

### REPAIRING BROKEN FEDERAL EDUCATION POLICIES

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I'm going out on a limb here and say that North Carolina teachers, parents, and administrators know more than the suits in Washington about North Carolina students' needs.

It's a shame that Federal law often stands in the way of local educators having the flexibility they need to innovate and serve students. It's a greater shame, though not a surprise, that Federal intervention has done little to improve student performance.

House Republicans aren't just going to comment on the problem or propagate a system where waivers, like Band-Aids, patch bad Federal laws. We're going to change the law. H.R. 5, the Student Success Act, takes steps to reduce the Federal Government's one-size-fits-all footprint in education. It empowers parents, supports effective teachers, and restores local control.

Children across this country are directly impacted by broken Federal education policies. There's no excuse to let the brokenness continue.

### FIXING OUR BROKEN IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

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

Mr. POLIS. It is rare, Mr. Speaker, that more than two-thirds of the United States Senate agrees on anything. It's rare, Mr. Speaker, when two-thirds of the American people agree on anything. And yet the Senate, with 68 votes, passed a comprehensive immigration reform bill that will finally replace our broken immigration system with one that works: one that works for our economy; one that works for American families; one that helps grow jobs; and one that restores the rule of law to an underground system where people continue to live in an underground economy here in our country today.

There are 11 million people here in our country illegally. The American people are fed up with the violation of the rule of law and of our sovereignty. It's time to fix our broken immigration system in a way that's consistent with our values as Americans.

We are a Nation of immigrants; we also are a Nation of laws. It's time to reconcile those two truisms. Take up the Senate bill in the United States House of Representatives, send it to President Obama's desk, and finally fix our broken immigration system to make it work for our country.

### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5, STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up

House Resolution 303 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 303

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-18. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1245

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. House Resolution 303 provides for a structured rule providing for consideration of H.R. 5, the Student Success Act.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the House Education and the Workforce Committee and I have been working to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Our efforts in reauthorization have centered on four principles: reducing the Federal footprint in education, empowering parents, supporting effective teachers, and restoring local control.

H.R. 5, the Student Success Act, ensures that local communities have the flexibility needed to meet the needs of their students. This legislation reauthorizes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, also known as ESEA, for 5 years, while making commonsense changes to update the law and address some of the concerns following the last reauthorization.

Despite good intentions, there's widespread agreement that the current law is no longer effectively serving students.

Instead of working with Congress to reauthorize ESEA, the Obama administration began offering States temporary waivers in 2011 to exempt them from onerous requirements in exchange for new Federal mandates from the Department of Education.

These waivers are a short-term fix to a long-term problem, and leave States and districts with uncertainty about whether they will again be subject to the failing law, and if the administration will change the requirements necessary to receive a waiver.

It is time to give students, parents, teachers, and school districts certainty to make decisions and flexibility to make the best decisions for their communities. H.R. 5 is a step in the right direction and will provide this certainty and flexibility.

Since Republicans returned to the majority in the House in 2011, we've held 20 hearings on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The committee considered five reauthorization bills in four markups in the 112th Congress, in addition to a markup and favorable reporting of H.R. 5 this year.

I'm pleased to work with my colleagues on the Rules Committee to report rules for floor debate and the consideration of legislation that promote transparency and participation.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 5, the so-called Student Success Act. The

Student Success Act is an ideological attempt to reduce the crucial Federal role in K-12 education.

To be clear, there's no excuse for bad policy that interferes with student learning and prevents opportunity from reaching all corners of this land. There's no excuse for bad classroom practices at the local level. There's no excuse for bad policies at the State level, and there's no excuse for bad policies at the Federal level.

However, we should also make no excuses for good policies at the State level, make no excuses for good policies that help improve classroom practices at the Federal level.

Unfortunately, under this restrictive rule, many of the commonsense amendments that would have helped improve this bill were shut out, including an amendment that I authored that would combat bullying and harassment against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender students, to ensure that schools are a safe learning environment for all children.

Under this rule, other amendments that were offered by both my Democratic and Republican colleagues were not included and not allowed to proceed to the House floor for a debate.

My colleague, Ms. FOXX, said that "local communities have the flexibility they need to meet the needs of their students." She stated that that was one of the goals of this bill.

I think the second goal that we should have with Federal education policy is, yes, to give local communities the flexibility to meet the learning needs of their students, but so, too, to not give local communities the flexibility to continue to not meet the needs of their students.

There are too many failing schools across our country—high schools that, year after year, have dropout rates in excess of 50 percent; elementary schools where kids are falling further behind every year.

We need to do everything we can as a society—that means at the State level, that means at the Federal level, that means at the district level—to make sure that, yes, the district has the flexibility and the school has the flexibility to do what works, but not the flexibility to continue to do nothing, which would only consign another generation of American kids, particularly and disproportionately our most at-risk families, to failure.

If the underlying bill becomes law, States wouldn't be required to set performance targets based on student growth, proficiency, or graduation rates. Effectively, it would allow States to define success down, simply to make themselves or their districts look good. The bill doesn't even define low-performing schools, nor does it establish parameters for intervention or timelines for improvement.

I have not heard any Member of this body, on either side, argue for Federal micromanagement. That's a straw man. We want to make sure that re-

form-minded superintendents are armed with the tools they need to make the tough decisions.

And there's no silver bullet in education. Sometimes it might be converting it into a charter school, sometimes it might be changing the staff, sometimes it might be closing a school, sometimes it might be an extended learning day.

One of the most critical aspects of successful school reform, in fact, is the local buy-in. And that's why I, as well as my colleague, Ms. FOXX, would agree that the Federal Government dictating what they should do is counterproductive towards effective school reform. However, continuing to do nothing is a guaranteed continued recipe for failure.

Mr. Speaker, we need to provide schools with more flexibility to design school improvement systems than the rigid measures under No Child Left Behind. I think we can agree on that. But we can't let them continue to do nothing and fail children.

No child in our country should be trapped in a failing school with little or no recourse or real choice. We need to mend accountability, not end it.

This bill constitutes the Federal Government throwing up its arms and simply letting the States define success downward, making themselves look good, patting themselves on the back saying, "Job well done," when more and more children are falling through the cracks.

We need a Federal role as an honest referee, a disruptive force to break up school district monopolies. We need to use our limited funds to give reform-minded school leaders leverage and resources and cover that they need to ensure that failing schools are subject to dramatic interventions that improve school quality.

No child should ever be trapped in a failing school. And we, as adults, should not be finger-pointing, saying oh, that's the State, that's the district, that's the Federal Government, that's your principal's fault, that's your teacher's fault. That's not the answer. The answer is to make the school work for the kids and make sure that every family has access to a good school.

While No Child Left Behind certainly has its flaws, including the problematic and wrongful definition of adequate yearly progress as a benchmark for success, it, nevertheless, did move us forward when it comes to serving low-income and minority students, students with disabilities and English language learners, and provided a new layer of transparency that prevented school districts from sweeping these problems under the rug.

Unfortunately, here, with this bill, H.R. 5, it takes another step backward, effectively excluding students with disabilities from school accountability systems. Currently, there's a 1 percent cap, saying the students with severe disabilities up to 1 percent of students can take alternative assessments based on alternative achievements standards.

This bill removes that cap, meaning that school district or that State, at their discretion, under this bill can simply say, you know what? We don't think any of our IDEA students, any of our Special Ed students can learn, so we're not going to include them in the accountability metric. They don't have to take the test. Or if they do, we're not going to count it. Or they can do an alternative test, and we'll look at that and sign off.

And we will never know, Mr. Speaker, under this bill. It truly, in our publicly-funded public education system, is continuing to meet the learning needs of all kids, including those with disabilities or not, which is why, across the disability advocacy community, there is strong opposition for this bill.

It's rare that a bill can unite such disparate forces as the Chamber of Commerce, organizations representing teachers, the civil rights community, advocates for the disabled, all in staunch opposition to a bill. Why?

Because the bill represents a step backward for public education in this country. This bill doesn't invest in our Nation's teachers, the most important frontline workers that provide a quality education for kids across the country.

While, to its credit, it eventually replaces highly-qualified teachers with a new teacher accountability system that's tied into student success, which is a key component of my STELLAR Act that I introduced with Representative SUSAN DAVIS, it fails to provide teachers with the professional development and support they need to succeed in the classroom.

And during the 3-year transition period, it does away with all measures, indicators and requirements for teacher quality, including getting rid of the definition of highly-qualified teacher. So for 3 years, our Federal taxpayer money that we are custodians of will go, in part, to pay the salaries of people with absolutely no quality input or outbased controls.

While I applaud the eventual replacement of the definition of highly-qualified teacher, and most people agree that we can do better measurement of teacher quality, the answer is simply not to throw up our arms and say we're not going to look at teacher quality.

While H.R. 5 retreats on the significant and constructive Federal role, Ranking Member MILLER's Democratic substitute advances a comprehensive vision of school accountability and improvement. The Democratic substitute would ensure that schools take into account student growth, proficiency rates, including disaggregation for groups, including students with disabilities, English language learners, minorities; design targeted interventions for low-performing schools; partner with school districts to use evidence-based criteria to improve school and classroom performance.

It is an advanced vision of school improvement that has received broad unified support from the education reform

community, the civil rights community, and the business community.

The Federal Government must ensure that all students receive a high quality, world-class education. We are a country. Education is under the local control of school boards subject to the laws of the State. As a Nation, we cannot abrogate on our responsibility to have a human capital development strategy that allows us to compete with other nation-states in the 21st century.

The Democratic substitute would ensure that schools set high expectations and use quality assessments for students with disabilities. We do not propose, in the Democratic substitute, nor does President Obama support any kind of national standard or national test.

Certainly, some States have chosen to work together to develop core common standards. Other States have developed other high quality standards and assessments. The Federal role should be to not allow States to define the success downward and capitulate the entire generation and consign an entire generation of children to failure.

I'm disappointed the Rules Committee didn't make in order my Student Non-Discrimination Act, which I introduced with Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN and 155 of our colleagues. When you have a bill that has so many cosponsors, I would hope that the Rules Committee would at least allow a debate and floor vote on this bill.

My Student Non-Discrimination Act would establish a comprehensive Federal prohibition on discrimination in public schools based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity.

Every day, across our country, tragically, kids who are perceived to be gay or lesbian are subjected to pervasive discrimination, harmful to both students and our education system. Surveys indicate that as many as 9 in 10 LGBT students have been bullied.

Just this last week we lost another life to bullying. On Sunday, a young man named Carlos in New Mexico took his own life after being bullied and called derogatory LGBT names since the age of 8. It's hard to imagine the torment that Carlos went through every single day. And unfortunately, too many LGBT students and their families often have limited recourses to fight this kind of discrimination that makes schools an unsafe and unwelcome learning environment for them.

My amendment would simply provide protections for LGBT students to ensure that all students have access to public education in a safe environment, free from discrimination, free from harassment, free from bullying, intimidation and violence.

I would have hoped that every Member of this body would agree that there's a bipartisan consensus that, regardless of what people think of divisive social issues like gay marriage or

other LGBT issues, school should be a safe place for all students to learn.

□ 1300

I am pleased that the underlying bill includes constructive language with regard to the expansion and replication of successful charter schools. I'm also pleased that the committee made in order two amendments I offered to improve this flawed bill. The first amendment further improves the Charter Schools Program. I enjoyed working with Chairman KLINE and Ranking Member MILLER on improving and modernizing the Charter Schools Program. Both the underlying bill and the Democratic substitute contain strong language around helping quality charter schools grow and expand to meet the demands of the more than 1 million kids who remain on charter school waiting lists across our country unable to attend the school of their choice.

A recent Stanford CREDO study found that charter schools that are successful in producing strong academic progress from the beginning tend to remain strong and successful schools as they grow and expand.

My amendment, which I'm offering with Mr. PETRI, would allow charter schools to receive Federal funding through the Charter Schools Program to use their grant dollars for vital startup costs like professional development, teacher training, and instructional materials. As a charter school founder, I know that this additional flexibility provided under our proposed amendment would really help get quality charter schools off the ground.

The amendment also allows per-pupil revenue to be more portable across school districts to provide States with the ability to move towards more innovative multidistrict models, including online education or competency-based education, if they so desire.

Finally, my amendment would ensure that charter schools are doing substantial outreach to low-income and other underserved populations. We know that many high-performing charter schools are already leading in this regard in helping our most at-risk families achieve success. We want to ensure that they continue to lead the way in providing access and choice for more families.

I'm also pleased my amendment I offered with Representative BROOKS regarding computer science is made in order. My amendment with Representative BROOKS would clarify that Federal funds can be used for computer science education. It's particularly important because it relates to funding for teacher preparation and professional development based on the bipartisan Computer Science Education Act, which Representative BROOKS and I introduced earlier this year.

In today's knowledge-based economy, it's more important than ever to ensure our education system aligns with the demands of the 21st-century workforce. We need high-quality teachers to

have access to training in all relevant fields, including computer science education.

I also worked with Mr. PETRI on another amendment regarding charter schools, which I withdrew. But I want to talk about some additional changes that are included in our All-STAR Act that I look forward to continue working with Chairman KLINE and Ranking Member MILLER to make crucial changes on the Charter School Programs that were included in my amendment with Mr. PETRI.

The amendment I offered with Mr. PETRI would offer improvements to help grow and replicate high-quality charter schools that are demonstrating outstanding results across the country. There's currently 6,000 charter schools serving more than 2.3 million students. Yet there are over a million students on charter school waiting lists. My amendment would have increased the overall authorization for this high-impact, low-cost program to \$330 million so that with our limited Federal resources we have the maximum impact on increasing choice and learning opportunities for families.

My amendment would also have allowed for the continuation of the Charter Schools Program grants from the Replication and Expansion of High-Quality Schools Program, a very successful program that helps more families access the highest-performing charter schools.

In this time of austerity and constrained public resources, we need to maximize the impact of every dollar spent by making sure we only invest in what works, fostering innovative new approaches both for results as well as for cost savings to achieve even greater gains in student achievement. That means investing in those public charter schools that are getting great results as well as allowing charter school operators with a strong evidence base of student achievement, particularly with our most at-risk kids and families, along with robust management capacity, to replicate and expand so they can serve more students.

I look forward to continuing the work with Chairman KLINE and Ranking Member MILLER to include some of those priorities in the ESEA reauthorization and further legislation.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the Education Committee and the great State of Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI).

Mr. PETRI. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my support for the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 5.

I am in frequent contact with educators in my district in Wisconsin. One of the concerns I hear the most is that Federal money comes to local schools and districts in a variety of funding streams, each with its own restrictions and reporting requirements. I am constantly asked if there's a way that we

can consolidate some of these funding pots so that schools can better apply the funds to those areas where they will have the most effect. These feelings are strongest in smaller or more rural schools, where funding tends to be the most limited. H.R. 5 would give them that much-needed local flexibility.

Wisconsin schools are doing a lot of innovative things to prepare their students for success in the 21st-century economy. They know that the nature of work is changing: jobs in manufacturing, where Wisconsin is a leader, require critical thinking, the ability to be innovative and to work with people of varying skill levels, and the ability to communicate effectively. These skills were favorably noted in a 2012 National Research Council report and in a recent Gallup Poll that found that those who have those skills are twice as likely to have higher work quality than those who don't.

Wisconsin is a member of the Partnership for 21st Century Skills, a coalition of States, education groups, and employers that's working to ensure that students have these critical skills. I hear from educators that these innovative programs help to bring to life the subjects that students are studying in school, oftentimes renewing their focus on core academics. Again, I also hear that schools and districts are hamstrung by their inability to put Federal funds to use in these innovative ways. So I'm pleased that the Student Success Act, through its Local Academic Flexible Grant and in other ways, gives educators the flexibility to pursue these innovative initiatives at the local level.

I would also like to mention the subject of geography, which is a core academic subject under No Child Left Behind, but has never received the same level of support as other core academic subjects. The National Geographic Society has invested millions of its own dollars to help invest in the future of geographic education—a critical investment, given the importance of geography to our national and international well-being. It's critical that geography be on a level playing field with other core academic subjects. This bill accomplishes that goal by letting geography compete equally for funds to enhance the professional development of teachers in this critical subject.

I, again, want to emphasize my support for the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), a former member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his unceasing efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule and H.R. 5 because the Republican bill fails America's students.

Mr. Speaker, America's public schools are the envy of the world.

We're fortunate to live in a country that believes that every child should be educated and given the opportunity to succeed in life. Our public schools are one of the best examples of American values. No matter where a child comes from, no matter what challenges a student faces in life—a disability, autism, poverty—that student can receive a good education.

Our local public schools are largely community-based and locally run; but the Federal Government provides important support, especially for working-class communities and for students with disabilities and learning challenges. We have important work to do to continue to improve public schools and recruit good teachers; but under this bill, Republicans want to go in the other direction.

The Republican bill before the House today proposes a harsh prescription for students and families who seek better schools and talented teachers. H.R. 5 guts education funding for students and teachers by over \$1 billion below last year's levels at a time when we want high-quality curricula, and States and local school districts have been challenged financially.

Back home in my Tampa Bay area district in Florida, I have over 200 title 1 schools, like Foster Elementary in Hillsborough County and Woodlawn Elementary in Pinellas County. These are students from working-class families. Over 90 percent of these students qualify for free and reduced lunch. It is the longtime compact between the Federal Government and our local schools that ensures support to these students that do not come from wealthy families. The students who attend these schools range from ones with special needs that require title 1 help to work with exceptional education teachers; English Language Learners that need a little extra help from translators; and students with severe emotional behavior disorders.

The Republican bill retreats from these students and the responsibility to education.

No Child Left Behind has been riddled with problems from the start. Its one-size-fits-all policy hasn't worked, but this Republican bill is not the answer. It's a step backward. And I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to our distinguished colleague from Tennessee, Congresswoman BLACKBURN.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for her excellent work on this measure and all of the work she has done in committee. Dr. Foxx is such a skilled educator. We're pleased to have her in our conference. I know that Chairman KLINE, who has really put a lot of effort into this bill, is so pleased to have her.

I do rise to support H.R. 5. This commonsense bill helps parents, teachers, and students. It will help prepare our

children to compete in the global workforce. It helps to right the wrongs of our broken education system by bringing back flexibility to the system and encouraging more effective teaching and learning in our schools.

I have to tell you that as a mother and a grandmother, as a classroom volunteer and a homeroom mother for many years, I know how important it is for our children. And the reason that we are bringing this bill forward is because of concern and in preparing every child to compete.

I'm troubled by a recent report that says the U.S. ranked 18th out of 23 industrialized countries in the quality and quantity of high school diplomas. These are all items that need our attention. The feedback we have gotten through the years from No Child Left Behind's one-size-fits-all mandate does not work. People do not want these decisions being made in Washington. The Student Success Act would fix this by repealing the Federal accountability system and restoring much-needed local control. It would also stop the administration's act of coercing States through Race to the Top funds and into adopting specific national academic standards, otherwise known as Common Core. It would put an end to that.

H.R. 5 would reverse the Federal footprint in our education system by repealing the K-12 waiver schemes and the pet programs that have been put in place. This is the right step that we should take for our students for their success and educational opportunities.

Mr. POLIS. The gentlelady said the U.S. ranks 18th on the quality and quantity of high school diplomas. This bill is a recipe to do even worse—worse on the quality by allowing States to define success and their standards down and worse in the quantity by removing graduation requirements as one of the issues that the Federal Government looks at with regard to the success of State formulas.

I am honored to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and to H.R. 5. This bill radically reduces the role of the Federal Government in education at a time when we need to revitalize our education system. It slashes over \$1 billion in funding to teach our kids. It eliminates accountability in our education system that ensures students graduate from high school and those with special needs don't get left behind.

I am particularly concerned about the impact this bill will have on community services that benefit the students struggling the most. Studies show that when we don't address students' social and economic disadvantages at schools, we undo the work that's achieved by having good skills and teachers with adequate resources. An astounding two-thirds of the achievement gap is due to factors outside of school. Children are more likely

to succeed in schools when their comprehensive needs—nutrition, health, and a safe and stable home—are met.

□ 1315

These support systems—sometimes called “wraparound services”—are particularly important for low-performing and low-income schools that greatly benefit from these services.

But instead of supporting programs that are scientifically proven to help close the achievement gap, H.R. 5 takes away the designated funding for them and lets States do with the money as they please. It completely cuts funding for after-school programs. It eliminates social and emotional programs that help keep our students safe, healthy, and ready to learn. And with the money that's left? There's no guarantee that it will be used to provide these services to students who need them the most.

We shouldn't leave to chance whether a school will care about students beyond their test scores. But this bill sets a dangerous precedent by exempting the Federal Government from responsibility to ensure schools adequately support students and families that face challenges outside of school.

Instead of improving No Child Left Behind, this bill takes us even further backwards. I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I now would like to yield 4 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule as well as the underlying bill, H.R. 5, the Student Success Act.

I want to thank also, as others have, the gentlewoman from North Carolina for her continued leadership on an important issue. And I also would like to commend the gentleman from Colorado on his interest in this legislation as well. Although we differ in opinions on what this legislation would do, I believe it is a conversation that we need to have.

You see, I have had the privilege to be married to a public school teacher for 25 years. I also have three children who are the product of a public school education, one of whom is a special needs child who has spina bifida, who graduated just a few years ago. I was happily there to present her with her diploma when she rolled across that stage.

We can talk about a lot of things today; but when it gets down to it, it's about the kids in our country and how they're educated and what role this body is to play in that. I think that's an honest conversation.

As I speak today as a parent, education policy is near and dear to my heart because I believe our democracy was founded on the principle that every child should have the opportunity to learn. And I believe that the goal of our educational system should be to in-

still in our children a love for learning that they will carry with them throughout their entire life.

There is nothing I love better than to walk into a room and see my child reading a book—a 14-year-old, a 17-year-old reading a book—or learning. That is what we cry for, as parents.

Whenever I'm home in Georgia, I encounter numerous folks who tell me their concerns about the endless expansion of our Federal Government—not just its size, but its scope and power. Like the parents and teachers I've heard from lately—and also live with—I'm very concerned about the top-down approach that this administration in Washington seems to be taking on education. Probably the best known example is the Common Core Standards, which has been mentioned already, which Washington wants to use as a national litmus test for States seeking funding. Again, it's a carrot-and-stick approach. When we look at this, is that what we want us to be in the business of doing?

As you will hear further from my colleagues, there is plenty of concern about the content of this so-called Common Core; and I could speak a lot about that, but I choose to focus on one thing and that is, I can't wrap myself around the fact that there are so many who wish to see Washington's role in education expanded and beyond the level it should be, when that role should not exist on the level that it does.

In fact, my friend from Colorado, he made this statement and he said that the Federal Government needs to be an honest referee. I appreciate that. However, I disagree in the fact that using an honest referee to use a carrot-and-stick approach with money and standards is not the way it should work.

I'm old school. As I've said before, I believe the referee on a football field should be not seen, and this goes very much against that. The referee should be there, but not be the center of attention, which Washington has become in education.

Make no mistake, I believe our education system should be a global leader; and in order for our students to be competitive on the world stage, our schools must have high standards.

We have seen firsthand in this country what occurs when our students fall behind in STEM education. That cannot continue to happen. We must raise the bar and demand excellence in our schools. However, education standards should be developed at the State and local level by those intimately familiar with the needs of the children and our educational policy, not from inside the beltway.

The beauty of public education is that every child, regardless of race, gender, religion and geography, has the opportunity to learn. Our Nation is great because our people are great. And if we as a Nation fail our most basic responsibility—providing education for our children—then our people and our

Nation will no longer be a shining light in a dark world.

I am proud to be a member of a party that believes that the best educational opportunities exist when the Federal Government gets out of the classroom, when the teachers are allowed to teach children how to learn, not how to bubble an exam.

I am tired of having to watch my wife for 20-something years worry more about filling out a form than actually having to be able to do her lesson plan the next day because she is inundated with the requirements. I'm proud that we can teach and that we can learn and that we can promote that, not on a Federal level, but on a State and local level.

Current Federal law clearly prohibits Federal approval or certification of academic standards to ensure State and local control over the classroom. Apparently, and unfortunately, this law just doesn't seem to matter up here. They decided that they know better than parents and teachers. As a parent, and as the husband of a school teacher, that thinking doesn't fly with me.

Our education system has its roots in the State and local government for a good reason. No one has a stronger interest in the child's success than his or her parents. No one knows what really works in the classroom like our teachers. The community surrounding a child naturally understands that student's needs and has a deep desire to do what it takes to ensure his or her success. I support the Student Success Act because it places education decision-making where it belongs—in the hands of parents and teachers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. FOXX. I yield the gentleman an 30 additional seconds.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot this country can do to improve education in our Nation and to empower our kids to take on the challenges of the 21st century. But those changes must be considered and debated and adopted by the parents whose children will live with the consequences of those choices.

Decisions of this magnitude rightfully belong not in Washington, but on Main Street, and the Student Success Act rightly restores the proper means of education policymaking in this country.

I strongly support H.R. 5 and support this rule.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, think of the excitement next month as so many young Americans return to school; and what this legislation does, it would greet them with a big cut in funds to our most disadvantaged schools.

I can tell you that in Texas, Governor Perry and his cohorts will redirect these funds from disadvantaged

students faster than you can say “oops.” And you will find other Governors across America with a similar tepid support for public education—the same kind of people who have come to this floor and called them “government schools” instead of public schools—you’ll find them seeing cuts to disadvantaged students as the easiest way to plug a State budget gap.

While No Child Left Behind is flawed, removing support for economically disadvantaged students is not the way to fix it. At Wheatley Middle School in San Antonio, in one of our poorest neighborhoods, title 1 funding has helped Principal Mary Olison and her team make real progress—a 30 percent improvement in math, reading and science scores; now the district’s second best record in attendance; and disciplinary actions have been reduced 75 percent.

Those educators are out there struggling. Now is not the time to remove the support they need to do their very difficult jobs. Cutting this support would turn back the clock on the progress there and across America.

Title 1 funding has already been cut for the next school year. This really is a “leave more students behind act” that will lock in those cuts and allow State diversion of much-needed funds.

And really, this bill turns a blind eye to the achievement gap, to the racial disparities in our classrooms, and it particularly ignores the needs of students who want to learn English by cutting the English Language Learners program, which helps many of our Latino neighbors in Texas.

With the damage that has already been inflicted in my home State to public schools, now is not the time to reduce Federal aid to our schools that are the most disadvantaged.

Mr. Speaker, this bill needs to be sent to detention. It needs to be given an F. It needs to be rejected. It is not the way to strengthen education.

I believe in our public schools as a way to bind our communities together. We need to be investing more, not doing less.

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

Over the last four decades, the Federal Government’s role in elementary and secondary education has increased dramatically. The Department of Education currently runs more than 80 K–12 education programs, many of which are duplicative or ineffective.

As a school board member, I saw how the vast reporting requirements for these Federal programs tie the hands of State and local leaders who want to make the best education available for their students.

Since 1965, Federal education funding has tripled; yet student achievement remains flat. More money is clearly not going to solve the challenges we face in education.

Our children deserve better. It’s time to acknowledge more taxpayer dollars and more Federal intrusion cannot ad-

dress the challenges facing schools. H.R. 5, the Student Success Act, will streamline the Nation’s education system by eliminating more than 70 duplicative and ineffective Federal education programs; cutting through the bureaucratic red tape that is stifling innovation in the classroom; and granting States and school districts the authority to use Federal education funds to meet the unique needs of their students.

The bill also requires the Secretary of Education to identify the bureaucrats in Washington who run the programs to be consolidated or eliminated in H.R. 5 and eliminate those positions to ensure that the bureaucracy shrinks with the programs.

Additionally, this legislation will take definitive steps to limit the Secretary’s authority by prohibiting him or her from coercing States into adopting academic standards like the Common Core. It also halts the executive overreach in the waiver process by prohibiting the Secretary from imposing extraneous conditions on States and local districts in exchange for a waiver.

The Student Success Act protects State and local autonomy over decisions in the classroom by removing the Secretary’s authority to add new requirements to Federal programs.

Mr. Speaker, Federal policy should not tie the hands of local educators to make the best decisions for their students and communities. H.R. 5 is a step in that direction.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), the ranking member of the Education and Workforce Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, if a school said that African American children could not take advanced math, it would be wrong and illegal. I think most of us agree if a school said that Jewish children couldn’t enroll in a certain program, that would be wrong—and it is illegal.

In most States in this country, though, if a school says that a child who is gay or lesbian or bisexual or transgender, or perceived to be, there is no legal protection for that child. Now, this is not simply a theoretical problem. LGBT children have been bullied and harassed and mistreated across this country. The stories are heartbreaking, and they often end in family tragedy, like suicide.

There is a serious proposal that would remedy this injustice that was sponsored by 156 Members of the House of Representatives and there was an attempt to make that in order for debate and a vote. It should have been, and it was not.

This is a serious issue. Frankly, unless the majority leadership agrees

there would be a separate and independent chance to move that bill, this was the chance to move that bill.

No child should be left behind. Certainly, a child should not be left behind because of their race, their religion, their ethnicity. That should extend to their sexual orientation as well, and we should have had a chance to vote on that.

For that reason and many others, I oppose this rule.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, Republicans do agree that schools should be safe places for all students to learn. However, as my friends and colleagues know, the amendment to which they have been referring had several parliamentary problems when it was introduced.

To begin with, it was not germane to the underlying bill.

□ 1330

Additionally, it violated CutGo provisions in House rules. My understanding is that although the CutGo issues were ultimately resolved, the amendment was not redrafted to fix the germaneness problem.

For these reasons, the amendment was not made in order.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. FOXX. No, not until I finish.

However, I appreciate the gentleman’s strong feelings on the issue and respect his desire to protect students.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of this bill, and I’m proud of the open and transparent process by which it has been brought up for consideration.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, what I was going to discuss with the gentlelady is that the CutGo issue was resolved, as she mentioned, and waivers that are routinely granted on a broad variety of amendments simply could have been approved by the Rules Committee, as is customary, and advanced this amendment to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman for yielding and for his tremendous support.

First of all, I agree that we must take a critical look at No Child Left Behind and address its numerous shortcomings, but the Republican proposal is not the answer.

This bill guts education. It violates the civil rights of students, and it does not support educators. It leaves students with disabilities, low-income students, students of color, English-language learners, migrant students, and LGBT students out in the cold.

The so-called Student Success Act, which really is the Letting Students Down Act—that’s what it really is—guts education. It guts it by \$1 billion below the fiscal 2012 level, locking in, really, these already detrimental sequester cuts. It would fail to support meaningful improvements and reforms



at the Nation's lowest performing schools. This bill does not support students, it does not protect students, and in no way does it guarantee access to equal quality public education.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me just say, the rule fails to make in order the student nondiscrimination amendment, which would protect lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender students across the country from harassment and bullying. Every child deserves these protections.

So we should go back to the drawing board on this bill. We should call it for what it is, and that's "letting students down." That's what this bill does. And we should really look at how we invest in our future through education rather than making it more difficult to improve student achievement.

Once again, this bill begins to erode our system of public education; it violates our students' civil rights; it does not support our teachers and our educators; and finally, let me just say, it fails to prioritize STEM education that would eliminate the Mathematics and Science Partnership program, which really is the only program at the Department of Education focused solely on teacher professional development in STEM subjects.

I hope that we vote against this rule and also the underlying bill.

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

Our colleagues have said that H.R. 5 guts education funding. That is not accurate. H.R. 5 authorizes funding for all programs under the act as the final appropriated amount for ESEA programs in FY 2013. Those amounts are level-funded for the 6-year life of the bill.

While authorizing spending for the act at the final FY 2013 level, H.R. 5 prioritizes Federal spending by protecting core programs. Title I aid for the disadvantaged, as well as targeted population programs: migrant education, neglected and delinquent, English-language acquisition, Indian education, and rural education are authorized at FY 2012 levels.

Additionally, because the bill consolidates many existing programs, funds currently spent on those lower priority programs have been used to increase the authorization for these core programs. As a result, our bill would authorize more spending—I'll emphasize—more spending for these core programs in FY 2014 than the President's own FY 2014 budget proposal.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the rule and to the underlying bill. This education bill fails students in so many ways it is difficult to know where to begin.

In addition to putting forth a proposal that will cause so much harm,

the majority denied many opportunities for amendments and improvements to the legislation that we are considering today.

Among those amendments that were denied consideration was one offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) to prohibit discrimination in public schools based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity.

The Student Nondiscrimination Act is an important piece of legislation that will protect lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender students across our country from harassment and bullying and would hold schools accountable for failing to protect our Nation's children.

The Federal Government has a responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to do all that we can do to ensure the safest and best possible environment in which students can learn. When students are bullied or harassed because of who they are, they are denied the opportunity to achieve their full potential.

Refusing to include provisions of the Student Nondiscrimination Act means we are failing our duty to protect all of our Nation's children and to guarantee them a safe and nurturing environment in which to learn.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5 continues the charter school, magnet school, and tutoring programs to provide parents with more choices in educating their children.

Along with parental involvement, encouraging and supporting effective teachers in the classroom is critical to student success in quality education. Most Americans can regale you with stories of their favorite teachers who made a lasting impact on their lives. H.R. 5 also supports the development and implementation of teacher evaluation systems that are designed by States and school districts with input from parents, teachers, school leaders, and other stakeholders.

In addition to evaluation systems, the Student Success Act reduces confusion and duplication by consolidating teacher quality programs into a single, flexible grant program to be used by States in school districts to support creative approaches to recruit and retain effective educators.

The recurring theme throughout this legislation is empowering the people closest to students to make decisions for their communities and ensuring that the law is flexible to meet the needs of diverse States, regions, and student populations.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

H.R. 5 takes a U-turn for educational policy.

It is interesting, our friends on the Republican side of the aisle in a farm bill a couple of weeks ago managed to

unite environmentalists, farm groups, and taxpayer advocates in unanimous opposition to their proposal, and now they have done it again. They brought together business, education, civil rights groups, and a broad cross-section of organizations that don't agree with each other very often to oppose this bill. In part, it is what happens when you simply refuse to work in a bipartisan and cooperative fashion, as the committee used to do.

I have a very vivid example of the impact of this shortsighted approach. I represent Grant High School in Portland, Oregon. They won the national competition for the U.S. Constitution contest. That project of "We the People" has been zeroed out by Congress, and programs like this are not going to come back if we approve the approach of this bill.

It not only continues to undercut programs for education, the overall spending for education is, in fact, dramatically reduced. It keeps the sequestration cuts. We are going to lose over \$10 million this year in Oregon, for instance. And worse, it locks in the post-sequestration funding level through 2019.

In addition, it takes away protections for key priority programs, dismantling provisions that would ensure equity. This legislation undermines the Federal partnership with the State and local communities to support education. That is why it is opposed by such a wide array of groups and why this House should reject it as well.

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

It is really puzzling why our colleagues continue to misrepresent what H.R. 5 does when the public can read the bill and know the truth. For example, our colleagues have said that H.R. 5 eliminates protections for students with disabilities, low-income students, and students from major racial and ethnic groups. This charge is simply false.

The Student Success Act maintains annual testing requirements in reading, math, and science. It also maintains the law's requirement that schools in districts disaggregate and report subgroup data on student performance. This ensures student achievement results for special needs students and other traditionally disadvantaged populations are transparent and parents and communities have the information they need to evaluate their schools properly.

Critics of this approach believe in the now widely discredited premise captured in No Child Left Behind that the Federal Government can and should devise an accountability system appropriate for all of the nearly 100,000 public schools in the country. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the most widespread criticisms of what we have known as No Child Left Behind, which was really a reauthorization of this bill several years ago. It is puzzling to me that they continue to criticize what is

bad about what exists and yet say they want to do it again. It doesn't make any sense.

H.R. 5 is based on a different premise that true education reform comes not from the top down, but from the bottom up.

Acknowledging that Washington can't fix schools does not mean we are backing away from our strongly held belief that schools should have standards to which they are accountable and that those standards should be equally applied across all school groups. It means we must empower and trust States and communities, those closest to the classroom, to develop an accountability and school improvement system that best meets the educational needs of their students.

All of the wisdom of the world is not in Washington, D.C., Mr. Speaker. It is out there in the country. It is out there with the local people, with the American people who are very bright and know how to do things for themselves.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentlelady if she has any remaining speakers.

Ms. FOXX. We do not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. POLIS. I would like to inquire of the Speaker how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

First, in response to the gentlelady's, Ms. FOXX's, allegation that Members on our side of the aisle have misrepresented the bill, that is completely false.

The bill does, in fact, remove the 1 percent cap for students with disabilities. A school district or a State can say, We are not even looking whether students with disabilities are making progress at all. Perhaps we are excluding every child with an IEP; we are excluding every child that receives IDEA funding, Federal funding, for taxpayer money that we are custodians for.

In addition, it allows States to define success downward. Rather than having meaningful college and career-ready standards, a State can simply say, We write our standards such that we are going to make all of our students brilliant because they are all going to pass it, then we are going to pat ourselves on the back and say, "Job well done." Those kids might not be ready for college and they might not be ready for careers. We, as a nation-state, cannot afford not to do better with regard to serving our public kids.

This bill slashes education funding. I don't know how you call moving \$3.6 billion worth of programs into a \$2 billion block grant anything less than slashing education funding.

What is being eliminated? School improvement grants, turning around some of our lowest performing schools and giving them the opportunity to succeed. Race to the Top, which has en-

couraged reforms at the State level, including my home State of Colorado, which replaced teacher tenure with an evaluation system, with bipartisan support.

□ 1345

Investments in innovation: replacing these important, tangible programs that are some of the highest-leveraged dollars that the Federal Government spends, which is amorphously block-granting money to States, sending more money into the "system" without any reforms or any accountability required.

As elected officials who are concerned about our Nation's welfare and as providers of 10 percent of education funding, we in the Federal Government have an obligation to provide transparency and accountability and, yes, to be a referee in the K-12 education system. We have an obligation to ensure that schools cannot fail kids year after year. We cannot retreat from the goals of No Child Left Behind, and while it was flawed, it has shined light on achievement gaps for minority and low-income students, and has unleashed State- and local-based reforms that we are just beginning and continue to benefit from. We need to use what we have learned from our experiences under No Child Left Behind to build on what reform-minded States and districts are doing. We need to encourage flexibility, improve and streamline the Federal role, invest in what works, and change what doesn't work.

I look forward to working together across the aisle to provide more transparency, accountability and to ensure funding equity in our Nation's schools. H.R. 5 would bring us back to a time in which adults had every incentive to hide poor student performance and students were left to attend failing schools for generations—without choice and without recourse.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat this partisan bill. I urge a "no" vote on this restrictive rule and the bill. I encourage my colleagues to move forward in improving our public education system.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Many of my Republican colleagues and I feel that the Federal Government should be out of education altogether, but that is not what we are recommending here. Rather, H.R. 5 is a reasonable first step in empowering the people closest to the students to make decisions for those students.

That being said, as long as taxpayer money is being used by the Federal Government to fund education, Congress must ensure that funding recipients are being held accountable for how they use that hardworking taxpayer money. Washington must live within its means just as families all across this country do, and limited resources require wise stewardship. Again, those

closest to the students—parents, teachers, principals, local school boards, school district leaders, and States—know what works best for their diverse student populations.

The Student Success Act recognizes this by allowing States to develop their own accountability systems that incorporate three broad parameters: an annual measure of the academic achievement of all public school students against State academic standards; an annual evaluation and identification of the academic performance of each public school in the State based on student academic achievement; a school improvement plan to be implemented by school districts when schools don't meet the State standards. These broad accountability measures not only serve to steward taxpayer money carefully but ensure parents have the information needed to make the best decisions about their schools' education.

Let's give control back to the people who know the needs of their students and communities best, and let's pass this rule and underlying bill. We tried it the other way, and it hasn't worked. Control from Washington has not brought us improvement in our educational programs.

Mr. Speaker, my background as an educator, school board member, mother, and grandmother reinforces my belief that students are best served when people at the local level are in control of education decisions. I also believe that education is the most important tool Americans at any age can have. I was the first person in my family to graduate from high school and go to college, where I worked full time and attended school part time. It took me 7 years to earn my bachelor's degree, and I continued to work my way through my master's and doctoral degrees.

From my own experience, I am convinced this is the greatest country in the world for many reasons, not the least of which is that a person like me, who grew up extremely poor in a house with no electricity and no running water, and with parents with very little formal education and no prestige at all, could work hard and be elected to the United States House of Representatives.

No legislation is perfect, and that is why I look forward to working with my colleagues to address their concerns and improve the Student Success Act through the amendment process. However, I have never been one to let the perfect be the enemy of the good, and while H.R. 5 isn't perfect, it's a step in the right direction of reducing the Federal role in education, empowering parents, teachers and local school districts, and increasing local control. That's why I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule and the underlying bill.

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



The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 303, if ordered, and on approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 192, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 364]

YEAS—232

Aderholt	Gibson	Mulvaney
Alexander	Gingrey (GA)	Murphy (PA)
Amash	Gohmert	Neugebauer
Amodei	Goodlatte	Noem
Bachmann	Gosar	Nugent
Bachus	Gowdy	Nunes
Barber	Granger	Nunnelee
Barletta	Graves (GA)	Olson
Barr	Graves (MO)	Palazzo
Barton	Griffin (AR)	Paulsen
Benishek	Griffith (VA)	Pearce
Bentivolio	Grimm	Perry
Billirakis	Guthrie	Peters (CA)
Bishop (UT)	Hall	Petri
Black	Hanna	Pittenger
Blackburn	Harper	Pitts
Bonner	Harris	Poe (TX)
Boustany	Hartzler	Pompeo
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Posey
Bridenstine	Heck (NV)	Price (GA)
Brooks (AL)	Hensarling	Radel
Brooks (IN)	Holding	Reed
Broun (GA)	Hudson	Reichert
Buchanan	Huelskamp	Renacci
Bucshon	Huizenga (MI)	Ribble
Burgess	Hultgren	Rice (SC)
Calvert	Hunter	Rigell
Camp	Hurt	Roby
Campbell	Issa	Roe (TN)
Cantor	Jenkins	Rogers (AL)
Capito	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Carter	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (MI)
Cassidy	Jones	Rohrabacher
Chabot	Jordan	Rokita
Chaffetz	Joyce	Rooney
Coble	Kelly (PA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Coffman	King (IA)	Roskam
Cole	King (NY)	Ross
Collins (GA)	Kingston	Rothfus
Collins (NY)	Kinzing (IL)	Royce
Conaway	Kline	Runyan
Cook	Labrador	Ryan (WI)
Cotton	LaMalfa	Salmon
Cramer	Lamborn	Sanford
Crawford	Lance	Scalise
Crenshaw	Lankford	Schock
Culberson	Latham	Schweikert
Daines	Latta	Scott, Austin
Davis, Rodney	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
Denham	Long	Sessions
Dent	Lucas	Shimkus
DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	Shuster
DesJarlais	Lummis	Simpson
Duffy	Marchant	Sinema
Duncan (SC)	Marino	Smith (MO)
Duncan (TN)	Massie	Smith (NE)
Ellmers	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Farenthold	McCauley	Smith (TX)
Fincher	McClintock	Southerland
Fitzpatrick	McHenry	Stewart
Fleischmann	McKeon	Stivers
Fleming	McKinley	Stockman
Forbes	McMorris	Stutzman
Fortenberry	Rodgers	Terry
Fox	Meadows	Thornberry
Franks (AZ)	Meehan	Tiberi
Frelinghuysen	Messer	Tipton
Gardner	Mica	Turner
Garrett	Miller (FL)	Upton
Gerlach	Miller (MI)	Valadao
Gibbs	Mullin	Wagner
		Walberg

Walden  
Walorski  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westmoreland

Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack

Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IN)

NAYS—192

Andrews  
Barrow (GA)  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera (CA)  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DeBene  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Enyart  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fattah  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
Grayson

NOT VOTING—9

Conyers  
Diaz-Balart  
Herrera Beutler

Holt  
Horsford  
McCarthy (NY)  
Negrete McLeod  
Pallone  
Young (FL)

□ 1416

Messrs. RANGEL, GARCIA, and Ms. GABBARD changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. TURNER and Ms. SINEMA changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 190, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 365]

AYES—230

Aderholt	Gosar	Pearce
Alexander	Gowdy	Perry
Amash	Granger	Petri
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Pittenger
Bachmann	Graves (MO)	Pitts
Bachus	Griffin (AR)	Poe (TX)
Barber	Griffith (VA)	Pompeo
Barletta	Grimm	Posey
Barr	Guthrie	Price (GA)
Barton	Hall	Radel
Benishek	Hanna	Reed
Bentivolio	Harper	Reichert
Billirakis	Harris	Renacci
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Ribble
Black	Hastings (WA)	Rice (SC)
Blackburn	Heck (NV)	Rigell
Bonner	Hensarling	Roby
Boustany	Holding	Roe (TN)
Brady (TX)	Huelskamp	Rogers (AL)
Bridenstine	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Rogers (MI)
Brooks (IN)	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Broun (GA)	Hurt	Rokita
Buchanan	Issa	Rooney
Bucshon	Jenkins	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Camp	Jones	Rothfus
Campbell	Jordan	Royce
Cantor	Joyce	Runyan
Capito	Kelly (PA)	Ryan (WI)
Carter	King (IA)	Salmon
Cassidy	King (NY)	Sanford
Chabot	Kingston	Scalise
Chaffetz	Kinzing (IL)	Schock
Coble	Kline	Schweikert
Coffman	Labrador	Scott, Austin
Cole	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Collins (GA)	Lamborn	Sessions
Collins (NY)	Lance	Shimkus
Conaway	Lankford	Shuster
Cook	Latham	Simpson
Cotton	Latta	Sinema
Cramer	LoBiondo	Smith (MO)
Crawford	Long	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Daines	Lummis	Southerland
Davis, Rodney	Marchant	Stivers
Denham	Marino	Stockman
Dent	Massie	Stutzman
DeSantis	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
DesJarlais	McCauley	Thornberry
Duffy	McClintock	Tiberi
Duncan (SC)	McHenry	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	McKeon	Turner
Ellmers	McKinley	Upton
Farenthold	McMorris	Valadao
Fincher	Rodgers	Wagner
Fitzpatrick	Fitzpatrick	Walberg
Fleischmann	Fleischmann	Walden
Fleming	Fleming	Walorski
Forbes	Flores	Weber (TX)
Fortenberry	Forbes	Webster (FL)
Fox	Fortenberry	Wenstrup
Franks (AZ)	Fox	Westmoreland
Frelinghuysen	Franks (AZ)	Whitfield
Gardner	Frelinghuysen	Williams
Garrett	Gabbard	Wilson (SC)
Gerlach	Gardner	Wittman
Gibbs	Garrett	Wolf
Gibson	Gerlach	Womack
Gingrey (GA)	Gibbs	Woodall
Gohmert	Gibson	Yoder
Goodlatte	Gingrey (GA)	Yoho
	Gohmert	Young (AK)
	Goodlatte	Young (IN)

NOES—190

Andrews	Bishop (NY)	Butterfield
Barrow (GA)	Blumenauer	Capps
Bass	Bonamici	Capuano
Beatty	Brady (PA)	Cárdenas
Becerra	Brown (FL)	Carney
Bera (CA)	Brownley (CA)	Carson (IN)
Bishop (GA)	Bustos	Cartwright

Castro (FL) Jackson Lee  
Castro (TX) Jeffries  
Chu Johnson (GA)  
Cicilline Johnson, E. B.  
Clarke Kaptur  
Clay Keating  
Cleaver Kelly (IL)  
Clyburn Kennedy  
Cohen Kildee  
Connolly Kilmer  
Cooper Kind  
Costa Kirkpatrick  
Courtney Kuster  
Crowley Langevin  
Cuellar Larsen (WA)  
Cummings Larson (CT)  
Davis (CA) Lee (CA)  
Davis, Danny Levin  
DeFazio Lewis  
DeGette Lipinski  
Delaney Loeb sack  
DeLauro Lofgren  
DelBene Lowenthal  
Deutch Lowey  
Dingell Lujan Grisham  
Doggett (NM)  
Doyle Luján, Ben Ray  
Duckworth (NM)  
Edwards Maffei  
Ellison Maloney,  
Engel Carolyn  
Enyart Maloney, Sean  
Eshoo Matheson  
Esty Matsui  
Farr McCollum  
Fattah McDermott  
Foster McGovern  
Frankel (FL) McIntyre  
Fudge McNerney  
Galleo Meeks  
Garamendi Meng  
Garcia Michaud  
Grayson Miller, George  
Green, Al Moore  
Green, Gene Moran  
Grijalva Murphy (FL)  
Gutiérrez Nadler  
Hahn Napolitano  
Hanabusa Neal  
Hastings (FL) Nolan  
Heck (WA) O'Rourke  
Higgins Owens  
Himes Pascarell  
Hinojosa Pastor (AZ)  
Honda Payne  
Hoyer Pelosi  
Huffman Perlmutter  
Israel Peters (CA)

## NOT VOTING—13

Braley (IA) Horsford  
Conyers Hudson  
Diaz-Balart Lynch  
Herrera Beutler McCarthy (NY)  
Holt Negrete McLeod

□ 1424

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.

Stated for:

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 365, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 365, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 278, nays

143, answered "present" 1, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 366]

YEAS—278

Aderholt Gowdy  
Alexander Granger  
Amodei Grayson  
Bachus Griffith (VA)  
Bachmann Grimm  
Barletta Guthrie  
Barrow (GA) Hahn  
Barton Hall  
Beatty Hanabusa  
Becerra Harper  
Bentivolio Harris  
Bilirakis Hartzler  
Bishop (GA) Hastings (WA)  
Bishop (UT) Heck (WA)  
Black Hensarling  
Blackburn Higgins  
Blumenauer Himes  
Bonamici Hinojosa  
Bonner Huelskamp  
Boustany Huffman  
Brady (TX) Hultgren  
Bridenstine Hunter  
Brooks (AL) Hurt  
Brooks (IN) Issa  
Brown (FL) Johnson (GA)  
Brownley (CA) Johnson, Sam  
Buchanan Jones  
Bustos Kaptur  
Butterfield Keating  
Calvert Kelly (IL)  
Camp Kelly (PA)  
Campbell Kennedy  
Cantor Kildee  
Capito King (IA)  
Capps King (NY)  
Carney Kingston  
Carson (IN) Kline  
Carter Kuster  
Cassidy Labrador  
Castro (TX) LaMalfa  
Chabot Lamborn  
Chaffetz Langevin  
Cicilline Lankford  
Clarke Larsen (WA)  
Clay Larson (CT)  
Cleaver Latta  
Clyburn Lipinski  
Coble Loeb sack  
Cole Lofgren  
Collins (NY) Long  
Cook Lowenthal  
Cooper Lucas  
Cramer Luetkemeyer  
Crawford Lujan Grisham  
Crenshaw (NM)  
Cuellar Luján, Ben Ray  
Culberson (NM)  
Cummings Lummis  
Daines Marino  
Davis (CA) Massie  
Davis, Danny Matsui  
DeGette McCarthy (CA)  
DeLauro McCaul  
DelBene McClintock  
Dent McCollum  
DesJarlais McHenry  
Deutch McIntyre  
Dingell McKeon  
Doggett McKinley  
Doyle McMorris  
Duncan (SC) Rodgers  
Duncan (TN) McNerney  
Ellmers Meadows  
Engel Meehan  
Enyart Meeks  
Eshoo Meng  
Esty Messer  
Farenthold Mica  
Farr Michaud  
Fattah Miller (MI)  
Fincher Miller, Gary  
Fleischmann Moran  
Forbes Mullin  
Fortenberry Murphy (PA)  
Foster Nadler  
Frankel (FL) Napolitano  
Franks (AZ) Neugebauer  
Frelinghuysen Noem  
Fudge Nugent  
Gabbard Nunes  
Gallego Nunnelee  
Goodlatte O'Rourke  
Gosar Olson

Wittman  
Wolf  
  
Amash  
Andrews  
Barber  
Barr  
Bass  
Benishek  
Bera (CA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Broun (GA)  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Chu  
Coffman  
Cohen  
Collins (GA)  
Conaway  
Connolly  
Costa  
Cotton  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
Delaney  
Denham  
DeSantis  
Duckworth  
Duffy  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleming  
Flores  
Fox  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Graves (GA)

Womack  
Yarmuth  
Yoho  
Young (IN)

NAYS—143

Graves (MO)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Gutiérrez  
Hanna  
Hastings (FL)  
Heck (NV)  
Holding  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huizenga (MI)  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Jenkins  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Lance  
Latham  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis  
LoBiondo  
Lowey  
Lynch  
Maffei  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Matheson  
McDermott  
McGovern  
Miller (FL)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (FL)  
Neal  
Nolan  
Pastor (AZ)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Owens

NOT VOTING—11

Conyers  
Diaz-Balart  
Gohmert  
Grijalva  
Herrera Beutler  
Holt  
Horsford  
McCarthy (NY)

□ 1432

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 580

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 580.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER of Florida). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

## STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5.

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