

Subcommittee Chairman SHIMKUS, and all the other staff and stakeholders who have worked diligently on this important legislation.

I urge the full support of my colleagues for H.R. 212.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, harmful algal blooms are a serious and growing threat to public health. The toxins they produce threaten communities that draw their water from coastal areas and the Great Lakes. They also pose risks to those who swim in contaminated waters or eat contaminated fish.

Health impacts include skin and eye irritation, gastrointestinal illness, cancer, paralysis, and even death. Economic impacts are also serious, adversely affecting fishing, recreation, and tourism. Estimates of annual costs of these algal blooms in the United States are in the billions of dollars.

This summer, Toledo, Ohio, experienced a profound disruption when citizens woke to a “do not drink” order. The impacts were significant and widespread. But the problem is not limited to Ohio or Lake Erie. Harmful algal blooms have been a recurring problem in my home State of New Jersey for decades. So I appreciate that the majority is taking up this bipartisan legislation to begin to address this most important environmental problem.

This bill is a good step. More needs to be done. I am happy to say that language reported from the Energy and Commerce Committee reflects several changes sought by Democratic members of the committee. The bill was broadened to ensure that EPA will look at all algal toxins that may have an adverse effect on human health and consider source water protection measures, which are the preferred and most effective approach to managing harmful algal blooms.

I thank the chairmen and majority staff for working with Ranking Member TONKO, myself, and the Democratic staff to improve the bill.

For too long, Republicans in Congress have been more interested in attacking the EPA than supporting the important work the Agency does to protect human health, and safe drinking water should be a bipartisan issue. Unfortunately, this bill does lack resources.

Addressing cyanotoxins in drinking water is very expensive for States and water utilities. If Congress doesn't make funding available at the Federal level, the money will have to come out of already strained State budgets or out of consumers' pockets. The cooperative agreements envisioned in the bill can address some of these costs, Mr. Speaker, but only if they are funded, and the strategic plan will have no impact if there are no resources to carry it out.

So I hope this bill can be the start of broader drinking water work to address

important threats like climate change, fracking, security, and aging infrastructure. As we continue our drinking water work this Congress, I hope the majority will recognize the importance of funding in addressing these needs.

Resources are central to the conversation about safe drinking water. Much of our Nation's drinking water infrastructure is well beyond its useful life and in desperate need of replacement. Algae and other emerging threats, spurred by climate change and other factors, add to the challenge. Investing in drinking water infrastructure protects public health, creates jobs, and boosts the economy, and this is something that we should all support.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), and my good friend from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for their hard work to address an important environmental threat.

I support this bill. I urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I, too, would ask that the House pass H.R. 212.

I appreciate, again, all of the work from all the members and the staff in putting this bill together and getting it on the floor, and also Chairman UPTON for his work on the legislation as well as Chairman SHIMKUS.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Drinking Water Protection Act, to arm communities against the threats posed by toxic algae.

The water emergency across the Toledo region for three days last August highlighted the need for a more robust federal response to harmful algal blooms in our Great Lakes and around the country.

Nearly half a million people, businesses, and hospitals were without fresh water from the city's system.

First and foremost, Northern Ohio—which draws its sustenance from Lake Erie—has to guarantee our water is safe to drink.

Our communities must be informed and prepared to respond, in the event of another emergency.

This bill is an important step in the right direction.

It is my hope that it expedites work at the U.S. EPA to publish long-overdue guidelines on safe consumption limits and testing protocols, in addition to treatment methods—information the EPA has been working on for more than a decade and a half.

This is information that our mayors, our governor, and our citizens are clamoring for.

Congress needs to pass this bill, and I hope our counterparts in the Senate will take up the measure quickly.

Still, this bill only addresses one facet of the challenge.

We must meet the larger challenge of stopping the growth of these blooms at their source—the nutrients flooding through our rivers, into Lake Erie.

That imperative is not included in this particular bill, but we are working through pro-

grams like the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative to install conservation projects across our watershed.

Congress should overturn the ill-advised proposed cuts to the GLRI program and fully fund it.

The EPA and Corps of Engineers are also working to better protect our waterways through the Clean Water Act.

If we are interested in protecting our Lakes and rivers and the communities that rely on them, Congress should stop opposing this important progress.

Until the flow of algae-feeding nutrients into the lake is stopped, the risk of further water emergencies will persist.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this broader effort, and that starts by supporting the bill before us today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 212, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. PALLONE. 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.

□ 1615

#### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION CONSOLIDATED REPORTING ACT OF 2015

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 734) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to consolidate the reporting obligations of the Federal Communications Commission in order to improve congressional oversight and reduce reporting burdens.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 734

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Federal Communications Commission Consolidated Reporting Act of 2015”.

#### SEC. 2. COMMUNICATIONS MARKETPLACE REPORT.

Title I of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

#### “SEC. 13. COMMUNICATIONS MARKETPLACE REPORT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In the last quarter of every even-numbered year, the Commission shall publish on its website and submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the state of the communications marketplace.

“(b) CONTENTS.—Each report required by subsection (a) shall—

“(1) assess the state of competition in the communications marketplace, including competition to deliver voice, video, audio,

and data services among providers of telecommunications, providers of commercial mobile service (as defined in section 332), multichannel video programming distributors (as defined in section 602), broadcast stations, providers of satellite communications, Internet service providers, and other providers of communications services;

“(2) assess the state of deployment of communications capabilities, including advanced telecommunications capability (as defined in section 706 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (47 U.S.C. 1302)), regardless of the technology used for such deployment, including whether advanced telecommunications capability is being deployed to all Americans in a reasonable and timely fashion;

“(3) assess whether laws, regulations, or regulatory practices (whether those of the Federal Government, States, political subdivisions of States, Indian tribes or tribal organizations (as such terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)), or foreign governments) pose a barrier to competitive entry into the communications marketplace or to the competitive expansion of existing providers of communications services;

“(4) describe the agenda of the Commission for the next 2-year period for addressing the challenges and opportunities in the communications marketplace that were identified through the assessments under paragraphs (1) through (3); and

“(5) describe the actions that the Commission has taken in pursuit of the agenda described pursuant to paragraph (4) in the previous report submitted under this section.

“(c) EXTENSION.—If the President designates a Commissioner as Chairman of the Commission during the last quarter of an even-numbered year, the portion of the report required by subsection (b)(4) may be published on the website of the Commission and submitted to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate as an addendum during the first quarter of the following odd-numbered year.

“(d) SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) ASSESSING COMPETITION.—In assessing the state of competition under subsection (b)(1), the Commission shall consider all forms of competition, including the effect of intermodal competition, facilities-based competition, and competition from new and emergent communications services, including the provision of content and communications using the Internet.

“(2) ASSESSING DEPLOYMENT.—In assessing the state of deployment under subsection (b)(2), the Commission shall compile a list of geographical areas that are not served by any provider of advanced telecommunications capability.

“(3) INTERNATIONAL COMPARISONS AND DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION.—The Commission may use readily available data to draw appropriate comparisons between the United States communications marketplace and the international communications marketplace and to correlate its assessments with demographic information.

“(4) CONSIDERING SMALL BUSINESSES.—In assessing the state of competition under subsection (b)(1) and regulatory barriers under subsection (b)(3), the Commission shall consider market entry barriers for entrepreneurs and other small businesses in the communications marketplace in accordance with the national policy under section 257(b).

“(5) CONSIDERING CABLE RATES.—In assessing the state of competition under subsection (b)(1), the Commission shall include in each report required by subsection (a) the aggregate average total amount paid by

cable systems in compensation under section 325 during the period covered by such report.”.

### SEC. 3. CONSOLIDATION OF REDUNDANT REPORTS; CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) ORBIT ACT REPORT.—Section 646 of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 (47 U.S.C. 765e; 114 Stat. 57) is repealed.

(b) SATELLITE COMPETITION REPORT.—Section 4 of Public Law 109-34 (47 U.S.C. 703) is repealed.

(c) INTERNATIONAL BROADBAND DATA REPORT.—Section 103 of the Broadband Data Improvement Act (47 U.S.C. 1303) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b); and  
(2) by redesignating subsections (c) through (e) as subsections (b) through (d), respectively.

(d) STATUS OF COMPETITION IN THE MARKET FOR THE DELIVERY OF VIDEO PROGRAMMING REPORT.—Section 628 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 548) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (g);  
(2) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (g); and  
(3) by transferring subsection (g) (as redesignated) so that it appears after subsection (f).

(e) REPORT ON CABLE INDUSTRY PRICES.—(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 623 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 543) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (k); and  
(B) by redesignating subsections (l) through (o) as subsections (k) through (n), respectively.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 613(a)(3) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 533(a)(3)) is amended by striking “623(l)” and inserting “623(k)”.

(f) TRIENNIAL REPORT IDENTIFYING AND ELIMINATING MARKET ENTRY BARRIERS FOR ENTREPRENEURS AND OTHER SMALL BUSINESSES.—Section 257 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 257) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(g) SECTION 706 REPORT.—Section 706 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (47 U.S.C. 1302) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) DETERMINATION.—If the Commission determines in its report under section 13 of the Communications Act of 1934, after considering the availability of advanced telecommunications capability to all Americans (including, in particular, elementary and secondary schools and classrooms), that advanced telecommunications capability is not being deployed to all Americans in a reasonable and timely fashion, the Commission shall take immediate action to accelerate deployment of such capability by removing barriers to infrastructure investment and by promoting competition in the telecommunications market.”;

(2) by striking subsection (c);  
(3) in subsection (d), by striking “this subsection” and inserting “this section”; and  
(4) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

(h) STATE OF COMPETITIVE MARKET CONDITIONS WITH RESPECT TO COMMERCIAL MOBILE RADIO SERVICES.—Section 332(c)(1)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 332(c)(1)(C)) is amended by striking the first and second sentences.

(i) PREVIOUSLY ELIMINATED ANNUAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 154) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (k); and  
(B) by redesignating subsections (l) through (o) as subsections (k) through (n), respectively.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Communications Act of 1934 is amended—

(A) in section 9(i), by striking “In the Commission’s annual report, the Commission shall prepare an analysis of its progress in developing such systems and” and inserting “The Commission”; and

(B) in section 309(j)(8)(B), by striking the last sentence.

(j) ADDITIONAL OUTDATED REPORTS.—The Communications Act of 1934 is further amended—

(1) in section 4—

(A) in subsection (b)(2)(B)(ii), by striking “and shall furnish notice of such action” and all that follows through “subject of the waiver”; and

(B) in subsection (g), by striking paragraph (2);

(2) in section 215—

(A) by striking subsection (b); and

(B) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b);

(3) in section 227(e), by striking paragraph (4);

(4) in section 309(j)—

(A) by striking paragraph (12); and

(B) in paragraph (15)(C), by striking clause (iv);

(5) in section 331(b), by striking the last sentence;

(6) in section 336(e), by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

“(4) REPORT.—The Commission shall annually advise the Congress on the amounts collected pursuant to the program required by this subsection.”;

(7) in section 339(c), by striking paragraph (1);

(8) in section 396—

(A) by striking subsection (i);

(B) in subsection (k)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraph (F); and

(ii) in paragraph (3)(B)(iii), by striking subclause (V);

(C) in subsection (l)(1)(B), by striking “shall be included” and all that follows through “The audit report”; and

(D) by striking subsection (m);

(9) in section 398(b)(4), by striking the third sentence;

(10) in section 624A(b)(1)—

(A) by striking “REPORT; REGULATIONS” and inserting “REGULATIONS”;

(B) by striking “Within 1 year after” and all that follows through “on means of assuring” and inserting “The Commission shall issue such regulations as are necessary to assure”; and

(C) by striking “Within 180 days after” and all that follows through “to assure such compatibility.”; and

(11) in section 713, by striking subsection (a).

### SEC. 4. EFFECT ON AUTHORITY.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to expand or contract the authority of the Federal Communications Commission.

### SEC. 5. OTHER REPORTS.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to prohibit or otherwise prevent the Federal Communications Commission from producing any additional reports otherwise within the authority of the Commission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, in our multiyear effort to update the Communications Act, one of the most common themes we have heard is the convergence of the telecommunications marketplace. No longer are companies just one service over just one medium. Both technology and consumer expectations have completely changed the game. However, the agency tasked with regulating the communications sector still exists in the outdated and siloed structure that reflects decades-old assumptions, even how they evaluate and report on the industry.

While that fractured approach will be a continued focus of our CommActUpdate process, this bill will take an important first step toward modernizing the way we look at this sector and its regulator. This legislation consolidates eight separate reports that require the FCC to evaluate the state of competition in various sectors and combines those eight reports into just a single biennial report to Congress on the communications marketplace as a whole.

This bill also takes the important step of eliminating outdated reports that only serve to junk up the Communications Act and cause confusion. Reports like the ORBIT Act—which I have a copy of here—are aimed at ensuring that satellites that were long ago privatized are procompetitive, an examination that the FCC and the industry recognizes as both outdated, unnecessary, and burdensome. There are still laws on the books that address such outdated technologies as telegraphs. This is a small but significant step toward cleaning up the act and modernizing the laws and the agency that control this very dynamic marketplace.

Ensuring that all of the reports on the books are both necessary and effective helps to reduce the burden on the agency. It also helps the regulatory agency make more informed decisions.

I would like to take a moment to thank my colleagues, Representative SCALISE, Ranking Member ESHOO, and the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. PALLONE, for their work to make this bill a bipartisan success both today and, frankly, in the last two sessions of Congress. I am hopeful that the first bill to pass out of our subcommittee this Congress is an indication of the work that we can get done when we collaborate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 734, the FCC Consolidated Reporting Act of 2015. Congress has charged the Federal Communications Commission with overseeing industries that make up one-sixth of our national economy. The communications and technology sectors are driving economic growth across the Nation, connecting businesses to markets large and small and delivering innovative new products and services to consumers.

As part of this critical mission, Congress has tasked the FCC with compiling reports to provide the public with information about these dynamic markets. Democrats and Republicans agree that the FCC needs to collect good data. Consumers and businesses rely on this information, and we here in Congress need this information, too, in order to make sound policy decisions and conduct effective oversight of the FCC.

Mr. Speaker, by consolidating certain reports and eliminating references to other outdated reports, this bill allows the FCC to use the agency's limited resources more wisely and present a more holistic analysis of the communications marketplace. At the same time, we have worked together to ensure this effort to promote efficiency does not undermine important existing FCC obligations and authorities. We were able to come to agreement in the Energy and Commerce Committee on language that preserves the FCC's duty to provide transparency to consumers about their cable bills and does not alter the FCC's authority over broadband under section 706.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Communications and Technology Subcommittee Ranking Member ESHOO for her leadership on these issues and Chairman UPTON, Chairman WALDEN, and Representative SCALISE for working with Democrats to address their concerns during the committee's consideration of the bill.

In short, this bill is an example of the progress we can make when we engage in a truly bipartisan process. The consideration of H.R. 734 should be a model for legislative efforts in our committee and the entire House. Working together through regular order, we crafted legislation that addressed concerns from both sides of the aisle, and I look forward to continuing to work with our Republican and Democratic colleagues in the Senate to help this bill become law.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), our majority whip, and a terrific member of our subcommittee.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. WALDEN, for his leadership in bringing this forward and the ranking member, Mr. PALLONE, as well

as Ms. ESHOO, the ranking member of the subcommittee, who has been working very closely I know with myself and others to bring a good, bipartisan bill that actually gets rid of outdated regulations and reports.

This FCC Consolidated Reporting Act actually reduces the workload that the FCC has placed for years and years that has been outdated. If you look at some of the reports that have been required for years that they are supposed to go and consolidate and accumulate, they have reports on competitiveness within the telegraph. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, it is long past time that we update these laws and get the FCC reform in place that will finally bring some consolidation so that industry can look at a full picture instead of a bunch of different silos and reports that are so outdated, like the telegraph, that they are not even being done, yet these laws are still on the books.

This is an important reform, and it is a good bipartisan reform that shows that Congress can work to get these kinds of things done to actually make things simpler in the real world and make an agency like the FCC more efficient in their operations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would urge support of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I join my friend and colleague from New Jersey and ask our colleagues to support passage of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, this legislation, the FCC Consolidated Reporting Act of 2015 (H.R. 734) is a reflection of what our Subcommittee can accomplish when we work together in a bipartisan manner.

Earlier this month, Chairman WALDEN, Rep. SCALISE and I introduced H.R. 734 as a way to streamline Congressionally-mandated reporting requirements under a single, industry-wide report. I've consistently supported this goal because it frees the FCC to focus on its ultimate mission: to protect the public interest and promote competition. These reports and the data collected serve a critical role in supporting the FCC's decision-making and our work as policymakers on issues like broadband deployment and adoption, cable pricing and assessing the state of competition.

As part of the Committee's markup of H.R. 734, two important clarifications were made. First, in our effort to consolidate reporting requirements, the legislation clarifies that the FCC's '706' Report does not in any way impact or alter the explicit grant of broadband authority that the court affirmed in the Verizon case last year.

Second, the legislation preserves the FCC's obligation to examine how retransmission consent fees impact a consumer's monthly bill.

For all these reasons, I support and urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 734.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 734.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. WALDEN. 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 question will be postponed.

#### STEM EDUCATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1020) to define STEM education to include computer science, and to support existing STEM education programs at the National Science Foundation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1020

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “STEM Education Act of 2015”.

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF STEM EDUCATION.

For purposes of carrying out STEM education activities at the National Science Foundation, the Department of Energy, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and the Environmental Protection Agency, the term “STEM education” means education in the subjects of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, including computer science.

#### SEC. 3. INFORMAL STEM EDUCATION.

(a) GRANTS.—The Director of the National Science Foundation, through the Directorate for Education and Human Resources, shall continue to award competitive, merit-reviewed grants to support—

(1) research and development of innovative out-of-school STEM learning and emerging STEM learning environments in order to improve STEM learning outcomes and engagement in STEM; and

(2) research that advances the field of informal STEM education.

(b) USES OF FUNDS.—Activities supported by grants under this section may encompass a single STEM discipline, multiple STEM disciplines, or integrative STEM initiatives and shall include—

(1) research and development that improves our understanding of learning and engagement in informal environments, including the role of informal environments in broadening participation in STEM; and

(2) design and testing of innovative STEM learning models, programs, and other resources for informal learning environments to improve STEM learning outcomes and increase engagement for K–12 students, K–12 teachers, and the general public, including design and testing of the scalability of models, programs, and other resources.

#### SEC. 4. NOYCE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM AMENDMENTS.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Section 10A of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n–1a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)(B), by inserting “or bachelor’s” after “master’s”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (2)(B);

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by inserting “for teachers with master’s degrees in their field” after “Teaching Fellowships”; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) in the case of National Science Foundation Master Teaching Fellowships for teachers with bachelor’s degrees in their field and working toward a master’s degree—

“(A) offering academic courses leading to a master’s degree and leadership training to prepare individuals to become master teachers in elementary and secondary schools; and

“(B) offering programs both during and after matriculation in the program for which the fellowship is received to enable fellows to become highly effective mathematics and science teachers, including mentoring, training, induction, and professional development activities, to fulfill the service requirements of this section, including the requirements of subsection (e), and to exchange ideas with others in their fields.”;

(3) in subsection (e), by striking “subsection (g)” and inserting “subsection (h)”;

(4) by redesignating subsections (g) through (i) as subsections (h) through (j), respectively; and

(5) by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

“(g) SUPPORT FOR MASTER TEACHING FELLOWS WHILE ENROLLED IN A MASTER’S DEGREE PROGRAM.—A National Science Foundation Master Teacher Fellow may receive a maximum of 1 year of fellowship support while enrolled in a master’s degree program as described in subsection (c)(4)(A), except that if such fellow is enrolled in a part-time program, such amount shall be prorated according to the length of the program.”.

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 10(i)(5) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n–1(i)(5)) is amended by inserting “computer science,” after “means a science.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the STEM Education Act of 2015 is bipartisan legislation that includes computer science in the definition of STEM education for programs and activities at our Federal science agencies. The bill also supports and strengthens ongoing STEM education efforts at the National Science Foundation. Similar legislation passed the House last year by voice vote.

I thank Representative ELIZABETH ESTY for cosponsoring the bill again this year. I also thank our new Research and Technology Subcommittee Chairwoman BARBARA COMSTOCK, Subcommittee Ranking Member DAN LIPINSKI, Subcommittee Vice Chair JOHN MOOLENAAR, and Representatives

RANDY HULTGREN, LARRY BUCSHON, CHRIS COLLINS, DAVID MCKINLEY, and JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER for their support.

Last Congress the Science, Space, and Technology Committee held several hearings on STEM education. Each hearing highlighted the importance of STEM education to keep America on the cutting edge of new products and ideas. Our hearings discussed the merits of ensuring computer science is included as a component of the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics that make up STEM education. Today a variety of jobs in industries from banking to engineering to medicine require familiarity with computer science.

□ 1630

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, computing and mathematics will be one of the top 10 fastest growing major occupational groups from 2010 to 2020, with a growth rate of 4 percent annually compared to 1 percent for all other industries.

Unfortunately, America lags behind many other nations when it comes to STEM education. American students rank 21st in science and 26th in math. That must change for the better.

We need to ensure that our Nation’s youth have the scientific and mathematical skills to strive and thrive in a technology-based economy, but we have to capture and hold the desire of young adults to study STEM subjects so they will want to pursue these careers.

H.R. 1020 includes language suggested by Mr. LIPINSKI to support informal STEM education programs and activities at the National Science Foundation. These activities reach students outside of the classroom and strengthen a student’s engagement in STEM subject areas.

The STEM Education Act also ensures that teachers working towards a master’s degree program in STEM subjects can participate in the Robert Noyce Master Teacher Fellowship program. I thank Ms. ESTY for this good addition to the bill.

This program provides opportunities for teachers who want to bolster their teaching skills. Through the Master Teaching fellowships, individuals receive training in order to become highly effective mathematics and science teachers. With this bill, the program now will encourage more teachers to pursue advanced degrees.

A healthy and viable STEM workforce literate in all STEM subjects, including computer science, is critical to American industries. A well-educated and trained STEM workforce ensures our future economic prosperity. More graduates with STEM degrees means more advanced technologies and a more robust economy.

Support for this bill from organizations like the STEM Education Coalition, STEM4US!, and Code.org illustrate the importance of aligning our