getting them the best teachers because those are the children that will benefit tremendously from having that right kind of guidance.

The median debt right now for somebody with a bachelor's degree from a public institution, not a private institution, but a public institution, is \$15,375. That is more than double what it was 10 years ago.

We deserve to have those qualified teachers. In fact, right now we require that all teachers have a child development credential and half have to have an associate's degree, and we have met that by the end of 2002; but this bill rightfully raises the bar to say that by 2008 at least half have to have a bachelor's degree. Where are the people going to get the money to do that?

We have well-deserving people who have that \$15,000-plus debt as they come out. They are making half of what a kindergarten teacher makes if they get a job in early childhood education, and the fear here is that they are going to be attracted into other areas, not because they do not want to teach and not because they will not make sacrifices, but because they have that burden that is so substantial that they have to go seek employment somewhere else where they can then afford to pay back that loan.

This is a disturbing feature on this. We have a bill that is a significantly good bill that comes up short because of this ideology, because we are so fo-

cused on the Republican side on tax cuts for the already wealthy. We could have had tax cuts. We could have distributed them fairly amongst a lot of people, and we could have taken some of money that was in that phenomenal surplus that we had at the beginning of this administration's term of \$5.6 trillion over 10 years. We could have taken some small part of that to invest in America, to invest in our children; and, yes, we would have invested in science teachers and mathematics teachers and special education teachers, but I suggest to my colleagues we also would have invested in reading teachers and children teachers for 3- and 4-year-olds in early education.

That is critical, Mr. Speaker, and I think that we have fallen short as a Congress here by putting those self-inflicted constraints on the House, and I think we have to start looking at that. The American people should know that this is an area where the Republicans do not want to vote on this issue because they know in their hearts this is something we should be doing.

So rather than be forced to take a tough vote because I doubt that this amendment, if it had been allowed to come for a vote, would have failed, I think clearly it would have passed. I think far and wide the majority of people, the Members of this House, know that we have to attract early childhood teachers, that loan forgiveness expansion has to be a part of that.

Rather than face the embarrassment of having the majority of this House, including their own Republican Members, tell them that they are at fault when we have that self-inflicted limitation, they chose to use the rules process to once again say that we are going to have a very restricted rule, that all of these amendments that Members should have an opportunity to raise their voices on will not even get the chance to be heard and debated and deliberated upon and voted upon.

That is the great disgrace of this 108th Congress, is manipulation through the Committee on Rules and the shutting down of debate so that the American people's voices cannot be heard so that their concerns cannot be reach and so that this country does not have the opportunity to have their Members who represent them stand up and say we want to invest in America, we want to invest in our children, we want to set the right ideological tone, and that is, inclusiveness for everyone; and the Committee on Rules has failed us here, and this rule has failed us.

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

The debate last night in the Committee on Rules did allow testimony from the gentleman and others who were with him, and they made a lot of good points. They made a lot of good points about how important Head Start is, not only to students as they come through the process and to parents, but to our educational quality; and there

was a great debate on that, an opportunity for feedback, and it simply was not included in this package.

What is included in this package is the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), who I believe is the main author of this bill, I think, accepted the challenge from our President, as I think many Members of Congress have, to go back to our local schools, to go to our school districts and to go listen to teachers, to listen to parents, listen to students, to listen to administrators, to listen to people who serve on the local boards of education and to hear from them about the state of education and things that we need.

I am just pleased that one of those good ideas, even though the gentleman from Massachusetts had also a good idea, but that we were able to bring one of these good ideas, gather a consensus about it, make it bipartisan, get through the process, go to the Committee on Rules, sustain the things that we believe about this bill that are fabulous, fabulous for schools, to go attract and help relieve the debt from these teachers who are in math, who are in science, who are in special education, because those are the hardest teachers to get.

I believe we are doing the right thing. I believe that what this entire opportunity is about today is to say that paying attention to students and teachers, school administrators, our whole process is what our President has asked us to do. I think we are bringing back bits and pieces of those things that we have learned that will make a real difference, make a real difference in the lives of not only each of the teachers and our school systems, but for the parents and students who are part of that.

I support what we are doing. This is a great rule. This is a great opportunity for us to pay attention to people who pay attention to our students and people who pay attention to us in our educational setting, and I am proud of what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, I would notify the gentleman from Massachusetts that I do not have any further speakers at this time, and I will let him determine what he would like to do, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

My good friend, the gentleman from Texas, said that last night in the Committee on Rules Democratic Members were allowed to come before the Committee on Rules and testify, as if to suggest that that is some great privilege. Every Member of this House has the right to be able to go before the Committee on Rules and make their case on behalf of amendments.

He then proceeded to say, in reference to the gentleman from Massachusetts' (Mr. TIERNEY) amendment, that it raised some good points and good ideas and was a worthy amendment, but then said that we just decided not to make it in order. I guess

my question to the gentleman from Texas is, If it was such a good idea, what was the harm? What was the problem with making it in order so that the full House could decide whether or not to extend these benefits to Head Start teachers and early Head Start teachers?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

The bottom line is we are trying to aim this money, these loan forgiveness opportunities, at the teachers who we need most.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would also remind the gentleman that even though he said it was a good idea, he did vote against this in committee, as did all the Republican Members; and again, the frustrating thing for those of us on this side who want to help our teachers, who want to make sure that we live up to our promise to leave no child behind is to make sure that we provide the resources, that we just do not get up and talk about how important our children are; that we actually provide the resources; that we make sure that we have teachers in Head Start and early Head Start.

Again, for the life of me, if my colleagues do not want to vote for this, then they do not have to vote for it, but there are a lot of us who think this is important enough that we should have a debate on the House floor and we should be able to vote up or down on it. I think it is really a disgrace, but not only this issue but on all number of issues that we get constantly shut out of the process.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), who had three very thoughtful amendments that were shut out. None of his amendments were made in order.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I appreciate the dialogue that has occurred between the two gentlemen from the Committee on Rules.

I want to begin by thanking the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the chairman, and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member, for the work that they have done in putting before this House this legislation which all of us understand and know that we need for our schools in America. Too many of our schools today do not have teachers with credentials teaching our kids. Too many of our schools just cannot find the teachers they need.

So this is a good first step. I think everyone will agree with that. I believe this will receive a resounding vote when it is before us for final passage. I just believe that many of us are very disappointed that the bill we will be voting on today is so limited. It is so curtailed, when there is much need out

there, and there is so much opportunity for us to try to really help our kids throughout our schools.

My kids are in public school right now, and we are very fortunate that it is a good public school; but I have got to tell my colleagues that there are a whole bunch of kids in my district that cannot say quite the same thing. It is not that people are not trying hard. It is just that they do not have the resources.

In my State of California, and I suspect in many of my colleagues' States right now, we are hearing about our public schools having to either close down certain classrooms, having to curtail their activities, reduce the size of the school year, any number of things, including sending teachers lay-off notices at a time when we have to try to provide them with a good education.

This is a good bill, but it could have been even a better bill had we allowed a few amendments to go forward, and I understand that there are certain constraints, and I appreciate that the Committee on Rules considered my particular amendment.

My amendment was very simple. It said we have got a good first start in this legislation to try to help recruit more teachers in our math and science programs, but let us not stop there. Let us not leave any children behind. Why shortchange our schools, especially today when they are suffering through very difficult financing and budget problems?

My amendment simply says, let us include librarians in our schools and in our public libraries because if the shortages are bad as the chairman from the Committee on Education and the Workforce pointed out just a second ago, if they are bad in the areas of math and if they are bad in the areas of sciences, they are even worse when it comes to our school libraries and our public libraries.

How many of us know of libraries, not just our school libraries but our public libraries, that are closed on certain days in the week because they just do not have the funding to stay open? The difficulty that they face is that they are not finding the librarians that they need to staff these libraries. One in every three libraries in this country is staffed by one librarian, one librarian.

Today, we face a shortage of librarians that will be so difficult to surmount into the future if we do not act now. Within 5 years, fully one in every four of our librarians will retire. In the next 12 years after that, more than 50, close to 60 percent of all the librarians will have retired, and we are not doing anything to backfill, to bring in the librarians we need to fill those gaps.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is good. It could have been better had we included a number of amendments at a time when we so desperately need to help our schools. I believe that is why First Lady Laura Bush has taken such

a prominent role in promoting our libraries because she understands what is going on. I wish that this Congress and this House would do the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, that is why today I will introduce legislation to try to do exactly what my amendment would have done, and that is, to permit librarians to partake of the loan forgiveness program that is currently allowed to certain teachers and to make sure that we are promoting school librarians in our various public libraries and in our school libraries. It is the right thing to do.

If we take a look at the cost of this legislation we have before us, it is about \$340 million over 10 years, about \$60 million for this current year. If we will all remember that we just passed legislation in this House no more than a month or so ago that cut taxes, principally for the wealthiest Americans in this country, to the tune of \$500 billion over the next 10 years, \$340 million, less than one-half of 1 percent or 5 percent of what we spent on that tax bill could have funded this entire bill, and the cost of adding librarians is probably somewhere between \$2 million to maybe, if every individual and college decided to take advantage of this program, maybe about \$10 million for the year. That seems a very clear choice to me.

We have opportunities, but we all have to make choices on this floor. While this amendment will not have an opportunity to be heard today or incorporated in the legislation today, I hope in the future, working with both sides of the aisle, we are able to get good amendments through that will help all of our country's school children and make it clear that our libraries, both in our schools and in the public setting, are importance to us.

I hope we move forward. We can, and I will vote for this legislation; but I have to vote against this particular rule.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, let me just say I thank the gentleman for yielding me a few minutes.

I am concerned about the process that has brought this rule to the floor and the previous rule. I had offered an amendment that would have had the effect of gathering more data on what is a national crisis, one that the President of the United States himself in the State of the Union 2 years ago addressed when he said that he wanted to work towards a country in which every child had a qualified teacher in their classroom.

We have seen study after study across this land in which African American, Latino, poor white youngsters in Appalachia and other communities are being put in a circumstance where every day they are in classrooms in which they are being taught by

teachers who did not major or minor in the subjects that they are teaching.

□ 1130

In fact, as a young, poor student in an inner city or in a poor rural area in Ohio, in Pennsylvania, you could go through your entire middle and high school years and never have a qualified math teacher or science teacher in your classroom.

My amendment would have sought to gather more data to add to the already fairly convincing set of statistics on this matter. For some reason, without explanation, the Committee on Rules of this House has decided that that amendment should not be made in order; that this body should not even have an opportunity to vote to pursue one of President Bush's number one priorities, and a priority that should be, I think, first and foremost in all of our efforts if we want to improve education, because we cannot possibly expect a child to learn from someone who is teaching them a subject that they do not know.

It is implausible to think that we would continue this dilemma across our country; that we would close our eyes to it, not want to have that information. And why this Committee on Rules would deny an opportunity for this amendment to be debated is without explanation. I think that it does a disservice to the House, to our democratic process. Moreover, and much more importantly, it does a disservice to future generations. We need that information so that as policymakers we can help shape education reform in a way that really is meaningful and makes sense.

I am going to work, notwithstanding what the Committee on Rules has decided, to have this amendment considered in some other format, in some other way, so that at the end of the day, as a United States Congress, the most important lawmaking body in the country, we can begin to address this issue to make sure that there are, in fact, qualified teachers. Why would we have a child take a standardized test in every State in the Union and not have any concern about the standards that their teachers who have been instructing them have had to meet; or whether or not they have had a decent textbook, a reasonable opportunity to learn?

I think this is not a partisan issue. There is no reason this amendment should have been ruled out of order. And I hope that the Committee on Rules in the future would give respect to the ideals that this is a democratic process and that all views should be heard, and then let the body work its will.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close for our side.

Again, we have no problem with the underlying bill, but we do have a problem with this process. Let me review for my colleagues what amendments

were offered last night in the Committee on Rules.

We heard about the Tierney-DeLauro amendment. This amendment would extend the \$17,500 loan forgiveness in the bill to Head Start teachers, Early Head Start teachers, and prekindergarten teachers in programs that serve children of which at least 60 percent of whom are eligible to participate in a Head Start or Early Start program. Only new borrowers as of fiscal year 2003 would be eligible for this loan forgiveness.

Mr. Speaker, let me just remind my colleagues that our Nation's Head Start and prekindergarten classrooms are desperately in need of highly qualified teachers. During the 2001-2002 program year, nearly 8,000 teachers, or 15 percent of all teachers, left the Head Start programs. Over half of those who left did so due to low salaries or desired to change job fields. These statistics highlight the inability of Head Start programs to retain their teachers, especially their most experienced and qualified. This is hugely important. This is hugely important. And that amendment was shut out last night in the Committee on Rules, so Members will not have an opportunity to vote up or down on it here on the floor.

We heard from the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), who had one amendment that would provide loan forgiveness for Perkins loans to highly qualified librarians working in eligible schools. He had another amendment that would provide loan forgiveness for Stafford and Perkins loans to highly qualified librarians working in eligible schools. And he had a third amendment that would provide loan forgiveness for Stafford loans to highly qualified librarians working in eligible schools.

Again, one of the things that the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA) pointed out is that we are having a problem in this country and in our school libraries in retaining librarians. It is a huge issue. And yet despite all of the sympathy that members of the majority party in the Committee on Rules expressed toward some of these amendments, they voted to make not in order all three of those amendments. All three Becerra amendments were shut out, made not in order.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) had an amendment that would ensure that any loan or portion of a loan discharged under the bill would not count as gross income for that individual's income tax purposes. That was shut out. He had another amendment that would establish a new program for teacher loan forgiveness under the guaranteed loan program and direct loan program. That was shut out. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) also had an amendment that would extend eligibility for an increased amount of loan forgiveness to all teachers in Title I schools and those schools that had high levels of low-income families. He was shut out on that as well.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) had an amendment that would increase the level of loan forgiveness for teachers in rural schools to \$17,500. The offset would be for new borrowers beginning October 2003. That was not made in order.

The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) had an amendment that would add to the list of qualification criteria for FFEL loan forgiveness teachers who have attended historically black colleges and universities, and those serving large portions of Hispanic, Native American, Asian Pacific Americans, or other underrepresented populations to pursue continuous teaching careers. She was shut out.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) had an amendment that would expand teacher eligibility for \$17,500 of loan forgiveness for all Title I teachers and increase the poverty percentage of a school to 65 percent at which a teacher who was receiving loan forgiveness must teach.

Mr. Speaker, all these amendments are only for Title I schools and schools with high levels of poverty. They are all very, very important amendments, and they all deserved to be discussed here on the House floor. If my colleagues on the majority side do not want to expand this bill, then they could vote "no" on all these amendments. They could come to the floor and cast their vote "no." But the Members of this House, both Republicans and Democrats, should have had an opportunity to be able to debate these amendments up or down.

Now, my colleague from Texas may say, well, some of these amendments may have needed waivers. Well, it is amazing that they can say that with a straight face, given the fact that routinely in the Committee on Rules we provide waivers all the time for Republican initiatives. It is just a matter of practice. We do it all the time. So that is not an excuse why these important amendments could not be brought to the floor and debated up or down.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we do not have any problem with the underlying bill. We have a problem with this process, and we are sick and tired of being repeatedly shut out of this process. And it is not just Democrats, there are Republicans who come before the committee with good ideas who are shut out. Now, I do not know who makes all these decisions, but we certainly have the time to be able to debate all these things fully, Democratic and Republican amendments. We have the time on the floor to do it. But for whatever reason, the Committee on Rules consistently shuts out debate, and I think it is a disservice to Members of both parties in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, this is supposed to be the people's House. Every Member counts in this House. We all represent the same number of constituents. We all have the right to be able to come to this floor and be able to voice the concerns of our constituents, and yet we

are denied that right repeatedly. I think it is not only a disservice to the Members of this House, it is a disservice to our constituents, and I think it prevents legislation like the one we are talking about right now from becoming even better.

So I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this restrictive rule.

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

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

I do understand the frustrations that the gentleman is talking about, Mr. Speaker. I also understand that the Committee on Rules has a job to do. Its job is to follow the rules of this House. The bottom line is that the gentleman from Los Angeles, who did have three very well-thought-through amendments that he chose to bring before the Committee on Rules were not germane. They were not germane because, despite what the gentleman from Massachusetts has claimed about it being for teachers, the amendments are very clearly written to say a librarian working full time in a public library. A librarian working full time in a public library, number five. Amendment number six in a public library. That is not germane to this bill where we are talking about teachers. That is not a part of what we are talking about, so it was not germane.

Lastly, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) took time to come before the Committee on Rules. We appreciate that. The bottom line is that there was a vote already, through regular order in the committee of jurisdiction, and the gentleman did not win in the committee of jurisdiction.

And so the process in this House is being followed, the process where people have an opportunity to bring forth amendments, bring forth ideas that they have. For us to challenge ourselves on this education opportunity that is in front of us is important, and that process is something that we followed today.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts to engage me.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would simply say to the gentleman that the Committee on Rules waives the rules all the time for amendments, and they have waived the rules for amendments that are in this bill already. So that is what we do. So to hide behind that somehow this does not fit into this bill I think flies in the face of what we do all the time.

The issue is whether or not we think this is a priority. And if it is a priority, and it should be, then we make it fit. And that is what we do all the time. That is what my colleagues do for all Republican amendments that they want to make in order. We are just asking that you do the same; that you treat us the same way that you treat your Members. That is all we are asking.

We have the power to do this. To say this does not fit in this bill because it requires a waiver of any kind I do not think passes muster. I just would say to the gentleman that the Committee on Rules had the power to make these amendments in order, and the Committee on Rules chose not to, and I think that is unfortunate.

Mr. SESSIONS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman, when he spoke earlier, talked about how the Committee on Rules did not make Republican Members' amendments in order, and now he is coming and asking us to treat them the same way. The bottom line is it is a fair process for Republican or Democrat. It is a fair process for people who go through the regular order, who have an opportunity to present germane amendments. It is very fair.

The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the great chairman of the Committee on Rules, spends an extensive amount of time attempting to work with Members to make sure their amendments are germane, to make sure their amendments are well understood, to make sure their amendments have time to come forth before the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I would at this time close by saying that we believe this rule that is before this great body today deserves not only the attention of the American public, but also a vote today.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank in particular two professional members of the Committee on Rules, Adam Jarvis and Eileen Harley, for their fabulous work on this, and Committee on Rules associate Josh Saltzman from my staff, for their great work on bringing this wonderful bill forward.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule for the simple reason that I believe in the process of representative government. The public quite rightly believes that, as their representatives, we take part in the process of legislation by offering meaningful amendments to the bills before us and that all of the representatives of this body will have an opportunity to consider and vote those amendments up or down. This is simply not the case.

As a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, I had the opportunity to speak and vote in support of extending the loan forgiveness provisions contained in this bill to Head Start Teachers. While that amendment failed in the committee on partisan lines, I believe it is such an important companion provision that all of the members of this Congress should have had the opportunity to vote on this issue.

In the Head Start reauthorization bill, which may be on the floor next week, the committee has included a requirement that 50 percent of Head Start teachers have a Bachelor's Degree and all of them to have an Associates Degree or equivalent certificate. Many of these teachers will need additional coursework. Historically, many Head Start personnel have been recruited from the parent body, who are, by definition, low income. Because pay for personnel in Head Start is so low, it is imperative that we support this mandate financially.

A loan forgiveness provision for Head Start personnel would match that for other critically needed teachers. It is the right place to begin.

I regret that not all of my colleagues will have the opportunity to consider this proposal because the amendment to do so was not ruled in order.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adopting House Resolution 309 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on adopting House Resolution 310.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 192, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 337]

YEAS—230

Abercrombie	Davis, Tom	Isakson
Aderholt	Deal (GA)	Issa
Akin	DeLay	Istook
Alexander	DeMint	Jenkins
Bachus	Diaz-Balart, L.	Johnson (CT)
Baker	Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson (IL)
Ballenger	Doolittle	Johnson, Sam
Barrett (SC)	Dreier	Jones (NC)
Bartlett (MD)	Duncan	Keller
Barton (TX)	Dunn	Kelly
Bass	Ehlers	Kennedy (MN)
Beauprez	Emerson	King (IA)
Bereuter	English	King (NY)
Biggert	Everett	Kingston
Bilirakis	Feeney	Kirk
Bishop (UT)	Ferguson	Kline
Blackburn	Flake	Knollenberg
Blunt	Fletcher	Kolbe
Boehlert	Foley	LaHood
Boehner	Forbes	Latham
Bonilla	Fossella	LaTourette
Bonner	Franks (AZ)	Leach
Bono	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (CA)
Boozman	Gallely	Lewis (KY)
Bradley (NH)	Garrett (NJ)	Linder
Brady (TX)	Gerlach	LoBiondo
Brown (SC)	Gilchrest	Lucas (OK)
Brown-Waite,	Gillmor	Manzullo
Ginny	Gingrey	Marshall
Burgess	Goode	McCotter
Burns	Goodlatte	McCrary
Burr	Granger	McHugh
Burton (IN)	Graves	McInnis
Buyer	Green (TX)	McKeon
Calvert	Green (WI)	Mica
Camp	Greenwood	Miller (FL)
Cannon	Gutknecht	Miller (MI)
Cantor	Harris	Miller, Gary
Capito	Hart	Moran (KS)
Carter	Hastings (WA)	Murphy
Castle	Hayes	Musgrave
Chabot	Hayworth	Myrick
Chocola	Hefley	Nethercutt
Coble	Hensarling	Neugebauer
Cole	Herger	Ney
Collins	Hobson	Northup
Crane	Hoekstra	Norwood
Crenshaw	Hostettler	Nunes
Cubin	Houghton	Nussle
Culberson	Hulshof	Osborne
Cunningham	Hunter	Ose
Davis, Jo Ann	Hyde	Otter

Oxley	Rohrabacher	Tancredo
Paul	Ros-Lehtinen	Tauzin
Pearce	Royce	Taylor (NC)
Pence	Ryan (WI)	Terry
Peterson (PA)	Ryun (KS)	Thomas
Petri	Saxton	Thornberry
Pickering	Schrock	Tiahrt
Pitts	Scott (GA)	Tiberi
Platts	Sensenbrenner	Toomey
Pombo	Sessions	Turner (OH)
Pomeroy	Shadegg	Upton
Porter	Shaw	Vitter
Portman	Shays	Walden (OR)
Pryce (OH)	Sherwood	Walsh
Putnam	Shimkus	Wamp
Quinn	Shuster	Weldon (FL)
Radanovich	Simmons	Weldon (PA)
Ramstad	Simpson	Weller
Regula	Smith (MI)	Whitfield
Rehberg	Smith (NJ)	Wicker
Renzi	Smith (TX)	Wilson (NM)
Reynolds	Souder	Wilson (SC)
Rogers (AL)	Stearns	Wolf
Rogers (KY)	Sullivan	Young (AK)
Rogers (MI)	Sweeney	Young (FL)

NAYS—192

Ackerman	Hall	Neal (MA)
Allen	Hill	Oberstar
Andrews	Hinchee	Obey
Baca	Hinojosa	Olver
Baird	Hoeffel	Ortiz
Baldwin	Holden	Pallone
Ballance	Holt	Pascrell
Becerra	Honda	Pastor
Bell	Hooley (OR)	Payne
Berkley	Hoyer	Pelosi
Berman	Inslee	Peterson (MN)
Berry	Israel	Price (NC)
Bishop (GA)	Jackson (IL)	Rahall
Bishop (NY)	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Blumenauer	(TX)	Reyes
Boswell	Jefferson	Rodriguez
Boucher	John	Ross
Boyd	Johnson, E. B.	Rothman
Brady (PA)	Jones (OH)	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Ruppersberger
Brown, Corrine	Kaptur	Rush
Capps	Kennedy (RI)	Ryan (OH)
Capuano	Kildee	Sabo
Cardin	Kilpatrick	Sanchez, Linda
Cardoza	Kind	T.
Carson (IN)	Klezka	Sanchez, Loretta
Carson (OK)	Kucinich	Sanders
Case	Lampson	Sandlin
Clay	Langevin	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Lantos	Schiff
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Costello	Lee	Sherman
Crowley	Levin	Skelton
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Davis (AL)	Lipinski	Snyder
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Solis
Davis (FL)	Lowe	Spratt
Davis (IL)	Lucas (KY)	Stark
Davis (TN)	Lynch	Stenholm
DeFazio	Majette	Strickland
DeGette	Maloney	Stupak
DeLahunt	Markey	Tanner
DeLauro	Matheson	Tauscher
Deutsch	Matsui	Taylor (MS)
Dicks	McCarthy (MO)	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	McCollum	Tierney
Dooley (CA)	McDermott	Towns
Doyle	McGovern	Turner (TX)
Emanuel	McIntyre	Udall (CO)
Engel	McNulty	Udall (NM)
Eshoo	Meehan	Van Hollen
Etheridge	Meeke (FL)	Velazquez
Evans	Meeke (NY)	Visclosky
Farr	Menendez	Waters
Fattah	Michaud	Watson
Filner	Miller (NC)	Watt
Ford	Miller, George	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Mollohan	Weiner
Frost	Moore	Wexler
Gonzalez	Moran (VA)	Woolsey
Gordon	Murtha	Wu
Grijalva	Nadler	Wynn
Gutierrez	Napolitano	

NOT VOTING—12

Cox	Goss	Millender-
Cramer	Harman	McDonald
Edwards	Hastings (FL)	Owens
Gephardt	Janklow	Smith (WA)
Gibbons		

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1205

Messrs. GEORGE MILLER of California, LANGEVIN, HINOJOSA, MATSUL, PRICE of North Carolina, SPRATT, and HONDA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. POMEROY changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2211, READY TO TEACH ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 310, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 252, nays 170, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 338]

YEAS—252

Abercrombie	Clay	Green (TX)
Aderholt	Coble	Green (WI)
Akin	Cole	Greenwood
Alexander	Collins	Gutknecht
Bachus	Cox	Harris
Baker	Crane	Hart
Ballenger	Crenshaw	Hastings (WA)
Barrett (SC)	Cubin	Hayes
Bartlett (MD)	Culberson	Hayworth
Barton (TX)	Cunningham	Hefley
Bass	Davis (TN)	Hensarling
Beauprez	Davis, Jo Ann	Herger
Bell	Davis, Tom	Hobson
Bereuter	Deal (GA)	Hoekstra
Berry	DeLay	Holden
Biggert	DeMint	Honda
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hostettler
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Houghton
Blackburn	Dicks	Hulshof
Blunt	Doolittle	Hunter
Boehlert	Duncan	Hyde
Boehner	Dunn	Isakson
Bonilla	Ehlers	Issa
Bonner	Emerson	Istook
Bono	English	Jefferson
Boozman	Eshoo	Jenkins
Boucher	Everett	Johnson (CT)
Boyd	Feeney	Johnson (IL)
Bradley (NH)	Ferguson	Johnson, Sam
Brady (TX)	Flake	Jones (NC)
Brown (SC)	Fletcher	Jones (OH)
Brown-Waite,	Foley	Keller
Ginny	Forbes	Kelly
Burgess	Fossella	Kennedy (MN)
Burns	Franks (AZ)	King (IA)
Burr	Frelinghuysen	King (NY)
Burton (IN)	Gallely	Kingston
Buyer	Garrett (NJ)	Kirk
Calvert	Kline	Kline
Camp	Gilchrest	Knollenberg
Cannon	Gillmor	Kolbe
Cantor	Gingrey	LaHood
Capito	Goode	Latham
Carter	Goodlatte	LaTourette
Castle	Gordon	Leach
Chabot	Granger	Lewis (CA)
Chocola	Graves	Lewis (KY)