schools would join the ranks of the most highly paid teachers in the state.

This is not a giveaway to teachers. To assure high quality, these changes would be directly tied to rigorous performance assessments. In fact, the entire structure of reform would be subject to ongoing review by an Independent Office for Research and Accountability that would identify target schools for augmented support and determine whether the Commission's intensified strategies are producing desired results.

What hope is there that these ideas will be acted upon? After all, similar proposals have been floated in the past.

The answer is that at this particular moment, we are blessed with a rare opportunity that combines a potential multi-billion dollar windfall for the city's school system with contract renewal negotiations between the United Federation of Teachers and the city and an upcoming Mayoral election.

Clearly the biggest barrier to school reform has been money. For decades, the city has been unable to offer the kind of teacher salaries found in the suburbs and upstate because it has not received a proportionate share of funding. More recently, under the provisions of the federal No Child Left Behind Act, city schools have been asked to meet clear and specific targets for student achievement even as they have been denied the wherewithal to do so. Now the courts have recognized that this amounts to a violation of our children's Constitutional right to a sound, basic education. A panel of special judges has recommended that the state make amends by providing the city with an additional $14 billion in operating and facilities funds over the next five years. That decision is being appealed, but many believe that within the next year, money will actually change hands.

That's a huge step, and certainly little else can happen without it. But it is only the beginning. Plaintiffs have won similar lawsuits in other states, gotten their money, and still were unable to enact meaningful reform. Usually this was because they failed to bring together all school stakeholders in a meaningful dialogue.

In New York City, the City Council commission began such a dialogue with the public hearings it held during this past year. But obstacles remain. One of the long-standing bones of contention has been the seniority system that allows the most experienced teachers to essentially choose their placements. Given the low pay and working conditions in struggling schools, most elect to work in higher-performing institutions where they can make a decent living and be effective. Not surprisingly, the union has fiercely defended this system.

The city government, for its part, has responded—with justification—that its hands are tied.

Lately, however, there have been encouraging signs. Both Randi Weingarten, the UFT president, and Joel Klein, the city schools chancellor, have said that in principle, they believe the key to turning around struggling schools is to populate them with excellent, experienced teachers. Mayor Bloomberg, who has made education reform the centerpiece of his first term, is running for a reelection. It is a moment, in short, when promises are being made; when compromise is in the air; and when unprecedented new financial resources seem likely to come our way.

That said, the beginning of the new school year is almost upon us. The teacher contract talks are at a critical point. So let's make the most of our opportunity. We have identified a clear priority—to put great teachers in the schools that need them most, as rapidly as possible. We have the political will to do so, and soon we will have the money. If we fail to deliver, history—and our children—will judge us harshly indeed.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 1965 VOTING RIGHTS ACT

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 2005

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on this 40th anniversary of the landmark Voting Rights Act of 1965, we must pause to recognize the importance of this legislation. A century before its passing, the 15th Amendment guaranteed the right for Black men to vote. In 1920, women were also granted that right. Despite these laws, minority men and women were still prevented from voting through discriminatory means common to Jim Crow, antebellum South including poll taxes, literacy tests, gerrymandering and language discrimination. Through the Voting Rights Act, considered one of the foremost pieces of Civil Rights legislation, Congress saw the discrimination and realized the critical need to protect the minority. We must continue to do so.

The most basic and fundamental principles of any democracy are equal opportunity, equal protection under the law and guarantee of the right to participate, to have that right protected and to have that participation count.

Unfortunately in the last two Presidential elections and in an increasing number of elections across the country are being marred with allegations of manipulation, chicanery, trickery, intimidation and outright illegal acts of fraud, thievery, and violence. All of these acts and actions have served to undermine confidence in our electoral system, disrupt the process of normalcy, and are beginning to shake the very foundation of our democracy. We must not waver in our commitment to our citizens and continue to ensure that their vote matters.

The face of America is changing every day. Diversity of race, ethnicity, language and other aspects of the American citizen are evident in our society. The need to protect the rights of the electorate despite these differences is a constant struggle. This 40-year-old legislation stood the test of time. It is our duty to continue to protect the right to vote, one of the most basic rights, for all Americans.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 6, ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005

SPEECH OF

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2005

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I cannot support this legislation.

There is nothing I would rather vote for than a balanced energy bill that sets us on a forward-looking course—one that acknowledges that this country is overly dependent on a single energy source—fossil fuels—to the detriment of our environment, our national security, and our economy.

But at a time of sky-rocketing oil prices, this report doesn't do what it needs to do—help us balance our energy portfolio and increase the contributions of alternative energy sources to our energy mix.

The process of developing the conference report is much improved from last year's contentious debate. Senate and House conferees worked together cooperatively and were able to compromise on a number of provisions and bridge difficult differences of opinion. I believe Chairman BARTON and Ranking Member DINGELL and on the Senate side, Chairman DOMENICI and Ranking Member BINGAMAN, have done a good job in this respect.

The conference report itself is also an improvement over the bill passed by the House earlier this year.

It includes an extension of the Renewable Energy Production Tax Credit for another 2 years, which will take us through the end of 2007. This is very good news. The report also includes clean energy bonds provisions from the Senate bill which will enable electric cooperatives to invest in renewable generation.

It also removes the methyl bromide tertiary-butyl ether, MTBE, liability waiver that would have let industry off the hook. It's true that the conference report does provide a "backdoor immunity" that could derail many legal claims by denying communities and states the right to be heard in state forums. But I believe that the conferees took a big step forward by dropping the liability waiver.

On energy efficiency, the conference report goes beyond the House bill in establishing new energy efficiency standards for 15 products. It also includes numerous energy efficiency tax provisions for alternative fuel vehicles, energy efficient appliances and new and existing homes, among others, provisions contained in the Energy Efficiency Cornerstone Act that I introduced with my colleague Rep. ZACH WAMP and others.

Electricity provisions are strengthened—not only does the conference report include new standards for grid reliability, but it also includes consumer protections in electric markets, such as new merger review, a prohibition on market manipulation, improved market transparency, among others. These protections are especially important given that the bill repeals the Public Utility Holding Company Act, PUHCA, which restricts the ownership and operations of power companies and their ability to control energy prices.

Another way in which the conference report has improved on the House bill is its treatment of oil shale.

This is a subject of particular concern to Coloradans, because Colorado has the most significant amounts of oil shale—and also the most experience with oil shale fever. In Colorado, we have had several bouts of that syndrome. The last one started during the 1970s energy crisis and ended abruptly on "Black Sunday" in 1982. That was when Exxon announced it was pulling out of the Colony shale project, an event that left an impact crater from the Western Slope to downtown Denver. There followed an exodus of other companies that had been working on oil shale—which led to an echoing exodus of jobs and of Coloradans who had nowhere else to turn.

The House bill would have required the Interior Department to set up a new leasing program for commercial development of oil shale, with final regulations to be in place by the end of next year. In other words, it called for a crash program to meet a short, arbitrary deadline.