

□ 1930

More reforms than have been done in probably 50 years. I haven't looked specifically, but I think President Reagan did a lot, and other Presidents have done them.

But this is about jobs, Mr. Speaker. Think about this. We go home to our districts every weekend, and we talk to constituents every weekend. Think about constituents that come up to us and say: Congressman, have you balanced the budget? We say: No, we are working on it, but we haven't done it yet.

I don't want to offend any of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I am probably going to, but I don't mean it. Our constituents say: Well, Congressman, have you repealed ObamaCare? I say: Well, no, not yet, but we are working on it.

Then they look at us and they say: Tell me, Congressman, you have done away with the only thing that we know of that helps create thousands of jobs all over this country and possibly would help create the job that they had because of some ideology or some conservative group that is scoring a Member of Congress, and now I don't have a job, and I am on unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, our constituents and hardworking Americans deserve better. They deserve better than Members of Congress playing political games because of scorecards.

I serve under one of the most principled chairmen, probably the most principled chairman in Congress, and I agree with him on 99.9 percent of everything that we do in our committee. We just happen to disagree on this one issue. My chairman is passionate and principled, and I never would doubt that.

Mr. Speaker, I won't take much more time. If America is going to get out of the hole we are in as a country, then Congress must start working together. Mr. Speaker, we should applaud. We should be happy on the day—and I don't want to offend the gentlewoman from California who spoke earlier, but we should be happy on the day when Democrats want to join Republicans on legislation that helps move the country forward. They are clapping, that is awesome.

We are trying to do what we think is best, and the Export-Import Bank doesn't cost the taxpayers a dime. It helps create thousands of jobs all over this country and makes sure we don't lose thousands of jobs to 60 other countries that have these credit agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what else to say. This is regular order, this closed rule. I am going to close in 10 seconds, but this is all about regular order. We could have had amendments. We could have had a thousand amendments in our committee, but we chose to go this route. We didn't choose it. Some of us chose to go this route. We are dealing with this today. Our constituents deserve better, and we have to do better.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. HENSARLING. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the House is H. Res. 450 which, as I understand it, would establish the rule for debate on this Ex-Im reauthorization bill, that it does not make in order any amendments.

The closed rule means that in addition to not having any debate on the rule—since all time has now been yielded back, with no other Member having a chance to speak—Members have been denied their chance to participate in that part of the process.

My parliamentary inquiry is whether there is any way, at this juncture, for Members to amend the resolution, H. Res. 450, to give Members an opportunity to offer amendments to the underlying Ex-Im reauthorization bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair was about to put the question on ordering the previous question.

If the motion for the previous question was rejected, there would be a potential for further debate on, or amendment to, House Resolution 450.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HENSARLING. So, if the previous question is defeated, then a Member who is opposed to the previous question would be afforded the opportunity to offer an amendment to H. Res. 450 that would strike the text of the closed, no amendments rule and replace it with the text of a rule that provided for consideration of the underlying Ex-Im reauthorization bill through an open process, with time for debate, where any Member—either Republican or Democrat—could offer germane amendments to the bill. Is that correct, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot respond to specific hypotheticals, but if the motion for the previous question were rejected, there would be potential for further debate on, or amendment to, House Resolution 450.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HENSARLING. If the previous question is defeated, may I or any Member who votes against the previous question claim time to offer such an amendment to create an open rules process for consideration of the underlying Ex-Im reauthorization bill where Members on both sides of the aisle can offer amendments to the bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot judge that at this time.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MULVANEY. A few minutes ago, in reference to a question raised by the gentleman from Texas, you indicated that the amendments would be in order if the motion for the previous question failed.

My question is: Are motions to amend in order before the motion for the previous question comes to the floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The previous question has preferential standing.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk. I would like to have it heard now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The previous question has already been moved.

Mr. MULVANEY. No, it hasn't.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is about to put the question on ordering the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry. Who moved the previous question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MULVANEY. Was that seconded?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The previous question does not require a second.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk. I would simply like to ask what rule the Chair is relying on in denying me the ability to bring that amendment now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Clause 4 of rule XVI.

The question is on ordering the previous question on the resolution.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. 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.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1090, RETAIL INVESTOR PROTECTION ACT

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-313) on the resolution (H. Res. 491) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1090) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide protections for retail customers, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

□ 1945

RESEARCH EXCELLENCE AND ADVANCEMENTS FOR DYSLEXIA ACT

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3033) to require the President's annual budget request to Congress each year to include a line item for the Research in Disabilities Education program of the National Science Foundation and to require the National Science Foundation to conduct research on dyslexia, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3033

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 “Research Excellence and Advancements for Dyslexia Act” or the “READ Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) As many as one out of six, or 8,500,000, American school children may have dyslexia.

(2) Since 1975, dyslexia has been included in the list of qualifying learning disabilities under the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

SEC. 3. RESEARCH IN DISABILITIES EDUCATION.

(a) PROGRAM.—Nothing in this Act alters the National Science Foundation's Research in Disabilities Education program for fundamental and implementation research about learners (of all ages) with disabilities, including dyslexia, in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). The National Science Foundation shall continue to encourage efforts to understand and address disability-based differences in STEM education and workforce participation, including differences for dyslexic learners.

(b) LINE ITEM.—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall include the amount requested for the Research in Disabilities Education program in the Foundation's annual congressional budget justification.

SEC. 4. DYSLEXIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The National Science Foundation shall support multi-directorate, merit-reviewed, and competitively awarded research on the science of dyslexia, including research on the early identification of children and students with dyslexia, professional development for teachers and administrators of students with dyslexia, curricula and educational tools needed for children with dyslexia, and implementation and scaling of successful models of dyslexia intervention. Research supported under this subsection shall be conducted with the goal of practical application.

(b) FUNDING.—The National Science Foundation shall devote at least \$5,000,000 annually to research described in subsection (a), subject to the availability of appropriations, to come from amounts made available for the Research and Related Activities account or the Education and Human Resources Directorate. No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated under this section. This Act shall be carried out using funds otherwise appropriated by law after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to 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, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3033, the Research Excellence and Advancements for Dyslexia Act, or READ Act, will help millions of Americans who struggle with dyslexia. It is fitting that the House considers this bill today, as October is Dyslexia Awareness Month.

Dyslexia affects an estimated 8.5 million school children and 1 in 6 Americans in some form. It causes these individuals to have difficulties with reading, though they often have normal or above-average intelligence.

Despite the prevalence of dyslexia, many Americans remain undiagnosed, untreated, and silently struggle at school or work. Too many children undiagnosed with dyslexia have difficulties in the classroom and sometimes drop out of school and face uncertain futures.

The READ Act requires the National Science Foundation's budget to include a specific line item for the Research in Disabilities Education program. The bill requires the NSF to invest at least \$5 million annually for merit-reviewed, competitively-awarded dyslexia research projects.

The bill uses funds already appropriated for the NSF and does not authorize any additional spending for these priority projects.

NSF research supported by the READ Act is focused on practical applications, which include the following: Early identification of children and students with dyslexia, professional development for teachers and administrators of students with dyslexia, curricula and educational tools needed for children with dyslexia, and implementation and scaling of successful models of dyslexia intervention.

The House Science, Space and Technology Committee held a hearing last

year on the science of dyslexia. Experts testified how research in the area of neuroscience has led to practical ways to better diagnose and deal with dyslexia but that more research is necessary.

At a second committee hearing held just a few weeks ago, we heard from experts who work directly with dyslexic students and their teachers. They know firsthand about the obstacles these children, parents, and educators face, and they stress the importance of research in developing practical tools.

If you can't read, it is hard to achieve. If we change the way we approach dyslexia, we can turn this disability into an opportunity for a brighter and more productive future for millions of Americans.

I am a co-chair of the bipartisan Dyslexia Caucus, along with Congresswoman JULIA BROWNLEY, which is comprised of more than 100 Members of Congress.

I have met hundreds of children and their parents in my congressional district in Texas and others across the U.S. who are affected by dyslexia, and they have shared their personal stories with me.

One child I met recently was Eddie, a middle school student from Baltimore. He, along with his family, has been on a long journey to receive a proper diagnosis and find a supportive learning environment.

After our meeting, his mother wrote me a letter explaining: “In only 1 year, Eddie has gone from repeatedly missing recess because he would not ‘try harder,’ a boy who would stare at his homework in defeat before he has even tried an assignment, to a boy now daring to dream of a career in the sciences.”

Eddie is very fortunate to have a mother who advocated for his proper education. He is now not only able to learn, but also to excel. His mother comments: “He is a voracious reader and wants to join the Jet Propulsion Lab or work with NASA.”

I also have had the pleasure of meeting an Austin, Texas, resident Robbi Cooper and her son, Ben. They shared many stories with me about the hardships they have faced in their attempts to ensure Ben receives the best education possible.

Ben has even taken his abilities one step further by becoming an advocate and has traveled to D.C. numerous times to lobby Congress so others can learn from his experiences.

The bipartisan READ Act, which unanimously passed the Science Committee 2 weeks ago, will help ensure that all children like Eddie and Ben have the means to succeed. Nothing could be more important to them.

I also want to acknowledge two young friends who are on the floor with me today, Leighton and Gipson, who have an interest in this bill too.

The READ Act is a significant step in the right direction to help those with dyslexia.