

Tiffany
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Van Drew
Wagner
Walberg

Walden
Walker
Walorski
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman

Williams
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Young

Lawson (FL)
(Evans)
Lieu, Ted (Beyer)
Lipinski (Cooper)
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Lowenthal
(Beyer)
Lowey (Tonko)
Meng (Clark)
(MA)
Moore (Beyer)
Napolitano
(Correa)
Pascrell
(Pallone)

Payne
(Wasserman
Schultz)
Pingree (Clark
(MA))
Pocan (Raskin)
Porter (Wexton)
Rooney (FL)
(Beyer)
Roybal-Allard
(Aguilar)
Rush
(Underwood)
Serrano
(Jeffries)

Sewell (AL)
(DelBene)
Thompson (MS)
(Fudge)
Trahan
(McGovern)
Watson Coleman
(Pallone)
Welch
(McGovern)
Wilson (FL)
(Hayes)

NOT VOTING—57

Abraham
Aderholt
Banks
Bergman
Brindisi
Burchett
Byrne
Castro (TX)
Cheney
Cook
Curtis
DeFazio
DesJarlais
Deutch
Engel
Gaetz
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)

Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Guest
Hill (AR)
Kelly (MS)
Kustoff (TN)
Lamborn
Luria
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
Murphy (FL)
Norcross
Nunes
Palazzo
Pence
Perry
Quigley
Riggleman

Scalise
Schneider
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Soto
Stewart
Timmons
Torres Small
(NM)
Trone
Waltz
Wenstrup
Wilson (SC)
Wright
Yoho
Zeldin

□ 1310

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, on September 15, 2020, I missed the second vote on H. Res. 1107. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 186.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, September 15, 2020, I was honored to attend the Abraham Accords Signing Ceremony at the White House. This historic peace deal between the United Arab Emirates and Israel demonstrates President Trump's commitment to bring stability to the region. For the above reason, I was not recorded for roll call vote 185 and 186. Had I been present, I would have voted Nay on the Previous Question on H. Res. 1107 and Adoption of H. Res. 1107.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, please accept this personal explanation as I was unavoidably detained due to my presence as the White House for the historic signing of the Abraham Accords between the United States, Israel, the United Arab Emirates, and Bahrain. Had I been present, I would have voted: "nay" on rollcall No. 185 and "nay" on rollcall No. 186.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, please accept this personal explanation as I was unavoidably detained due to my presence at the White House for the historic signing of the Abraham Accords between the United States, Israel, the United Arab Emirates, and Bahrain. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 185 and "nay" on rollcall No. 186.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Barragán (Beyer)
Blumenauer
(Beyer)
Butterfield
(Kildee)
Chu, Judy
(Takano)
Clay (Davids
(KS))
Cohen (Beyer)

Davis, Danny K.
(Underwood)
DeSaulnier
(Matsui)
Frankel (Clark
(MA))
Garcia (IL)
(Raskin)
Grijalva (Raskin)

Hastings
(Wasserman
Schultz)
Jayapal (Raskin)
Khanna (Gomez)
Kirkpatrick
(Gallego)
Langevin
(Lynch)
Lawrence
(Kildee)

Lawson (FL)
(Evans)
Lieu, Ted (Beyer)
Lipinski (Cooper)
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Lowenthal
(Beyer)
Lowey (Tonko)
Meng (Clark)
(MA)
Moore (Beyer)
Napolitano
(Correa)
Pascrell
(Pallone)

Payne
(Wasserman
Schultz)
Pingree (Clark
(MA))
Pocan (Raskin)
Porter (Wexton)
Rooney (FL)
(Beyer)
Roybal-Allard
(Aguilar)
Rush
(Underwood)
Serrano
(Jeffries)

Sewell (AL)
(DelBene)
Thompson (MS)
(Fudge)
Trahan
(McGovern)
Watson Coleman
(Pallone)
Welch
(McGovern)
Wilson (FL)
(Hayes)

STRENGTH IN DIVERSITY ACT OF 2019

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 2639, the Strength in Diversity Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ESPAILLAT). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1107, I call up the bill (H.R. 2639) to establish the Strength in Diversity Program, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1107, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-62, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2639

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 "Strength in Diversity Act of 2020".

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to support the development, implementation, and evaluation of comprehensive strategies to address the effects of racial isolation or concentrated poverty by increasing diversity, including racial diversity and socioeconomic diversity, in covered schools.

SEC. 3. RESERVATION FOR NATIONAL ACTIVITIES.

The Secretary may reserve not more than 5 percent of the amounts made available under section 10 for a fiscal year to carry out activities of national significance relating to this Act, which may include—

(1) research, development, data collection, monitoring, technical assistance, evaluation, or dissemination activities; and

(2) the development and maintenance of best practices for recipients of grants under section 4 and other experts in the field of school diversity.

SEC. 4. GRANT PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—From the amounts made available under section 10 and not reserved under section 3 for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall award grants in accordance with subsection (b) to eligible entities to develop or implement plans to improve diversity and reduce

or eliminate racial or socioeconomic isolation in covered schools.

(2) TYPES OF GRANTS.—The Secretary may, in any fiscal year, award—

(A) planning grants to carry out the activities described in section 6(a);

(B) implementation grants to carry out the activities described in section 6(b); or

(C) both such planning grants and implementation grants.

(b) AWARD BASIS.—

(1) CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING APPLICATIONS.—The Secretary shall award grants under this section on a competitive basis, based on—

(A) the quality of the application submitted by an eligible entity under section 5; and

(B) the likelihood, as determined by the Secretary, that the eligible entity will use the grant to improve student outcomes or outcomes on other performance measures described in section 7.

(2) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to the following eligible entities:

(A) First, to an eligible entity that proposes, in an application submitted under section 5, to use the grant to support a program that addresses racial isolation.

(B) Second, to an eligible entity that proposes, in an application submitted under section 5, to use the grant to support a program that extends beyond one local educational agency, such as an inter-district or regional program.

(c) DURATION OF GRANTS.—

(1) PLANNING GRANT.—A planning grant awarded under this section shall be for a period of not more than 1 year.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION GRANT.—An implementation grant awarded under this section shall be for a period of not more than 3 years, except that the Secretary may extend an implementation grant for an additional 2-year period if the eligible entity receiving the grant demonstrates to the Secretary that the eligible entity is making significant progress, as determined by the Secretary, on the program performance measures described in section 7.

SEC. 5. APPLICATIONS.

In order to receive a grant under section 4, an eligible entity shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require. Such application shall include—

(1) a description of the program for which the eligible entity is seeking a grant, including—

(A) how the eligible entity proposes to use the grant to improve the academic and life outcomes of students in racial or socioeconomic isolation in covered schools by supporting interventions that increase diversity in such covered schools;

(B) in the case of an implementation grant, the implementation grant plan described in section 6(b)(1); and

(C) evidence, or if such evidence is not available, a rationale based on current research, regarding how the program will increase diversity;

(2) in the case of an eligible entity proposing to use any of the grant to benefit covered schools that are racially isolated, a description of how the eligible entity will identify and define racial isolation;

(3) in the case of an eligible entity proposing to use any portion of the grant to benefit high-poverty covered schools, a description of how the eligible entity will identify and define income level and socioeconomic status;

(4) a description of the plan of the eligible entity for continuing the program after the grant period ends;

(5) a description of how the eligible entity will assess, monitor, and evaluate the impact of the activities funded under the grant on student achievement and student enrollment diversity;

(6) an assurance that the eligible entity has conducted, or will conduct, robust parent and community engagement, while planning for and implementing the program, such as through—

(A) consultation with appropriate officials from Indian Tribes or Tribal organizations approved by the Tribes located in the area served by the eligible entity;

(B) consultation with other community entities, including local housing or transportation authorities;

(C) public hearings or other open forums to inform the development of any formal strategy to increase diversity; and

(D) outreach to parents and students, in a language that parents and students can understand, and consultation with students and families in the targeted district or region that is designed to ensure participation in the planning and development of any formal strategy to increase diversity;

(7) an estimate of the number of students that the eligible entity plans to serve under the program and the number of students to be served through additional expansion of the program after the grant period ends;

(8) an assurance that the eligible entity will—

(A) cooperate with the Secretary in evaluating the program, including any evaluation that might require data and information from multiple recipients of grants under section 4; and

(B) engage in the best practices developed under section 3(2);

(9) an assurance that, to the extent possible, the eligible entity has considered the potential implications of the grant activities on the demographics and student enrollment of nearby covered schools not included in the activities of the grant; and

(10) in the case of an eligible entity applying for an implementation grant, a description of how the eligible entity will—

(A) implement, replicate, or expand a strategy based on a strong or moderate level of evidence (as described in subclause (I) or (II) of section 8101(21)(A)(i) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801(21)(A)(i))); or

(B) test a promising strategy to increase diversity in covered schools.

SEC. 6. USES OF FUNDS.

(a) **PLANNING GRANTS.**—Each eligible entity that receives a planning grant under section 4 shall use the grant to support students in covered schools through the following activities:

(1) Completing a comprehensive assessment of, with respect to the geographic area served by such eligible entity—

(A) the educational outcomes and racial and socioeconomic stratification of children attending covered schools; and

(B) an analysis of the location and capacity of program and school facilities and the adequacy of local or regional transportation infrastructure.

(2) Developing and implementing a robust family, student, and community engagement plan, including, where feasible, public hearings or other open forums that would precede and inform the development of a formal strategy to improve diversity in covered schools.

(3) Developing options, including timelines and cost estimates, for improving diversity in covered schools, such as weighted lotteries, revised feeder patterns, school boundary redesign, or regional coordination.

(4) Developing an implementation plan based on community preferences among the options developed under paragraph (3).

(5) Building the capacity to collect and analyze data that provide information for transparency, continuous improvement, and evaluation.

(6) Developing an implementation plan to comply with a court-ordered school desegregation plan.

(7) Engaging in best practices developed under section 3(2).

(b) **IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS.**—

(1) **IMPLEMENTATION GRANT PLAN.**—Each eligible entity that receives an implementation grant

under section 4 shall implement a high-quality plan to support students in covered schools that includes—

(A) a comprehensive set of strategies designed to improve academic outcomes for all students, particularly students of color and low-income students, by increasing diversity in covered schools;

(B) evidence of strong family and community support for such strategies, including evidence that the eligible entity has engaged in meaningful family and community outreach activities;

(C) goals to increase diversity in covered schools over the course of the grant period;

(D) collection and analysis of data to provide transparency and support continuous improvement throughout the grant period; and

(E) a rigorous method of evaluation of the effectiveness of the program.

(2) **IMPLEMENTATION GRANT ACTIVITIES.**—Each eligible entity that receives an implementation grant under section 4 may use the grant to carry out one or more of the following activities:

(A) Recruiting, hiring, or training additional teachers, administrators, and other instructional and support staff in new, expanded, or restructured covered schools, or other professional development activities for staff and administrators.

(B) Investing in specialized academic programs or facilities designed to encourage inter-district school attendance patterns.

(C) Developing or initiating a transportation plan for bringing students to and from covered schools, if such transportation is sustainable beyond the grant period and does not represent a significant portion of the grant received by an eligible entity under section 4.

(D) Developing innovative and equitable school assignment plans.

(E) Carrying out innovative activities designed to increase racial and socioeconomic school diversity and engagement between children from different racial, economic, and cultural backgrounds.

SEC. 7. PERFORMANCE MEASURES.

The Secretary shall establish performance measures for the programs and activities carried out through a grant under section 4. These measures, at a minimum, shall track the progress of each eligible entity in—

(1) improving academic and other developmental or noncognitive outcomes for each subgroup described in section 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(2)(B)(xi)) that is served by the eligible entity on measures, including, as applicable, by—

(A) increasing school readiness;

(B) increasing student achievement and decreasing achievement gaps;

(C) increasing high school graduation rates;

(D) increasing readiness for postsecondary education and careers;

(E) reducing school discipline rates; and

(F) any other indicator the Secretary or eligible entity may identify; and

(2) increasing diversity and decreasing racial or socioeconomic isolation in covered schools.

SEC. 8. ANNUAL REPORTS.

An eligible entity that receives a grant under section 4 shall submit to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require, an annual report that includes—

(1) a description of the efforts of the eligible entity to increase inclusivity;

(2) information on the progress of the eligible entity with respect to the performance measures described in section 7; and

(3) the data supporting such progress.

SEC. 9. APPLICABILITY.

Section 426 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1228) shall not apply with respect to activities carried out under a grant under this Act.

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act such sums as may be nec-

essary for fiscal year 2020 and each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years.

SEC. 11. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **COVERED SCHOOL.**—The term “covered school” means—

(A) a publicly-funded early childhood education program;

(B) a public elementary school; or

(C) a public secondary school.

(2) **ELIGIBLE ENTITY.**—The term “eligible entity” means a local educational agency, a consortium of such agencies, an educational service agency, or regional educational agency that at the time of the application of such eligible entity has significant achievement gaps and socioeconomic or racial segregation within or between the school districts served by such entity.

(3) **ESEA TERMS.**—The terms “educational service agency”, “elementary school”, “local educational agency”, “secondary school”, and “Secretary” have the meanings given such terms in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(4) **PUBLICLY-FUNDED EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM.**—The term “publicly-funded early childhood education program” means an early childhood education program (as defined in section 103(8) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1003(8)) that receives State or Federal funds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, is debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

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

Mr. Speaker, racial segregation in public education has been illegal for more than 66 years in the United States. Still, American public schools are more segregated today than at any time since the 1960s. The average African-American or Latino student attends schools with a majority of children of their own race.

Most of these schools serve a high number of low-income students forced to learn in old, broken-down buildings with fewer resources and disproportionately high rates of discipline.

Segregated schools are inherently unequal, creating barriers for the students who reside in underserved communities. It has been 66 years since the landmark decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*, and the promise of equal access to education has yet to be realized.

Today, public schools are not segregated because the law requires it, they are segregated by their ZIP Codes.

Segregation exists due to the erosion of a middle-class tax base. An erosion that has caused communities of color to become systemically poor. Essential services and public education are continuously underfunded.

These communities have been denied access to the intergenerational wealth that comes from homeownership due to discriminatory housing patterns and mortgage lending policies. This is particularly true for Black communities.

When districts split schools between affluent and poor neighborhoods, it draws a bright line between the haves and the have-nots. This type of separation inflicts the same harm on students today as legalized segregation did prior to 1954.

That is why I introduced H.R. 2639, the Strength in Diversity Act. It directly addresses inequities in public education by authorizing funding to support local education leaders in their efforts to lessen racial and socioeconomic isolation in public schools.

The Strength in Diversity Act will ensure every student has equitable access to a quality education. This is one step toward remedying the issue of segregated schools.

The bill provides support for school districts that are developing, expanding, or implementing school diversity initiatives.

Eligible school districts can devote funding to study the adverse effects of segregation, provide equitable access to transportation, create programs to attract children from neighboring communities, and recruit new specialized teachers.

Studies show school integration benefits students of all races. Even the conservative think tank, the Hoover Institution, agrees that diverse learning environments help close the achievement gap and lead to numerous academic, social and cognitive benefits. Research tells us school integration results in cross-racial friendships and a decline in stereotyping, allowing students to better navigate an increasingly diverse society and preparing them for real world experiences.

Mr. Speaker, the Strength in Diversity Act is not new policy. It is practically the same policy the Obama administration sought to pursue in its 2016 Opening Doors, Expanding Opportunities program, which provided \$12 million to help school districts increase diversity.

Nearly 30 school districts from 22 States and the District of Columbia applied for the Obama-era integration grant, but the program was eliminated by the current administration in 2017 without explanation. That decision came at a time when research clearly showed a resurgence in segregated schools.

Totally ignoring this increase in separate educational facilities, Education Secretary Betsy DeVos moved to rescind Federal guidance to assist school districts in pursuit of racial diversity. When my Education and Labor Committee colleague Representative TRONE asked the Secretary about this rescission, she said she was “unfamiliar with the guidance.” That was 2 years ago. Since then, things have gotten worse, not better.

Mr. Speaker, we are experiencing a racial reckoning in this country. Despite efforts from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue to sow racial division, I remain hopeful.

Now is the time to enact the Strength in Diversity Act and provide

school districts with the support they need to tackle the task of true integration.

This is hard work, but necessary work, and it is past time the Federal Government support local leaders to fulfill the promise of Brown.

Today, I urge my colleagues to make a commitment to put an end to racial and socioeconomic isolation and segregation in our Nation’s public schools by voting in favor of the Strength in Diversity Act.

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

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

I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2639, the Strength in Diversity Act.

Republicans and Democrats agree that discrimination and State-sanctioned segregation are repugnant, illegal, and blatantly immoral. Studies have shown that integrated schools promote greater understanding, tolerance, and improved educational outcomes.

I don’t disagree with the intentions behind this bill but have major reservations about its efficacy. Will this bill stand the test of time? Will these ideas have helped the ongoing effort to achieve greater equality for children? Sadly, the answer is no.

The Education and Labor Committee has a long history of reaching across the aisle and finding common ground to effect meaningful reform for our Nation’s schools and students.

The legislation before us today was another opportunity for committee Republicans and Democrats to find bipartisan compromise. Unfortunately, committee Democrats ignored common-sense approaches to this problem to impose a top-down, Big Government mandate that would have the Federal Government decide how best to address the issues of racial and socioeconomic isolation in America’s schools.

As we have seen many times before, additional government mandates and burdensome red tape are not the answer. Congress has already set up the Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants, a block grant created to give school districts flexibility to pursue local solutions to their communities’ educational challenges. Local and State leaders and those with their feet on the ground know how best to combat these challenges, not the Federal Government.

That is why Representative ALLEN will offer a Republican alternative later today that will provide this House a bipartisan solution that could easily garner an overwhelming majority of support in this Chamber if every Member chose to focus on the importance of actually addressing racial and socioeconomic isolation in schools. His amendment would ensure that nearly every school district in the country would have the flexibility with Federal funds they may need to tackle this problem. This is how legislating for so-

lutions, rather than legislating for headlines can work.

Republicans want nothing more than to see all American children prosper. That means expanding opportunities for marginalized students to gain access to an education that prepares them for lifelong success. It also means school districts taking action to reduce racial and socioeconomic isolation in schools.

A bipartisan path forward to make that possible is achievable, but Democrats would rather score political points than work with Republicans on solutions that will make a significant difference in the lives of our Nation’s children.

Instead of building upon a program that has bipartisan, bicameral support, Democrats’ H.R. 2639 sets up a new grant program within the Department of Education that will inevitably be underfunded, if it is funded at all.

Creating more government programs that have to scramble for funding in order to operate successfully is the last thing we need to foster the best environment for all students to learn.

H.R. 2639 also ignores the biggest problem facing low-income students and students of color—a lack of high-quality educational options. Committee Republicans stand ready to work with our colleagues in the majority to expand educational opportunities to all families. But rather than bring a bill to the floor that would expand the availability of charter schools or offer marginalized families the kind of educational freedom that the wealthy exercise for themselves, Democrats decided teachers unions are more important to them than real families who are desperate for access to a better education for their children.

My Republican colleagues and I believe that expanding opportunities for students should be a priority. We know school choice gives families the opportunity to break the cycle of poverty and enroll their children in challenging environments that better develop their skills and intellect, encouraging them to reach higher. In fact, studies show that when students are given the freedom to attend school in a learning environment best suited to their abilities, they pursue and complete postsecondary opportunities at higher rates.

Access to opportunities, freedom to climb, these are aspects of a student’s education that must be equal for all children nationwide. No one-size-fits-all structure can deliver on those essentials. Separate was never equal, but equality cannot simply mean uniformity if that uniformity doesn’t prepare students for lifelong success. Equality is affirming that all children are fundamentally the same in dignity, importance, and worth but also understanding that not all children’s needs are the same.

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I think that we all want commonsense solutions, but as proven by Secretary

DeVos, common sense is not always common, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the chair of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Strength in Diversity Act.

It has been 66 years since the Supreme Court unanimously struck down public school segregation in the landmark case of *Brown v. Board of Education*. In that case, the Court declared that public education where the State has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms.

The Court went on to say that, “in the field of public education, the doctrine of ‘separate but equal’ has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal.”

More than six decades later, we have failed to fulfill that promise. According to the Government Accountability Office, our public schools are more segregated today by race and class than at any time since the 1960s, and segregation is actually getting worse according to the Government Accountability Office.

□ 1330

School segregation has profound consequences for students. Today, low-income students of color are more likely to attend schools with fewer experienced teachers and resources. In fact, schools serving predominantly students of color face a \$23 billion funding gap compared to schools serving predominantly White students.

Now, we know that integration works. Black students who attend integrated schools have higher test scores and are more likely to graduate from high school, complete college, and even earn higher wages throughout their lives.

Communities across the country have recognized the importance of school diversity for student success and have developed integrative strategies to promote diversity in education.

In 2016, dozens of school districts applied for funding under the Opening Doors, Expanding Opportunities grant program, which was designed to help schools to pursue voluntary, community-driven school integration strategies. Regrettably, one of Secretary Betsy DeVos’ first actions in office was to terminate that program before any money was disbursed.

The Strength in Diversity Act corrects this action by providing Federal support to help school districts develop, implement, or expand efforts to integrate their local schools.

The legislation will also shield these resources from the whims of changing administrations and allow communities to compile best practices for tackling segregation.

This expertise is critical because of a series of Supreme Court rulings that have been hostile to integration. Most

recently, in the *Parents Involved* case, the Court struck down two voluntary integration plans, one in Louisville, Kentucky, and the other in Seattle, Washington. The Court held that using race in desegregation plans is constitutional, but only if the plan is narrowly tailored to address the compelling interest of integrating the public schools. Unfortunately, they ruled in those cases that the plans were not narrowly tailored.

The Strength in Diversity Act will provide resources so that the localities will be able to design plans that will be not only effective, but also be able to withstand constitutional challenge.

Addressing America’s legacy of racial discrimination is often uncomfortable and complicated. However, we must confront, not ignore, inequities in education if we are to reckon with this legacy and overcome a global pandemic that threatens to worsen the achievement gaps.

Our former colleague, Congressman John Lewis, once stated: “When you see something that is not right, not fair, not just, you have to speak up. You have to say something. You have to do something.”

Let’s follow his guidance and vote for the first time in more than three decades to provide new resources that will help integrate our public schools and fulfill the promise of equity in education.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support the Strength in Diversity Act. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) for her distinguished leadership in this legislation.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), my good friend.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, first, let me just thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) for yielding and for her tremendous leadership on behalf of our children, but also for demonstrating what strength in diversity means throughout her life’s work. I thank her for bringing this Strength in Diversity bill to the floor, H.R. 2639.

Let me just say a couple of things. First of all, this bill takes action where Secretary DeVos and the administration have failed to act to make sure that all of our children, no matter what color they are, get the same opportunities to get an education and pursue their dreams. We have had this discussion over and over and over again in the Appropriations Committee with the Secretary.

Sixty years ago, Ruby Bridges was the first African-American student to attend an integrated school in the South. Yes, as has been said by our chair and also the gentlewoman authoring this bill, this is 66 years after *Brown v. Board of Education*.

We still have segregation in our school districts, and it is leading to

measurably unjust outcomes for Black and Brown students, robbing them of their future.

Now, when I started school, mind you, schools were segregated. My family in El Paso, Texas, fought to desegregate schools, especially my beloved mother, Mildred Parish Massey, who was one of the first students to integrate the University of Texas at El Paso.

In addition to the GAO report, a 2019 report out of Stanford University also reviewed hundreds of millions of test scores from students across the Nation. Their findings show that racial segregation leaves Black and Brown students concentrated in high-poverty schools, leading to a huge opportunity deficit even for high-performing students.

In fact, they found large achievement gaps in every single school district with just moderately high segregation. This fact remains. This data is the same. Also, these schools have fewer resources, and the students experience more disciplinary actions than in more diverse schools.

The Strength in Diversity Act would help reverse this segregation by promoting diversity, increasing student achievement and readiness, and investing in our children.

The bill would authorize Federal funding to provide grants to support new and existing local efforts to increase racial and socioeconomic diversity in our schools.

It would further document segregation in our public schools, implement programs to recruit and hire diverse teachers, and work to ensure our students have equitable access to resources.

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman FUDGE for yielding the additional time.

Let me conclude by saying, in doing this, Congresswoman FUDGE and Chairman SCOTT have documented this, that by having equitable access to resources, we actually found that racial prejudice is reduced by making sure that our children are in diverse schools and classrooms.

All of our students should receive the best education regardless of their race and ethnicity. That is what this bill is about.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman FUDGE, the gentlewoman from Ohio, for putting forth this bill, because she more than most knows the importance of diversity.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, Ms. FUDGE,

for allowing me the time. I acknowledge Mr. SCOTT for the outstanding work that he has done on this legislation, among many other pieces of legislation.

I have an amendment that speaks for itself. This amendment deals with the entry exams that fail the diversity test at many elite schools—elite schools, by the way, that are funded with tax dollars that come from poor communities, elite schools that can accept tax dollars but cannot accept the students who are from communities that are affording the schools the tax dollars.

The amendment reads: If applicable—meaning if you haven't done it already—develop an implementation plan to replace entrance exams or other competitive application procedures with methods of student assignments to promote racial and socioeconomic diversity.

This amendment does deal with minorities, but it also deals with other persons who happen to be disadvantaged. Mr. Speaker, that is another way of saying poor White people. They, too, suffer from disadvantages associated with the elite tests that can fail even some of the best that come from schools that have little resources.

I believe that if this amendment is passed, this amendment is going to encourage schools to do what John Lewis would call the right thing, the just thing, the fair thing.

Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment and beg that my colleagues would support it as well.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman FOXX for yielding. I appreciate the opportunity to address this issue today.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 2639, and I oppose it because I believe every child should have access to a good education. I have long advocated for the need to expand choice to each student so that they have the opportunity to live out the American Dream regardless of their ZIP Code or family resources. In fact, we talked about this very thing on the steps of the Capitol this morning.

H.R. 2639 is a partisan proposal that would impose a top-down, Big Government solution—that is the problem—allowing the Federal Government to decide how best to address the issues of racial and socioeconomic isolation in America's schools.

Unfortunately, this debate is not about equality for all children. If it were, we would have ensured no State had the ability to trap students in low-performing schools.

Rather than bring a bill to the House floor that would expand the availability of charter schools or offer families educational freedom, Democrats have decided the teachers unions are more important to them than real families who are desperate for access to a better education for their children.

Additionally, this partisan proposal would create another Federal program while ignoring existing priorities.

During committee markup, I offered a substitute amendment to the bill that would have expanded the Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants, or SSAEG, in the Every Student Succeeds Act to allow school districts to use funds to reduce or eliminate racial or socioeconomic isolation in schools.

The SSAEG were authorized on a bipartisan basis to give school districts flexible funding to address local needs and receive \$1.21 billion in fiscal year 2020 appropriated funds.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, committee Democrats rejected my amendment and chose to push forward a partisan bill that would only result in another broken promise from the Federal Government.

Instead of working in a bipartisan, bicameral fashion to implement a commonsense solution, Democrats are once again choosing partisan political messaging over sound policy.

It has been a tough year, especially on families who have had to adapt to learning in the age of coronavirus. So, let's have a real conversation on how we can best serve our students and families by working to expand choice.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this partisan bill before it is too late.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I have no idea what bill my colleagues are reading. There is nothing in this bill about teachers unions or anything else that they are talking about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), my colleague, who is also a member of the Education and Labor Committee.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) for yielding and for her incredible leadership on this issue.

It has been 66 years since the Brown v. Board of Education decision when this country took a step toward making amends for its legacy of oppression and discrimination against African Americans. But policymakers haven't always done the work necessary to make the promises of Brown a reality.

After years of gains, the last three decades have been marked by increased racial isolation for Black and Brown students.

Since 1988, the percentage of schools where less than 10 percent of the student body is White has increased from 6 to 18 percent. More than half of our Nation's schoolchildren are in districts where over 75 percent of students look just like them.

So, I am happy that today, after 30 years of backsliding, the House will take a vote to live up to the legacy of Brown.

The Strength in Diversity Act is as good as its name. It will restore the government's commitment to school desegregation and to ensuring that every child receives equal opportunity because as Brown told us, separate is inherently unequal.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to help this Nation live up to those ideals by voting in support of the Strength in Diversity Act. I thank my colleague from Ohio for bringing this bill forward.

□ 1345

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2639, the Strength in Diversity Act. I thank this bill's sponsor, Congresswoman FUDGE, and Chairman SCOTT for shepherding this bill through the Education and Labor Committee.

Nearly 20 years after Brown v. Board of Education, lesser-known Supreme Court cases like Milliken v. Bradley determined that segregation was allowed, if not considered an explicit policy, of each school district.

This meant schools and communities were not held responsible for desegregation. Busing policies meant to integrate city and suburban schools were abandoned and the inequality created by racist redlining and exclusionary housing policies continued, keeping Black Americans out of the suburbs and trapped in underfunded schools to this day. Today, the school system at the center of Milliken v. Bradley, Detroit's, is more segregated than it was in 1974.

This bill will provide grants to improve racial and socioeconomic diversity in public schools, an essential step toward fulfilling the promise of Brown v. Board, ending the segregation that continues to plague school districts across this country, including in my own district, Michigan's Ninth.

Thurgood Marshall, the Supreme Court's first Black Justice, warned in his dissent in Milliken v. Bradley, "unless our children begin to learn together, there is little hope that our people will ever learn to live together and understand each other."

As we reckon with our Nation's past and work to dismantle racist institutions that have stood for far too long, let us not forget our children.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, Democrats' approach in H.R. 2639 is wrong for our Nation's schools and students if we hope to achieve greater equality for children nationwide. Not only does this bill push another Democrat-led, top-down, Big Government mandate, but it has

also been crafted to mirror a failed Obama administration program.

At the Rules Committee yesterday, and also referenced today, Chairman SCOTT touted the fact that 30 school districts applied under the Opening Doors, Expanding Opportunities program created during the Obama administration. For the sake of debate, let's say that half of those school districts had been awarded funding. That is only 15 school districts nationwide that would have received Federal funding under President Obama's program that this bill is modeled after.

In contrast to this failed approach, Representative ALLEN will offer an amendment that would allow school districts to use funds from an existing Federal grant program to accomplish the same goals as the Democrats' bill.

About 12,000 school districts receive ESEA block grant funding every year. By supporting Representative ALLEN's amendment, we can ensure that nearly every school district in the country has the flexibility to tackle this problem using taxpayer funds at the Federal level. This is how legislating for solutions, rather than legislating for headlines, can work.

A high-quality education is an indispensable tool, and America's children deserve nothing less than an education that empowers them to reach their greatest potential. This bill doesn't move us in that direction.

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA).

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2639 and congratulate my fellow Clevelanders, Representative FUDGE, and Chairman SCOTT for their leadership, and all the members of the committee on Education and Labor who have worked tirelessly to get us here today.

We know that modern school segregation is largely related to housing and income segregation, with the worst cases concentrated in urban and suburban areas.

Research shows that schools with a large proportion of middle-class White students tend to have access to more resources. They benefit from challenging, college-level courses, teachers and guidance counselors who can help plan for college, and from wide-ranging extracurricular activities in sports, the arts, and music, all of which greatly contribute to a student's academic achievement.

The impact, however, goes well beyond academic opportunities. Children who aren't regularly exposed to people from other backgrounds are less likely to see racial and economic disparities as a problem.

Diversity, almost everyone agrees, is good; inclusion is good; exposure to different cultures and ideas is good.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent Miami, a city that values diversity and multiculturalism as the backbone of our society.

Miami is the second largest minority-majority school district in the Nation, where more than 92 percent of the students are Black or Hispanic, students whose families often escaped political persecution and extreme poverty. Yet the typical Black or Hispanic student attends an underresourced school where more than 60 percent of other students come from low-income families.

Similarly, schools with large Black enrollment don't excel in State ratings, and Black students are woefully underrepresented in the district's stellar magnet program.

The grants in H.R. 2639 would fund efforts to explore different approaches to integration, recruit or train staff to better serve minority students, and engage local communities on specialized academic programs.

If we as policymakers say we have an interest in increasing the academic success rate for Black and Hispanic youth, then we support H.R. 2639.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2639, the Strength in Diversity Act.

I thank Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE and Chairman BOBBY SCOTT for their leadership and for affording me the opportunity to speak today, and I am proud to support this important step toward addressing the legacy of segregation in America's schools.

"Segregation distorts the soul," Martin Luther King, Jr. wrote in 1936 from a Birmingham jail. Yet 66 years after the Supreme Court unanimously held in *Brown v. Board of Education* that racial segregation of children in public schools is unconstitutional, segregation remains a reality for many of America's children. It is a persistent stain on the soul of our country.

The Strength in Diversity Act incentivizes inclusive educational environments and promotes racial and socioeconomic diversity in schools as instrumental to the education and development of every single child. This act encourages school districts to study the effects of segregation, evaluate their current policies, and implement evidence-based solutions to deepen diversity in their schools through inclusive policies.

We all wish that racism was a thing of the past. It is not. We must actively confront our Nation's sins, past and present. We must confront the fear and the hatred embedded in our institutions, embracing, once and for all, the strength of our diversity.

America can do better for our children, and we must. And it is important to remember, discrimination robs the victim of the ability to become all that they can, of their full potential. But it also robs the entire community of what that person could contribute and do,

free of the pernicious discrimination that is at the heart of this legislation.

So I urge all of my colleagues to vote in support of H.R. 2639.

I thank Congresswoman FUDGE and Chairman SCOTT for their extraordinary leadership.

I am really proud that this bill is on the floor today, and I hope my Republican colleagues will embrace their responsibility to help end racism in this country and in our schools and be sure that every child in America has the same opportunity to realize their full potential.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY), my good friend.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE, for bringing this bill to this Chamber.

I stand here as the chair of the Subcommittee on Diversity and Inclusion. I have probably spent more hours and time looking into the difference diversity makes, whether it is a small business, whether it is an educational system, whether it is a child.

I remind us to history. In 1960, a little Black girl by the name of Ruby Bridges was denied the right to enter a school—against the Supreme Court of this land—by a Governor.

I stand here on this floor and hear indictments about President Obama. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, anything that his educational Secretaries did was better than what we have now with Secretary Betsy DeVos.

Let me just say that it is so important when we think about diversity and inclusion and we think about those little children, Black children, marginalized White children.

When I look at the votes for what my colleagues on the other side have said about us—and they don't vote for budgets; they don't vote for funding that can save lives—their arguments are weak. Their arguments are unfounded.

This bill is about equal opportunity. This bill is about removing systemic racism.

We already know that racism is a national crisis. So when I think of housing, when I think about feeding a child, what kind of Member of Congress would stand here against Congresswoman FUDGE, Congressman BOBBY SCOTT, who is the chair of this committee and has done more in his lifetime on education than anyone who has been to this microphone on the other side?

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we all want to create the maximum amount of opportunity for our children, regardless of their background. That is why it is unfortunate

that this legislation fails to fix the most tragic inequity in our education system: the absence of choice.

The right to a high-quality education is fundamental to the promise of America, and no child should be denied that right because of income or background. Thankfully, President Trump and Republicans in Congress are working to provide that opportunity to all families.

I am proud to have introduced the CHOICE Act, which creates opportunity grants that families can use for private school tuition, microschools, learning pods, and homeschooling costs.

My bill ensures that all families—not just those with the means or those lucky enough to live in a wealthy school district—have access to the best possible education for their child. Giving families this choice is the only way to furnish equal access to the American Dream. Republicans are ready to take this step. If Democrats join us, we can make it a reality.

□ 1400

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio has 6¼ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 17½ minutes remaining.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MFUME).

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, this legislation, this bill, this movement, and this purpose that we are debating today really found its genesis long ago with a Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas*, when, on May 17, 1954, nine men robed in black assembled not far from here to announce on the steps their unanimous decision to end segregation in public education. On that day, among the Nation's Black citizens, there was, indeed, a celebration, and it was a celebration, indeed, by many of its Whites.

Many of us thought that this decision was the launching of the threshold of a new era in life when education all across this Nation would be treated the way it should be for all of its citizens. Many people felt in the bowels of their being and in their very existence that this Nation again at long last would find a way to launch itself into a new era.

So this is the manifestation of that new era. This legislation extends the guarantees, the protections, and the expectations of that decision; and it is the expectations that we are talking about today: to be able to provide the kind of education and the kind of treatment of education that would extend to all people, to increase diversity, and to do away with those things that have held us back for so many, many years.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the sponsor of this bill. I urge my colleagues to

understand her intent and the expectations that it brings with it so that we might do the right thing and pass it. I urge an "aye" vote, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans and Democrats agree that discrimination and State-sanctioned segregation are repugnant, illegal, and blatantly immoral. Action must be taken to achieve greater equality for our Nation's students and in our schools.

We continue to strive toward a future where all students, regardless of race or color, have the chance to succeed. Education and hard work are the paths out of poverty for millions, and education provides students with the tools and skills they need to build a successful life.

It is disappointing that a bipartisan path forward to address these issues was possible but not attained because of political posturing from Democrats. Apparently, political wins are more important than building upon bipartisan, bicameral legislative solutions that will help our Nation's children prosper.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on H.R. 2639 so that we can have the opportunity to work on a bipartisan solution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we started this out with the ranking member saying we just wanted headlines. I absolutely want headlines to bring to the attention of this country the poverty in our schools. I want headlines about the crumbling schools my children go to school in. I do want headlines about the disinvestment in public education that my colleagues continue to do.

I want the headlines. So I admit it.

We also talked this afternoon about how equality cannot mean uniformity, but it can also not mean doing nothing but giving lip service to a problem, which is what my colleagues do. They talk and do nothing. Not one solution comes from the other side of the aisle—not one. I didn't hear one today.

Then we talk about this amendment that is coming to use another fund to help us do some of these things. They don't tell you, Mr. Speaker, that that fund is a fund that is used for mental health for children. So they want us to choose between integrating schools and the mental health of our children.

I think if that is the best they have got then I am so very, very disappointed, Mr. Speaker, because at some point we have to reckon with what is going on in this country today and deal with the racial segregation of my children—and they are all my children.

Mr. Speaker, if we fail to begin to address this issue—and this is only a beginning—then we can no longer say we agree that every child should have access to a quality education, that every

child should go to a school that has the kind of equipment that they should have, that every child has internet and broadband access, and that every child has an opportunity to succeed. If we don't do this, we don't mean it.

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2639, the Strength in Diversity Act. This landmark legislation would allow our students to learn in an environment that is representative of America, rather than being in a bubble with other students who look like them or share the same backgrounds and experiences.

66 years ago, the Supreme Court opened the door to school integration with their ruling in *Brown vs. Board of Education*. Soon after, schools in my home state of Texas and other states across the south started the process of integrating Black and White students so that one day there would be a level playing field for students in the classroom.

However, since that period, we have slowly seen a creeping effect where students have been divided into bubbles based strictly on the neighborhoods where they live. Opposition to busing, white flight to the suburbs, and lingering systematic racism have all contributed to the alarming situation we find ourselves in today as a country.

A GAO report published in 2016 found that 61 percent of all high-poverty schools served majority Black and Hispanic students. This separation by racial and socioeconomic lines prevents students in our poorest neighborhoods from getting the same educational outcomes as those in wealthier ones. Studies have shown that more diverse schools lead to better grades and test results, higher rates of college attendance, and lower dropout rates for students.

This bill helps to stem the tide and reverse the wrongs of the past few decades by authorizing federal funding to provide grants to school districts across the country to promote racial and socioeconomic diversity. Specifically, this additional funding could be used by school districts to study the impact of segregation in their schools, create innovative programs like magnet schools to attract students from outside the local community, and to train, hire, and retain high quality teachers to support these diversified schools.

Mr. Speaker, North Texas is blessed to have such a diversified community; however, I have seen how some neighborhoods in my district have had better educational outcomes for students than others. It's time that we level the playing field and give every student an opportunity at success. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2639, the "Strength in Diversity Act." H.R. 2639, directs the Department of Education (ED) to award grants to specified educational agencies, that may include local educational agencies, to develop or implement plans to improve diversity and reduce or eliminate racial or socioeconomic isolation in publicly funded early childhood education programs, public elementary schools, or public secondary schools. Specifically, ED may award planning and implementation grants to specified educational agencies.

A recipient of a planning grant must use the grant to support students through certain activities, such as developing options to improve

diversity in schools that might include weighted lotteries or school boundary redesign. In addition, a recipient of an implementation grant must implement a high-quality plan to support students. This plan must, among other things, include a comprehensive set of strategies that are designed to improve academic outcomes for all students, particularly students of color and low-income students. A grant recipient may also use the grant for certain activities such as recruiting additional teachers and staff, investing in specialized academic programs, and developing innovative and equitable school assignment plans.

This legislation will also allow ED to carry out national activities under the grant program, such as developing best practices for grant recipients and other experts in school diversity. The bill also requires ED to establish performance measures for the program and its related activities.

H.R. 2639 is needed because for far too often, for reasons of legacy or policy, students of color or in low-income communities are shut out of the opportunity to get a good education. Just as intolerance and discrimination are learned behaviors, so are tolerance and inclusion learned behaviors. As years of research have shown us, school integration benefits students and communities. Research shows that racial and socioeconomic diversity in the classroom can provide students with a range of cognitive and social benefits. And school policies around the country are beginning to catch up.

Today, over 4 million students in America are enrolled in school districts or charter schools with socioeconomic integration policies—a number that has more than doubled since 2007. Students in integrated schools have higher average test scores. On the 2011 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) given to fourth graders in math, for example, low-income students attending more affluent schools scored roughly two years of learning ahead of low-income students in high-poverty schools.

Students in integrated schools are more likely to enroll in college, when comparing students with similar socioeconomic backgrounds, those students at more affluent schools are 68 percent more likely to enroll at a four-year college than their peers at high-poverty schools. Students in integrated schools are less likely to dropout, with dropout rates that are significantly higher for students in segregated, high-poverty schools than for students in integrated schools. Education policy is contributing to systemic racism that exists in how education is provided in the United States, which resists efforts to remove barriers that would allow all children to succeed.

It has been well documented that integrated schools help to reduce racial achievement gaps. In fact, the racial achievement gap in K through 12 education closed more rapidly during the peak years of school desegregation in the 1970s and 1980s than it has overall in the decades that followed—when many desegregation policies were dismantled through federal court decisions allowing discriminatory segregated education to continue. Benefits are not limited to minority students, but also extend to white students.

Integrated classrooms encourage critical thinking, problem solving, and creativity. We know that diverse classrooms, in which students learn cooperatively alongside those

whose perspectives and backgrounds are different from their own, are beneficial to all students—including middle-class white students—because these environments promote creativity, motivation, deeper learning, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills.

This bill will help in this effort by providing grants to school districts that want to increase diversity in schools. As many of you know the school-age population in the United States is becoming more racially and ethnically diverse. A National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) report released in February 2019, on “Status and Trends in the Education of Racial and Ethnic Groups 2018,” examined how education experiences and outcomes vary among racial/ethnic groups. The report contains 36 indicators that cover preprimary to postsecondary education, as well as family background characteristics and labor force outcomes.

Prior research shows that living in poverty during early childhood is associated with lower-than-average academic performance that begins in kindergarten and extends through high school, leading to lower-than-average rates of school completion. In 2016, the percentages of children living in poverty were highest for Black and American Indian/ Alaska Native children and lowest for White and Asian children.

One of the casualties of COVID-19 are the millions of children and young people who have lost out on opportunities to learn and grow in diverse school settings during the spring and fall of this year. Between 2000 and 2017, the percentage of 5- to 17-year-olds who were White decreased from 62 to 51 percent, while the percentage who were Hispanic increased from 16 to 25 percent. The challenge of diversity in education is not just limited to racial diversity in schools. Questions of socioeconomic diversity combined with those of racial diversity are important to consider in determining how far we have come in school equality. This bill builds on the work already underway by schools and school districts who are pursuing diversity to have additional resources.

In 2019, approximately 56.6 million students attended elementary and secondary school in the United States: 50.8 million students were in public schools; 5.8 million students were in private schools. Among the 50.8 million students enrolled in elementary and secondary public schools: 1.4 million were in prekindergarten; 3.7 million were in kindergarten; 35.5 million attended elementary through middle school (K–8th grade); 15.3 million attended high school (9–12th grade). Through 2028, enrollment is projected to increase to 51.4 million.

In 2018, 3.3 million students graduated from high school, marking nearly a 1 percent increase from 2017: 3.7 million were expected to graduate in 2020; 3.3 million from public high schools; 0.4 million from private schools. The average per-student expenditure in public schools is \$13,440.

In 2019, there are approximately 16,800 school districts in the United States. Thirteen percent of all public school students were served by the Individuals with Disabilities Act for the 2015–2016 school year.

Between 2000 and 2016, total public school enrollment increased for 32 states. The following saw increases of 15 percent or more: Florida, Delaware, North Carolina, Idaho,

Georgia, Colorado, Arizona, Texas, Utah, and Nevada. The following states saw decreases of 10 percent or more: Michigan, Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont. In 2018, 7 million or 13.7 percent of public school students received special education services. In 2017, 9.6 percent of public school students were learning English as a second language.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2639, Strength in Diversity Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). All time for debate has expired.

Each further amendment printed in part B of House Report 116–502 not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 1107, shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Education and Labor or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of House Report 116–502, not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. TORRES OF CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 116–502.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 2, strike “and” at the end.

Page 3, line 7, strike the period at the end and insert “; and”.

Page 3, after line 7, insert the following:

(C) the likelihood that the grant will lead to a meaningful reduction in racial and economic isolation for children in covered schools.

Page 3, after line 19, insert the following:

(C) Third, to an eligible entity that demonstrates meaningful coordination with local housing agencies to increase access to schools that have a disproportionately low number of low-income students.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1107, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, in 1954, *Brown v. Board of Education* unequivocally asserted that segregated schools are inherently unequal. When Thurgood Marshall argued this landmark case before the Supreme Court, he thought it would take just 5 years to integrate schools nationwide. Sadly, 60 years later, schools are more segregated now than any time since the early 1970s, and school segregation is occurring at alarming rates nationwide.

In order to address increased school segregation, we must address one of the root causes of the problem: residential segregation. Housing segregation leads to school segregation. That is why I am taking an initial step to address the link between housing and school segregation by offering an amendment to the Strength in Diversity Act to prioritize grant recipients that coordinate with local housing agencies to integrate schools.

My amendment will make sure that all grants have a meaningful reduction in racial and economic isolation for children in schools. Segregation in schools is propagated by housing segregation, and my amendment will work to address this underlying issue.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment and have great affection for the introducer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, this amendment does nothing to correct the flaws of the underlying bill, but it doesn't make the bill any worse either. The amendment includes language that would ensure applicants are judged on their ability to meet the fundamental purposes of the bill, which should be done with all grant applications and by anyone receiving taxpayer funding, and that makes sense.

However, the amendment doesn't change the fundamentally flawed approach this bill takes to tackle a problem we all agree that school districts should address. But nothing in the amendment itself is objectionable—in fact, it may be helpful—so I will support the amendment.

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

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, no child should receive a lesser education because of the color of their skin or the neighborhood where they live, and I am proud that my amendment will address school segregation holistically by supporting coordination between schools and housing agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this amendment and pass this legislation to fight discrimination and secure the future for

all American children, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1107, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES).

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ALLEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 116–502.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 1 and all that follows through the end of the bill and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Strength in Diversity Act of 2020”.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to support the development, implementation, and evaluation of comprehensive strategies to address the effects of racial isolation or concentrated poverty by increasing diversity, including racial diversity and socioeconomic diversity, in covered schools.

SEC. 3. ACTIVITIES TO IMPROVE DIVERSITY AND REDUCE OR ELIMINATE RACIAL OR SOCIOECONOMIC ISOLATION.

(a) **LOCAL USES OF FUNDS.**—A local educational agency, or consortium of such agencies, that receives an allocation under section 4105(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7115(a)) for a fiscal year may use such funds to develop or implement comprehensive strategies to improve diversity and reduce or eliminate racial or socioeconomic isolation in covered schools.

(b) **LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY APPLICATIONS.**—A local educational agency, or consortium of such agencies, that intends to use an allocation under section 4105(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7115(a)) for the purposes described in subsection (a) shall include in the application such local educational agency or consortium submits under section 4106 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 7116) a description of—

(1) the comprehensive strategies to be carried out under subsection (a);

(2) the robust parent, student, teacher, school leader, and community engagement that has been conducted, or will be conducted, in the planning and implementation of such comprehensive strategies, such as through—

(A) consultation with appropriate officials of Indian Tribes or Tribal organizations approved by the Tribes located in the area served by such agency or consortium;

(B) consultation with other community entities, which may include local housing or transportation authorities;

(C) public hearings or other open forums to inform the development of such comprehensive strategies; and

(D) outreach to parents and students, in a language that parents and students can understand, and consultation with students and families within such agency or consortium that is designed to ensure participation in the planning and development of such comprehensive strategies; and

(3) how such projects or activities will comply with Federal law.

(c) SPECIAL RULES.—

(1) **ASSURANCES.**—A local educational agency, or consortium of such agencies, that intends to use an allocation under section 4105(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7115(a)) for the purposes described in subsection (a) shall be required to provide only one of the assurances described in subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E) of section 4106(e)(2) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 7116(e)(2)).

(2) **TRANSPORTATION.**—Notwithstanding section 426 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1228), activities carried out to meet the purposes of subsection (a) may include transportation if such transportation—

(A) is sustainable after the allocation received under section 4105(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7115(a)) expires; and

(B) does not represent a significant portion of such allocation.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) **COVERED SCHOOL.**—The term “covered school” means—

(A) a publicly-funded early childhood education program;

(B) a public elementary school; or

(C) a public secondary school.

(2) **ESEA TERMS.**—The terms “elementary school”, “local educational agency”, “school leader”, and “secondary school” have the meanings given those terms in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(3) **PUBLICLY-FUNDED EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM.**—The term “publicly-funded early childhood education program” means an early childhood education program (as defined in section 103(8) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1003(8)) that receives State or Federal funds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1107, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have got to be frank for a minute. I find it a shame that this amendment is even necessary.

When we replaced the No Child Left Behind Act with the Every Student Succeeds Act, we created the Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants program on a bipartisan, bicameral basis. We did this to provide school districts the flexibility they need to use Federal funds as they see fit to meet local needs.

It is disappointing that my Democratic colleagues didn't invite Republicans to the table to negotiate in good faith to build on that consensus. Instead, Democrats once again ignored commonsense approaches and impose a top-down, Big Government solution that will have the Federal Government decide how best to address the issues of racial and socioeconomic isolation in American schools.

□ 1415

You know, we have heard story after story of the history of our schools and how we got to this point. The question is, will we continue with this top-down government approach or allow the

schools the flexibility to fix this problem.

My amendment, on the other hand, offers a commonsense solution that could easily garner an overwhelming majority of votes in this body if every Member chose to focus on the importance of actually addressing racial and socioeconomic isolation in schools and not on scoring political points.

This amendment would explicitly allow school districts to use funds they receive from the Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants program under the Every Student Succeeds Act to develop or implement comprehensive strategies to improve diversity and reduce or eliminate racial or socioeconomic isolation in public early childhood programs and public schools.

This is a real solution. The SSAEG block grant is currently receiving just over \$1 billion. The proposal before us today would have to fight for funding with the multitude of other Federal programs that currently exist.

This amendment also ensures that school districts are engaging with their communities to design programs that comply with Federal law and have the support of parents and other constituents. It also alters requirements to distribute funds across multiple spending categories so that districts will have sufficient funding to design effective integration programs.

The amendment uses the same language as the Magnet Schools Assistance Program under the Every School Succeeds Act to ensure that school districts choosing to use funds for improving diversity can fund transportation activities, if they see fit.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the chairman.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

While I appreciate that the gentleman from Georgia acknowledges the importance of providing resources to support school diversity, encouraging the use of IV-A funds for this purpose is not a reasonable solution.

Schools already rely on a very limited amount of IV-A funding for a wide range of activities and programs, including mental health resources, educational technology, STEM education, extracurricular activities, and other critical needs.

This amendment would effectively force schools to choose between addressing school segregation and providing mental health services. Developing, implementing, and expanding school diversity initiatives is costly and should not come at the expense of important programs already being sup-

ported by title IV. We will not improve services for students, parents, and communities by cutting the same size pie into even smaller slices.

The purpose of the Strength in Diversity Act is to provide direct and additional investments in education that helps communities integrate their schools without undermining existing school programs and services.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment and urge my colleagues to support it.

I applaud the gentleman from Georgia for offering such an alternative. As has been said, it builds on bipartisan, bicameral agreements to ensure nearly every school district in the country has Federal funds to pursue the goals of the underlying bill rather than affording this opportunity to a select few school districts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, it is a shame that we even have to offer this amendment. We have got a problem, but I can tell you, my community solved this problem, which is the reason I ran for Congress.

The faith-based community created a school for kids who are branded as losers in the public education system, and these moms don't have but one choice, and that is to send these children to this school. And it is amazing how kids who are branded as losers have become the most outstanding students in Richmond County.

We keep talking about fixing these things and, like I said earlier, we continue to offer solutions, but we continue with the same problem. There is a way to fix this. This is a start. Rather than create a new program we know will be underfunded that will benefit, at best, a small handful of school districts, my amendment would ensure that nearly every school district in this country would have Federal funds available to improve diversity and reduce or eliminate racial or socioeconomic isolation in schools.

I urge the majority to put the students and families and educators my amendment would benefit before their political interest and take "yes" for an answer.

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I just have to say that, once again, my colleagues have put forth an amendment that does nothing to stop or to help with integrating schools. Absolutely nothing. They have had time after time after time to address this issue, even as recently as 2017 when Betsy DeVos decided to eliminate the program, as well

as to start to roll back the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Education.

So it is not like this just came up. I think part of the problem is when you have never experienced this kind of racism, it is hard to deal with it, but I am giving you an opportunity now to deal with it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1107, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

The question is on the amendment.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MS. FUDGE OF OHIO

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 1107, I offer amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc consisting of amendment Nos. 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, and 12, printed in part B of House Report 116-502, offered by Ms. FUDGE of Ohio:

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

Page 10, line 11, insert "school counselors," after "administrators,".

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

Page 12, line 17, strike "and" at the end.

Page 12, line 18, strike the period at the end and insert "and"; and".

Page 12, after line 18, insert the following:

(4) a description of how the eligible entity will continue to make improvements toward increasing diversity and decreasing racial or socioeconomic isolation in covered schools and sustaining inclusion.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. COOPER OF TENNESSEE

Page 3, line 11, strike "(A) First" and insert "(B) Second".

Page 3, after line 10, insert the following:

(A) First, to an eligible entity that submitted an application for a grant under the Opening Doors, Expanding Opportunities program described in the notice published by the Department of Education in the Federal Register on December 14, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 90343 et seq.).

Page 3, line 15, strike "(B) Second" and insert "(C) Third".

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. ESCOBAR OF TEXAS

Page 4, line 19, after "diversity" insert "for students".

Page 7, line 9, strike "and" at the end.

Page 7, line 20, strike the period at the end and insert "and"; and".

Page 7, after line 20, insert the following:

(11) in the case of an application by a consortium of local educational agencies, a specification of which agency is the lead applicant, and how the grant funds will be divided among the school districts served by such consortium.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. GREEN OF TEXAS

Page 9, after line 7, insert the following:

(8) If applicable, developing an implementation plan to replace entrance exams or other competitive application procedures with methods of student assignment to promote racial and socioeconomic diversity.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. MOULTON OF MASSACHUSETTS

Page 12, line 3, strike “(E)” and insert “(F)”.

Page 12, after line 2, insert the following:

(E) improving access to mental health and social-emotional learning;

Page 12, line 4, strike “(F)” and insert “(G)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MS. MUCARSEL-POWELL OF FLORIDA

Page 8, line 6, strike “and” at the end.

Page 8, line 10, strike the period at the end and insert “; and”.

Page 8, after line 10, insert the following:

(C) teacher diversity in covered schools, and plans for expanding teacher diversity.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. TLAIB OF MICHIGAN

Page 12, line 17, strike “and”.

Page 12, line 18, strike the period at the end and insert “; and”.

Page 12, after line 18, insert the following:

(4) information on the progress of regional programs on reducing racial and socioeconomic isolation in covered schools, if applicable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1107, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I first want to recognize not just the hard work of my colleague from Ohio, Representative MARCIA FUDGE, but really a lifelong commitment to improving the quality of education for all of our children across this country, regardless of your background and experience, regardless of your ZIP Code, and that is what the Strength in Diversity Act does.

I thank Representative FUDGE for her leadership and for giving me an opportunity to present a portion of this en bloc amendment, the two amendments that I sponsored and that are part of the en bloc.

Mr. Speaker, I rise, of course, in support of the Strength in Diversity Act and my amendments to this legislation, which will ensure that our reforms continue to have an impact well into the future. We still have work to do to address persistent racial and socioeconomic disparities that exist in our schools.

According to the 2016 GAO report, 61 percent of all high-poverty schools were serving majority Black and Hispanic student populations. The COVID-19 pandemic has further exasperated the racial and socioeconomic isolation throughout our country and our school systems.

Without proper support, the learning loss will be greatest among low-income Black and Hispanic students during the period of remote learning. The Strength in Diversity Act will help create a level playing field by authorizing grants to localities that have significant achievement gaps and segregation in their schools.

These grants will allow school districts to recruit, hire, and train additional teachers, administrators, and other instructional and support staff, knowing that our educators are essential to creating the world-class education that our children deserve.

My first amendment would allow education systems to use grant funds to also recruit, hire, and train school counselors. School counselors serve a vital role in maximizing students' success, working with students individually and collectively to create an exclusive school climate.

Numerous studies have shown the value of school counseling for students in academic and social-emotional development, as well as college and career readiness. Having the additional support of a school counselor helps develop well-rounded and prepared students.

But hiring our best talent cannot be the end of our efforts. We need accountability now and into the future.

The underlying bill requires grantees to submit an annual report to the Department of Education on their efforts to increase diversity and meet certain performance measures.

My second amendment requires the annual report to include a description of how grantees will continue this important work following the grant period to ensure schools are thinking ahead to the future and creating sustainable strategies and programs to continue fostering diversity, inclusion, and achievement.

We cannot task our schools to only address diversity and inclusion for the duration of a grant. Longstanding issues require long-term, community-driven solutions. School systems must readjust their frameworks so that increasing diversity and inclusion is always part of the conversation and curriculum.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support the en bloc amendment and the underlying bill.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the majority of the amendments are unobjectionable, though none of them address the underlying problems with the bill.

However, I highlight two problematic amendments:

The amendment offered by Representative COOPER would give school districts priority in this program if those districts had previously submitted an application under an Obama-era predecessor to the program in the underlying bill. This amendment is flawed for two reasons:

An application filed 4 years ago, may or may not still be adequate. Auto-

matically giving those districts priority would disadvantage school districts who might have new and better ideas to propose.

Submitting an application 4 years ago is not the same as being funded 4 years ago. Applicants that never demonstrated their merit then should start on equal footing with new applicants now.

Another amendment concealed within the en bloc is offered by Representative GREEN of Texas, which forces grantees' hands on a dilemma many are still considering for themselves. The amendment requires that participating school districts that utilize entrance exams and competitive application procedures must replace these processes with other methods.

Republicans recognize that many school districts, as well as colleges and universities, are wrestling with the role entrance exams and other competitive application procedures have played in the admissions decisions and should play in the future. Democrats would, apparently, like to short-circuit that debate and make those determinations for school districts themselves.

Ironically, entrance exams began as an earnest effort to combat discrimination and prejudice by creating objective criteria that weren't as easily manipulated by admissions personnel who were biased against certain populations. Objective enrollment criteria can decrease the potential for schools—especially highly competitive schools—to be able to justify discrimination against students based on their backgrounds or racial identities.

Today, there are legitimate arguments to be made on both sides of the debate for keeping or eliminating this practice. But this amendment would proclaim that the House of Representatives has decided against the use of entrance exams, a conversation this body has never had.

These two amendments—one undermining the quality of the application process, and the other unfairly deciding an outcome of an ongoing debate—cause me great concern and I oppose them.

Ultimately, though, on balance, this en bloc consideration is worthy of support, even if it doesn't ultimately redeem the underlying bill.

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

□ 1430

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her terrific leadership in the Strength in Diversity Act.

I am afraid the gentlewoman from North Carolina completely misunderstood my amendment. My amendment would allow the 30 school districts that were prevented from applying for the Opening Doors, Expanding Opportunities grant—it would just give them the

first shot at reapplying. It does not guarantee acceptance for these 30 school districts but, rather, gives them a first shot at correcting the racial injustices in their districts.

It is very sad that Secretary DeVos' first action in office was to cut this critical program, so this offers an opportunity to right that wrong.

I want to commend, again, the gentlewoman from Ohio for her terrific leadership on this bill. I would like to thank Chairman SCOTT, BOBBY SCOTT, the head of the whole committee. I would also like to thank BARBARA LEE for her critical support of this amendment.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL).

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my amendment to the Strength in Diversity Act, and I am very grateful to Representative FUDGE for allowing me to introduce this amendment, a critical piece of legislation to begin reversing decades of resegregation in our schools.

In Florida, nearly 63 percent of students are from minority communities, compared to only 30 percent of teachers. This disparity is exacerbating racial and socioeconomic achievement gaps.

A teacher in my district, Sharon Rivers, emphasized the importance of diversity in the classroom, saying: "Culture diversity in the classroom is essential in helping us recognize, respect, and welcome the many differences across the district. It is imperative that we allow our understanding of our differences to build a bridge of respect for one another."

I couldn't agree more, and my amendment would build upon that effort by increasing the diversity of our teaching workforce. Teachers of color can provide more culturally relevant education and better understand the situations their students of color are facing, helping develop stronger student-teacher relationships.

Our teachers should reflect our communities and our schools. Recent studies show that increased teacher diversity results in better achievement scores, lower levels of disciplinary action, and reduced dropout rates. In fact, a Florida study showed that Black students had higher reading and math scores when taught by Black teachers.

Unfortunately, in most States, as the proportion of students of color grows, the number of minority teachers is not keeping pace. We must do more to ensure that all students, regardless of their race or background, are set up for success.

I urge everyone to vote to pass my amendment.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my amendment to the Strength in Diversity Act, which re-

quires grantees to report on their progress in reducing racial and socioeconomic segregation in our schools.

In the year 2020, our schools are still separate and unequal. My home district has some of the most racially segregated schools in the country, and this is no coincidence. This was by design.

Forty-five years ago, rich White suburbs around my district decided they didn't want to bus their children to desegregate schools, and the highest court in our land agreed with them. The Supreme Court case of *Milliken v. Bradley* made racial integration of schools nearly impossible, and we are still seeing the negative impact of that decision today.

We see it in our Detroit Public Schools, where students had to sue the State of Michigan for the right to literacy. We see it in the lead that poisons our school drinking fountains throughout my district. We see it in having just \$7,000 per pupil while the neighboring the Grosse Pointe community, a largely White, affluent suburb, has nearly \$14,000 per pupil.

I want to thank Representative FUDGE for her tireless efforts in leading this legislation, which is a critically important step toward racial desegregation of our schools.

I also want to thank Chairman SCOTT and his incredible staff for working with me on this amendment and for their leadership.

I urge strong support for this amendment and for this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1107, the previous question is ordered on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE).

The question is on the amendments en bloc.

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. DEAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 116-502.

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, line 10, insert "AND STATE" after "national".

Page 1, line 11, strike "The Secretary" and insert the following:

(a) NATIONAL ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary

Page 2, after line 3, insert the following:

(b) STATE ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary may reserve not more than 10 percent of the amounts made available under section 10 for a fiscal year for planning grants and implementation grants made to State educational agencies under section 4.

Page 7, line 9, strike "and" at the end.

Page 7, line 20, strike the period at the end and insert ";; and".

Page 7, after line 20, insert the following:

(11) in the case of an application by a State education agency, a demonstration that the agency has procedures in place—

(A) to assess and prevent the redrawing of school district lines in a manner that increases racial or socioeconomic isolation;

(B) to assess the segregation impacts of new school construction proposals and to prioritize school construction funding that will foreseeably increase racial and economic integration; and

(C) to include progress toward reduction of racial and economic isolation as a factor in its State plan under section 1111 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311).

Page 13, line 14, insert "a State educational agency," after "means".

Page 13, beginning on line 23, strike "and 'Secretary'" and insert "'Secretary', and 'State educational agency'".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1107, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my amendment No. 6 to H.R. 2639, the Strength in Diversity Act. This amendment would allow State education agencies to apply for the grants provided under this bill and would require these agencies to have procedures in place to assess and to prevent the redrawing of school district lines in a manner that increases racial or socioeconomic isolation.

Specifically, agencies applying for grants will have to demonstrate procedures to, number one, assess and prevent redrawing of school district lines that increase isolation; number two, assess segregation impacts of new school construction proposals and prioritize construction funding that will increase integration; and, number three, identify progress toward reduction of racial and economic isolation in their State plans.

Mr. Speaker, diversity is our strength, and ensuring equity in our education systems will benefit all students and school districts across this Nation.

I am a parent, a grandparent, and a former teacher. I know that access to a good education is the key to determining one's future, and each child deserves equal opportunity to that promise. Yet, we are reminded every day that we have a racial and economic divide in this country that leaves too many children behind.

This amendment is about good government and about equitable education, giving all children the opportunities they deserve while also ensuring the prevention of school secessions, which usually create wealthy White enclaves separated from more diverse communities.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, while I support the goals of this amendment, I must reluctantly urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Hidden within this amendment is potentially a sweeping change to how States evaluate their schools under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The amendment requires States to include progress on reducing racial and economic isolation in evaluating schools as a factor under State's title I State plans.

I say this is a potentially sweeping change because the language is unclear. However, I read it as intending to require States to consider racial and economic isolation as a factor in the State-driven accountability systems required under title I.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if such a change to how States evaluate schools is a good or bad idea. But I am sure that such a significant change should be debated as part of a proper reevaluation of title I, not in the context of a standalone competitive grant program.

If this is not the gentlewoman's intent with this amendment, then this just highlights the flaws in legislating without bipartisan discussions. Perhaps there are steps we could agree States should take in the context of title I to reduce racial and economic isolation, but let's debate those changes in the proper context.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, I am a little puzzled by those remarks. After all, the Allen amendment sought some rather drastic changes to ESEA, but that didn't seem to generate that same comment.

We all know that equal educational opportunities enrich us all, and they are the right of all and lead to better financial outcomes later in life.

Though we need to collectively do better across this Nation in increasing diversity in our educational systems, my home State of Pennsylvania, in particular, demonstrates the need for greater action.

According to a 2015 report by the UCLA Civil Rights Project, the amount of majority-minority and intensely segregated schools statewide more than doubled, 21 percent and 11 percent, respectively, over two decades.

In fact, 17 percent of Philadelphia schools have a student body that is 99 percent to 100 percent minority students. Also, in the Philadelphia metro area, a typical Black and Latino student attended a school with, respectively, 71 percent or 68 percent low-income students, while a typical White student attended a school with only 21 percent low-income students.

This is a problem. These inequities isolate and segregate students, which in turn separate our communities, limit student growth, and hurt the educational resources in highly segregated schools.

Our schools are meant to serve all students equally, no matter their race,

ethnicity, or socioeconomic status. Without adequate educational resources, students do not have the necessary tools to perform to the best of their abilities and to further their education. This not only hurts students who are racially or socioeconomically isolated; it hurts us all because America works best when we all succeed.

Despite Pennsylvania's need for further action to combat these problems, there is promise and hope in the fact that my State has shown real change can happen. From the early sixties to the late nineties, there were intentional desegregation efforts that resulted in evidence-based decreases in segregation. New, competitive grants to State agencies would direct resources to States looking to advance and support these efforts moving forward.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close by saying that I thank Chairman SCOTT and Representative FUDGE for their leadership.

I urge Members to support this amendment.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat something I said earlier. Republicans and Democrats agree that discrimination and State-sanctioned segregation are repugnant, illegal, and blatantly immoral. Action should be taken to achieve greater equality for our Nation's students and in our schools.

We believe we should strive toward a future where all students, regardless of race or color, have the chance to succeed. Education and hard work are the paths out of poverty for millions, and education provides students with the tools and skills they need to build a successful life.

My colleague mentioned that she didn't see the difference between her amendment and Representative ALLEN's amendment. Well, Representative ALLEN's amendment provides a way for all schools to achieve worthy goals through grant programs. This goes to the fundamental way schools are evaluated and would be a major change in policy.

I, again, urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment. We should be debating this issue when we are debating the issues related to title I.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1107, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN).

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1445

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. MOULTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part B of House Report 116-502.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 11, after line 7, insert the following:

(F) Creating or improving systems and partnerships to create a one-stop enrollment process for students with multiple public school options, including making school information and data more accessible and easy to understand, in order to ensure access to low poverty or high-performing schools for low-income children and to promote racial and socioeconomic diversity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1107, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, school segregation is inseparable from housing and the persistence of segregated communities, communities segregated by race largely due to decades of purposeful law and policy that supported White homeownership while denying people of color the same subsidies, things like the ways that Black World War II veterans were denied the use of GI Bill-guaranteed mortgages in suburban neighborhoods; purposeful policies and restrictive covenants allowing open and rampant discrimination in lending and homeownership; and policies like redlining that robbed Black and Brown Americans of access to public resources to grow wealth and opportunity—all of these things embodied, I think most clearly, by the underfunding of neighborhood schools serving communities of color that were on the wrong side of the red line. These purposeful policies, housing policies, created tremendous inequities in education.

Now, some of my colleagues across the aisle claim that the underlying bill ignores the opportunity, the issue, of school choice. Well, my amendment brings these two things together. This amendment makes it clear that, where school choice supports diversity, it should be encouraged. And, indeed, there are great examples of this across the country.

Public school choice is the most effective means of achieving racial and socioeconomic integration in K-12 education in diverse schools across the country today, supporting parents to enroll their children beyond their neighborhood schools.

Public school choice did not exist in 1954. It did not exist in 1968. It did not exist at scale in the 1990s, but it does today. The problem is just that, all too often, school choice policies ignore the pressing issue of segregation by housing.

When school choice is not intentional, it can serve to exacerbate inequity instead of remedying it. This has been confirmed by decades of research here in the U.S. and across the world.

Many school choice systems are overly complex, parents aren't supported, and, too often, only the wealthy and well-connected take advantage of open enrollment policies.

My amendment would support school districts in using public school choice to improve school diversity and, in turn, equity of opportunity. This commonsense amendment would ensure that districts receiving grants can use the funds to design or improve public school choice systems, while prioritizing diversity in school assignment, and make them easier for parents to navigate. These all should be bipartisan priorities.

We have more public school choice now than we ever had before, yet our schools are more segregated by race and class than at any time since the 1960s. But it doesn't have to be this way.

My amendment, a relatively small change, would make a big difference because it would say that the use of public school choice policies, like open enrollment across and between districts, that match parent choice with purposeful diversity planning can be used successfully to accomplish all of these goals.

It is time we support school districts in using responsible public school choice as a tool to achieve equity of opportunity, a fundamental right in our Constitution.

When public school choice controls for diversity in school assignment, we see not only improved diversity of the student body, but also resource equity among schools, higher parent and teacher satisfaction, and increased achievement for all students.

I urge my colleagues to stand with me in supporting the use of public school choice to decrease racial and socioeconomic school segregation, and I urge a bipartisan "yes" vote on my amendment.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I mentioned in my opening remarks that the underlying bill fails, in part, because it doesn't address the biggest challenge facing low-income families and families of color, namely, the lack of access to high-quality education options that will prepare their children for lifelong success. Unfortunately, this amendment doesn't directly address that problem either, but at least it takes a small step in that direction.

As more and more communities embrace charter schools and other public school options, one-stop enrollment processes are one way some communities have made it easier for parents

to understand and navigate their options.

As charter school enrollment grew in Washington, D.C., to include nearly half of the city's students, the city implemented an open lottery system to provide parents a one-stop portal to apply to multiple schools.

The system isn't perfect, but that is mostly because the open lottery system doesn't address the fact that there are an insufficient number of seats in high-performing schools to meet demand. I wish we were here debating solutions to that problem today, Mr. Speaker.

But in the absence of a real effort to increase the availability of the high-quality education options, I will settle for an effort to facilitate easier selections of these options where they exist.

I applaud the gentleman for bucking the trend in his party of opposing educational freedom for low-income families and families of color, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for her support and for understanding that, yes, this is not perhaps the sweeping change that we would all like to see to fix these truly historic inequities in our education system, but it is an important step in the right direction.

And there are great examples across the country of school systems that have been able to use public school choice in positive ways to improve educational opportunities for all. It is simple common sense that access to these programs should be simple, it should be easy to navigate, and these programs should not effectively discriminate against certain families that do not have access to all the information or wealth or other opportunities to navigate them successfully.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my Republican colleagues for their support on this amendment, and I particularly want to thank the leaders of this committee, Chairman SCOTT and Representative FUDGE, for continuing to push to recognize the fundamental values of our country and our education system. That opportunity should be equal for all, that education should be the great equalizer because, if we can do that, we will live up to our Founders' ideals.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's comments, and, as I said, this is a very small step in the right direction. I wish that there were more people in the gentleman's party who wanted to see this. We have tremendous evidence that school choice is the tide that lifts all boats in education. It does everywhere.

It breaks my heart when I see places like New York City where people there—particularly, the mayor there, has done everything he can to snuff out

choice and to snuff out the opportunities that exist there, such as Success Academy, which not only has provided extraordinarily high-quality education to the students, but has really helped raise the level in a very minor way in the other public schools there.

We have way too many situations in this country where the teachers unions want to stop all opportunities for choice. And I will take a tiny, tiny step as a good faith movement in the direction of providing all students, particularly low-income students, with the opportunity for choice, because we know where there is choice, the quality increases.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1107, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON).

The question is on the amendment.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ALLEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on amendment No. 2, printed in part B of House Report 116-502, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 171, nays 243, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 187]

YEAS—171

Aderholt	Byrne	Fortenberry
Allen	Carter (GA)	Foxx (NC)
Amash	Carter (TX)	Fulcher
Amodei	Chabot	Gaetz
Armstrong	Cheney	Gallagher
Arrington	Cline	Garcia (CA)
Babin	Cole	Gianforte
Bacon	Collins (GA)	Gibbs
Baird	Comer	Gohmert
Balderson	Conaway	Gonzalez (OH)
Banks	Cook	Gooden
Barr	Crawford	Granger
Bergman	Crenshaw	Graves (LA)
Bilirakis	Curtis	Graves (MO)
Bishop (NC)	Davis, Rodney	Green (TN)
Bishop (UT)	DesJarlais	Griffith
Bost	Diaz-Balart	Grothman
Brady	Duncan	Guest
Brooks (AL)	Dunn	Guthrie
Brooks (IN)	Emmer	Hagedorn
Buchanan	Estes	Hartzler
Bucshon	Ferguson	Hern, Kevin
Burchett	Fleischmann	Herrera Beutler
Burgess	Flores	Higgins (LA)

Hill (AR) McClintock
Holding McKinley
Hollingsworth Meuser
Hudson Miller
Huizenga Mitchell
Jacobs Moolenaar
Johnson (LA) Mooney (WV)
Johnson (OH) Mullin
Johnson (SD) Murphy (NC)
Jordan Newhouse
Joyce (OH) Norman
Joyce (PA) Nunes
Keller Olson
Kelly (MS) Palmer
Kelly (PA) Pence
King (IA) Perry
King (NY) Posey
Kinzinger Reed
Kustoff (TN) Reschenthaler
LaHood Rice (SC)
LaMalfa Roby
Lamborn Rodgers (WA)
Latta Roe, David P.
Lesko Rogers (AL)
Long Rogers (KY)
Loudermilk Rose, John W.
Lucas Rouzer
Luetkemeyer Scalise
Marchant Schweikert
Marshall Scott, Austin
Mast Sensenbrenner
McCarthy Shimkus
McCauley Smith (MO)

NAYS—243

Adams Doggett Lawson (FL)
Aguilar Doyle, Michael Lee (CA)
Allred F. Lee (NV)
Axne Engel Levin (CA)
Barragán Escobar Levin (MI)
Bass Eshoo Lieu, Ted
Beatty Espallat Lipinski
Bera Evans Loebsack
Beyer Finkenauer Lofgren
Biggs Fitzpatrick Lowenthal
Bishop (GA) Fletcher Lowey
Blumenauer Luján
Blunt Rochester Frankel Luria
Bonamici Fudge Lynch
Boyle, Brendan Gabbard Malinowski
F. Gallego Maloney,
Brindisi Garamendi Carolyn B.
Brown (MD) Garcia (IL) Maloney, Sean
Brownley (CA) Garcia (TX) Massie
Buck Golden Matsui
Budd Gomez McAdams
Bustos Gonzalez (TX) McBath
Butterfield Gosar McCollum
Carbajal Gottheimer McEachin
Cárdenas Green, Al (TX) McGovern
Carson (IN) Grijalva McNeerney
Cartwright Haaland Meeks
Case Harder (CA) Meng
Casten (IL) Harris Mfume
Castor (FL) Hastings Moore
Chu, Judy Hayes Morelle
Cicilline Heck Moulton
Cisneros Hice (GA) Mucarsel-Powell
Clark (MA) Higgins (NY) Murphy (FL)
Clarke (NY) Himes Nadler
Clay Horn, Kendra S. Napolitano
Cleaver Horsford Neal
Cloud Houlahan Neguse
Clyburn Hoyer Norcross
Cohen Huffman O'Halleran
Connolly Hurd (TX) Ocasio-Cortez
Cooper Jackson Lee Omar
Correa Jayapal Pallone
Costa Jeffries Panetta
Courtney Johnson (GA) Pappas
Cox (CA) Johnson (TX) Pascrell
Craig Kaptur Payne
Crist Katko Perlmutter
Crow Keating Peters
Cuellar Kelly (IL) Peterson
Cunningham Kennedy Phillips
Davids (KS) Khanna Pingree
Davidson (OH) Kildee Pocan
Davis (CA) Kilmer Porter
Davis, Danny K. Kim Pressley
Dean Kind Price (NC)
DeGette Kirkpatrick Raskin
DeLauro Krishnamoorthi Rice (NY)
DelBene Kuster (NH) Richmond
Delgado Lamb Rose (NY)
Demings Langevin Rouda
DeSaulnier Larsen (WA) Roy
Deutch Larson (CT) Roybal-Allard
Dingell Lawrence Ruiz

Ruppersberger Sires
Rush Slotkin
Rutherford Smith (NJ)
Ryan Smith (WA)
Sánchez Spanberger
Sarbanes Speier
Scanlon Stanton
Schakowsky Stevens
Schiff Suozzi
Schneider Swalwell (CA)
Schrader Takano
Schrier Thompson (CA)
Scott (VA) Thompson (MS)
Scott, David Titus
Serrano Tlaib
Sewell (AL) Tonko
Shalala Torres (CA)
Sherman Torres Small
Sherrill (NM)

Abraham Palazzo Timmons
Calvert Quigley Walker
Castro (TX) Riggleman Wright
DeFazio Rooney (FL) Young
Graves (GA) Simpson
McHenry Soto

NOT VOTING—16

□ 1550

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, JOHNSON of Texas, GABBARD, Messrs. ESPAILLAT, COHEN, MCEACHIN, RUTHERFORD, GOSAR, and HARRIS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. BARR, SCHWEIKERT, GAETZ, and NUNES changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Barragán (Beyer)	Khanna (Gomez)	Pingree (Clark)
Blumenauer	Kirkpatrick	(MA))
(Beyer)	(Gallego)	Pocan (Raskin)
Butterfield	Langevin	Porter (Wexton)
(Kildee)	(Lynch)	Roybal-Allard
Chu, Judy	Lawrence	(Aguilar)
(Takano)	(Kildee)	Rush
Clay (Davids	Lawson (FL)	(Underwood)
(KS))	(Evans)	Serrano
Cohen (Beyer)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	(Jeffries)
Davis, Danny K.	Lipinski (Cooper)	Sewell (AL)
(Underwood)	Lofgren (Jeffries)	(DeBene)
DeSaulnier	Lowenthal	Thompson (MS)
(Matsui)	(Beyer)	(Fudge)
Frankel (Clark	Lowey (Tonko)	Trahan
(MA))	Meng (Clark	(McGovern)
Garcia (IL)	(MA))	Watson Coleman
(Raskin)	Moore (Beyer)	(Pallone)
Grijalva (Raskin)	Napolitano	Welch
Hastings	(Correa)	(McGovern)
(Wasserman	Payne	Wilson (FL)
Schultz)	(Wasserman	(Hayes)
Jayapal (Raskin)	Schultz)	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 2639 is postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1601

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE) at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

STRENGTH IN DIVERSITY ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2639) to establish the Strength in Diversity Program, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. MOULTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on amendment No. 9, printed in part B of House Report 116-502, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 379, nays 34, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 188]

YEAS—379

Adams	Clyburn	Garcia (TX)
Aderholt	Cohen	Gianforte
Aguilar	Cole	Golden
Allred	Collins (GA)	Gomez
Amodei	Comer	Gonzalez (OH)
Armstrong	Connolly	Gonzalez (TX)
Arrington	Cook	Gottheimer
Axne	Cooper	Granger
Bacon	Correa	Graves (LA)
Baird	Costa	Green, Al (TX)
Balderson	Courtney	Grijalva
Banks	Cox (CA)	Grothman
Barr	Craig	Guest
Barragán	Crenshaw	Guthrie
Bass	Crist	Haaland
Beatty	Crow	Hagedorn
Bera	Cuellar	Harder (CA)
Bergman	Cunningham	Harris
Beyer	Curtis	Hartzler
Bilirakis	Davids (KS)	Hastings
Bishop (GA)	Davis (CA)	Hayes
Bishop (NC)	Davis, Danny K.	Heck
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Rodney	Hern, Kevin
Blumenauer	Dean	Herrera Beutler
Blunt Rochester	DeGette	Higgins (NY)
Bonamici	DeLauro	Hill (AR)
Bost	DelBene	Himes
Boyle, Brendan	Delgado	Holding
F.	Demings	Hollingsworth
Brady	DeSaulnier	Horn, Kendra S.
Brindisi	DesJarlais	Horsford
Brooks (IN)	Deutch	Houlahan
Brown (MD)	Diaz-Balart	Hoyer
Brownley (CA)	Dingell	Hudson
Buchanan	Doggett	Huffman
Bucshon	Dunn	Huizenga
Budd	Emmer	Hurd (TX)
Burchett	Engel	Jackson Lee
Burgess	Escobar	Jacobs
Bustos	Eshoo	Jayapal
Butterfield	Espallat	Jeffries
Byrne	Estes	Johnson (GA)
Calvert	Evans	Johnson (LA)
Carbajal	Finkenauer	Johnson (OH)
Cárdenas	Fitzpatrick	Johnson (SD)
Carson (IN)	Fleischmann	Johnson (TX)
Cartwright	Fletcher	Joyce (OH)
Case	Flores	Joyce (PA)
Casten (IL)	Fortenberry	Kaptur
Castor (FL)	Foster	Katko
Chabot	Fox (NC)	Keating
Chu, Judy	Frankel	Keller
Cicilline	Fudge	Kelly (IL)
Cisneros	Gabbard	Kelly (MS)
Clark (MA)	Gallagher	Kelly (PA)
Clarke (NY)	Gallego	Kennedy
Clay	Garamendi	Khanna
Cleaver	Garcia (CA)	Kildee
Cloud	Garcia (IL)	Kilmer