Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I offer this resolution in that it recognizes the continued importance of transatlantic relations and the need for a continued and meaningful dialogue between the United States and Europe.

Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the difficult debate over Iraq, the Subcommittee on Europe held two hearings in June on the future of transatlantic relations. At these hearings, experts from both Europe and the United States presented their views on what went wrong. More important, however, was the consensus view of all of the witnesses who testified at these hearings that the time was right to put the debate over the Iraq war behind us and to begin to energetically consider how to reenergize the transatlantic relationship in a positive manner which is forward looking and which focuses on developing common strategies to address common challenges.

H. Res. 390 urges a renewed effort to develop stronger relations with our friends and allies in Europe through enhanced dialogue and communications between this Nation and Europe, especially through such mechanisms as the various formal and informal interparliamentary organizations which we have here in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, as the Iraq debate has shown, both sides need to communicate more. It is neither in the interest of the United States to ignore Europe nor to try to work with a weak or divided Europe. Europeans, on the other hand, need to attempt to better understand U.S. policies and objectives and its responsibilities as a global power.

The good news is there is dialogue, but that dialogue must be enhanced, and it must be predicated on the conviction that the United States and Europe cannot meet the global challenges which confront us both unless we strengthen our partnership and address these challenges together.

Mr. WEXLER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate and thank the gentleman from Nebraska, the chairman, for his leadership in introducing this resolution which recognizes the importance of America's transatlantic relationship. It is an undeniable fact that the present and future of America and Europe are interwoven and cannot be separated without grave consequence to either side. If the transatlantic relationship is to move forward, it is critical that Europe accept the realities of a post-Saddam Iraq and the potential for transformation in the greater Middle East. At the same time, the Bush administration, which has deftly managed to turn most of Europe against America, must understand that military power alone is not a panacea to guaranteeing our security, fighting terror or halting the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Ultimately, these goals cannot be achieved without the assistance of our allies in Europe and throughout the world. It is this message of friendship, understanding and cooperation that I hope will lay the future of transatlantic ties.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 390

Whereas for more than a half century transatlantic policy cooperation and coordination have been essential for the preservation of peace and freedom in Europe, have enabled the development of free and prosperous economies, and helped restore stability and unity in the Euro-Atlantic area;

Whereas a central goal of United States policy toward Europe remains that the development of a Europe united, free, strong, and at peace is in the best interests of the United States and Europe so long as the United States and Europe continue to work as partners, not rivals or counterweights;

Whereas the central pillar of the United States partnership with Europe remains a strong and cohesive Atlantic Alliance;

Whereas the United States and the European community are aware of their shared responsibility, not only to further transatlantic security, but to address other common interests such as environmental protection, poverty reduction, combatting international crime and promoting human rights, and to work together to meet those transnational challenges which affect the well-being of all;

Whereas in recognition of the threats posed by global terrorism, terrorist states, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and the nexus of the three, the partnership should be expanded progressively from a transatlantic community of values to an effective transatlantic community of action by developing a collaborative strategy and action plan for dealing with those challenges of mutual interest and concern;

Whereas no policy disagreement, such as the dispute with respect to Iraq, should be allowed to significantly disrupt transatlantic relations nor cause any member of the Euro-Atlantic community to choose between partners;

Whereas a renewed commitment to strengthen the partnership through increased cooperation, communication, consultation and information-exchange is required to achieve our common goals, which will continue to ensure peace and prosperity between the United States and Europe;

Whereas Congress has played a constructive role in this cooperative approach to partnership with Europe through mechanisms such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Parliamentary Assembly, the Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue, and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) Parliamentary Assembly which have for years brought together legislators of both the United States and Europe for discussions of issues of common interest in order to further transatlantic understanding and partnership at the parliamentary level; and

Whereas the House of Representatives welcomes and congratulates the newest member nations invited to join NATO and the European Union and looks forward to broader dialogue through their participation in these transatlantic parliamentary organizations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) affirms the conviction of the United States that, despite the occasional differences and difficulties, the underlying ties which have historically bound the people of the United States and of Europe remain strong;

(2) accepts the indivisibility of transatlantic security which provides an indispensable link between North America and Europe;

(3) recognizes that both the United States and Europe face new challenges at home and abroad and must strengthen and adapt the transatlantic partnership to effectively meet these challenges;

(4) acknowledges that in order to strengthen the transatlantic partnership there must be a renewed commitment to regular and intensive consultation, information exchange and dialogue between the United States Government and the governments of Europe and the European Union; and

(5) commits on its part to continue to improve the transatlantic partnership by enhancing the communication between the United States Congress and the legislatures of Europe through the formal frameworks of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, the Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue, the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, and various other formal and informal inter-parliamentary organizations.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2660, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. DELAURO moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 2660, be instructed to insist on the Senate level for part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer the motion to instruct that I presented yesterday. This motion will instruct House conferees for the fiscal year 2004 Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriations bill to insist on the Senate funding level for part B of the special education funding, the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, or IDEA. IDEA part B is the main vehicle with which the Federal Government provides its contribution to States toward educating children with disabilities.

Twenty-eight years ago, Congress made a promise to students, families

and communities around this country, a promise that said that the Federal Government would do its part to ensure that the more than 6.5 million children with disabilities and special needs in this country would have the same educational opportunities as every other child. It is a promise that this body has never lived up to, a promise quite honestly that this body has never even attempted to live up to.

This shortfall creates a huge burden on local communities and denies full opportunity to all students, with or without disabilities. And today in a time of unprecedented deficits at the State and Federal level alike, special education becomes just another in a long line of unfunded mandates that the Federal Government has passed on to the States. But we have an obligation to fund special education for children who have special needs. It is a moral obligation.

With the passage of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1975, Congress agreed that it would pay 40 percent of that bill. Only, it never has. What that has meant for the last 28 years is that the burden of meeting the mandates of special education has been placed largely on the shoulders of local communities. As the cost of educating students with disabilities continues to rapidly increase, there is little doubt that these increased costs are being paid for at the expense of other student services and programs. Moreover, this Republican majority cannot even keep the commitments they made earlier this year, both in the budget resolution and during the vote on the reauthorization of IDEA in April to provide a $2.2 billion increase for special education over fiscal year 2003. Sadly, the House Labor-HHS bill only provides a $1 billion increase which is demonstrated on this chart, promises made and promises broken.

In my State of Connecticut, which faces a billion-dollar budget deficit, school districts are paying $409 million more for special education than they did 10 years ago, a 76 percent cost increase. During the 2000–2001 school year, nearly 19 percent of the total education expenditures in the State were directed to special education students with some individual districts exceeding 25 percent, meaning one out of every four education dollars was going to special education.

This is a situation not unique to my district or my State. Right now, 47 States are experiencing budget deficits. If you ask virtually any municipality in the Nation what their number one budgetary concern is, they will tell you, without hesitation, special education. They simply cannot bear the strain the Federal Government is putting on them year after year. The strain will continue should Congress adopt the special education funding levels included in the House Labor, Health and Human Services, Education appropriations bill for fiscal year 2004. That bill fell $1.2 billion below what is needed to even put IDEA on the path to full funding by 2010. In my opinion, an abdication of our responsibility to our States and our children alike and a situation in which no one wins.

What is needed here is leadership. Our States are crying out for it. Parents are crying out for it. I wish we could call on the President to intervene on behalf of children with special needs. But President Bush's special education request would have amounted to the smallest increase for special education in 5 years.

□ 1845

So the responsibility falls to us to rise to the occasion, match what the other body has done by meeting our commitment once and for all to our children and our States and provide that extra $1.2 billion. The time for using the issue of special education as a political football is over. As I said before, it is a game in which no one wins. And as representatives for 50 States and the more than 6½ million children who need our help, the Congress is obliged, obliged to provide this $1.2 billion in funding in this bill and obliged to promote the capacity of our country to act together on what are indisputably shared values.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress reneged on its commitment to children with special needs in 1975. We cannot allow it to renege on that commitment again. We must meet our obligations. That is what this motion to instruct is about. And I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a very interesting point. Promises made, 1975, the Democrats were in control. They made promises. Here is the performance. Look at that, barely increased over 19 years. Barely increased over 19 years. Republicans take over, and we kept the promises. Here it goes, up, up, up, up, up, up. We can see the difference. This clearly shows us the difference between the Democrat Party, make the promises, do nothing. Republicans deliver.

On top of that, just recently the Members of the Democrat Party voted against a bill to increase special education by $1 billion. And I think it is interesting that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are seeking to instruct conferees to adopt the Senate funding levels for IDEA when just 3 months ago they voted against a $1 billion increase. They did not seem to want that. We strongly support funding for special education and the hope it gives millions of families every day.

In fact, since fiscal year 1996, the first year Republicans controlled the House, funding for special education has tripled; and under Republican control the percentage of per-pupil expenditures that the Federal Government contributes toward special education has increased to nearly 20 percent. By way of contrast, when the Democrats were in charge from 1975 until 1995, 20 years, the percentage of per-pupil expenditures was never more than 9 percent.

There are the facts; and I say to those who are looking at this situation, do not go on what I say. Go on what the chart shows happened when the Republicans took control. They made the promises; we delivered.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican commitment to funding special education cannot be questioned. The bill passed by this House in July continued the investment in IDEA by increasing the program by another $1 billion, representing the largest dollar increase in the entire Labor, Health and Human Services Education appropriations bill ever.

As most of my colleagues know, the original bill reported by the Committee on Appropriations in the other body provided a slightly smaller increase for this program. That is the bill that they reported out of committee. It was less than we have done. On the floor the other body adopted an amendment that would have added $1.2 billion to the program.

One little problem, however. This amendment was offset by the use of a customs user fee. Basically, this is a tax, and as we all know, increasing taxes is something that is not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations to decide. And tax policy is also something which the United States Constitution says must, and I emphasize must, originate in the House, not in the Senate. Therefore, this provision must be dropped by the other body in order for us to complete our conference on this bill. So we are talking about an instruction that cannot happen under the Constitution.

If we accept the gentlewoman's motion, it will have the effect of cutting $1.2 billion out of every other program in this bill. It will mean we will have to make cuts in funding for biomedical research that is seeking cures for cancer or diabetes or Parkinson's disease. Or perhaps the gentlewoman would suggest we take the funding out of programs under No Child Left Behind, such as programs to teach children to read or improve teacher quality. Or should we take the funding out of that provided for colleges and universities, or funding to produce textbooks for blind students? Or should we reduce the Pell grants? That is the effect of this motion.

We are not going to disagree with it because we are for IDEA. Here is the evidence: it says clearly which party cares about these children; and, therefore, we want the conference committee to do as much as possible. We did it on the bill that passed here in July. We raised IDEA by $1 billion, and the Democrats for whatever reason chose to oppose this.

Mr. Speaker, this motion is nothing more than a vain attempt to divert the

public's attention from the fact that my colleagues on the other side of this aisle voted against the $1 billion increase for children with special needs earlier this year.

The bill passed by this House was a balanced approach to addressing the needs of all of our citizens, including those with special needs. It gives hope to children and families across this Nation. And I say once again here are the facts, just look at the chart. It tells us the story eloquently. They make the promises; the Republicans deliver.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Let me be very quick, and there are others who will respond to what my colleague has said, and I appreciate his comments. I said in my remarks that the commitment to children with special needs was reneged on in 1975. We cannot let that happen again. In this current year, the Republican majority committed to $2.2 billion. They have reneged on that promise. No, in fact, we should not cut back on Pell grants, on No Child Left Behind, not any of the other education programs.

What, in fact, we ought to cut back on is that $93,000 a year that we are giving in a tax cut to the 184,000 millionaires in this country. That is why we are short on this effort. That is why we are short-changing children with special needs. The fact of the matter is that the Republicans would have cut IDEA in 1996 by $88 million; 1997 by $279 million; in 2003, $500 million below the President's budget. They have every single year worked at cutting the amount of money for children with special needs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the DeLauro motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 2660 to fully fund the Federal commitment to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA. What an idea, taking the funding out of the tax cuts for the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans, not funding this program from other deserving programs.

Whenever I talk to educators or school administrators in my district, the very first thing they bring up is IDEA, special education. The first thing they say about IDEA is that we need to have it funded. The Federal Government must meet its commitment for 40 percent of the cost. In fact, if the Federal Government fully funded its share of IDEA, schools in Sonoma County, in my congressional district, would have received almost $20 million to help educate students with disabilities, students with special education needs. Instead, Sonoma County schools received just under $6 million, or about 15 percent of their costs.

Every Member here could tell the same story about their school districts. If the Federal Government fully funded its share of IDEA, schools nationwide would receive almost $20 billion to help pay for the cost of educating students with special needs. H.R. 2660 falls far short of this needed funding; and when we do not fully fund IDEA, we do not just take needed resources from students with disabilities. We shortchange all students.

If school districts had their full share of IDEA funds, they would be able to use their own funds for improvements that benefit all students such as increasing teachers' salaries, reducing class size, building new schools, renovating old schools. When we underfund IDEA, we pit children with disabilities against other children, schools against parents, parents against parents. We must fully fund the Federal share of IDEA. Vote for the DeLauro motion to instruct conferees to include full funding in the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill to cover the Federal share of IDEA.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the original IDEA bill authorized this Congress to give up the 40 percent of the additional cost of educating a child with special needs so that communities would have some help with that burden even though it was their constitutional obligation to educate every child to 100 percent of that. For years Congress did not fulfill that commitment. They were at 9, 10, 11, or 12 percent. What were those years? Those years were the Reagan-Bush years. We were running deficits of incredible amounts, building up on our debt in this Nation; $295 billion of deficit in 1992 accumulated since 1980 to a point where we had a debt of almost $5 trillion. Congress could not do more. They were busy trying to pay off those bills.

From 1993 to 2000 with a Democrat in the White House, Congress started to pay down those deficits, started to pay those bills; and around 1997 where the yellow number is upticking on that chart that the gentleman from Ohio was showing, that was when we finally got a grip on the deficit, and we finally were able to start putting some money towards the obligations of IDEA. In fact, we did it almost every year over the objections of the Republican majority and had to fight every year. This is the type of issue the Republican majority almost brought the House to a standstill on. But we managed to tick it up. We managed to bring those numbers up, with the objections of the Republicans in many instances, and started to do better.

Now we have an opportunity in 2000, with a $5.6 trillion surplus projected over 10 years, to really reach that 40 percent level; and instead the Republican majority and the White House decided that is not where they want to spend the money. Despite the fact that the Republican ''Contract on America'' in the mid-1990s promised this was one of their 10 items, they have never come close; and we have had resolutions in this House where every single Democrat voted to fund IDEA and not a single Republican voted to do it. And when we had the chance with a $5.6 trillion surplus projected over 10 years, the majority in this House, the Republican majority, and the White House walked away from it and did not do it.

And why does the gentlewoman from Connecticut come up with the number of $2.2 billion? Because it is the amount that Republicans promised. They put it in their budget very disingenuously as if they were going to do it. They put it in their authorization bill as if they might do it. And when Democrats on the Committee on Education and the Workforce tried to make that mandatory so they would have to do $2.2 billion, the Republicans would not vote for it. And now we know why they would not. They had no intention of doing it. 2.2 billion was the number they held publicly out in both the budget and their authorization; $1 billion is the amount they finally come in with in the end. And they claim it might be more than last year. Yes, a paltry amount more than last year. And again we are back to pushing, pushing, pushing, trying to make them meet their obligation.

Why can we not do it? It is not because we would have to cut from every other part of the budget. It is because there is not much in every other part of the budget because the Republicans decided to give $1.3 trillion away in three rounds of tax cuts.

□ 1900

The choices that were made, the Republican majority and the President and the White House decided money is not going to go to special education. They decided money is not going to go to No Child Left Behind. They decided no money is going to go to fix our roads and bridges, nor for the myriad of obligations the Federal Government has made to cities and states and towns. It is going to go, instead, to the wealthiest people in this country.

That, my friends, is what is happening here. It is a canard to say we do not have the money. It was an intentional misappropriation. We need to do better in this Congress.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to instruct conferees, insisting on increasing funding for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, or IDEA.

Full funding of IDEA has been one of my priorities since I have been in Congress. When Congress first addressed

this issue in 1975, we made a commitment that we would provide children with disabilities access to a quality education, but not once in the past 28 years has Congress lived up to its obligation to fund the services it requires States and school districts to provide, despite a commitment that we would do so.

My home State of Oregon, like so many States across this country, is suffering from tremendous budget shortfalls. When the Federal Government does not pay its share, the remaining costs just do not go away. The States and school districts are forced to pick up the additional costs, putting additional strain on our education funding.

In 2003, we appropriated $8.9 billion for Part B of IDEA. While this is a small increase over past years, it is still leaving States and local school districts with an unfunded Federal mandate of over $10 billion. That is $10 billion that our States and school districts could be spending to alleviate State budget crises, reduce class sizes and build and modernize our schools.

Funding IDEA is not just about educating disabled students, it is about relieving the school funding crises that States across this Nation are facing.

It is high time we renew our commitment to all of our Nation's children and pay our fair share of the cost of IDEA. I urge my colleagues to support funding for IDEA and support the DeLauro motion to instruct conferees. This is a promise the Federal Government made. This is a promise, for the sake of our children, we need to keep.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the DeLauro motion to instruct conferees, and I commend the gentlewoman from Connecticut for introducing it.

H.R. 2660, the appropriations bill for the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education, is underfunding our Nation's education system. Although this Congress made the promise to increase funding for education by $2.2 billion in the FY 2004 budget resolution, and then again in H.R. 1350, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, these promises do not appear in the appropriations bill. Instead, special education falls $1.2 billion short of the budget promise.

Due to the insufficiency of funding for local education, our local communities will need to absorb more of the costs for providing special education to 6.7 million school children. Ultimately, schools will be forced to cut essential programs or raise local taxes. That is why I voted against the appropriation resolution and why I voted against the IDEA reauthorization.

During discussion in the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I spoke to the need to fully fund IDEA, and even voted in favor of an amendment which did in fact fail. Now I am asking my colleagues in the House to follow suit with our Senate colleagues and fulfill the promise from the budget resolution and the Senate-passed bill, which included the bipartisan amendment to increase IDEA funding by $2.2 billion.

I believe that we have no greater responsibility as legislators than to fully fund education; to make sure that we have adequate buildings, schools, teachers, textbooks; and to help those children who have the greatest amount of need. No children have greater needs than those with disabilities. I ask that we support the DeLauro motion and support our children who need help the most.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the DeLauro amendment.

Many decades ago, our country did a great and noble thing. We made a commitment as American people that every child in this country, regardless of his or her disability, would get a good education. At that time, the Federal Government promised that it would pick up 40 percent of the costs of providing that education to youngsters with disabilities. But as we are gathered here today, the Federal Government is only paying 19 percent, and the result of that is not only that children with disabilities are not getting the Federal resources that are required for education, but also children without disabilities are suffering, as we are pitting one against the other.

Now, we can talk about decades of who is to blame or who promised what, but let us just look at this year. This year we already have a story of sordid, broken promises.

I serve on the Committee on Education and the Workforce. This year the chairman of the committee came forward with an authorization bill that would increase the authorization from last year's levels originally by $1.4 billion, to $10.3 billion. Then we in the Committee on Education and the Workforce had a discussion where we, Republicans and Democrats alike, agreed that in order to meet our commitment, we had to increase that authorization.

So the chairman of the committee went back to the Committee on the Budget and, very proudly, as he should, came back to the Committee on Education and the Workforce and said, ''Look, I have talked to my colleagues, and they have agreed we are not going to increase it by just $1.3 billion; we are going to increase it by $2.2 billion.'' That is what the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce announced.

Many of us were skeptical about whether that would be delivered on. We said, ''Let's make that mandatory.'' We had a vote in committee. The chairman of the committee said to The Members, ''Let's not take a vote to make it mandatory, because I have talked to my colleagues on the Republican side on the Committee on the Budget and we have a commitment here. Let us not make this binding.''

We had a vote. It was 10 to 9. Democrats voted in favor in the subcommittee of making it binding, Republicans did not. The same story in the full committee.

Well, look where we are today. It turns out that we should have had a binding vote. That would have been the only way to hold the Committee on the Budget and the Republican leadership to its word on this issue. The chairman of the committee said, ''Don't worry about it. Trust us.'' Well, look where that has gotten us.

The fact of the matter is, we have let down the American people. We do not need to go back with broken promises for decades. We have multiple broken promises just this year, promises broken to American children.

Let me just end by talking about priorities, because what we are seeing here is the budget that was passed at the beginning of the year, that set the road map. Everything after that was on automatic pilot. That budget was premised on huge tax cuts for the very wealthiest Americans.

Now, I do not have any problem if people want to say ''I am for tax cuts,'' and it is okay that for some economic theory that they should go to the wealthiest Americans. But do not say you are for that, and, at the same time, go back to your districts and say, ''We are for full funding for special education,'' as Republicans and Democrats alike do. They all go out and say they are in favor of it. Because you cannot do everything. You cannot have big tax cuts for the wealthiest and come back to this body and fully fund special education.

We have to make choices. That is what leadership is all about. If you want to choose higher tax cuts for the wealthy, that is a fine choice. Stand up for it. But do not at the same time come and say we really wanted to do this, but we just could not do it, because we can do it if we make the right choices. We should make the right choices for the America's children. That is why we have got to support this motion.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD), a very valued member of our subcommittee.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion to instruct, and I do it with a lot of history.

For many of the years, about 15 of the years that the Democrats controlled this House, I was a school board member in Tunkhannock, Pennsylvania, and I know what it means to not have enough IDEA funding. We worked

very hard to make the choices to balance our budget, to do what the Federal law required with the amount of money that was given to us.

At that time, the highest that we ever got was 9.9 percent. When the Democrats controlled this House, the most money we ever got was 9.9 percent. This year, we are giving the schools 20 percent. That is double what we ever got when the Democrats were in control.

Now, what is this disingenuous discussion about? We do have choices to make. We made choices to give more funding this year than we have done in the past. There is an extra $1 billion in this bill, and we are halfway to full funding the 40 percent of IDEA. That is much more than we have done in the past, and it will go a long way toward helping school districts with these major challenges.

I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) for his leadership on this bill. He always gives us fair and balanced leadership, and this is a fair and balanced bill that lives within realistic priorities and shows that the majority is trying very hard to leave no child behind, to do the right thing for American education.

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON), also a very valued member of our subcommittee.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the chairman on this bill. The bill that we presented increased special education funding by over $1 billion, and I believe those who are offering this motion to instruct tonight all voted against it.

Now, you cannot have it both ways. When you look at the chart that we had up here a little bit ago, the big chart, in 9 years under Republican leadership we went from a little over $2 billion to almost $10 billion. That is just under $8 billion.

Now, the 9 years preceding that, under Democrat leadership, you increased funding $1 billion in 9 years. We increased it $1 billion this year. We increased it almost $8 billion in the 9 years that we have been in control. Just count them, 9 years. Come back here 9, just a little bit over $2 billion. $1 billion in 9 years.

Now, the interesting part is it is easy to say they want to fully fund it. The other body put in a tax provision to fund it that cannot stay there. It is illegal. It cannot be there. So if you are really serious about this, your motion to instruct will say we are going to take it from Pell Grants, or we are going to take it from basic education, or we are going to take it from higher education, because that is how you have to do it.

You are making no choices. When we look at the record, the choices you made for 9 years previous to the 9 years that we have been in power were not for special education. In 9 years, a $1 billion increase.

□ 1915

Just a few days ago, we passed this bill with $1 billion of additional money in it, and they vote ''no.'' I think the American public understands showmanship. I think the American public understands a sham motion, because that is what this one is.

Now, I do not think there is anybody here that does not think we should not fully fund special education, and we are on track today to do it. We have the record. There has been a game plan of when we are going to reach it. Now, that is reasonable, because we will be taking new money and new dollars. But if you are serious, tell us where it comes from, because the other body's tax provision cannot remain to fund it. If you are serious, show us where the cuts are. Is it Pell grants? Is it higher education? Is it No Child Left Behind? Because it has got to come from one of them.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the record, and I am proud of our chairman's leadership on this issue, and his predecessor, John Porter's leadership on this issue. Because this is their record: getting us to where we ought to be as fast as we can.

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

Let me just make one or two comments about what my colleagues have said.

First of all, and this is not my commentary, but CRS's commentary, that if we continue to go in the direction that we are going in with $1 billion, we are never going to get to full funding. I commend the CRS data and material to my colleagues.

Secondly, the fact of the matter is, as my colleagues have said before, the issue is about choices. It is not only about choices, but it is about priorities; and those priorities in terms of our budget are fundamentally determined by where our values are on these issues.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to my colleagues that when the choice, the most important and fundamental choice was made in this body about trillions of dollars of tax cuts, $93,000 a year to the 184,000 millionaires in this country, that was a choice. It is the choice, the fundamental choice which is starving the Federal Government of the resources that it needs to meet its public commitments; not willy-nilly commitments, but commitments where we have said we are going to put up so much money for special education, and, you, State of Connecticut, Minnesota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, you put up so much money.

We are reneging on those commitments because of the fundamental choice that was made by the Republican President of the United States, by the Republican House majority, by the Senate House majority to fund the tax cuts. That is the priority, not special education, not Pell grants, not let no child be left behind, not any of the education programs that we view as critical to the opportunities that young people have in this country.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out the facts: promises made by the Democrats, very little increase; promises delivered by the Republicans. The chart tells more eloquently than words what it is all about. I simply say that we believe in special education, and we have put the money there to back up our beliefs.

This motion to instruct is a sham because the Senate money is not there. They did something proposed, and I would again emphasize that the bill that came out of the Senate committee had less, less in IDEA than the House bill. They had a floor amendment that said we are going to raise taxes to pay for it. Unconstitutional. So let us get on with it.

I would point out one other fact, and that is that the Democrats voted against $1 billion for IDEA in the July bill for labor, health and human services.

So I submit to my colleagues that the record is clear. Republicans deliver; the Democrats promise.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

There is no doubt in my mind that tonight what we were going to hear from the other side of the aisle is about how much funding for special education has been increased in the past years. But there is no denying the fact that the Republicans broke their promises to the Nation's 6.7 million special needs children this year when they denied the promised $2.2 billion increase in the Republican fiscal year 2004 Labor-HHS bill.

Let me just say that it is true that promises for IDEA part B State grants, the main Federal program for which the Federal Government finances special education, have increased from $2.3 billion in fiscal year 1996 to $8.9 billion today, an increase of $6.6 billion. But it is equally true, equally true, and understand this, that if the Labor-HHS bills put forth by House Republicans over that period of time would have been enacted into law, the $6.6 billion increase actually provided for IDEA would have been cut nearly in half, because if House Republicans had had their way, they would have spent $2.8 billion less on special education between fiscal years 1996 and 2003.

I am going to briefly, briefly read my colleagues the facts in these years and the Republican activity on these issues.

In 2003, the majority failed to pass a Labor-HHS bill because they wanted to avoid voting on the Bush education cuts. However, the HHS bill, H.R. 246,

was introduced by the very fine chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies. The chairman offered the bill, and it was the House position for the purpose of the conference negotiations. That bill included $8 billion for IDEA part B State grants, $500 million less than the Bush IDEA request and $846 million less than the amount ultimately that was enacted into law.

In 2002, we had a bipartisan year. Democrats and Republicans supported a healthy increase for special education: $186 million over the final conference level of $7.5 billion.

In 2001, the House Republican Labor-HHS bill was a shocking $850 million below what was the $6.3 billion included in the grants and in the conference agreement.

In 2000, the House Republican bill was $179 million below the final conference level of $5 billion for special education.

In 1999, the House bill provided the same amount, $4.3 billion, which was ultimately enacted into law.

In 1998, another bipartisan year, House Republicans initially proposed $3.4 billion for IDEA grants, $375 million below the final amount secured by the Democrats in the Labor-HHS conference agreement, which provided a total of $3.8 billion.

In 1997, the House Republican bill would have frozen IDEA at $2.3 billion, $279 million below the request, and a whopping $784 million below the final conference agreement.

In fiscal year 1996, House Republicans proposed to freeze the special education grant at $2.3 billion. That was the amount ultimately enacted into law, a cut of $88 million below the Clinton request.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, a careful examination of the Republican record on IDEA funding paints a less rosy picture than my colleagues would like to portray. In 5 of the last 8 years, the House Republicans have provided less than the amount actually enacted into law for IDEA part B State grants.

Democrats insisted that we provide those increases. Democrats want to fulfill our commitments to the 6.7 million special needs children before we begin to provide super-sized tax cuts to the Nation's well-off and wealthiest citizens.

Under a funding scenario of $1 billion per year, as is in the Republican Labor-HHS bill, we will never, never meet the goal of fully funding for IDEA. It was the majority party, once again, that promised a $2.2 billion increase this year for IDEA. 216 Republicans voted for the increase in the 2004 budget resolution; 217 Republicans voted again for the increase in the IDEA reauthorization bill.

Democrats say this evening, on the issue of special education for our youngsters, a moral obligation which we have committed to, which we have committed our States to, what Democrats say this evening is keep your promises to those 6.7 million children who, without the proper funding, will not ever realize their dreams, their aspirations for opportunity for their future and a way in which they can hold on to the American Dream of education.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this motion to instruct.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, it would be disingenuous, and plain false, for anyone to suggest that this Congress has not been dedicated to the needs of our nation's special education students. In the past year we have recognized the importance reform has on the program when we reauthorized IDEA. Rather than to throw money at IDEA this body passed a reauthorization bill that will enhance efficiencies ultimately resulting in increased services for special education students. In the past year we have also voted to increase funding for IDEA, at a record level. There should be no doubt that this Congress is consistently focused on the needs of these students.

In the past eight years we have more than tripled funding for special education. In 1975 the Congress said it would pay 40 percent of the per pupil cost to educate special education students. We are making great strides toward meeting the 40-percent goal. Since 1996 we have increased this contribution from 7.3 percent to almost 20 percent this year. We all deserve to be proud of this and we all should be dedicated to continuing this progress.

Having said that, we must not forget that we have also seen historic increases in funding for all of our education programs. Last week we passed a motion to support funding increases for programs under the No Child Left Behind Act and today we could potentially be taking those away. Look at the big picture. For fiscal year 2004, with the guidance of Chairman REGULA, this House is continuing our efforts in providing unprecedented increases for No Child Left Behind, Head Start, Higher Education and especially IDEA. This year's $1 billion increase for IDEA represents the single largest dollar increases in the bill and one of the largest funding increases for IDEA ever. This Congress and this Administration are without a doubt dedicated to all students.

I have always prioritized adequate funding for education programs as well as fiscal conservatism. Given other expenses we have across the country and the world, I believe the House Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations Act represents a delicate balance between increased funding for federal education programs and fiscal restraint. I encourage Members, on both sides of the aisle, to take an unbiased and honest look at what we are doing for students, and particularly our special education students.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEARCE). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

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

Ms. DELAURO. 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.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1308, TAX RELIEF, SIMPLIFICATION, AND EQUITY ACT OF 2003

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BECERRA moves that the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1308 be instructed as follows:

1. The House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report the provision of the Senate amendment (not included in the House amendment) that provides immediate payments to taxpayers receiving an additional credit by reason of the bill in the same manner as other taxpayers were entitled to immediate payments under the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003.

2. The House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report the provision of the Senate amendment (not included in the House amendment) that provides families of military personnel serving in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other combat zones a child credit based on the earnings of the individuals serving in the combat zone.

3. The House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report all of the other provisions of the Senate amendment and shall not report back a conference report that includes additional tax benefits not offset by other provisions.

4. To the maximum extent possible within the scope of conference, the House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report other tax benefits for military personnel and the families of the astronauts who died in the Columbia disaster.

5. The House conferees shall, as soon as practicable after the adoption of this motion, meet in open session with the Senate conferees and the House conferees shall file a conference report consistent with the preceding provisions of this instruction, not later than the second legislative day after adoption of this motion.

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

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

Mr. Speaker, let me give my colleagues a few numbers and see if we can find the connection in these numbers: 25, 161, 6.5 million, zero, and