

Rest in peace, Rafe.

CLEAN WATER AND SAFE DRINKING WATER STATE REVOLVING FUNDS

(Mr. MCNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, during a severe drought crisis, such as the one now in California, we must focus on solutions that create water and maintain a clean water supply. That is why I am stressing how crucial the Clean Water and Safe Drinking Water State Revolving Funds are.

Clean and safe water is essential for our homes, farms, and businesses. These funds help finance projects that treat domestic sewage, capture stormwater run-off, and deliver drinking water to homes and businesses. SFR programs are the only low-cost loans available for many small- and medium-sized communities to finance clean water infrastructure.

Every dollar that we invest in water infrastructure comes back to our economy six times over. Cutting the SFR programs will have a crippling effect on our communities' abilities to meet water needs.

Republicans say they support drought relief. But, in reality, they have cut desperately needed funds for both these programs, a 23 percent cut in the House Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations bill being debated today.

Congress must provide necessary funding to maintain our Nation's aging water infrastructure. Our communities depend upon it.

OPPOSING THE STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose H.R. 5, also known as the Student Success Act. The Federal Government has played a key role in funding our education for 40 years; 40 years, Mr. Speaker.

We know how effective title I is when it is properly funded. We know low-income children and English language learners are negatively impacted when education funding is block-granted or made portable.

H.R. 5 does all these things: It locks in cuts to title I funding, block-grants many of the funding streams dedicated to specific at-risk populations, and it allows these funds to be diverted away from the districts and schools that need them most.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act is meant to promote opportunity, Mr. Speaker, not take it away. I urge all my colleagues to oppose H.R. 5.

And while Ranking Member SCOTT's substitute amendment is an improve-

ment over the current law and I will be supporting it, I still have serious concerns about our Nation's emphasis on standardized testing. We cannot continue to use standardized test scores to punish teachers and schools.

OPPOSING THE STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as well in strong opposition to H.R. 5, the so-called Student Success Act.

There should be no question that education in this country is a right, not a privilege. Every student deserves the opportunity to succeed, and that opportunity begins with equal access to high-quality education.

But this bill severely undercuts our public schools. It slashes funding and takes away critical resources from students with the greatest needs. It eliminates key protections for students with disabilities. It guts support for vital afterschool programs.

And on the Central Coast of California, where I am from, our high school graduation rates have continuously improved over the past 5 years, exceeding statewide averages.

We must build upon these successes, not turn the clock backwards by dismantling equity and accountability standards. We must instead continue to move forward, deliver the promise of a great education and the opportunity for a bright future. Sadly, this bill only takes away that promise.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 5.

PASTOR BERNYCE CLAUSEL

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

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the late Bernyce Clausel, who passed away at the age of 98 last week. She was a civil rights leader in Tallahassee who participated in the bus boycotts of 1956. She was a devout Christian who, with her husband, founded Calvary Baptist Church in 1958. And later she became the church's pastor, one of the first women to do so in Tallahassee.

She was a fixture at town hall meetings and charity drives, and she was always there to help those in need. We lost a true north Florida hero, but I am so thankful that we had her for so long.

May God bless Pastor Bernyce Clausel, and may He bless each of us with the strength and dedication to serve our communities as well as she did.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5, STUDENT SUCCESS ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2647, RESILIENT FEDERAL FORESTS ACT OF 2015

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 347 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 347

Resolved, That during further 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, pursuant to House Resolution 125, it shall be in order to consider the further amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution as though they were the last further amendments printed in part B of House Report 114-29.

SEC. 2. At any time after 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. 2647) to expedite under the National Environmental Policy Act and improve forest management activities in units of the National Forest System derived from the public domain, on public lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, and on tribal lands to return resilience to overgrown, fire-prone forested lands, 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 amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendments in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committees on Agriculture and Natural Resources 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 114-21 modified by the amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. 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 part C of the report of the Committee on Rules. 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, 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 gentleman from Washington is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend, 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.

□ 1245

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEWHOUSE. 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 gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a House rule, House Resolution 347, providing for consideration of two important pieces of legislation for which I am honored to be able to bring forward for consideration by this legislative body: H.R. 2647, the Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2015, and H.R. 5, the Student Success Act.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2647 under a structured rule with four amendments made in order, a majority of which were offered by our Democratic colleague Members of the House. The rule also provides for further consideration of H.R. 5 under a structured rule with four additional amendments that were made in order.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2647, the Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2015, a bill that is critically important to my district in central Washington State which is, unfortunately, once again facing another devastating wildfire season.

This bipartisan, comprehensive legislation is aimed at expediting and improving forest management activities in Federal forests. It builds upon many legislative concepts introduced in this and in previous Congresses to address disastrous consequences of catastrophic wildfire, insect and disease infestations, and other threats to our Nation's forests.

H.R. 2647 would return resilience to the overgrown, fire-prone forests that encompass a great deal of land in the Western United States. It would dramatically improve the health and resiliency of our Federal forests and rangelands by simplifying environmental process requirements, curtailing project planning times, and reducing the cost of implementing forest man-

agement projects, all while still ensuring robust protection of the environment.

Mr. Speaker, just last year, my district in central Washington endured the Carlton Complex fire, the largest wildfire in our State's history, which was responsible for the destruction of over 300 homes and businesses. This devastating, catastrophic wildfire crippled many parts of my district, and many of my constituents are still trying to recover; yet it seems, as soon as we start to move past one major wildfire, another is immediately on our doorstep, literally.

Almost 10 days ago, new fires broke out in Washington State in cities like Wenatchee and Quincy and counties, including Benton, Chelan, Grant, Adams and Douglas, immediately spreading and some requiring Washington State fire mobilization resources to keep them from escalating. As the West continues to face severe drought conditions, the threat of wildfire will only continue to worsen.

In order to begin to prevent and address these fires, we need to reform the way we prepare for, respond to, and fund wildfire response and mitigation efforts. We cannot continue to limp from one devastating fire season to the next, leaving little to no time, and even less funding, available for reforestation, rehabilitation, and overall forest management.

This bill addresses those shortcomings by providing new methods of funding, which will tackle the problem of fire borrowing. It also includes tools the Forest Service can implement immediately to treat thousands of acres of forest land at a lower cost.

Earlier this year, the House Natural Resources Committee's Subcommittee on Federal Lands, of which I am a member, held a hearing on this bill. One of the witnesses testifying was U.S. Forest Service Chief Tom Tidwell.

In his opening comments, Chief Tidwell remarked that "the Forest Service is encouraged by many of the goals outlined within" the bill and "welcomes legislation that incentivizes collaboration and expands the toolset that we can use to complete critical work on our Nation's forests without over-riding environmental laws."

I believe these comments reflect the bipartisan nature in which the legislation was drafted and highlights the necessity of the reforms we are considering here today.

Mr. Speaker, it should also be noted that, because of the reforms and streamlined authorities in this bill, there will be an increase in acres of treated land, all at no additional costs to taxpayers. This legislation is essential and desperately needed to change the current path of forest management on public lands, which is outdated, unsustainable, and dangerous.

This rule also provides for further consideration of H.R. 5, the Student Success Act, an education reform bill that reduces the Federal Government's

footprint and restores local control over education by eliminating wasteful and duplicative Federal programs and replacing them with guidelines that maintain both high-performance expectations and appropriate levels of funding.

This legislation provides local governments with the flexibility necessary to develop appropriate strategies with which to serve their students, parents, and communities.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, known as No Child Left Behind, has been due for reauthorization since 2007. Because it has not been reauthorized, the administration has been free to circumvent Congress and impose its own vision of education reform on the country, resulting in unprecedented intervention in local education issues.

The Student Success Act addresses this overreach by streamlining and eliminating more than 70 elementary and secondary education programs that have been deemed ineffective and instead promotes a more focused, efficient, and appropriate Federal law in the Nation's education system.

H.R. 5 will eliminate the current one-size-fits-all Federal accountability requirement and replace it with State-determined accountability systems designed to maintain high expectation for our Nation's schools. Additionally, the bill supports and encourages parental engagement in their children's education by helping parents to enroll their children in charter schools and allowing title I funds to follow low-income children to the school of their parents' choice.

Mr. Speaker, a well-educated workforce is imperative to the health and vitality of both our Nation's children and our economy. The Student Success Act will benefit students, parents, teachers, and school administrators by returning responsibility for student achievement to the States and local communities while maintaining high standards and expectations for our Nation's students, teachers, and schools.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good, straightforward rule, allowing for consideration of two critical pieces of legislation that will help protect our rural communities, provide much-needed reforms to our education system, and ensure that we are prepared to respond to devastating and catastrophic wildfires that have plagued many areas of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule's adoption; I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this morning, I got to meet with one of the superintendents from my district, Bruce Messinger, superintendent of the Boulder Valley

School District. Bruce told me, as so many others have over the previous years, how the outdated policies under No Child Left Behind stifle innovation and burden teachers and principals with a culture of overtesting.

I remember a lot of these concerns well because I served on our State Board of Education in Colorado from 2000 to 2006, when we were originally implementing No Child Left Behind; and just as we are now frustrated, we were then frustrated with the lack of flexibility, the fact that solutions were coming out of Washington rather than honoring our local accountability system in how we were able to make things work locally, and a formula, adequate yearly progress, that we knew wouldn't work.

We knew that we wouldn't have 100 percent proficiency in all subgroups within a decade. We knew we needed reasonable goals to look at student achievement growth rather than the 1-year picture. Since that time, there has been additional discretion given through a policy of waivers that have been given in many States, including my home State of Colorado, but I think we can all agree that it is past time to reauthorize and replace No Child Left Behind with a Federal education policy that makes sense.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today is not that policy that makes sense. One need go no further than the very beginning of the bill in the sense of Congress section on page 7, just to see some of the Tea Party paranoia that underpins a lot of this bill.

It starts out on page 7 as a finding of Congress saying that the Secretary of Education, through three separate initiatives, has created a system of waivers and grants that influence, incentivize, and coerce State educational agencies into implementing common national curriculum programs of instruction and assessments for elementary and secondary education, which is just patently false.

First of all, I believe this is a reference—incorrect of course—to the Common Core standards. Now, first of all, standards are different from curriculum. Standards are certainly different from programs of instruction which stem from curriculum, and standards are different from assessments.

Common Core was an effort of the States to create college- and career-ready standards. What the Federal Government and Secretary Duncan have attempted to do is say States need to have college- and career-ready standards.

We can't define success downwards and say that kids are passing the test because it is a low test, it is an insufficient test. Whether States want to do it through Common Core or other mechanisms and other types of standards, they are welcome to do it.

Now, none of that—and the most factually erroneous part—none of that has to do with curriculum or program of

instruction. Those are entirely developed at the local level. Standards and the grade level expectations are one thing, as anybody involved with education knows; curriculum is another.

This bill starts with a false premise. It starts with a premise that somehow Washington is trying to run local school districts. That has never been the case, nor should it be the case. If that is the beginning of the essence of our cooperation, I think we can work together on a bill that empowers teachers, empowers local school districts, and empowers States with an accountability system that makes sense and the resources they need to meet the learning needs of all students.

Now, more than a decade has passed since Congress has authorized No Child Left Behind. While again, there are some good intentions in this bill, and there is some good language—which is also reflected in our Democratic substitute—it is far outweighed by some of the unintended consequences of the harmful language which will hurt students that is in this bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me give a little refresher on how we got here. In early February, Chairman KLINE introduced this bill. The bill was introduced without input or buy-in from Democrats, and it was drafted with zero committee hearings on ESEA.

The bill immediately went to markup and was passed along partisan lines. The bill resembles a bill last session that passed this Chamber with zero Democratic votes. This bill is actually worse from my perspective and the perspective of Democrats, for a number of reasons that I will get into, than the bill that attracted zero Democratic support last session.

This bill was brought before the House in February. It was then pulled. Look, everybody can agree that this is a bad bill. Teachers say it is a bad bill; principals say it is a bad bill; parents say it is a bad bill; the civil rights community says it is a bad bill; disabilities advocates say it is a bad bill, and the business community and the chamber do not support this bill.

I think—and I am sure they will mention it—the only group that we can even find that supports this bill are superintendents. I am sure they will find a few more. We will have an enormous record of disability groups, civil rights groups, teachers groups, and many others that oppose this bill for a number of reasons, and those reasons are correct.

If it looks bad, if it looks like a duck, it walks like a duck, and it quacks like a duck, it really is a duck. It is hard to bring together the business community, the civil rights community, and teachers unions around anything; and to bring them around saying that this bill will result in less educational opportunities for American kids really is a crowning achievement.

We need a bill that prepares the next generation of our workforce with the skills they need to succeed.

□ 1300

We need an ESEA reauthorization that helps improve American competitiveness in the global economy. We need a bill that expects the best of teachers and gives teachers the respect that they deserve as a profession. We need a bill that cares about students with special needs and gives them the support they need. We need a bill that allows for innovation in our schools. We need a bill that protects lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender students from discrimination and bullying; and yet both times that I offered an amendment to include the Student Non-Discrimination Act, it was not allowed in the Rules Committee. And we need a bill that ensures that every child in America has access to a world-class education, regardless of their ZIP Code, their race, their background, their socioeconomic class, or their sexual orientation.

The Democratic substitute that Mr. SCOTT has offered and will be debated and voted on is a strong step forward and reflects many of these priorities. It would have been wise for Chairman KLINE and the sponsors of the bill to take a closer look at Mr. SCOTT's Democratic substitute and to have considered many of those provisions in the underlying bill.

Now, I do want to point out a few of the good provisions in the bill, all of which are also reflected in the Democratic substitute and are generally reflected in some of the language being debated in the Senate as well.

As the founder of a public charter school network called the New America School, I understand how the freedom to innovate and flexibility to pursue a unique mission can help public charter schools achieve the highest levels of success.

The New America School has campuses in two States—Colorado and New Mexico—serving over 2,000 students from 40 countries. Just a few years ago, I was honored to speak at its Colorado graduation, and it was moving to hear the tales of some of the immigrant students who were served by this school.

There is excellent language around the charter school title V programs in both the Democratic substitute and nearly identical language in the underlying bill that ups the bar on charter schools and makes sure that the districts and States have best policies surrounding accountability for charter schools and makes sure that successful charter school models can replicate and expand to serve more students.

I am also pleased that two of my amendments to H.R. 5 were made in order and have already passed the House in the previous debate in February. One of my amendments encouraged collaboration among charter schools and traditional public schools, and another amendment allowed funds to be used for open educational resources to help save districts and students money on textbooks and other programs. These resources that are

open source, which are licensed but free to use, can reduce the burden of overtesting and can help reduce costs in education.

Now, there is not a lot more to say with regard to the positive provisions of this bill, but I want to talk about one of its biggest shortcomings and, namely, getting accountability right.

We can all agree that No Child Left Behind did not get accountability right, but the answer is to move forward and improve upon and make accountability work, not to take a step backward, which is what this bill does, by having a misguided set of principles defining performance targets and accountability.

In fact, if this bill were to become law, States would not be required to set performance targets based on student growth, proficiency, or graduation rates. The bill doesn't define low-performing schools, nor does it establish any parameters for intervention when we know a school isn't working.

One of the most compelling things that we can do here in Washington is equip local superintendents with the toolbox they need to help turn around persistently failing schools, and this bill fails to do that.

Mr. Speaker, we should provide schools with more flexibility to design school improvement programs that No Child Left Behind does, but we should not provide schools with the option to do nothing and allow dropout factories to continue to exist, elementary schools where we know that kids are falling further and further behind every year.

No child should be trapped in a failing school with no recourse. We need to fix accountability, not step away from it. This bill constitutes the Federal Government throwing up its arms and letting States define success downward to make themselves look good while leaving more students behind.

This problem is compounded by another amendment that was not even previously discussed that has now been allowed under this rule, namely, the Salmon amendment, 129, which is universally opposed by civil rights groups from the NAACP to La Raza to the Urban League to LULAC to the Education Trust.

The Salmon amendment assumes that disadvantaged students aren't capable of high achievement, perpetuating low expectations that are projected on students of color, poor students, immigrant students, students with disabilities, and others.

This amendment effectively gives in to those political pressures which we all feel that work against disadvantaged students, that work against them at the district level because often their parents are not enfranchised members of the community or voting in school board races or serving on the board that work against them at the State level because they are up against the special interests and, yes, work against them here even in Washington.

This body needs to stand up for disadvantaged communities, needs to stand up for African Americans, Latinos, immigrant communities, those students with disabilities and ensure that any deficiency in the quality of instruction for disadvantaged communities is not swept under the rug as the Salmon amendment would do.

I strongly encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject the Salmon amendment.

While No Child Left Behind certainly had its flaws, it did move us forward in continuing to serve low-income and minority students, English language learners and students with disabilities.

H.R. 5 is a step backwards. Even without the Salmon amendment, it excludes students with disabilities from school accountability systems. The bill eliminates the 1 percent cap on alternate assessments based on alternative achievement standards.

Now, again, there is a real-world problem to be solved. There are some kids with learning disabilities so severe that they can't be given a test for accountability purposes. And that 1 percent number is an arbitrary number. You can argue it should be half a percent, you can argue it should be 1½ percent. That is a very legitimate discussion to have. And I would be fully open, as many of my colleagues were, to figuring out what that number is.

The answer is not to eliminate that number and effectively allow a State that might serve 12 percent of a population with students with disabilities to say none of those students will be tested; none of those students with individual education plans, none of those students who might be dyslexic will be looked at in terms of how they are learning.

Do you know what? My father was dyslexic, and it took him until fifth grade to learn to read. But under provisions of this bill, he might never have learned to read because he and millions of other Americans with disabilities would be completely swept under the rug with the elimination of the cap.

This bill also fails to invest in our Nation's teachers. In February, I introduced the Great Teaching and Leading for Great Schools Act, which would advance a new definition of professional development based on research and best practices.

Professional development doesn't have to simply be hiring someone to lecture teachers for a few hours while they are all bored. In fact, there is better proven, data-proven ways that can help advance teaching and learning in schools, including collaborative peer networks, feedback from teachers and principals, tying data in to ensure that our professional development opportunities work. Unfortunately, H.R. 5 eliminates any requirement that ensures quality professional development for teachers.

Now, let me talk about one of the most concerning provisions in this bill to Democrats, including myself, and it

has an innocuous name. It is called title I portability. It sounds like a good concept. It says that Federal aid for students of poverty would follow the student.

Now, that sounds good, again, just as that finding that somehow the Federal Government should never do these programs of destruction in national curriculum sounds good. But again, it is devoid of facts.

Let me tell you what the effect of this provision would do. What this provision would do is it would shift millions of dollars from schools that serve our most at-risk kids to schools that serve wealthier children.

The Center for American Progress recently released a report that broke down exactly what the language would mean for high-need schools in each State. In Colorado alone, schools that serve students of poverty would lose over \$8 million of funding.

So again, let's talk about how this works.

There is a threshold in each school district for schools that receive title I free and reduced lunch services. They are focused on the schools that serve the largest pockets of poverty.

In a school district like Boulder Valley School District whose superintendent was in to meet with me earlier today, they offer title I services in their schools that have about 40 percent or more free and reduced lunch kids. That allows them to focus on the eight or nine schools that have the highest need in what is overall a fairly prosperous school district.

If this provision were passed, resources would be diverted out of those schools that are in our neediest communities to the schools that are in our wealthiest communities.

As our ranking member has said and probably will say again, what problem is it you are trying to solve by shifting resources from poor schools to wealthy schools? While, again, it is a noble concept, and if there were a way to hold harmless or provide additional support for schools that serve at-risk kids, there might be some basis of discussion with myself and Members on my side of the aisle; but to simply say that we are going to shift tens or hundreds of millions of dollars from schools that serve kids in communities of poverty to wealthier schools, under any possible accountability metric, I guarantee you, will only increase the already persistent learning gap that exists between communities of poverty and prosperous communities, and is exactly the wrong way to go with regard to how we target our Federal resources to make the biggest difference in the lives of Americans who deserve access to quality public education.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I appreciate my colleague on the other side of the aisle's enthusiasm on this issue. This is an important topic, something that we have been discussing and debating for many, many

years and will continue to, because all of us want to do right by the children in our school districts. They are our future. We have an equal amount of enthusiasm on our side of the aisle.

At this time, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the good gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), our majority whip.

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

I rise in support not only of the rule, but of the underlying legislation with reforms that are included not only in the bill, but in the amendments that are coming forward in this rule.

I first want to commend Chairman KLINE and his staff for working over the last few months with many members of our Conference that had some real issues they wanted to see addressed in the bill. I want to talk about a few of those, specifically, the Salmon amendment that this rule makes in order that brings forward the ability for parents to opt out of testing in a way that doesn't impact the local school system.

This comes down to a question of whether or not you trust parents to make the right decisions for their children in making real reforms that give parents more control, getting Washington out of those decisions and allowing local innovation to move forward, and allowing parents to make those decisions about what is best for their children. So the Salmon amendment does that. I strongly support it, and I know Chairman KLINE supports it as well.

I want to also point out the Rokita-Grothman amendment. This is an amendment, again, that Chairman KLINE worked very closely with a number of our members on to bring forward to reduce the timeframe of the authorization. Instead of a 6-year authorization, it would be a 4-year authorization to give an opportunity to let the next administration put their own prints on what they want to see in terms of education reform while allowing these other reforms to move forward. That is an amendment that Chairman KLINE supports, as I do, and, hopefully, gets added to the bill.

The third amendment I want to talk about is the Zeldin amendment. This is an amendment that gets the Federal Government out of Common Core, not only financially, but also taking the ability away from the Secretary of the Department to use things like Common Core as a bludgeon when they are determining whether or not to approve waivers. So I think it is very important to get the Federal Government out of those decisions of Common Core, and that is what the Zeldin amendment does.

And then, finally, the Walker amendment, allowing a vote on A-PLUS, is something that I support, and I am glad that that is in the rule as well.

So many good reforms, not only with the amendments, but with the underlying bill, to give parents more control

and get the Federal Government out of those decisions, really good legislation to advance conservative causes in letting innovation happen at the local level.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON), the ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on Workforce Protections.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a former teacher, elementary school principal, and school board member, I know firsthand that No Child Left Behind is in need of serious improvement. Improvements must take substantial steps towards fulfilling the promises made by ESEA, those simple, yet powerful, promises that are at the heart of this civil rights law, promises made to all American children.

H.R. 5 ignores these promises and endangers the educational gains made in the 50 years since ESEA was passed. H.R. 5 threatens to thrust us back to a time when the right to quality education was merely an intangible promise for disadvantaged children. It ignores the promises at the heart of this civil rights law.

We must take substantial steps towards fulfilling the promises made by ESEA. H.R. 5 ignores the promise to value every child by allowing States and school districts to redirect funds away from the schools and the children most in need. They call it portability. H.R. 5 ignores the promise that every child counts by using vague and undefined accountability measures and failing to provide Federal guardrails for student achievement.

□ 1315

H.R. 5 ignores the promise that every child deserves a quality education, and it does so by failing to address our excessive dependence on deeply problematic standardized tests. We need to move toward more balanced forms of assessment that effectively measure diverse kinds of success in teaching and learning.

Mr. Speaker, I have spent decades working to understand how children learn, and I can tell you this—that this bill fails to meet the very promises that are essential for educating our children and that are at the heart of the ESEA. I strongly urge all of my colleagues to vote against this bill of unfulfilled promises.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), someone who really embodies something that I have seen in this Congress on both sides of the aisle since my becoming a Member, people who dedicate their lives to different fields. Congresswoman FOXX is a colleague and a member of the Rules Committee who has dedicated her life to education.

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague from Washington for yielding and for his kind comments.

Mr. Speaker, today's debate on education and the Student Success Act is a crucial one for our future.

Over the last five decades, the Federal Government's role in 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 in North Carolina, I saw how the vast reporting requirements for these Federal programs tie the hands of State and local school education leaders.

My colleagues on the House Education and the Workforce Committee and I have been working on the Student Success Act to make common-sense changes to update Federal law, addressing the concerns raised following No Child Left Behind.

Our legislation is 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, will also streamline the Department of Education's bureaucracy by eliminating more than 65 duplicative and ineffective Federal education programs, cutting through the bureaucratic red tape that is stifling innovation in the classroom, granting States and school districts the authority to use Federal education funds as they believe will best meet the unique needs of their students.

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.

If we would like to reduce the Federal Government's role in education, we must act. In the absence of congressional action, President Obama and his Education Department have taken unprecedented steps to regulate education.

Beginning in 2011, the Obama administration began offering States temporary waivers from No Child Left Behind's onerous burden in exchange for granting the Secretary of Education complete discretion to coerce States into enacting the President's preferred education reforms.

The Student Success Act provides an important opportunity to stop President Obama's overreach into State and local education debates through his waiver scheme.

Mr. Speaker, our children deserve better. It is time to acknowledge more Federal intrusion cannot address the challenges facing schools. That is the promise of the Student Success Act: a reduced Federal role, focused on restoring authority and control to parents, teachers, States, and communities on how our children are educated.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, on the 50th anniversary of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, now more than ever we must ensure that every kid has access to a great school. It shouldn't matter who your parents are, what ZIP code you live in, or how many zeros are at the end of your bank account.

H.R. 5 breaks the promise made 50 years ago to help all kids get a good public education and to recognize the challenges faced by kids living in poverty.

Republicans will have the opportunity to make their bad bill even worse by allowing an amendment to come to the floor today which essentially turns all of ESEA into a block grant, allowing States to use Federal resources for any educational purpose, meaning States can redirect Federal funds towards taxpayer-funded vouchers for private and religious schools.

That has been a failed experiment in Wisconsin, and that strips money away from public schools and hurts kids everywhere. I urge a "no" vote on H.R. 5, a bad bill that could likely get even worse today.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), a fellow freshman.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the debate before this floor today is who knows best how to educate our children.

I rise today to speak about H.R. 5, the Student Success Act. This is legislation that I believe goes a long way in getting the Federal Government out of the way of our schools and teachers and putting education back in the right hands by restoring local control.

As a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, I have spent several hours debating and marking up this legislation. I have also visited several schools in my district and have spoken with parents, teachers, and administrators about the challenges they are facing.

What I heard across the board was that top-down regulations from Washington are burdening our teachers with seemingly endless compliance requirements.

Our educators should have the ability to focus on the individual needs of their students and their classes. Instead, our current system is forcing them to spend time filling out paperwork and meeting this one-size-fits-all requirement.

That is exactly why H.R. 5 is important legislation that I urge my colleagues to support today. This bill replaces the current accountability system that says Washington knows what is best for our students, and it replaces it with a system that gives States and school districts the responsibility for measuring the success of their schools. Through bottom-up reforms, it restores local control and gives our educators more freedom to innovate.

I have personally seen in my district how students and communities benefit

from local innovation in schools. We have one such example in my district that does not get \$1 of Federal funding, and it takes children who are discarded by the public school system and makes successful students from this group. I am very proud of what this school has accomplished.

H.R. 5 empowers parents, just like at this school, with more information to hold schools accountable for effective teaching, and it expands opportunities to send their children to a school that best meets their needs. It also gets rid of almost 70 unnecessary Federal programs and, instead, creates a block grant that provides money to the States.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ALLEN. Under H.R. 5, States are protected from being coerced into adopting Common Core by the Department of Education, and they have the right to opt out of any program under the law.

Mr. Speaker, all of these are significant and needed steps to put the responsibility of education back where it belongs, and that is with the States, local school districts, parents, and the educators, as they know what is best. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, more than 60 years ago, in *Brown vs. Board of Education*, the Supreme Court talked about the value of education when it said that, these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity where the State has undertaken to provide it is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms.

The fact is that equal educational opportunities were not and still are not always available in low-income areas, basically, for two reasons. First, we fund education through the real estate tax, virtually guaranteeing that wealthy areas will have more resources; and just with the give and take in politics, you know that low-income areas will generally get the short end of the stick.

In 1965, we enacted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to recognize the disparities in funding. It addresses "the special educational needs of children of low-income families and the impact that concentrations of low-income families have on the ability of local educational agencies to support adequate educational programs."

While public education would remain fundamentally a local issue through ESEA, the government recognized that, without Federal oversight and support, districts would not address these inequities.

In the last reauthorization, better known as No Child Left Behind, in addition to money, Congress required States to identify and address achievement gaps.

Because of that work, the education of our children has been much improved, as high school dropout rates are at historic lows, as the long-term scores on the national tests have gone up, and as the achievement gaps for racial and ethnic minorities have actually been closing, but the gap between rich and poor has actually been going up.

Mr. Speaker, with that background, the House has put forth its vision of the reauthorization of the ESEA, the Student Success Act. It violates the original purpose of ESEA, first, by reducing the funding, but also by changing the funding formula to take money from low-income areas and to give it to wealthy areas.

For example, Los Angeles, with 70 percent poverty, would lose about a quarter of its funding while Beverly Hills, with virtually no poverty, would pick up about 30 percent in additional funding under that new formula.

This rule enables amendments that, if adopted in the bill, will significantly reduce the ability of States to determine academic achievement gaps.

Now, I recognize that everybody is mad at having to take tests, and we address that in the bill by auditing the number of tests, making sure that there are as few as possible and that they are used for purposes which are validated.

The bill significantly scales back the ability of States to identify achievement gaps and then scales back their requirement to do anything about it.

These are the major flaws in H.R. 5: less funding, less ability to determine the achievement gaps, and then no requirement to do anything about it.

There are other problems with the bill, for example, block granting programs that will end up underfunding bilingual education, afterschool programs, STEM, arts education, and others. These vital programs will certainly do worse.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, we should both defeat the rule. And if the rule passes, we should defeat the bill.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK), another freshman colleague.

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and of the underlying bill.

We have a chance today to help put our K-12 education system back on track, helping students all across this country.

Over the past 6 months, I have traveled in my district to listen to the concerns of teachers, administrators, parents, and students.

One of the most common themes I hear is that there is too much confusion coming from Washington and that

those who know what is best—our educators and parents—are not getting a say in our children's futures.

Local school districts understand the unique needs of their students far better than any bureaucrat in Washington ever will.

From No Child Left Behind, Race to the Top, and waivers, the Department of Education has sent so many mixed signals that it is impossible for teachers and administrators to focus on what is needed most, flexibility to help students learn and succeed. This is why I am a strong supporter of H.R. 5.

I commend Chairman JOHN KLINE and Subcommittee Chairman TODD ROKITA for putting forward legislation that ensures that students and schools are put first. Accountability will now be placed where it should have been all along, with States and local school districts.

Labeling half of all schools in the United States as failing has caused the Department of Education to become far too overreaching in defining accountability as they continue to shift the metrics on what is considered satisfactory.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5 empowers parents and students by giving them access to information about local schools in order to hold them accountable.

In addition, this bill eliminates 65 duplicative and underperforming programs and consolidates the money into a new grant program for local school districts. This money can be spent by districts to meet their unique needs.

Funding for title I remains robust in the bill, and students and parents retain the ability to make the best educational decisions for them by providing access to charter schools and magnet schools.

□ 1330

Particularly important for my constituents in New York is language in H.R. 5 that prevents the Secretary of Education from forcing States to implement Common Core.

I urge all Members to vote "aye" on the rule and to support the underlying bill.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, here we go again, back to the same bill we debated earlier this year that continues to embrace the idea that less Federal oversight over Federal dollars is what we need to transform K–12 education.

The opposition seems to believe that removing Federal standards would help local leaders make tough decisions. That is absolutely wrong. It actually makes it harder.

For 9 years, I served on a school board in a large urban school district, and I remember agonizing over the decision to move money from one high-needs school to another. In the end, it was the law and safeguards around

title I that helped direct us to make sure the money went to the students that required the greatest assistance. This changes that.

Mr. Speaker, what we need is a Federal law that gives guidance to local school board members that must deal with thousands of competing interests every single day and which enables local leaders ultimately to make the right decision.

Mr. Speaker, today represents a missed opportunity. We need a 21st century education system that makes investment in all our Nation's children. That and only that will help our Nation compete in the global economy. Today's reauthorization of ESEA not only misses the mark, but actually moves us in the wrong direction.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule, a "no" vote on final passage and also on the Salmon amendment.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the leadership, the gentleman from Washington, and the members of the Committee on Rules for bringing this rule to the floor. I think it is a good rule. I urge a "yes" vote on it and the underlying bill, which I am hopeful and pleased we are going to get to today.

In response to some of the last speakers, first of all, let me associate myself with the remarks of Ms. STEFANIK from New York. She is right on. This is exactly the kind of policy and law that we need in this country at this particular time because it puts the trust and the personal responsibility back in the hands of the people where it belongs; and that is our parents, our teachers, our school principals, and superintendents.

How arrogant for anyone to think that we here in Washington know better how to raise our children than those children's parents, working hand in hand, side by side, with that child's teacher and school leaders.

This bill is needed. It is right on point. It is needed for the 21st century, and I want to address some of the misinformation that might be out there.

First of all, I want to be very clear, Mr. Speaker, that the civil rights protections, which I agree with my friend, the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, are very, very important—critical. That is all kept here. That language remains because it is essential.

Secondly, we mandate disaggregated data so that we can see from a holistic, collective standpoint how our children of whatever ethnic background are doing. That is very important. That is kept. Title I is there. There is some more portability, but we think that is a good thing because choice in this subject is a good thing.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would say that this isn't about money. Federal spending in education has gone up 300

percent since the Federal Government got involved in this business, and test results are flat. It is not about money. It is about leadership.

The best way to empower leaders is to give them the tools that they need so that they can help our children grow and compete in the 21st century world and win. That is exactly what the Student Success Act does. It trusts teachers and parents over Washington bureaucrats.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for full support from this House for the rule and for the underlying legislation.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0).

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule which would allow for consideration of H.R. 5, a harmful bill that abandons our commitment to ensuring all children in my home State of Arizona and across the country are afforded quality education that prepares them for success.

We can all agree that every child deserves a fair shot by giving them and their teachers the tools they need; but the reality is millions of kids face additional barriers that require targeted resources. Unfortunately, this bill turns its back on these kids by block granting all funding for English language learners, migrant students, and at-risk students and lets the funding be spent elsewhere.

What is more, it eliminates requirements that schools improve the education of English language learners each year. By removing accountability for the achievement and learning gains of Latinos and English language learners, this bill ignores the real needs of kids and families across our communities.

Mr. Speaker, a Latino child in Phoenix deserves every resource he or she needs to succeed. That is why I strongly support the Democratic substitute amendment to H.R. 5 offered by my colleague Congressman SCOTT. This alternative recognizes the needs of Latino students and ensures proper oversight that we know is necessary.

I urge all my colleagues to oppose H.R. 5 and its dangerous provisions for Latino students.

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

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, when he first signed into law the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, President Lyndon B. Johnson greatly advanced both education and civil rights.

Now, here, 50 years later, the need for Federal support for our schools remains very real, but Republicans celebrate the anniversary by effectively repealing the civil rights portion, Title I, of this act.

In February, Republicans began consideration of this bill and then suspended it because so many of their Members did not think it was extreme

enough in cutting aid to our schools. Since then, the Senate has come together in a bipartisan, though lacking, approach, but a better approach that recognizes the need for civil rights and public education.

Just as it did previously on immigration reform, the House has rejected that bipartisan approach and has jumped off the right end with a more extreme antieducation attitude.

In a few weeks, bright-faced young schoolchildren will put on their backpacks and head off to school. As their number increases, this bill actually cuts the purchasing power available to our schools to meet those growing needs.

Most importantly, Republicans would encourage the States to divert aid from the schools with the greatest need and to actually use Federal dollars to replace what the States are already spending on education.

Not only does the bill shortchange our schools and our students, it also eliminates dedicated funding for important programs like STEM—science, technology, engineering, and math education. These STEM skills are driving innovation.

It is silent on support for our youngest Americans, as schools across the country recognize that brain research supports having pre-K through 12 education. We need not only accountability but funding. This bill should be rejected. We cannot shut the door on these students.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the good gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, passage of this measure will restore responsible management to our forests after decades of Federal neglect. My district includes seven national forests which have suffered from increasingly devastating forest fires caused by overgrown, mismanaged forests and has been economically hobbled by restrictions on forest management.

Last year, in just one of my counties, just three forest fires burned 200,000 acres. Our rural communities, public lands, and environment are being destroyed by this neglect.

This measure will return active management to our forests by increasing flexibility; cutting red tape; and, most importantly, acting to manage forests before fires occur, not afterwards. Streamlining the review process means that forest management can occur when it is actually needed to address dangerous conditions, not after years of legal roadblocks.

Allowing categorical exclusions for postfire salvage and rehabilitation hastens forest recovery and prevents fuel buildup that can contribute to the next future fire. Expanding local involvement in forest management will improve the data available for planning and respect local priorities.

In light of Forest Service surveys finding that over 12 million Sierra Nevada trees have died in the last year, we cannot afford to wait another year.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we act today before our forests have passed beyond any point where they can be restored to good forest health.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN). The gentleman from Colorado has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Instead of engaging in partisan fights on so important an issue that, in essence, is about our future as a Nation and future generations, we should find common ground. Education is a civil right. All students deserve the opportunity of a world class, high-quality education.

This very week, the Senate is discussing their own version of ESEA reauthorization. Now, while nothing is perfect, their bill reflects the bipartisan spirit that would improve this bill if it was allowed in this body.

Members of the Tri-Caucus and leaders of the New Democrat Coalition have sent letters to the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions with a number of suggestions for their bill, but at least there is a bipartisan attempt to help prepare our Nation's kids for our future.

ESEA is one of the most significant pieces of legislation this body will consider. It is a bill about our future. Members of this body are eager to improve this bill and pass a reauthorized version to finally replace No Child Left Behind.

No child should have to attend a failing school, and ZIP Code and race should never determine the quality of an education that a child receives. I think that is something, hopefully, we can agree on as a core principle.

Unfortunately, the bill before us retreats from our promise to our Nation's students. H.R. 5 would bring us back to a time with no accountability standards, where students with disabilities are swept under the rug.

It would divert money from the schools and kids that need it the most; and with the Salmon amendment, it would sweep minority students, students with disabilities, new immigrant students, and low-income students under the rug, as they were in the past. Now that they have emerged, we must ensure that they meet all the learning needs for all students.

Mr. Speaker, we are shortchanging our Nation's kids by not being thoughtful and deliberate with this issue. It is rare that a bill would unite the business community, teachers, school boards, and many others in opposition, but H.R. 5 does this.

The bill's sponsors had 133 days to give students and our country a bill that they deserve.

□ 1345

It is a shame that they didn't take better advantage of that opportunity.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule; "no" on the bill; "no" on the Salmon amendment; and "yes" on the Democratic substitute, which was thoughtfully put together to ensure that America's next generation is prepared to carry on our legacy of global leadership and to put food on their tables as aspiring members of our great country.

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

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

As you can tell, due to the number of colleagues from both sides of the aisle speaking today, these are critically important issues we are considering, important to the economic well-being of our country, as well as to the health of our forest lands and the safety of rural communities.

Reforming our education system and the way we combat wildfires and manage our forests is of the highest priority, and I urge my colleagues to support this rule, as well as both of the underlying bills.

This rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2647, the Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2015, a bipartisan, comprehensive bill aimed at expediting and improving forest management activities in Federal forests.

This critical piece of legislation would address the disastrous consequences of catastrophic wildfire and would return resilience to our overgrown, fire-prone forests by dramatically improving the health of our Federal forests and rangelands.

My district, as well as many other areas around the country, continue to face the threat of catastrophic wildfire, which is made worse by the continuing drought conditions and the poor management and maintenance of forests on our Federal lands.

We must begin to take steps to prevent and address these fires, which this bill does by reforming the way we prepare, respond to, and fund wildfire response and mitigation efforts.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue on this current path, where we limp from one devastating fire to the next, unable to break the cycle of destructive fire seasons due to ineffective funding mechanisms, insufficient forest maintenance, and a burdensome Federal permitting and review process.

This bill addresses these shortcomings by tackling the problem of fire borrowing, simplifying environmental process requirements, reducing project planning times, and lowering the cost of implementing forest management projects, all while ensuring robust environmental protections.

Mr. Speaker, because of the reforms and streamlined authorities in this bill, there will be an increase in acres of treated land, which will come at no additional cost to our taxpayers. This legislation is essential and desperately needed to change the outdated, unsustainable, and ultimately dangerous system of forest management on Federal lands.

This rule also provides for further consideration of H.R. 5, the Student Success Act, a reform of our Nation's education system which reduces the Federal Government's footprint in State and local issues and restores control over education back to those on the ground who are best qualified to make the decisions affecting their students, parents, teachers, and communities.

Mr. Speaker, a well-educated workforce is imperative to the health and vitality of both our Nation's children and our economy. The Student Success Act empowers parents, local communities, and State governments to lead the way in fixing America's broken educational system.

H.R. 5 will benefit students, parents, teachers, and school administrators by returning responsibility for student achievement to the States and local communities, while maintaining high standards and expectations for our Nation's students, teachers, and schools.

This is a good, straightforward rule, Mr. Speaker, allowing for consideration of two critical pieces of legislation that will help protect our rural communities, provide much-needed reforms to our education system, and ensure that we are prepared to respond to the devastating and catastrophic wildfires that have plagued many areas of our country. I support the rule's adoption, and I urge my colleagues also to support both the rule and the underlying bills.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 185, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 392]

YEAS—242

Abraham	Calvert	Duncan (SC)
Aderholt	Carter (GA)	Duncan (TN)
Allen	Carter (TX)	Ellmers (NC)
Amash	Chabot	Emmer (MN)
Amodei	Chaffetz	Farenthold
Babin	Clawson (FL)	Fincher
Barletta	Coffman	Fitzpatrick
Barr	Cole	Fleischmann
Barton	Collins (GA)	Fleming
Benishke	Collins (NY)	Flores
Billirakis	Comstock	Forbes
Bishop (MI)	Conaway	Fortenberry
Bishop (UT)	Cook	Fox
Blackburn	Costello (PA)	Franks (AZ)
Blum	Cramer	Frelinghuysen
Bost	Crawford	Garrett
Boustany	Crenshaw	Gibbs
Brady (TX)	Curbelo (FL)	Gibson
Brat	Davis, Rodney	Gohmert
Bridenstine	Denham	Goodlatte
Brooks (AL)	Dent	Gosar
Brooks (IN)	DeSantis	Gowdy
Buchanan	DesJarlais	Granger
Buck	Diaz-Balart	Graves (GA)
Bucshon	Dold	Graves (LA)
Burgess	Donovan	Graves (MO)
Byrne	Duffy	Griffith

Grothman	McCarthy	Rouzer	Nolan	Rush	Takano
Guinta	McCaul	Royce	Norcross	Ryan (OH)	Thompson (CA)
Guthrie	McClintock	Russell	O'Rourke	Sánchez, Linda	Thompson (MS)
Hanna	McHenry	Ryan (WI)	Pallone	T.	Titus
Hardy	McKinley	Salmon	Pascrell	Sanchez, Loretta	Tonko
Harper	McMorris	Sanford	Payne	Sarbanes	Torres
Harris	Rodgers	Scalise	Pelosi	Schakowsky	Tsongas
Hartzler	McSally	Schweikert	Perlmutter	Schiff	Van Hollen
Heck (NV)	Meadows	Scott, Austin	Peters	Schrader	Vargas
Hensarling	Meehan	Sensenbrenner	Peterson	Scott (VA)	Veasey
Herrera Beutler	Messer	Sessions	Pingree	Scott, David	Vela
Hice, Jody B.	Mica	Shimkus	Pocan	Serrano	Velázquez
Hill	Miller (MI)	Shuster	Polis	Sewell (AL)	Visclosky
Holding	Mooleenaar	Simpson	Price (NC)	Sherman	Walz
Hudson	Mooney (WV)	Smith (MO)	Quigley	Sinema	Wasserman
Huelskamp	Mullin	Smith (NE)	Rangel	Sires	Schultz
Huizenga (MI)	Mulvaney	Smith (NJ)	Rice (NY)	Slaughter	Waters, Maxine
Hultgren	Murphy (PA)	Smith (TX)	Richmond	Smith (WA)	Watson Coleman
Hunter	Neugebauer	Stefanik	Roybal-Allard	Speier	Welch
Hurd (TX)	Newhouse	Stewart	Ruiz	Swalwell (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Hurt (VA)	Noem	Stivers	Ruppersberger	Takai	Yarmuth
Issa	Nugent	Stutzman			
Jenkins (KS)	Nunes	Thompson (PA)			
Jenkins (WV)	Olson	Thornberry			
Johnson (OH)	Palazzo	Tiberi			
Johnson, Sam	Palmer	Tipton			
Jolly	Paulsen	Trott			
Jones	Pearce	Turner			
Jordan	Perry	Upton			
Joyce	Pittenger	Valadao			
Katko	Pitts	Wagner			
Kelly (MS)	Poe (TX)	Walberg			
Kelly (PA)	Poliquin	Walden			
King (IA)	Pompeo	Walker			
King (NY)	Posey	Walorski			
Kinziger (IL)	Price, Tom	Walters, Mimi			
Kline	Ratcliffe	Weber (TX)			
Knight	Reed	Webster (FL)			
Labrador	Reichert	Wenstrup			
LaMalfa	Renacci	Westerman			
Lamborn	Ribble	Westmoreland			
Lance	Rice (SC)	Whitfield			
Latta	Rigell	Williams			
LoBiondo	Roby	Wilson (SC)			
Long	Roe (TN)	Wittman			
Loudermilk	Rogers (AL)	Womack			
Love	Rogers (KY)	Woodall			
Lucas	Rohrabacher	Yoder			
Luetkemeyer	Rokita	Yoho			
Lummis	Rooney (FL)	Young (AK)			
MacArthur	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (IA)			
Marchant	Roskam	Young (IN)			
Marino	Ross	Zeldin			
Massie	Rothfus	Zinke			

NAYS—185

Adams	DeFazio	Johnson, E. B.
Ashford	DeGette	Kaptur
Bass	Delaney	Keating
Beatty	DeLauro	Kelly (IL)
Becerra	DelBene	Kennedy
Bera	DeSaulnier	Kildee
Beyer	Dingell	Kilmer
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Kind
Blumenauer	Doyle, Michael	Kirkpatrick
Bonamici	F.	Kuster
Boyle, Brendan	Duckworth	Langevin
F.	Edwards	Larsen (WA)
Brady (PA)	Ellison	Larson (CT)
Brown (FL)	Engel	Lawrence
Brownley (CA)	Eshoo	Lee
Bustos	Esty	Levin
Butterfield	Farr	Lewis
Capps	Fattah	Lieu, Ted
Capuano	Foster	Lipinski
Cárdenas	Frankel (FL)	Loebach
Carney	Fudge	Lowenthal
Carson (IN)	Gabbard	Lowey
Cartwright	Gallago	Lujan Grisham
Castor (FL)	Garamendi	(NM)
Castro (TX)	Graham	Luján, Ben Ray
Chu, Judy	Grayson	(NM)
Cicilline	Green, Al	Lynch
Clark (MA)	Green, Gene	Maloney,
Clarke (NY)	Grijalva	Carolyn
Clay	Gutiérrez	Maloney, Sean
Cleaver	Hahn	Matsui
Clyburn	Hastings	McCollum
Cohen	Heck (WA)	McDermott
Connolly	Higgins	McGovern
Conyers	Himes	McNerney
Cooper	Hinojosa	Meeks
Costa	Honda	Meng
Courtney	Hoyer	Moore
Crowley	Huffman	Moulton
Cuellar	Israel	Murphy (FL)
Cummings	Jackson Lee	Nadler
Davis (CA)	Jeffries	Napolitano
Davis, Danny	Johnson (GA)	Neal

NOT VOTING—6

Aguilar	Culberson	Lofgren
Black	Deutch	Miller (FL)

□ 1418

Messrs. DOYLE, SIRE, and HIMES changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. FITZPATRICK, FRELING-HUYSEN, DUFFY, STEFANIK, MULLIN, YOHO, BRIDENSTINE, TIBERI, YOUNG of Alaska, ROGERS of Alabama, and TIPTON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SEVENTH ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL WOMEN'S SOFTBALL GAME

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the congressional version of the Women's World Cup Soccer team, the softball version.

I am here with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, my teammates, my sisters who played valiantly in the 7th Annual Congressional Women's Softball Game.

Congratulations to the women Members of Congress who beat the press in a shutout game, defending our title in back-to-back victories as Congressional Women's Softball Game Champions.

I want to thank my teammates on both sides of the aisle. They have become my sisters and my friends throughout the whole season.

It is always so amazing to think about what we do over 3 months with the incredibly busy schedules that so many of us have, coming out to practice at 7:00 in the morning, two or three times a week. We did not have a smaller turnout for practice than 10 Members at each practice at 7:00 in the morning. And our hard work paid off.

This is a game that, I know, many of you know is near and dear to my heart.

I know that many of you know this. It bears repeating just because of the reason that we play this game. I was