United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 8, 2014 No. 69

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 8, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

RESEARCH TAX CREDIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I supported the research tax credit legislation in the Ways and Means Committee, as I have done repeatedly in the past. I intend to do so on the floor as a first step in getting some certainty into a program that has been plagued with uncertainty for as long as I have been in Congress.

The tax credit has been extended 15 times without concern about whether or not it is ''paid for.'' Anyone who has been in Congress for awhile, in essence, has already voted to make it permanent and not pay for it.

Regardless of the budget rules, this is one area of investment that I think probably does pay for itself. It pays for itself in economic activity, scientific breakthroughs, and product development. It advances the interests of not just American companies, but of commerce and our overall economy.

As a country, we are consistently underinvesting in research. There is no substitute for the Federal Government playing the vital role that it has in the past with the development of the semiconductor, the Internet, and the basic role that it has played in dealing with health and medical research.

I don't like how this legislation has been handled. This is an issue that should have been characterized by bipartisanship, by working together to make the research tax credit more effective. We could consider making it refundable to help smaller emerging businesses. We could take a hard look at constructive criticisms that have raised questions about how we could make it work better. That should be our job.

Luckily, this is the start, not the end, of the process. There will be more work that will be done with our friends in the Senate under the leadership of Senator WYDEN and Senator HATCH on the Senate Finance Committee, who have already started down this path.

What is very likely to emerge in the short term will not be a permanent but rather a 1- or 2-year extension. It is progress to get it reenacted and to signal broad support for its permanence and refinement.

All of the controversy surrounding tax reform underscores the fundamental challenge.

The inability of the Republican leadership to embrace the work product of Chairman CAMP is illustrative. He worked diligently and produced a somewhat simplified code with a lowered tax rate and without adding to the deficit, which is essentially what Republican leadership Presidential ticket claimed they wanted.

Yet my Republican friends are unable to accept the necessary reductions in other tax benefits that come with the package. But there is bipartisan reluctance in this regard.

It illustrates that we are, I think, never going to get out of this box until we have another source of revenue. The most promising would be a carbon tax, which would be broadly distributed throughout the economy. It should be revenue-neutral, using the revenue raised to modify the impacts on lower-income citizens and businesses, and using the rest of the proceeds to keep it revenue-neutral could help us simplify the Tax Code. It might be the only way to reform the Tax Code.

Simplification costs money, which an aging and growing country needs to replace. The carbon tax will do that and will have the added benefit of providing greater simplification for energy-sensitive provisions and, by the way, will help us save the planet.

The report released this week by the administration on climate underscores the impact that climate change and global warming is having now. A carbon tax is the best way to exercise our leadership to change that process. I have long supported a revenue-neutral carbon tax, and will continue to do so, as the key to long-term tax reform and environmental protection.

In the meantime, I will continue to support individual tax provisions that are important to my community, that help our economy and protect and enhance the infrastructure. I only hope that we are able to make the transition so that we can do this in a more thoughtful and constructive fashion.

Printed on recycled paper.

PUTTING FISH BEFORE PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, California is suffering one of the worse droughts in its history. More than a half-million acres of the most fertile farmland in the Nation have been devastated. Some Central Valley farmers have been notified that they will receive zero water allocations from the Federal system. The owners of long-held water rights are being cut off.

In some communities ''water police'' go from door to door to enforce water restrictions. Homeowners are forbidden to water their lawns, except under the most rigid constraints. Sacramento offers an app so they can turn in their neighbors to the water authorities.

And yet, knowing full well that we are facing a devastating drought and that our dwindling water supply will be desperately needed by our people this summer, over the past several weeks the Bureau of Reclamation has released 70,000 acre-feet of water from dams on the American and Stanislaus Rivers to meet environmental demands that place fish above people.

This is enough water to meet the annual needs of a city of half a million people, all sacrificed in order to flush salmon smolts to the ocean, where they tend to swim anyway, and keep the river at the right temperature for the comfort of the fish.

The releases of this water are so enormous they are called ''pulse flows.'' Citizens are warned to exercise extreme caution on rivers undergoing pulse flows, so swift is the water current they produce as the water rushes toward the ocean.

Four months ago, Folsom Lake on the American River was almost empty. Yet on April 21, the Bureau of Reclamation more than tripled the water releases from Folsom and Nimbus Dams from 500 cubic feet per second to more than 1,500 cubic feet per second for 3 days. That is about 7,000 acre-feet of water.

On April 14, a 16-day pulse flow drained nearly 63,000 acre-feet of water from New Melones and Goodwin Dams on the Stanislaus. The irony is that if we hadn't built these dams, these rivers would be nearly dry in this drought and there wouldn't be any fish.

We cannot demand that our people discriminate and save and stretch and ration every drop of water in their parched homes while at the same time this government treats our remaining water supply so recklessly, so irresponsibly, and so wastefully.

This conduct utterly destroys the credibility of government demands for stringent conservation and sacrifice by our people, and it thoroughly undermines its moral authority to make these demands.

Inflexible laws administered by ideologically driven officials have taken this wastage of water to ridiculous extremes, and it cries out for fundamental reform. The House twice has passed such a reform bill, most recently as H.R. 3964, but the Senate refuses to act on it or to pass its own alternative.

Nevertheless, the administration has the authority to stop these releases through provisions in the Endangered Species Act but has failed to do so.

Mr. Speaker, we use the word ''outrage'' too often on this floor, but in this case it is an understatement. If a homeowner is caught with a 1-gallon puddle on his lawn on the wrong day, he can be fined. But the government thinks nothing of flushing 23 billion of gallons of desperately needed water for the comfort and convenience of the fish.

How much longer will the people tolerate this kind of mismanagement from their government? How much longer will we allow these policies to threaten the health, safety, and prosperity of the human population throughout these drought-afflicted lands?

California's chronic water shortages won't be addressed without additional storage. There are plenty of suitable sites, but current laws have delayed them indefinitely and made them cost-prohibitive.

Until those laws are changed and new dam construction can begin, our State and Federal Government have a responsibility to manage our dwindling water supply as carefully as we ask our citizens to do.

The wildly frivolous and extravagant water releases from our dams last month make a mockery of the extraordinary sacrifices that our citizens are making to stretch supplies in this crisis.

Perhaps, at least, these releases will serve to educate the public on just how unreasonable these environmental laws are—and the policymakers responsible for them.

HONORING NORMAN LUMPKIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life and legacy of veteran newscaster Norman Lumpkin, who passed away on Tuesday, May 6. While we mourn the passing of this pioneer, I am comforted in knowing that his legacy will live on through the barriers he broke for Black journalists in the State of Alabama.

I join with his family, friends, and former colleagues in remembering Norman Lumpkin for his numerous contributions to the industry.

Norman launched his longstanding media career by working for radio stations in Montgomery, Alabama, and Indianapolis, Indiana. However, Norman would rise to prominence when he was hired in 1969 by WSFA in Montgomery, Alabama. He was the station's first Black reporter and also the first Black reporter hired in the Montgomery media market.

Historian Richard Bailey defined Norman's prolific career in 3 words: ''forceful, thorough, and believable.'' Bailey further noted that Norman personified Black broadcasting. He coined the phrase, ''If you don't want to hear it on this station, don't let it happen.'' The phrase represented not only his thirst for truth but his commitment to accurate reporting.

Norman was guided by these principles when he was assigned to cover the reelection bid of then-segregationist Governor George Wallace in 1970. During the race, Norman admitted that fellow reporters would give him misinformation to embarrass him in efforts to discredit his journalistic integrity.

But this passionate advocate for truth was not deterred. In fact, Governor Wallace personally made sure that Norman was kept abreast of new developments and campaign events. Through his extraordinary coverage of Governor Wallace, Norman not only earned credibility but a lasting respect from those in the industry.

His perseverance proved that he was poised to become one of the best investigative journalists in the State of Alabama.

Norman Lumpkin also made history off-camera. He was the first Black president of the Alabama AP Broadcasters Association and was inducted into the National Academy of Television and Arts' prestigious Silver Circle in 2007.

He eventually left WSFA in 1999 and became news director at Montgomery's ABC affiliate before serving as public relations director for the Alabama Highway Department, where he eventually retired.

Today, I honor Norman Lumpkin for serving as an impeccable role model and source of inspiration for generations of Black journalists who now follow in his footsteps. Those that had the pleasure of watching him were indeed inspired by his mere presence. He was to many a perfect illustration of what was possible in his field. As he courageously broke barriers, he gave African Americans a voice in a State that was still struggling for racial equality.

□ 1015

On behalf of a grateful Nation and State, we salute this American hero and Alabama treasure. Saying thanks to Norman Lumpkin somehow seems woefully inadequate, but on behalf of the countless journalists and media professionals that you have inspired, we honor your legacy and your place in Alabama history.

I ask my colleagues to join me in mourning the passing of a great veteran journalist, Norman Lumpkin.

NATIONAL NURSES WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, many of you may not be aware, but this week is National Nurses Week.

I am honored to be able to stand on the floor of this great institution to talk about the nursing profession, what nurses mean to our health care industry and what nurses mean to each and every one of us when a family member is being treated at a time when we need the most compassion, we need the best care, and a nurse is the one who steps into that room and offers that compassion and offers that care on a daily basis.

I have a special place in my heart for nurses because my wife, Shannon, is a nurse, somebody who not only has served patients in their home, on the hospital floor, at the beginning of life and at the end of life, she has also helped teach the next generation of nurses.

We, in Washington, hear constantly about a nursing shortage in this country; and we, in Washington, need to remember that it is up to us to enact policies and programs that are going to encourage more young people to go into the nursing profession.

I want to honor all nurses this week during National Nurses Week because I want to recognize the hard work that they do and the impact they have, not only to the nursing profession, but to America as a whole.

Whether it is the support nurses provide at major hospitals throughout my congressional district in central and southwestern Illinois or in smaller, critical access hospitals that provide some of the most localized care in places like Staunton, Illinois; Clinton, Illinois; Litchfield; Hillsboro; and even my hometown of Taylorville, they are vital to the success of not only the health care industry they serve, but to the health of the patients that they are trained to care for.

As baby boomers continue to retire, ensuring that we have enough educated nurses should be one of the priorities of this institution that I mentioned earlier. We should continue to support funding for nurse education programs at all of our universities, colleges, and hospitals, so that patients can continue to receive the quality care that they are used to in our health care delivery system.

So happy National Nurses Week, and thank you to my wife Shannon and to the nearly 3 million other registered nurses for all that you do for the health and wellness of our country.

A special thanks to my wife, Shannon. I love you.

FIND THE KIDNAPPED GIRLS AND STOP THE KILLING IN NIGERIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, among other challenges in this world and in this Congress, Nigeria faces a killing machine. In the last 48 hours, again, Boko Haram struck and killed 300 people. This killing has been going on for a minimum of 5 to 10 years.

Yesterday, five Members—five women of the United States Congress held this sign to indicate that we, as mothers, grandmothers, aunts, and those who care about children, all of our colleagues stand united to find the kidnapped girls and to stop the killing in Nigeria.

We stand united to find the vile and evil Abubakar Shekau, the head of the Boko Haram killing contingent. We saw him most recently grabbing attention by standing in front of a tank, holding a gun, and citing the most ludicrous and insulting prospect that one could hear. He held up $12 and indicated that he would sell the kidnapped girls.

Mr. Speaker, that is not all that he is doing. He has been killing and pillaging. He has caused parents to have to, in essence, go after him with sticks and stones.

Yesterday, we spoke not only with the leadership at the Nigerian Embassy, a relationship that the United States prides in terms of the contribution Nigeria has made, but it is no doubt that, in this instance, we want Nigeria to do more and more and more.

We asked, by speaking to the leadership in Nigeria by phone, that President Goodluck Jonathan stand up and indicate Nigeria's commitment to finding these girls and, in essence, bringing this horror terrorist to justice.

At the World Economic Forum, his opening remarks did just that. He spoke about the help that was coming from the United States, the leadership of President Obama and Secretary Kerry, and the other nations that are coming together to be able to find these girls.

Outside of Syria and Afghanistan, in terms of mass killings over the recent years, this stands, clearly, in the eye of the storm.

We ask to have created a victims' fund. We want to be able to ensure that these parents who are, literally, broken and the children that may be found—or the wounded ones—have the opportunity to be made whole.

We believe that it is important to create an elite police or military force, one that is focused to utilize the resources of intelligence and the law enforcement resources that are being sent to Nigeria by the United States. That deployed elite military and/or police force—special ops, if you would—would have the sole purpose of getting those kidnapped girls.

The reason why this is so very important is because Nigeria has porous borders. There is speculation that these girls may be in Cameroon, may be in Chad, may be in Niger, Benin, all places that will make it even more difficult to find these innocent children who simply came to school to be able to take an exam, so that they could do better in life.

How dare we allow this brutal killer to last much longer without being brought to justice?

So that elite force would bring this vile and evil person, who has no intent to do anything more than to continue to ramp up his publicity and the world's attention to his violence, bring him now to justice, move quickly utilizing the resources and focusing.

It is also important that all of the world's institutions declare Boko Haram—the ridiculous group that says: we don't want any western education, and all girls should be married—declared a terrorist organization.

It must be done swiftly, so that all the world's focus will be on this dastardly, devastating, vile leader of this organization and the organization.

We can collaborate with the African Union and the U.N. peacekeepers. Then we want to provide armed protection for all of the schools as they finish out or continue their educational training.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to you these are like the boys and girls that are in the schools of America right now. These are primary education children. These are secondary.

I ask my colleagues to join in the outrage of this ridiculous and horrible situation. I ask that we are finding our girls and capturing this terrorist leader.

PUTTING AMERICA BACK TO WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, later today, the Republicans, in violation of their own rules, are going to push through a permanent extension of research and development tax credits, at a cost of $16 billion a year. That is another $16 billion a year of deficit to be added to the national debt—over the next 10 years, $160 billion.

Now, that is not to say that research and development tax credits don't have tremendous merit. They can do a great deal to encourage American innovation and research, new design, development. They can boost our economy. They can help our international competitiveness.

Sure, they, among many other programs and many other investments, are and can be good for the economy; but they are going to violate, waive their own rules, and say: we are not going to pay for it, we are just going to magically fund it, and don't worry about the new debt and deficit.

Now, the Senate has passed a different version. They have 62 provisions in their bill, which include energy efficiency, saving consumers money, new R&D for solar and wind, alternate fuels, among many, many other things that they put in there, that they think also have merit to help consumers, help boost the American economy.

The Republicans over here say: no, those other 61 are off the table, unless you kill or cut some other program. We can't afford them.

Then there is another issue that also comes to the floor. We had, this week, testimony from the Congressional Budget Office. The highway trust fund goes flat this summer. That means the Federal Government, beginning this summer, will make no new commitments to the States for repairing the 140,000 bridges on the national system that need repair or replacement, repairing or replacing the 40 percent of the national highway system that is in very sad repair, the $60 billion backlog in our transit.

Nope, we can't afford a penny of that. In fact, the Ryan budget says we are going to abandon—abandon—Federal investment in the national transportation system, and we are going to devolve it to the States. The States will fund, pay for, and somehow coordinate a national transportation system because we simply can't afford it.

Well, oddly enough, the shortfall in the trust fund is $16 billion a year. That is the exact cost of the R&D tax credits.

Why can't they wave their magic wand and say, well, hey, a million direct jobs and a couple million more indirect jobs in transportation, not only in construction, but in design, engineering, in manufacturing and research, we don't want to lose those?

We are not talking about maybe keeping or getting a few jobs. We are talking about losing well over a million direct jobs and a couple more million indirect jobs in the area of transportation, but their magic wand doesn't work for transportation.

Now, there could be a lot of cynical reasons for why they are just pushing this one R&D proposal. It probably doesn't have anything to do with campaign contributions or powerful interests that are out there. I am sure it doesn't.

One has got to wonder: Why is transportation—national transportation—old hat and unaffordable, but R&D, somehow wave the magic wand, and we can afford it?

Now, I was conflicted at coming here this morning because, at the same time, one of the greatest advocates that this body has ever had for national transportation, James L. Oberstar, died suddenly the other night.

I thought Jim would—rather than having me go up to his memorial service today, he would rather have me come to the floor and advocate for something he believed in and knew was essential for the future of this country, which is adequate investment in our system, a coordinated national system of transportation and infrastructure, an energy-efficient, 21st century system, and a repair to our 20th century system.

That is what we need. No more of these political shenanigans on the Republican side. Let's get serious about real investments and putting America bact to work.

□ 1030

NATIONAL CHARTER SCHOOLS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, so often folks will use this time in the morning to draw attention to failures or to divisions, but I want to use this time to draw attention to successes.

This is National Charter Schools Week, among other things, Mr. Speaker, and I happen to have two charter schools in my district. I represent only two counties, Mr. Speaker, Gwinnett County and Forsyth County, in the great State of Georgia. Both have outstanding public school systems.

And so often when we start talking about charter schools, Mr. Speaker, we talk about an either/or, as if somehow charter schools and public schools are in competition with one another, but that is not the story that I tell from the great State of Georgia. In fact, Gwinnett County, one of my two counties, won the Broad Prize in 2010 for the absolute finest urban education school district in the Nation. Interestingly, they are now reeligible to win that prize again this year after a 3-year waiting period. They are in the final two. Just amazing stories of young people and their successes. And they come through, among other things, two charter schools in my district.

We have the Gwinnett School of Mathematics, Science, and Technology, GSMST, Mr. Speaker. They don't have a football team. They have a robotics team, and an outstanding robotics team at that. If you want a future in the STEM fields, you can find no better education in the United States of America than the Gwinnett School of Mathematics, Science, and Technology, and it is free if you just happen to live in Gwinnett County. A wonderful story of success through the charter school program. Absolutely any student in the county is eligible. In fact, it takes a lottery to get in, Mr. Speaker, because so many young people, so many families want their children to be able to avail themselves of this charter school program.

The Washington Post called it the 17th most challenging high school in the land. U.S. News & World Report called it the third best high school in the land. I, of course, believe it is the number one best high school in the land, but an amazing testimony of what you can do when you free an institution, when you free the teachers, when you free the students to be the very best they can be.

Now, right next door, Mr. Speaker, to GSMST, the Gwinnett School of Mathematics, Science, and Technology, we have the Maxwell High School of Technology. Now, the Maxwell School aims to take folks, these young people who are trying to find their way in life, and prepare them for a job tomorrow—program after program, Mr. Speaker, whether it is Web design, whether it is welding, architecture, technology field after technology field, not thought of theoretically, Mr. Speaker, but thought of from how can you graduate from high school and begin to provide for yourself and your family. That is not available in the normal public schools, but it is available at the Maxwell High School of Technology. And again, any student in Gwinnett County is welcome to come and be there.

Mr. Speaker, we still live in a land where there is more that unites us than divides us. We still live in a land that brings people together rather than tears people apart, and the charter school debate should be that debate. It should be the debate not that pits public schools against private schools; it should be the debate that brings us together around making sure that every young person in this land, every family in this land who has a dream of what they want to do with their life, that we have the public schools in this land that can help them fulfill that dream.

Mr. Speaker, we are doing that successfully in the Seventh District of Georgia, and I look forward to joining my colleagues in this Chamber to make sure we can do that successfully in every single congressional district in this land.

CELEBRATING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF JOHN HOUBOLT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor John Houbolt, a native of Joliet, Illinois. He was one of the great unsung heroes of the Apollo program.

Politicians are fond of citing President Kennedy's famous speech made in this room at a joint session of Congress more than 50 years ago to ''commit this Nation, before this decade is out, to landing a man on the Moon and returning him safely to the Earth.'' Politicians like to imagine that anything is possible if the right politician and speechwriter can muster just the right words to stir a country to action, but engineers know differently. If you do not have a workable engineering concept and a set of design parameters that respect both available resource limitations and engineering reality, then no amount of fine words from politicians is going to make any difference. Dr. John Houbolt provided that crucial engineering concept that made the 10-year success of the Apollo program possible.

John Houbolt came from humble beginnings, working 16 hours a day on his family's dairy farm near Joliet, Illinois, where he developed an early interest in aviation, building model airports in his free time. He graduated from Joliet Township High School and Joliet Junior College. He obtained a bachelor's and master's degree from the University of Illinois in civil engineering. He then went on to obtain a

Ph.D. and serve as an engineer at NASA's Langley Research Center. His contributions to the U.S. space race in the 1960s were vital to NASA's successful Moon landing.

He is best known for his advocacy of lunar orbit rendezvous, the crucial mission design decision that proved essential to carry the Apollo crew safely to the Moon and back in 1969. Dr. Houbolt, along with several of his colleagues at Langley, became convinced that this relatively obscure technique was the only feasible way to land on the Moon by the end of the decade.

Initially, NASA rejected Dr. Houbolt's plan for being too complicated and risky, but like the world's greatest innovators, Dr. Houbolt didn't let initial failure stop him. Despite opposition from NASA and from leading rocket scientists at the time, Dr. Houbolt tenaciously advocated for lunar orbit rendezvous.

To convince the decisionmakers at NASA to consider his plan, Dr. Houbolt took the bold step of writing a letter directly to the associate administrator of NASA—at the time a clear breach of protocol. ''Do we want to go to the Moon or not?'' asked Dr. Houbolt. Because of his tenacity, NASA gave his idea another chance and eventually approved it.

Now, John Houbolt won that argument, despite having had all the political winds blowing against him, because he had fundamental engineering reality on his side. It was simply not possible, with the engines and boosters that could plausibly be developed in the 1960s, to launch a payload that would allow a manned rocket to land in its entirety on the Moon, including all of the fuel necessary to return to the Earth. But, as John Houbolt pointed out, if you left the fuel for the return trip in lunar orbit and rendezvoused with the command module after making the lunar landing, then a single Saturn booster, already under design at the Marshall Space Flight Center, could do the job.

NASA Administrator George Low later said of this pivotal moment:

> It is my strongly held opinion that without the lunar rendezvous mode, Apollo would not have succeeded; and without John Houbolt's letter, we might not have chosen the lunar orbit rendezvous mode.

The lunar rendezvous mode has been described by space historians as ''Langley's most important contribution to the Apollo program'' and is widely credited for allowing the United States to accomplish the goal President John F. Kennedy set out in 1961, to land a man on the Moon by the end of the decade.

Dr. Houbolt received numerous awards for his work, including NASA's Medal for Exceptional Scientific Achievement. He was elected to the National Academy of Engineering and was the first recipient of Joliet Junior College's Distinguished Alumni Award.

Additionally, the Joliet Historical Museum is home to a permanent exhibit dedicated to Dr. Houbolt and to his family, titled, ''The Soaring Achievements of John C. Houbolt.'' They have now declared July 20, 2014, the 45th anniversary of the Moon landing, as Houbolt Family Day at the museum. The museum will be open free to the public each July 20 to encourage families to learn about Joliet's local contribution to one of humankind's greatest scientific achievements.

Dr. Houbolt retired after a distinguished career in 1985. He and his family remained noted philanthropists and supporters of the community of Joliet, touching countless individuals with their generosity.

Dr. Houbolt passed away on April 15, 2014, at the age of 95. His life is an example of the impact that a determined, intelligent, and passionate individual can have. I rise today to remember Dr. Houbolt for his outstanding contributions to American science and engineering.

In a society where we seem to celebrate mainly the accomplishments of our heroes in sports and entertainment, as well as those who ride our rockets off into space, it is important also to celebrate the heroes of science and engineering who make the modern world possible.

CHICAGO'S GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, April was a particularly violent month in the city of Chicago. Thirty-two people were shot and killed in the city, 19 of them under the age of 25.

You have heard me talk before about the epidemic of gun violence, about how urban violence in cities like Chicago is robbing us of a generation. But nothing illustrates how our gun violence permeates everyday life in Chicago more than the stories of the deaths of those 19 young people.

They, like scores of teens and young adults across the city, were stalked by gun violence. It followed them home from school, creeping up on their porches or tapping on their car windows; and, in an instant, an everyday activity became an unspeakable tragedy.

Jordan Harris, 24, was shot during a house party.

Michael Flournoy, 17, was shot in front of a neighborhood church.

Adrian Soto, 17, shot on a sidewalk.

Gakirah Barnes, 17, shot in the street.

Andres Cervantes, 22, shot while sitting in a car.

Joshua Martinez, 20, shot on a front porch.

Keno Glass, 16, shot in a drive-by shooting while on spring break.

Trevolus Pickett, 20, shot in a gangway.

Nicholas Ramirez, 19, chased and shot while he was driving.

Anthony Bankhead, 18, and Jordan Means, 16, shot in an apartment during an argument.

Timmy Bermudez, 19, shot while driving in an ambush on Easter Sunday.

Quinton Jackson, 22, shot in a building hallway.

Darius Kelly, 22, shot in a drive-by.

Demario Collins, 19, shot while sitting in a car.

Martavarian Emery, 21, shot from outside while standing in a kitchen.

Jaquez Williams, 17, shot on a sidewalk.

Cindy Bahena, 21, shot while riding in the backseat of a car.

And then there is Endia Martin, a 14-year-old girl who was shot and killed last week by another 14-year-old girl in a dispute over a boy.

Endia, a high school freshman and an honor student, and the 14-year-old suspect, an honor student, friends since elementary school, had been feuding on Facebook. After school last week, the teen suspect confronted Endia with a gun. That gun, a .38 caliber revolver, went from a local gun shop popular with straw purchasers to a man who resold the gun illegally and falsely reported it as stolen. From there, it made its way to a 25-year-old man who gave the gun to his niece, the 14-year-old suspect.

The girl, standing in a crowd of onlookers and instigators, drew the gun from her waistband and pulled the trigger. The gun actually malfunctioned. She handed it to someone in the crowd who fixed it and handed it back to her before she fired again, hitting Endia in the back and another teen in the arm.

This shooting painfully underscores the need for commonsense gun reforms, like cracking down on straw purchasers and better tracking gun sales to curtail illegal trafficking. There were many opportunities along the journey of that .38 caliber revolver to save Endia's life.

The shooting also spotlights the need for better social supports, greater accountability within our families and communities, and increased responsibility for the welfare of our children.

Losing a bright light like Endia is a tragedy, but so is the baby-faced accused killer sitting in juvenile lockup right now, the product of a community of accomplices who encouraged one child to kill another. As a society, we failed both girls. We have failed to provide Endia with a safe community she deserved, and we failed to teach her killer to value her own life, much less anyone else's.

Preventing senseless killings like this requires a combination of legislative initiatives and community action. We in Congress must do our part to stop the bloodshed by passing commonsense gun legislation. We must also do more to support programs on the ground that provide our young people with alternatives to violence. It is a moral imperative we can no longer ignore.

Before I go, I would like to pay tribute to Leonore Draper, a beloved and dedicated gun violence prevention advocate in Chicago who herself was

killed last week in a possible drive-by shooting. Leonore was headed home from an antiviolence charity fundraiser she helped organize when she was shot and killed. What a horrible irony.

Leonore devoted her life to ending the violence on Chicago's streets. Her killing rattled the city and her fellow antiviolence advocates who are determined to continue to work to stop the shootings that claimed her and young Endia. Both Leonore and Endia were buried on Monday. Please do not let their deaths be in vain.

To my colleagues, it is past time that we took action.

COMMEMORATING GROUNDBREAKING FOR APSAALOOKE WARRIORS APARTMENT COMPLEX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, today the Crow tribe will break ground on the Apsaalooke Warriors Apartment Complex, a 15-room complex that will serve the homeless veterans of the Crow Reservation.

The Crow Reservation is home to more than 400 veterans, and far too many are without a home to call their own. Unfortunately, this struggle goes largely unseen. As Crow Vice Chairman Dana Wilson has said:

> Homelessness is invisible because the Crow always take care of each other. It is not uncommon to see 10 to 20 people living in a home.

I am grateful to see the Crow Tribe's commitment to addressing this problem and giving our warriors a home of their own.

I also want to thank Vice Secretary Shawn Backbone, Vice Chairman Dana Wilson, Secretary AJ Not Afraid, and the director of Crow Veterans Affairs, Paul Little Light, for their efforts to make this project a reality and to serve Crow veterans. Your work is deeply appreciated.

□ 1045

STUDENT LOAN REFINANCING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of legislation that I filed in the House this week and Senator ELIZABETH WARREN filed in the Senate. It would enable tens of millions of students, parents, and families to responsibly refinance their student loans.

More and more, constituents are calling, they are emailing, and even approaching me on the street to share their stories of how they are buried in student loan debt. This debt is not only causing them to put on hold life decisions, such as moving out of their parents' house or buying a car or purchasing a home and getting married, but it is also leading some to question whether or not they should even enroll in college or to consider dropping out because of the pure shock factor of these looming college loans.

A young woman from Boxford, Massachusetts, wrote recently. She said to me:

> I pay more than the minimum balance every month. I sacrifice daily for my loans. I live at home and have a 50-minute commute to work every day because I cannot afford to live on my own or even with roommates. I cannot have the dreams that I have dreamed all my life. I am 23, and I am already telling myself that I can't own a house, that I will probably never have children because I can't afford to bring them into the world and take care of them when I can't even afford to live myself. That is what I live with every day, the anger, the depression, and the disbelief that I am forever stuck.

Parents are calling and writing me about the anxiety and concern they have about the debt their sons and daughters have accumulated. Some parents have even delayed their retirement or made early withdrawals from their 401(k) just to help their children's student debt problem.

A mother from Middleton, Massachusetts, wrote to me and said:

> I have two children with multiple student loans. It is difficult enough to graduate, find a job in the field they desire and to pay loans, rent, and bills, et cetera. Please do all that you can to make sure rates are not increased. My children may never afford to buy a house and live the American Dream because of college student loan debt.

Mr. Speaker, these are just two examples in my district. There are millions of others just like them throughout this country.

Outstanding student loans now total more than $1.2 trillion, surpassing total credit card debt. An estimated 71 percent of college seniors had debt in 2012, with an average outstanding debt of $29,400 for those who borrowed to get a bachelor's degree.

Last year, Congress sought to address the issue of student loan rates, but I and several others believed that final bill didn't go far enough. One of the deficiencies was that it only applied to new student debt. It did nothing for the nearly 40 million Americans with existing student debts.

Our bill simply rights this wrong and simply gives students the opportunity to refinance their loan debt at the same low rate being offered to new borrowers in the student loan program. Homeowners and businesses are often able to refinance their debts. Shouldn't student borrowers be able to do the same? We certainly think so.

Our legislation is also deficit-neutral and paid for by implementing the so-called Buffett rule, which holds millionaires and billionaires accountable to pay their fair share in taxes.

Student loan debt is a crisis all throughout our country. It is making a generation of Americans feel like they are ''forever stuck,'' in the words of my constituent.

But if the moral imperative isn't enough to act, we should be mindful of the benefits to the economy as a whole for allowing students to refinance their loans. The nonpartisan Congressional Research Service produced an analysis of our bill indicating that certain borrowers could save thousands of dollars. This is a savings that no doubt would be invested back into the economy.

Last year, the Center for American Progress estimated that the refinancing of just Federal student loans would have pumped $21 billion into the economy.

Mr. Speaker, our bill will benefit millions of students and their families, and it will boost our economy. It deserves the immediate action of this House.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

> H.R. 3627. An act to require the Attorney Gerneral to report on State law penalties for certain child abusers, and for other purposes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 48 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Lieutenant Commander Stephen Coates, Chaplain, United States Navy, Office of the Chaplain of the Marine Corps, Greenville, Illinois, offered the following prayer:

Sovereign Lord, the sound of this corporate prayer is as nothing compared to the clarion call of Your divine voice—rolling thunders of justice, resounding echoes of mercy, redemptive whispers of grace, calm assurances of comfort, promising songs of hope.

Like Your clear voice, may all words spoken in this Chamber today accurately reflect the fidelity of honest conversations between Members, the brutal wonder of free exchange amid volitional minds, the compassion of sincere interactions with constituents known by name and place, the hallowedness of solitary, bended-knee utterances known only to You, and the sacred thoughtfulness incumbent upon persons of privilege vested with the responsibility to weigh the consequences of matters temporal in light of the gravity of matters eternal.

May the same purity of passion that stirred these willing servants to seek

positions of public protection and provision empower them this day to honor You in serving all.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

> I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MARTIN COBB

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

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor the life of Martin Cobb, an 8-year-old boy from Richmond, Virginia, who was taken from us way too soon. He was killed in a heinous act while trying to protect his 12-year-old sister from a violent attacker.

From the very beginning, Martin was a fighter against all odds, surviving open heart surgery at 3 months old, when the doctors did not believe he was going to make it.

Martin was a student at Elizabeth Redd Elementary School and he enjoyed the kind of things that most kids grow fond of: playing with toy cars and riding his bike around the neighborhood.

Martin didn't have a father at home, and so his mother referred to him as the ''man of the house.'' As a loving son and brother, relatives say he had the ''heart of a lion.''

We will always remember him as a true family man, someone who loved his sister so much that he gave his life to protect her. In the face of grave danger, his only thought, his only instinct, was to help his sister.

At 8 years old, he may have been small in stature—some say he looked no older than 4 or 5—but in his last moments, Martin showed he was a bigger man than most men ever dream to be.

We honor Martin by remembering his incredible bravery. But let us also commit to honoring him by redoubling our efforts to foster safer neighborhoods and communities that produce more Martins and less assailants. Our children should be able to grow up enjoying childhood, not fearing for their lives.

In Martin's front yard there now reads a sign, ''A Real Hero Lived, Fought, and Died Here.''

Martin may no longer be with us, but I hope and pray his strength, his courage, and his spirit endure in each and every one of us.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT IN BUFFALO

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate three highly impressive students from City Honors High School in Buffalo, New York. Seamus Degan, Rex Herzberg, and Hakeem Salem made western New York proud by being selected to participate in the Congressional Science Student Forum, which was hosted yesterday on Capitol Hill.

In recent months, these students have worked hand-in-hand with local researchers at esteemed medical institutions in western New York, including Roswell Park Cancer Institute, to research cutting-edge medical issues, form hypotheses, and conduct hands-on experiments.

Mr. Speaker, when students start learning and experimenting with science, technology, engineering, and math as young adults, they are creating a lifelong commitment to learning and dedication to making a difference in the future. It is why it is so critical that Congress provide adequate funding to STEM education programs in our schools nationwide.

I commend these students for their achievement and look forward to hearing more from these promising innovators in the years to come.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON BENGHAZI

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 2 years, House committees have been investigating the terrorist attack in Benghazi that killed four brave Americans. These committees have done good work. However, many questions remain unanswered as the White House continues to stonewall our efforts by withholding information.

National Review editors recently summed it up best:

> The White House misled the American public about a critical matter of national interest, and it continues to practice deceit as the facts of the case are sorted out.

That, to answer Hillary Clinton's callous question:

> What difference does it make?

The administration's obstruction and dishonesty are unacceptable and warrant a new level of investigation. Creating a select committee to investigate this tragedy is long overdue, and with a former Federal prosecutor such as TREY GOWDY at the helm, it gives me great hope that Americans and the families of the victims will hear the truth and see accountability. They want, need, and deserve no less.

EXTEND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise because today in the House we will bring up a vote on approximately $310 billion of permanent tax credit extenders, including the very popular research and experimentation credit, a bipartisan-supported tax extender, but this is something that is being brought up without a pay-for at a time when the United States of America now has 2.6 million citizens who have lost their long-term unemployment benefits.

In my State of Pennsylvania alone, we have 125,000 families who lost that lifeline because, Mr. Speaker, you refuse to bring this up for a vote because it doesn't have a pay-for.

Fair is fair, Mr. Speaker. We support many of these extenders, but we can't leave these American families out in the cold like this.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, as we continue to celebrate National Foster Care Month, I would like to recognize the dedicated foster families, social workers, and service providers for their work to support the nearly 400,000 youth who are part of our country's foster care system.

Our Kids of Miami-Dade/Monroe, Foster Care Review, and CHARLEE of Dade County are just a few of the many organizations that work each and every day in our south Florida community to find a stable home with a devoted and loving family for our youth.

While May has been designated as National Foster Care Month, the work to ensure that every child has a safe and permanent family does not stop when the calendar turns. In fact, before the end of this year, Mr. Speaker, at least 23,000 of these vulnerable members of our society will age out of the foster care system. Research has shown that these young individuals are at a heightened risk of poverty, homelessness, incarceration, and early parenthood.

I encourage my congressional colleagues and every person across our Nation to work together so that we can

change these tragic facts and figures for the betterment of our youth and the improvement of our society.

FREE THE NIGERIAN GIRLS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I think we all understand and believe that our children are our most precious resource.

Over the last couple of weeks, hearts and minds of many around the world have been captured by a heinous thug by the name of Abubakar Shekau, the leader of the Boko Haram, who has been a vile, disgraceful, violent, and uncaring terrorist thug.

Yet we do not know where these girls are.

As women of the United States Congress, yesterday, myself, BARBARA LEE, MARCIA FUDGE, KAREN BASS, and JANICE HAHN went to the Nigerian Embassy to stand and reject the $12 that Shekau wants to sell these girls for.

We ask that we have a concerted effort on this. We should also establish a victims' fund.

In the meeting, as we spoke to those from Nigeria, we asked President Jonathan to stand up to say they will find these girls and they will bring this terrorist to justice. We ask that today because no one knows where these girls might be.

I close by calling two names: Aisha Ezekial and Nguba Buba. I will be calling these girls' names throughout this week to remind us they must be found now.

LERNER IN CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the American people have known since April 23, 2012, over 2 years ago, by a letter of 63 Members of Congress to the IRS Commissioner, that the IRS has targeted political organizations which question the President.

Congress has the responsibility to the American people to determine the facts and prevent future threats to American families. Sadly, the administration has refused to cooperate with House Republicans to facilitate oversight investigation. Instead of helping to restore the American people's faith in impartial government, key IRS officials remain silent.

Last night, the House voted to hold former IRS employee Lois Lerner in contempt because she refused to tell the truth before Congress. Congress also asked Attorney General Eric Holder to appoint a special counsel to further investigate this scandal.

The administration should take this opportunity to restore accountability, put politics aside, and help Congress provide citizens and the groups who are unfairly targeted with the answers they deserve.

In conclusion, God bless our troops and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

□ 1215

RESPONDING TO THE KIDNAPPINGS IN NIGERIA

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the whole world is watching Nigeria, and the whole world is outraged at the recent kidnappings of over 200 girls from a Nigerian school.

Make no mistake, this is human trafficking. They say they are selling them into marriage. They are selling them into sex slavery, rape, and human bondage.

As cochair of the Congressional Caucus on Human Trafficking, I hope the world will respond to this horrendous human tragedy with the same sense of urgency and compassion and the same level of assistance that was offered in the search for the missing Malaysian aircraft.

The U.S. Africa Command, Departments of Justice and State, and the FBI are offering assistance to the Nigerian Government; and we, as a Congress, should support sanctions against Boko Haram.

Decisive and swift action is needed to bring these young girls home and to prevent future mass kidnappings.

THE CFPB RURAL DESIGNATION PETITION AND CORRECTION ACT

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

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my support for H.R. 2672, the CFPB Rural Designation Petition and Correction Act.

One of the most troubling aspects of the Dodd-Frank Act was its creation of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which is a new bureaucracy with broad powers that is unaccountable to Congress or the American people.

When I talk to financial institutions in Kansas, one of their main concerns with this agency is that the CFPB will fail to correctly classify rural banks and, possibly, leave them open to overzealous regulation as a result.

I am a proud cosponsor and supporter of this bill, which will allow these financial institutions a way to appeal the CFPB's decisionmaking process and ensure that rural lenders and their communities are not unintentional victims of poor decisionmaking by the CFPB.

TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Stew Adams, who has been recognized by the Illinois Education Association as its 2014 Retired Teacher of the Year.

I am proud to say that Stew is a constituent of mine and has spent years teaching special education in the Rock Island/Milan School District.

In addition to his teaching duties, Stew was a tutor and a mentor to many young students in the Rock Island School District. He also contributed to the Rock Island Safe Schools program and has been an adviser to the Illinois State Board of Higher Education and Special Education and founder of the Western Illinois Retired Educators.

In addition to thanking Stew for his service to our community, I also want to take this opportunity to thank the teachers that I have had and have taught so many of our youngsters across our country during Teacher Appreciation Week. Their hard work and dedication to our children is both awe-inspiring and invaluable.

Our communities simply could not function without our educators, and I want to thank them.

COMMEMORATING MAY AS LET FREEDOM RACE MONTH

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

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate May as Let Freedom Race month at Charlotte Motor Speedway, and thank the folks who have worked hard to honor our brave men and women in uniform with this outstanding celebration.

Speedway Motorsports and Charlotte Motor Speedway are both in my hometown of Concord, North Carolina. While I am incredibly grateful for the impact both have on our local economy, I am also appreciative of their continued support for our Nation's military, veterans, and their families.

This Memorial Day weekend marks the 55th Let Freedom Race celebration, and more than 100,000 fans will gather at the speedway to celebrate and honor our military heroes.

This tradition will, once again, showcase America's military strength, while displaying our pride and appreciation for those we have lost, our veterans, those who continue to serve, and our military families.

We are so fortunate to have heroes who stand committed to serving in our Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the work done by the racing community to honor our veterans, and I join them and other North Carolinians to salute our warfighters who paid the ultimate price to protect our freedom.

NATIONAL TEACHERS WEEK

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, today, I stand in support of our National Teachers Week.

As the husband of a teacher, the brother of a teacher, and the lucky student of great teachers in the Jefferson County Public School system and the University of Colorado, I hold this profession in very hard regard.

Our Nation's teachers work tirelessly to provide education, resources, and a bright future for all of American students.

Colorado is blessed with a dedicated community of teachers in both K–12 and higher education. Teachers provide an invaluable service to our country, while earning salaries that do not reflect the importance of their jobs.

Every day, I hear about teachers striving to improve their schools and outcomes for their students. America's students now face one of the most competitive economies in our history.

Strong teachers are the key to the successful education of our children, and those same children are key to a prosperous, healthy, and successful future for our country and for the planet.

Thank you to all the teachers in my life, the Seventh Congressional District, and the State of Colorado.

TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, teachers are remarkable people. These dedicated professionals work hard to ensure that our children have the skills necessary to succeed and achieve the American Dream.

They get up early and stay up late, often sacrificing their own time and money, so our children have a fair shot at future success.

They don't do it for fame; though glory, they should receive. They don't do it for fortune; though riches, they do deserve. They do it because they love their jobs and care about their students. It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of our Nation's teachers to our country's strength and prosperity.

One of those teachers is my sister-in-law, Mandy Messer, who teaches elementary school at North Decatur Elementary.

A day should not pass that we don't thank teachers for their service on behalf of our children and our country.

Today, during Teacher Appreciation Week, I say thank to you my former teachers who played such an important role in my own life, and I express my gratitude to all the teachers throughout my congressional district who are doing such wonderful work.

SEEKING MAXIMUM PARTISANSHIP

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, last night, Republicans and Democrats on our House Armed Services Committee came together to pass a defense bill that all of us—I mean all of us—all of us on the committee could support. That is something remarkable, considering what is on the House floor this week.

Instead of debating the minimum wage, we are getting maximum partisanship. Instead of creating a select committee on job creation, we are voting to create a select committee on Benghazi, shamefully playing politics with a terrible tragedy.

The only person whose job the majority seems to care about is the former Secretary of State's. The national climate assessment released this week laid bare the consequences of climate change, but sadly, instead of reducing our carbon footprint, we get a climate of dysfunction and hot air.

Enough is enough. House leadership should follow the example of the House Armed Services Committee. Put the partisanship aside and get to work on the things that really matter to the American people.

WARREN COUNTY CAREER CENTER

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, career and technical education is critical to our economy.

I have a great program in my district, the Warren County Career Center, in Lebanon, Ohio. I have had the opportunity to tour the program a number of times. They do a great job.

Two success stories—Karie Lacy and Nick Cornett—both completed programs at the Warren County Career Center. Karie now owns her own salon and employs others; and Nick is working at a local robotics company, while working towards a degree in electrical engineering.

There are others like Karie and Nick across America who deserve access to programs that will prepare them for the workforce and lay the foundation for a successful career.

As we work together to strengthen our economy, we should support institutions like the Warren County Career Center. Programs like this, we should support all across America.

THE KIDNAPPINGS IN NIGERIA

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the tragic and shocking turn of events in Nigeria, where as many as 300 young girls have been abducted by a terrorist organization known as Boko Haram.

As a father, I can't imagine the anguish that these parents must be feeling as they wonder about what happened to their young girls.

I stand in solidarity with the people of Nigeria in this difficult time and condemn the violence against innocent people committed by Boko Haram and urge that all possible actions be taken and that President Jonathan finally do something about the terrorists and the thugs that seem to be ruling the country.

Too often, women and young girls are tragically persecuted, victimized, or denied education opportunities and a voice, particularly in these countries, based only on their gender. The violence and discrimination has no place in our world today.

Today, I will be joining my fellow colleagues and urging them to sign on to House Resolution 573, to condemn this heinous abduction, and supporting all efforts to find these girls and bring them home.

HONORING THE 250TH ANNIVERSARY OF EAST BERLIN, PENNSYLVANIA

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor East Berlin, Pennsylvania, on its 250th anniversary. The borough was founded on May 8, 1764, by John Frankenberger, a Prussian, who purchased 200 acres of land from Thomas and Richard Penn.

John laid out a town with 85 lots, one main street, four cross streets, and five alleys. He named the town ''Berlin'' after his native town in Prussia. East was added to the name in 1827, when the town post office was established.

Today, East Berlin is a thriving community of over 1,400 residents in Adams County. I am proud to congratulate East Berlin on this momentous day and wish the borough another successful 250 years.

SOLVENCY OF THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

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

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my continued concerns about the highway trust fund, which is projected to reach a critically low level in July, right in the middle of the busy summer construction season.

This funding is essential to projects in New Hampshire, and we simply cannot let the highway trust fund run out of money. It would cost us jobs, jeopardize public safety, and hurt our economy.

That is why I am introducing a bill to ensure that the highway trust fund

remains solvent for the remainder of this fiscal year. This will provide certainty to our States and businesses and allow Congress time to pass a full 6-year reauthorization of surface transportation programs.

My bill, the DRIVE Now Act, will do this, while increasing efficiencies in the government and reducing the deficit. Congress must invest in infrastructure and pass a long-term reauthorization of transportation programs.

To ensure that the highway trust fund doesn't run dry this summer, I urge the House to pass my commonsense legislation.

□ 1230

LIFE IS NOT ABOUT DISTANCE

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago, our justice system gave us a new definition for life. Convicted murderer Kermit Gosnell, the abortionist who for decades worked in Philadelphia, who personally killed hundreds of children in the womb, who personally kept body parts in bags and bottles that were scattered all around his clinic, he was not tried for that. Those things were all permitted.

One year ago this week that court clarified their definition of ''life.'' It wasn't about conception. It wasn't about age. It wasn't about ability to survive. It was about distance. ''Life'' was defined by distance for them.

Kermit Gosnell had the audacity to induce the labor of pregnant women and then take the child outside the womb, move them about 3 feet away, whether on his hands or set them on a table, and cut their spinal cord, sitting on the table, where they would die either on his hands or on the table. He moved them 3 feet. What tortured logic is that to say it is not a child in the womb, but it is a child if you move them 3 feet?

This is the United States of America. Life is not about distance. Life is about children. Let's choose life.

LONG ISLAND'S TOP TEACHER

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

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during Teacher Appreciation Week to honor a top teacher in the Third Congressional District of New York, John Motchkavitz, or ''Motch'' as he is called by his students.

John is the head of the business technology department at Great Neck South High School. He was named as a top five finalist on Live! with Kelly and Michael's top teachers search contest, and he will appear on the morning show next week when the winner will be announced.

In the 12 years that he has taught in Great Neck, he has helped lead the school's robotics team to the national competition. He coaches lacrosse; he builds sets for school plays; and four times a year, Mr. Speaker, he brings students to New York City to distribute food and supplies to the homeless. He also lives the lessons he teaches inside the classroom in his life outside the school. As a volunteer with the Great Neck Alert Fire Company, he was one of the first to respond to the September 11 terrorist attacks.

I am so proud of the contributions that John has made to Great Neck, to my congressional district, to Long Island, and to the Nation. I congratulate him. He is an example for teachers everywhere.

THE BOSS LIFT PROGRAM

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize a unique program organized through the National Committee for Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve, or ESGR, called ''Boss Lift,'' which is designed to help businesses gain a better understanding of the responsibilities of our National Guard and Army Reserve.

In my home State, the Pennsylvania National Guard is doing a tremendous job with the Boss Lift program by providing local employers with a new perspective on the sacrifices and the challenges these soldiers and airmen face and a firsthand look at the work being performed by these citizen soldiers.

This past weekend, I had the opportunity to visit Fort Indiantown Gap and the Pennsylvania National Guard and met with the incredible citizen soldiers who help make this program possible, all while remaining ready to defend our country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank ESGR, the Army Reserve, and the Pennsylvania National Guard for their outreach efforts through the Boss Lift program and helping to remind us all of the vital role our Reserve and Guard components play in our national security and local communities.

UNEMPLOYMENT

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, the failure of the majority to bring the extension of unemployment insurance benefits up for a vote by December 28 of last year has left many without a lifeline. Let's review these figures. On December 28, 1.3 million were immediately cut with no benefits; 1.9 million will be added by the end of the first 6 months of 2014.

Let's look at it another way. It means 72,000 every week. It also means one person every eight seconds in this country, the greatest country in this world. 200,000 of them are veterans. The loss of this benefit also means that our economy lost $5 billion in the first 3 months of 2014.

Mr. Speaker, two-thirds of America's people support the extension of unemployment benefits. The Democrats have signed a discharge petition. Please bring the extension to the floor. Remember, they are unemployed through no fault of their own. That is why they are entitled to these benefits.

HONORING WORLD WAR II VETERAN AND FORMER POW, SERGEANT GEORGE THURSBY

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Sergeant George Thursby.

Sergeant Thursby, who I met last week, is a resident of New Florence, Pennsylvania. He was a B–24 gunner in the Army Air Forces during World War II.

Sergeant Thursby was forced to land and was taken prisoner of war after his aircraft was hit while bombing Munich. He attempted to escape but was arrested and returned to the POW camp. Conditions were abysmal, and Sergeant Thursby was skinny as a rail. He attempted to escape again and reached American lines in France.

When Sergeant Thursby returned home, he had a long and productive career working at U.S. Steel's Homestead Works and retired in 1983.

Last week, almost 70 years after his successful escape, Sergeant Thursby finally received his long overdue and well-deserved recognition in a ceremony at the Pentagon. He was awarded the Prisoner of War Medal.

Sergeant Thursby's bravery, strength, and spirit serves as an inspiration to all Americans. It is fitting that we honor him on Victory in Europe Day. Let us all take time to thank World War II veterans like Sergeant Thursby today for their service and sacrifice.

FOSTER YOUTH MONTH

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Foster Youth Month.

Every child deserves a healthy, safe, and stable home, yet too many continue to go without these basic needs that so many of us take for granted. This May, we recognize more than 400,000 American children in foster care who are waiting for their forever family.

The theme of this year's Foster Month is ''Building Blocks Toward Permanent Families,'' an issue that is near to my heart. My parents took in several foster children when I was

growing up, and I was able to see firsthand the difference that this made. And some of them are still in touch with my family today.

To all those people across the country who are taking in a foster child today, I say thank you. I know you are making a positive difference in that child's life, and I encourage others to consider doing the same.

Foster children belong to all of us, and we have a moral obligation to treat them with the same love and care that we would our own children. And I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing May as Foster Youth Month.

BOURBON WHISKEY

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 50th anniversary of the passage of S. Con. Res. 19, which officially recognized bourbon as a distinctive product of the United States of America.

Specifically, the resolution provided that bourbon whiskey is a distinctive product of the U.S. and is unlike other types of alcoholic beverages, whether foreign or domestic; that bourbon whiskey has achieved recognition and acceptance throughout the world as a distinctive product of the United States; and the resolution further prohibited the importation of whiskey designated as ''bourbon'' to protect bourbon as a product distilled and aged in the United States alone.

Many great nations have a national spirit. Bourbon certainly belongs in the same class. As the report that accompanied the resolution notes, the name ''bourbon'' refers to the particular part of the world this distinctive distilled spirit first arrived from, Bourbon County, Kentucky. The name is now universally accepted as meaning American whiskey, and over 90 percent of all bourbon is distilled in my home State, the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Today, Kentucky's bourbon industry is enjoying an explosive growth due to demand both here and abroad. I think this renaissance is the result not only of bourbon's timeless production process and depth of flavor, but is also thanks to its status as a uniquely American spirit.

This week we celebrate the 50th anniversary of Congress putting that concept into law, and we thank all of the hardworking men and women in my home State who make this uniquely American spirit such a great product.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Republican leadership to bring up the bill that would extend critical unemployment insurance. So far, the gentleman from Ohio, Speaker BOEHNER, is telling struggling Americans that they are out of luck and out of money.

This bill was passed in the Senate on a bipartisan basis, 65–34, to move forward to help people who are unemployed, and yet the Republican leadership here still refuses to bring it up. It is also completely paid for. Still, the Republicans insist that there is no longer an emergency and that unemployment numbers are dropping, but the reality is just the opposite.

Long-term unemployment, defined as being out of work for 27 weeks or more, has not been this high since World War II. And we know that anyone receiving unemployment benefits, when they get their check, the money goes right back into the economy. In fact, unemployment insurance generates $1.52 in economic activity for every $1 spent.

So why does the Republican leadership simply not bring this up? Instead, they focus on issues like Benghazi or setting up a select committee on Benghazi. They should be focusing on job creation—creating jobs—and helping the unemployed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 567, ESTABLISHING SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE EVENTS SURROUNDING THE 2012 TERRORIST ATTACK IN BENGHAZI

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 575 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 575

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 567) providing for the Establishment of the Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attack in Benghazi. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MESSER). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my friend, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 575, which provides for a closed rule for consideration of H. Res. 567.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, it has been nearly 20 months since terrorists attacked the American diplomatic mission in Benghazi, Libya, killing four Americans, including then-U.S. Ambassador to Libya J. Christopher Stevens.

Since that time, the House Armed Services Committee, the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform have all conducted investigations related to the events surrounding the attack and the administration's response. And I want to commend each of these committees and their chairmen and their members for work that has been done that is exemplary, that has aimed exactly on the questions that needed to be asked, and for those who have dedicated time and effort to make sure that these important issues are not only discussed but understood and resolved so that each of these committees, as they work with their particular agencies in the Federal Government, come to a clear and a clean understanding about what happened, what our responses might and should have been, and what they would be in the future.

We are here today because this administration has chosen not to fully participate, to block our efforts to know the truth, and to provide the necessary people in a forthright manner who could be a part of answering these questions. This blockage has included a timed delivery that has not been timely but the time interval for requesting information, for the redacting of information that has not been properly done, and, perhaps most importantly, for the remarks that have been made by the administration, including the President of the United States, the former Secretary of State, the Secretary of State, and other highly public officials who serve at the pleasure of the American people who have tried to thwart, who have tried to misdirect, and who have tried to—what I believe is—badger Republicans into believing that what they did was aboveboard and correct when, in fact, an evaluation and a proper lessons learned lesson being available not only for them, for the United States Congress, but also accountability to the American Government.

□ 1245

We are here specifically today because in the last few weeks an outside group, Judicial Watch, through the Freedom of Information Act, obtained information and received that information through the judicial system of the United States whereby they received emails that were not redacted, that were not doctored or altered, and that came to them and did not match up with the information that had been provided to official committees of the

United States House of Representatives for official business.

At a time when an administration decides that they are going to take advantage of the structure of the United States House of Representatives under official business, then that means that it is time for the United States House of Representatives to then learn that they are being duped, that they are being taken advantage of, and that our open system was being used, I believe, in a political way.

That is why we are here today, Mr. Speaker. We are here today not for political reasons but because the official business of the United States House of Representatives, article I, is to make sure that we understand and have oversight over those that are in article II and work with people who are in article III.

We work together in a careful balance to make sure that what we do is in the best interest of the people—the American people, who need to have faith and confidence in the work that is done on their behalf—but also be accountable to the American people when great things happen and when mistakes happen also.

To sweep something under the rug, to try and move people in another direction and try and fool them, to not be forthright about the actions that were taken or understood, I believe is a dereliction of duty. Most importantly, I think that what the investigation up to now has revealed is a lack of desire by this administration to fess up to what I believe might be failures or weaknesses in a system that we need to work on together.

Four Americans' lives were not only at stake, but the reputation of the United States of America was on the line. Terrible things happened. Worse things could have happened, also. And for the United States Congress to have oversight to work on these issues is, I believe, an important national security objective.

We are here today because President Barack Obama and his administration are not forthright or interested in working with official Members of the United States House of Representatives to clear the issue, and to understand what happened so that we may move forward with great confidence; that as our men and women who are in the State Department are engaged in the sensitive work, the work that is done on behalf of this great Nation, that we can understand that relationship with the United States military, with intelligence, with the money that we spend and the mission that the President of the United States decides that these men and women will be engaged in.

We are here today to gain answers, to gain knowledge, and to gain corrective action. And that is why I believe last night in the Rules Committee, the Rules Committee moved forward on an original jurisdiction hearing whereby the Rules Committee would make and take the responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that we understood that we would be taking the time of the House of Representatives, that we would be taking, in essence, jurisdiction and putting that to a select committee, a select committee which would have the authority and the responsibility to ensure that the things which I have spoken of this morning were achieved.

This is not political. This is public policy at its most important level. It is national security that is being discussed not only today but discussed in private among Members of Congress with this administration to ensure that the events that occurred on that day were well understood and reflective to the Members of Congress who provide money, resources, and oversight relating to those events.

Unfortunately, it became apparent to me and others, including the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN BOEHNER, that these committees are struggling with an unwanted partner: the administration. And this administration, by refusing to completely comply with congressional subpoenas, by delaying the delivery of important documents, by heavily redacting critical information—not sensitive or information that might be considered national security—and by retroactively classifying previously unclassified files, the Obama administration has thrown roadblocks at every turn of the road.

The most recent example of this was the deliberate subversion of the investigation which occurred on April 17, less than a month ago. This is why the Speaker of the House of Representatives, JOHN BOEHNER, who has been very deliberative and most involved but careful to let each committee operate to the level of its jurisdiction, to make sure that each committee had not just the resources but the ability to make sure that they were on a process for the delivery of the things which I have talked about, up to and including the truth, Mr. Speaker, the truth behind the events, the truth behind how we would describe this event so that lessons would be learned, and evince how we would effectively and capably understand the new and current threats against the United States and what occurred on that day and on a moving-forward basis. If you refuse to participate with the United States Congress, if you subvert the process and take advantage of our structure, the Honorable JOHN BOEHNER will then respond with that which is given to him and to the United States House of Representatives, and that is to honorably pivot based upon something that happened less than a month ago, April 17.

This administration chose to deliberately mislead the United States Congress, and we responded therein. On that day, the administration delivered 276 documents consisting of 779 pages. They gave these to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, many of which continued to be heavily redacted. The same day, the State Department complied under a Freedom of Information Act requested by Judicial Watch. I believe that the timing of these two productions is not a coincidence as to whether or not Congress would have received these documents absent Judicial Watch's FOIA request. The two sets of documents are incredibly similar, and, shockingly, some of the documents received by the committee are more redacted than those received by Judicial Watch.

Well, I get that. That is because under FOIA, the Freedom of Information Act, there is a criminal statute attached to that which those lawyers preparing these documents knew they could be criminally held liable.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line of this is this administration has not respected the United States Congress, did not respect the committees that were asking for this information, and there, too, made sure that they made their job even more difficult. These roadblocks, I believe, serve as two important points for us to remember: that the Speaker of the House of Representatives did not choose to be where we are today but, rather, it was this administration through its deliberate attempt to place us exactly where we are.

So, first, the committee will have questions that it has to ask, and they are going to this administration to make sure that we have complete documentation. Every Member of this select committee will have the opportunity—and should have on a bipartisan basis—to see the documents. The select committee will consolidate itself into a centralized location in order to make sure that they work together. We are going to streamline congressional efforts when we find out the things which we could have and should have known but know now to avoid in the future.

And lastly, we are going to come with an answer to the American people that we believe is what they are due, and that is: what happened; how could we have avoided it; and what do we look for in the future.

Our representative government is founded on the assumption of a transparent government. Our President, Barack Obama, stated when he was elected that this would be the most open and transparent government. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to take the President at his word. The question is: Will the President live up to his word and expect this administration to join with the House of Representatives in this new era, this new way of trying to go about getting an answer for the American public?

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the 2012 attack on Benghazi was a tragedy that took the

lives of brave American public servants representing and serving our country. And Congress has an obligation here—both to the families of the victims and to the country—to try to prevent this from ever happening again. But that is not at all what we are doing here today.

The Senate has produced two bipartisan reports on the issue, and the State Department's Accountability Review Board has produced a constructive, unbiased report. There is a vast body of evidence already collected, and none of it demonstrates any sort of coverup or conspiracy.

The majority here has had 13 congressional hearings over four committees, 50 briefings, produced five reports and 25,000 pages of documentation, wasted countless millions of dollars, and has gotten absolutely nowhere. One more committee weighted in favor of the majority is not going to do any better. We have bottomed out on Benghazi.

Nonetheless, the majority has repeatedly demonstrated that rather than engaging in a serious, objective examination of the circumstances, they want to use the tragedy as an excuse to generate partisan talking points, and then has descended into the crass and the unbelievable.

Several press reports this week, including one from Politico, indicate that the National Republican Congressional Committee sent out a fundraising email entitled ''You Can Become a Benghazi Watchdog Right Now,'' and that leads to a donation page where you have to pay to be a Benghazi watchdog. And even after their fundraising effort was exposed, Republicans are continuing to use this effort to raise money off of this tragedy. This morning's Politico says: ''Republicans stick with Benghazi cash grab.''

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit into the RECORD these two articles from Politico, May 8 and May 9. The first one, ''NRCC''—which stands for the National Republican Congressional Committee—''fundraising off Benghazi,'' and the second one this morning, ''Republicans stick with Benghazi cash grab.''

[From POLITICO, May 7, 2014]

NRCC FUNDRAISING OFF OF BENGHAZI

(By Jake Sherman)

The House Republican campaign arm is rebuffing the chairman of the Benghazi select committee and is raising money off the GOP's investigation into the 2012 attack.

A post on the National Republican Congressional Committee website dated May 6 is titled ''You Can Become a Benghazi Watchdog Right Now.''

''House Republicans will make sure that no one will get away from [Trey] Gowdy and the Select Committee,'' the blog post says. ''This is going to be a national effort for a national investigation.''

Once a visitor to the site enters their name, email and ZIP code, it asks for a donation to ''stop Democrats from controlling all of Washington.''

But Rep. Trey Gowdy (R–S.C.), whom Speaker John Boehner (R–Ohio) tapped to chair the panel, said Wednesday morning on MSNBC's ''Morning Joe'' he would ask Republicans to forgo fundraising off the attacks.

''Yes, and I will cite myself as an example,'' Gowdy said. ''I have never sought to raise a single penny on the backs of four murdered Americans.''

For right now, the NRCC doesn't appear to be backing down.

''The Obama administration has not been honest with the American people with regards to the security failures in Benghazi, which left four Americans dead,'' said NRCC spokeswoman Andrea Bozek. ''Our goal is to hold Democrats in Congress accountable who vote against creating the select committee on Benghazi and who continue to try to sweep this controversy under the rug.''

[From POLITICO, May 7, 2014]

REPUBLICANS STICK WITH BENGHAZI CASH GRAB

(By Byron Tau and Katie Glueck)

Republicans have no intention of listening to Trey Gowdy.

A number of Republican candidates and conservative groups have openly used the Sept. 11, 2012, attacks in Benghazi, Libya, as a cash grab. And that's likely to continue despite a strongly worded rebuke from the new chairman of the Republican select committee assigned to investigate the response to the attacks.

Gowdy, a South Carolina Republican, commented on MSNBC Wednesday that he and fellow Republicans should not fundraise off ''the backs of four murdered Americans''—creating a new standard by which the party can be judged and opening the GOP up to charges of past, present and future hypocrisy.

That's put the party in an awkward spot. Republicans on Capitol Hill are eager to lend the looming committee investigation into the murder of four Americans an air of sobriety, dignity and seriousness. But political strategists are eager to mobilize the GOP base and amp up grassroots fundraising by capitalizing on the base's outrage over how the Obama administration handled the attacks.

The 2012 consulate attack and accusations of a White House cover-up are catnip for grassroots donors and activists. And Benghazi—and the select committee assigned to investigate it—is a key part of the GOP fundraising and mobilization strategy. This week, the National Republican Congressional Committee rolled out a new fundraising campaign called ''Benghazi Watchdogs''—an effort by the aiming to raise money off Gowdy's new position. Publicly available domain registration data shows that the site was registered Tuesday.

Other fundraising solicitations about Benghazi include:

A fundraising page from the NRCC with a photo of Obama and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, accompanied by big bold text proclaiming: ''Benghazi was a coverup. Demand answers.''—and asking for donations of up to $500.

A May 2 blog post from the National Republican Senatorial Committee titled ''Dude. You're Being Lied To About Benghazi.'' The post was in response to former White House spokesman Tommy Vietor's appearance on Fox News last week where he used the line ''Dude, that was like two years ago.'' It concludes: ''Americans deserve the truth about Benghazi and it's clear Democrats will not give it to them. Donate today and elect a Republican Senate majority.''

A May email blast from the conservative nonprofit Special Ops OPSEC Education Fund that asks for an ''immediate contribution'' of $25, $50, $100 or more to ''hold Obama and Hillary's feet to the fire until justice is done.''

A January email from Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Texas) in the aftermath of the State of the Union noting that Obama ''failed to mention Benghazi, the IRS, or the NSA'' and asking for donations.

A John Bolton PAC email from April accused Obama, Clinton and former Defense Secretary Leon Panetta of refusing to take responsibility for ''leaving Americans to die at the hands of terrorists.''

An email from Senate candidate Joe Miller saying that there is ''strong evidence that senior administration officials crafted a false narrative for purely political purposes.''

An email this week from Rep. Scott Rigell's (R-Va.) campaign asking for ''$5, $10, $20, or $50 to help keep him in Congress and hold the Administration accountable'' that also asks ''Why didn't the military respond to the events in Benghazi Were there even military assets in the region available? If not, why not? Who made the decision not to send support? House Republicans are committed to finding out the truth about Benghazi.''

An email from House candidate Andy Tobin accusing Obama of ''covering up vital information about what happened that night'' and asking for donations.

Conservative pundits and former politicians like Mike Huckabee, Allen West and others have sent emails to their lists, according to the liberal watchdog group Media Matters.

Brad Dayspring, a spokesman for the NRSC, said that there hasn't been a coordinated effort from the committee to fundraise off of the issue, even though his committee wrote a blog post with a fundraising solicitation about the hearings.

''Part of politics is fundraising. I think fundraising is a separate activity than calling attention to important issues,'' he said in an interview. ''Benghazi is going to be a topic of discussion because it deserves answers, and I think it's important for both candidates and elected officials to discuss it.''

GOP strategist Rick Wilson said that while fundraising off of such a sensitive topic needs to be done within the ''bounds of propriety,'' candidates on both sides of aisle aren't hesitant to try to turn the ''story du jour'' into donation pitches, especially when seeking to round up small-dollar contributions.

''It's a tragedy, a serious national security question that has to be resolved, and the administration owes answers,'' Wilson said of Benghazi. ''On the other hand, you're going to see people on both sides use it to build mailing lists, build name ID, fundraising lists, etc. There's a base level of inevitability.''

Democrats pointed to both the committee itself and the fact that it was being used as a fundraising ploy as evidence that the entire investigation was a political farce.

Chris Lehane, a veteran Democratic strategist, said that Republicans fundraising off of Benghazi could easily overplay their hand.

''At the end of the day you're dealing with an issue that was a tragedy,'' he said. ''From a political perspective, that's raising money from a situation where people representing our government were killed. It's a politically perilous, treacherous thing to do.''

In a general election, he said, a Democrat could easily dismiss such a Republican as ''playing politics with people's lives.''

White House Deputy Press Secretary Josh Earnest on Wednesday jabbed the NRCC for its fundraising efforts.

''I think that the fact that the National Republican Congressional Committee is raising money off the creation of this committee

is a pretty good indication of the political motivation that's at work here,'' he said aboard Air Force One.

And Republicans aren't the only ones to use national tragedies for fundraising or list-building.

The nonprofit Organizing for Action has come under fire several times for using gun-related events to build their email list—sending emails on the anniversary of the Newtown shooting and the day of the Navy Yard shooting.

Republican officials defended their tactics as giving voters answers to pressing questions.

''The Obama administration has not been honest with the American people with regards to Benghazi, and if Nancy Pelosi becomes speaker the American people will never know the truth. Our goal is to hold Democrats in Congress accountable who vote against creating the select committee on Benghazi and who continue to try to sweep this controversy under the rug,'' said NRCC spokeswoman Andrea Bozek.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Additionally, reports today from a prominent journalist say that Mr. BOEHNER himself says that he will not try to stop the fundraising.

The majority is demonstrating without a shadow of a doubt that like the many, many votes we have taken trying to kill health care, this is a political move. That is the most crass and awful thing to do to the families of these four people who died. We keep over and over rubbing salt into that awful wound by bringing this up over and over. And how do you think they feel now knowing what this game is about in the House of Representatives?

I am appalled the majority would use these deaths for political gain and political money when what the families of the victims and Americans want to do is to ensure it never happens again. But we are doing nothing in the world to ensure that.

Not only is the majority disregarding the bipartisan findings, but their own process is so wrought with error, partisanship, and deception that leaders in their own party are calling foul.

The Oversight Committee has produced several witnesses of dubious quality, but the most recent one is a brigadier general, to testify about the minority, and the minority was only give his name and had no way—we didn't have any address or anything else—to even verify his credentials.

□ 1300

We are indebted to Congressman BUCK MCKEON, Armed Services Committee chairman, who discredited this witness by calling Brigadier General Robert Lovell an unreliable witness and criticized Lovell's assertion that the State Department was not quick to deploy troops to respond to the 2012 terrorist attack in Libya. Lovell testified Thursday before Issa's oversight panel.

Congressman MCKEON stated:

Brigadier General Lovell did not serve in a capacity that gave him reliable insight into operational options available to commanders during the attack, nor did he offer specific courses of action not taken.

MCKEON added:

The Armed Services Committee has interviewed more than a dozen witnesses in the operational chain of command that night, yielding thousands of pages of transcripts, emails, and other documents. We have no evidence that State Department officials delayed the decision to deploy what few resources DOD had available to respond.

How tragic is that? How tacky is that? How beneath the dignity of the House of Representatives is that?

I have an amendment to this resolution based on a simple premise that, if this thing is going to be put together and funded, that it really does some kind of work bipartisanly, which would be really strange in this House, but the idea of having another committee to try to get different results from all of other committees and all of the other hearings with the results they have had really is a foolish waste of time.

Our amendment makes membership on the committee equally divided between Republicans and Democrats. We know already that is not going to happen.

It guarantees the minority signoff on subpoenas and depositions—no such luck.

It guarantees equal distribution of money, staffing, and other resources of the committee.

It requires the committee to establish written rules—that would be a good one—specifically including rules concerning how documents and other information may be obtained, used, or released.

It guarantees equal access to evidence and materials of the committee and perhaps can identify witnesses who are going to be coming before the committee.

It provides for transparency of the committee's expenditures and budgeting.

It ensures that a quorum for taking testimony or receiving evidence includes at least one minority member.

Finally, it ensures that the majority has a say in decisions about extended questioning and staff questioning of witnesses.

Mr. Speaker, it is shameful what is happening here today. People, not just persons right now, but I believe that future historians looking at the setup of this committee will be appalled, as all of the rest of us are on our side, that to make use politically and financially of the tragedy of the loss of four brave Americans is beneath contempt.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee is the committee that meets upstairs. We decide what legislation will come to the floor. In this case, the House Rules Committee has original jurisdiction over this bill, but the Rules Committee is made up of specialists, of experts across this Congress, not only on the Republican and Democrat side, but people who represent people back home who hear from and want to know about the effects that Congress does and about the daily impact.

One of those Members comes with vast experience and comes to us as former chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee. She is a person who is well respected and thoughtful.

More importantly, she was on duty as the chairwoman at the time Benghazi occurred, and we are delighted she is on the Rules Committee. She has brought incredible integrity and insight into this matter.

At this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SESSIONS for his inspiring leadership on the Rules Committee on every issue, but most especially as he spearheaded the creation of this select committee on Benghazi to examine what happened, what led to this attack, and what has happened since. Thank you for your leadership, Chairman SESSIONS.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here to fully support this measure, but it really is unfortunate, it is sad, it is tragic that it has come to this. We shouldn't have to be here today debating the rule and, later, the underlying resolution on having to form a select committee to be able to get to the truth about what happened on that tragic day and night of September 11, 2012; but, unfortunately, our patience has been sorely tried, so here we are.

The administration has, for nearly 2 years now, been stonewalling and obfuscating, anything it can do, to avoid letting the truth out about that tragic terrorist attack in our consulate in Benghazi, Libya.

As chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee at the time of the attack, as Chairman SESSIONS has pointed out, I know, perhaps as well as any of our colleagues, just how much the administration has been trying to protect this false narrative and President Obama, the narrative that Libya was a political success. Repeated requests for more protection were ignored.

When the Accountability Review Board report was released, I planned on convening a hearing to examine the assessment and the recommendations; but in true stalling fashion, the State Department did not release the report to us until about 8:30 p.m., just a few hours before our hearing was set to begin.

Then, of course, there was a new song and dance every time we tried to secure a date for Secretary Clinton to come before our House Foreign Affairs Committee to testify.

We would even have taken any administration official, for that matter. It took 3 months for the administration to provide us with witnesses, and it did not provide Secretary Clinton to our committee until the following year.

This is not the moves, Mr. Speaker, of an administration that had planned on being the most transparent in history. In fact, this administration has been anything but transparent, as we

have seen with the emails, having been the latest revelation in the never-ending attempt to avoid telling the American public the full truth about what happened, what was the lead up to the terrorist attack, what happened during the many hours of that firefight, and what happened to all of those documents afterwards

That is why, Mr. Speaker, we need this select committee, to get the truth out there for the American public, so that we can have an open and honest debate about what happened on that fateful day and to ensure that we can do everything in our power to prevent another terrorist attack like this from happening in the future.

Let's remember these names, Mr. Speaker: Ambassador Chris Stevens, Information Officer Sean Smith, and former Navy SEALs Tyrone Woods and Glen Doherty. These are names that the American people need to remember each and every day.

Mr. Speaker, some folks have mentioned the fundraising aspect of this Benghazi investigation, and that is rather sad and pathetic to bring that up, but it is interesting because I was reading a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. It is interesting that this says that the Democrats are fundraising off GOP fundraising off Benghazi. It is a very interesting article, and I hope that all of our colleagues will look at it.

It is an article, and it says:

> Contribute now, Democrats 2014.

I am not pointing fingers and calling names; but if we are going to get blamed for something, I think that there is enough blame to go around. To sensationalize this and to fundraise off it, this is something some groups are trying to do, but I believe that the pot is calling the kettle black.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for your respected leadership on this issue. The American people deserve to know the truth. We must not keep promoting a false narrative. Libya was not a political success. Libya continues, to this day, to be a tinderbox waiting to explode.

Terrorist groups are all over the place. Let's not ignore the facts on the ground. Let's get to the truth about what happened to Benghazi, and having this select committee is a way to get to the truth—pure and simple—no politics.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), the ranking member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend, the former chairman of the Rules Committee, LOUISE SLAUGHTER from New York.

I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying resolution, H. Res. 567. The majority's obsession with keeping Benghazi conspiracy theories front and center through the midterm elections, despite the fact that Republicans have held 10 Congressional hearings already, nine classified Member briefings, and 16 Intelligence Committee oversight events on the Benghazi attack, despite those 35 congressional proceedings here in the House alone on Benghazi, the most astonishing information to emerge has been the striking level of disinterest exhibited by certain Members of the majority with respect to posing substantive questions that actually might inform efforts to enhance the security of American personnel abroad.

In fact, the independent Accountability Review Board of Admiral Mullen and Ambassador Pickering, two of the most respected civil servants in our lifetimes, as well as the report of the Republican majority-controlled House Armed Services Committee, have thoroughly vetted and debunked the outrageous and irresponsible Benghazi conspiracy theories that may make for good Republican fundraising, but disgracefully slander the service and dedication of public servants in the military and diplomatic corps.

In a USA Today op-ed published yesterday, my friend, Mr. GOWDY, from South Carolina asked:

> Was our military response during the pendency of the siege sufficient?

To save us all the time and resources that the Speaker now apparently plans to spend on his proposed partisan show panel, respectfully, I would recommend that my colleagues pose that very question to the esteemed Republican chairman of the House Armed Services Committee who stated last week:

> The Armed Services Committee has interviewed more than a dozen witnesses in the operational chain of command, yielding thousands of pages of transcripts, emails, and other documents. We have no evidence that the Department of State officials delayed the decision to deploy those resources available to the DOD to respond.

With their one-sided partisan select committee, we will not further an investigation or get at the truth the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) talked about.

We will reveal nothing new; rather, we will do our great Nation a grave disservice in continuing to perpetuate myths and conspiracies that cloud a simple, painful truth: the attack on Benghazi was a tragedy perpetrated by jihadist terrorists—not by foreign diplomats, not by U.S. diplomats.

There was no coverup. There was no soft-pedaling of this act of terror, not by the President, not by the Secretary of State, not by the Secretary of Defense, nor our Intelligence Committee; and to suggest otherwise is a great slander.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Instead, Republicans on the Oversight Committee remain obsessed with recycling tired and worn talking points in a cynical attempt to fire up the GOP base before the midterm elections this November.

Unfortunately, the regression into crass demagoguery has real world consequences, Mr. Speaker. Our country's diplomatic corps cannot operate effectively if we lock them in fortresses and prevent them from engaging in foreign nations because there might be a risk.

The reality is that striking the right balance between necessary security and effective diplomacy is an inherently complex and daunting challenge for our foreign service every day, everywhere.

As Ambassador Pickering and Admiral Mullen accurately stated in their review report:

> No diplomatic presence is without risk, and the total elimination of risk is a nonstarter for U.S. diplomacy.

In closing, I would ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: Why do they not trust the judgment of this Chamber's foremost military expert, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, who pronounced himself ''satisfied that where the troops were, how quickly the thing all happened, and how quickly it dissipated, we probably couldn't have done more than we did''?

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

□ 1315

> Mr. CONNOLLY. We probably couldn't have done more than we did.

Those are the words of our colleague from California, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

I urge all Members to oppose this cynical, exploitative, partisan ploy that is not worthy of this House.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Lewisville, Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the recognition. I thank the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Texan, for yielding me the time. I certainly thank him for his confidence in me in allowing me to be on the Rules Committee this past year and a half.

Mr. Speaker, it is now nearly 2 years, an administration that ran on the concept of transparency but now only functions in opacity. We heard from the administration on September 12 of 2012:

> We will not waiver in our commitment to see that justice is done for this terrible act. And make no mistake, justice will be done.

It seems strange now, almost 2 years later, to think on those words. That seemed like a sincere promise. The American people believed that promise that was made just days after the attack. If then we could have known that 19 months later the President's press secretary would stand before the White House press corps and laugh about the

event and call it a conspiracy theory. I don't think we would have believed it if someone had told us what the future held, but sadly, that is the state of affairs today.

Here we have a tragic event against our Ambassador, against American citizens, and the darned thing has nearly become a cold case because of the refusal of the White House to prioritize anything related to the investigation except for their own bizarre political spin about what happened.

Mr. Speaker, we have been forced to look into the anguished faces of the victims' families and tell them that we have not been able to find answers for them about the attack, the attack that killed their sons. We have an entire Caucus that has threatened to boycott an investigation that they have simply dismissed as political excess. It is not political excess to those families, Mr. Speaker.

In turn, we as a Congress must do everything in our power to do what the President said, what the President stated back in 2012: to ensure that justice is done for this terrible act. The only way to deliver that justice is to establish the select committee.

This is another step in what has become a very long process. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and support the underlying bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman, the ranking member on the Rules Committee, and my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, for the hard work that the Rules Committee engages in.

I think the first comment that I would like to make is what we have been making, Ms. SLAUGHTER, throughout this process, is our deep and abiding sympathy for the Americans who lost their lives in the name and in the duty to this country. I don't think there is a divide on that issue.

I would take a different perspective from a cold case. This is a hot and ongoing case that has been investigated and has evidenced individuals whom I would believe that, in any other instance, my friends on the side of the aisle would hold to the integrity of their representation.

One hundred years of military experience testified on the question of Benghazi, I believe, in the Committee on Armed Services. We have heard over and over from those in the State Department. We have had conclusions on the question of coverup, and we have seen nothing pointed to the administration to do so.

I think the issue today is a question of fairness. That is what Democrats have always stood for. I have watched my leaders through the endless investigations, starting from Waco and the impeachment process, and I can almost say—maybe I should even say that I come from a district where the Honorable Barbara Jordan served. She was on the Watergate Committee and the impeachment process as a member of the Judiciary Committee. I remember her posture on that committee and holding up the Constitution. As a Texan, as a Democrat, we admired that. That is the premise upon which I believe we should be looking at this process.

As I read this resolution, I am troubled, Mr. Speaker, because if we are going to do fairness and if we are going to reach a level of ethical respect, then there is a concern. We need an amendment, because this follows the rules of the House, which means that the chairman is solely given and ceded the authority—that means he or she could—of subpoena power. That does not rise to the level of fairness.

Now, someone refuted our leadership's request for a bipartisan, even-numbered committee and cited that the only committee that is even-numbered is the Committee on Ethics, and they are right, Mr. Speaker. We want this to be an ethical, fair, responsibly, constitutionally grounded committee investigation report, because the committee is unending. It will end only 30 days after the completion of its work; therefore, it can go on and on and on. The question is will the American people see fairness.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlewoman another minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, what we want them to see, if we truly honor those dead Americans that died in the line of battle and duty, then we need the kind of face to the American people that balances the subpoena power so that we all—meaning Republicans and Democrats who are on that committee, if that committee is finalized—can responsibly question witnesses, and that the issue will not be the committee in its process, but it will be the fairness, it will be the Constitution, it will be the dignity and honor we give to those who have fallen.

I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle, we can waive the point of order, amend this on the floor of the House to give a balance to this committee, to add the balance that our leadership has asked for, the fairness that our leadership is asking for, give the subpoena powers in a balanced manner, pay tribute to those who have honored this Nation by being willing to stand in the line, in the eye of fire.

I conclude simply by indicating we are the people of this Nation. Respond to our concerns. And I ask my colleagues to reject this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Members of Congress who attend hearings and heard the testimony yesterday should not mislead the American people by their statements on the floor as the gentlewoman from Texas did.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) just talked about how we have proposed that this be a balanced committee like the Ethics Committee. That was done with regard to another special committee, in fact, the bill that was sponsored by current Speaker, then-minority leader, JOHN BOEHNER in the 110th Congress.

They set up a special committee with regard to voting irregularities. They had an equal balance between Democrats and Republicans to remove any taint of partisanship from the proceedings. That would be a welcomed change, but again, that was not even allowed to be discussed under this rule.

Another language of concern in the underlying bill which we tried to address in the Rules Committee but unfortunately were voted down is that this bill allows for such funds that are needed to be appropriated for this purpose. We were not even presented with any cost estimates for this committee.

On the committee, it was noted that Kenneth Starr's investigation of then-President Clinton cost in excess of $80 million. We simply don't know if this is a $1 million, a $10 million, a $50 million, or a $200 million endeavor; nor were we allowed to even allow for a vote our very simple bipartisan proposal to pay for this bill, which would have been to allow a vote on H.R. 15.

H.R. 15, which is a bill that has bipartisan support, has already passed the Senate by more than two-thirds, would pass as a pay-for if brought to the floor of the House, actually generates over $200 billion. Even if this select committee were to spend hundreds of millions of dollars, if we were able to include immigration reform as a way of paying for it, it would still reduce the deficit by $199 billion or more.

We weren't even allowed an up-or-down vote on that topic. In the spirit of bipartisanship, I offered to support the establishment of the select committee if we could establish immigration reform as the way of paying for this. Unfortunately, despite support from both sides of the aisle in committee, we were, nevertheless, voted down.

I want to be clear that the issue of immigration reform will not go away. We will continue to offer it as a way of paying for various bills. I hope that a discussion is allowed about how to pay for this committee, and that is why I oppose the rule.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from New York for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong opposition to both the rule and the bill. It is really a political charade and a pointless attempt to find a scandal that simply doesn't exist.

What happened in Benghazi in September 2012 was a tragedy. The loss of those four Americans broke our hearts, and it reminded us that diplomacy can be dangerous work and that we need to do all we can to protect those who represent our country around the world.

What have we seen from certain members of the majority since that day? Partisan games. And this select committee would be nothing more than the next chapter in this political farce, just in time for the midterm elections and with 2016 peeking over the horizon.

What is it exactly that my colleagues are after? After the attack in Benghazi, we all wanted answers: What happened that night that led to the death of Chris Stevens, Sean Smith, Tyrone Woods, and Glen Doherty? Where did we fall short in protecting our people, and who was responsible? What could we do to make sure something like this wouldn't happen again?

Well, an Accountability Review Board led by Ambassador Thomas Pickering and Admiral Michael Mullen, two men with seriousness of purpose and no partisan agenda, helped answer those questions. They found serious management and leadership failures at the State Department. Bipartisan reports from the Senate Homeland and Intelligence Committees supported those findings.

Former Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton sat before committees in both Houses and took full responsibility. She and her successor, John Kerry, have said over and over again that the State Department is implementing all of the recommendations of the Review Board.

That didn't satisfy some of my friends on the other side. They started moving the goalpost, and so began this long, costly exercise. They tried to tie Secretary Clinton directly to the security failures that led to this tragedy, but that didn't turn up anything. Then they floated the idea that our military was told to stand down in the moment of greatest need in Benghazi. Even the Republican chairman of the Committee on Armed Services said that claim had no merit.

Since there is no wrongdoing to be found with respect to the actual attack, now we are focused on the talking points and the so-called coverup. I ask again: What is it my colleagues are after? What is allegedly being covered up?

At the time the attacks took place, American Embassies from Southeast Asia to the Middle East, to North Africa, to England were surrounded by protestors angered over an anti-Islamic video. In Egypt, our Embassy was stormed.

So as the fires in Benghazi were still burning and the air was thick with smoke, the CIA's assessment was that the attack was the result of a spontaneous protest. They were wrong. In the days that followed, they corrected that mistake, confirming that the attack was a deliberate and organized terrorist attack carried out by extremists.

In the days after the attack, these protests in the region were still raging. Some of them were violent. In Yemen, additional marines were deployed to protect our personnel. The latest conspiracy theory centers on an email sent at the time. In context, it is clear that Ben Rhodes, the Deputy National Security Adviser, was concerned about protecting Americans amid a volatile climate around our diplomatic facilities all over the world.

Those who want to create a scandal where none exists call this a smoking gun. That is not much to go on. Nevertheless, after more than a year of turning up nothing new, my colleagues want to create a new committee with sweeping powers, a broad mandate, and no fixed timeline for producing any sort of report.

When I heard of the terrible idea to create this special committee, I could not help but think of Iraq where, not four, but 4,000 Americans died. My Republican colleagues conducted virtually no investigations into that tragedy based on a lie. They set up no committees to uncover the truth behind the phony intelligence, the torture, the secret prisons, or the spin about how Iraqis would greet us with flowers. Nothing.

So I have to ask a final time: What is it my colleagues on the other side are after? I think the answer is pretty clear. They are after a political win. They want to tear down leaders in the Democratic Party and raise money for their campaign committees, and they are willing to politicize the deaths of four Americans to do it.

□ 1330

Our constituents aren't interested in this. They want us to do our jobs, not waste millions of taxpayer dollars on a fabricated scandal.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Let's do what they sent us here to do. Let's protect our diplomats and development experts. Let's work to create jobs and shore up our crumbling infrastructure. Let's fix our immigration system and promote energy security. Let's vote ''no'' on this resolution and get back to governing.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Colorado will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. I would like to inquire if the gentleman has any remaining speakers on his side.

Mr. SESSIONS. In fact, I do not.

Mr. POLIS. Then I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 8 minutes remaining.

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

As we have seen time and time again, sadly the Republicans are taking an unspeakable tragedy—the death of four brave American citizens—and turning it into a partisan talking to the point of selling membership to become Benghazi investigators on a partisan Web site rather than engaging in a bipartisan process to get to the root of the matter.

The families of those who died deserve more than that. They deserve that Democrats and Republicans work together rather than use their pain for political or financial gain for either party.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to make in order our amendment to ensure that the select committee has a chance to succeed where four previous House investigations have not to ensure that we have a full, accurate, and objective accounting for the American people of the events in Benghazi. By ensuring equal representation, equal resources, and equal say over the use of subpoenas and depositions, we can fulfill our obligations to our Nation and to our institution to ensure that we get to the bottom of this matter for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, we and my colleagues on the Rules Committee have tried to make this process work. We tried to propose a bipartisan way of paying for these efforts, we tried to propose a balanced way for this committee to go about its business. But at every turn we were shot down. That is why I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who care about honoring those who lost their lives, who care about getting to the bottom of the events, join me in opposing this rule and defeating the previous question so that we may begin a process that has the confidence of the American people rather than just speaks to one partisan base or the other.

The American people deserve this institution acting at its best with regard to this matter, Democrats and Republicans acting in concert, both enjoying the power of subpoena, the ability to schedule witnesses, equal resources on the committee, so we can have a full, objective, and hopefully unanimous account of the events.

That should be the goal of the legislation. Under this rule, we are not even

allowed to discuss our proposals to ensure equal representation on this committee. We are not allowed to discuss our proposal to pay for the proceedings under this bill with a bipartisan bill that passed the Senate with more than two-thirds.

This is a closed process that, frankly, Mr. Speaker, risks losing the faith of the American people in the outcome of this process. I fear, Mr. Speaker, that whatever the outcome of this process, if it moves forward, will fall on deaf ears of the American people because they will know that there was not an institutional commitment to being objective, there was not an effort to reach out in a bipartisan manner to find the truth, there was not a bipartisan effort to even pay for the costs of this investigation or this bill or contain or estimate those costs in any way.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can get this process right. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question, ''no'' on the rule, and ''no'' on the underlying resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There is an old saying that the closer to the target you get, the more flak comes up. While that is probably a naval or an Air Force term whereby pilots who are on their duty know when they are getting close to the real target. Mr. Speaker, we are getting closer to the real target.

The facts of the case are really pretty simple. There is no gag order involved here. We spoke last night and yesterday in a very open, probably several-hour meeting on original jurisdiction at the Rules Committee. I was very open with the members of the committee. I told them, which has not been expressed today, that the last day of the 113th Congress this investigation, if it is still going on, would have to be reauthorized by the next Congress. It is not like there is a never-ending date. As a matter of fact, we say in the original jurisdiction that 30 days after the completion of their report this select committee would go away.

Secondly, we spoke very openly about not having new money available, but rather the money that was originally given to the House of Representatives for the purposes of running the House. The Speaker of the House would have to make sure that this committee operates within what we had originally asked for. There are not unlimited amounts of money. And to suggest as has been done on the floor, up to $200 million to run this investigation, that simply would not be truthful.

Mr. Speaker, the closer to the target we have gotten, we have found that the Obama administration is trying to do everything they can to keep the United States House of Representatives and the committees from doing their job to try and misdirect us, to try and trick us, to try and fool us, to try and redact information that did not fall under a national security title but rather was to politically save them from what might be an embarrassment.

What are some of those embarrassments? Well, some of the embarrassments would be: Why didn't the State Department understand on September 11 of any year why you probably do not conduct official operations, especially in a dangerous area? That might be one question.

Another question might be: Who is it that said no? We have heard that there are serious flaws in the State Department. We already knew that. The former Secretary of State has numerous investigations that have revealed inadequacy all the way to the top of the State Department when Hillary Clinton was Secretary of State.

But what we are about here is to get to the bottom of it, to effectively get this done, to report to the American people, and they, Mr. Speaker, will see exactly why this was done, because the oversight responsibilities of the House of Representatives were done at the highest levels of this House. And by the way, we will read the bills before we pass them, we will understand the facts of the case and be able to explain them, and, more importantly, the Speaker of the House of Representatives will be in support of the American people knowing the truth.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing the Rules Committee to bring forth its rule today to talk about this important, not just intelligence operation and national security and State Department and military operations, but to be able to say that the confidence that the American people have in the brave men and women who represent America—that we will never leave them on the battlefield alone in hours of firefights without a backup position of knowing that the next sound you hear will be the United States Navy or the United States Air Force coming to aid the men and women who are in harm's way. That is the bottom line to this: an apology, not just stating a mismanagement, based upon the facts of the case.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the resolution and ''yes'' on the underlying legislation. I believe what we are doing today is an honorable day for the American people, and I am proud to be here as an American, as a Member of Congress, saying we will get to the bottom of this, it will be done quickly, and it will be done efficiently, and the American people can then make their decisions and us move on, knowing that we will support the men and women who wear the uniform.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 575 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

Strike ''except'' and all that follows and insert the following:

''except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules; and (2) the amendment specified in section 2 of this resolution if offered by Representative SLAUGHTER of New York or a designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.''

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

SEC. 2. The amendment referred to in the first section is as follow:

Page 1, lines 9 and 10, strike ''after consultation with'' and insert ''on the recommendation of''.

Page 4, strike lines 15 and 16 and redesignate accordingly.

Page 4, line 22, after ''Select Committee'', insert '', including one of the members who was appointed to the Select Committee after consultation with the minority leader under section 2(a),''

Page 5, line 3, strike ''chair of the''.

Page 5, line 7, before the period, insert '', only upon an affirmative vote of the majority of its members or with the concurrence of the ranking minority member''.

Page 5, lines 8 and 9, strike ''upon consultation with'' and insert ''with the concurrence of''.

Page 5, line 16, before the period, insert '', and shall be taken only upon concurrence of the ranking minority member''.

Page 5, line 18, strike ''after consultation with'' and insert ''with the concurrence of''.

Page 6, after line 3, add the following new subsections:

(d) All Members of the Select Committee shall have equitable and timely access to all evidence and other material received by the Select Committee.

(e) The Select Committee shall adopt written procedures governing how documents and other information may be obtained, used, or released by the committee or any members or staff of the committee.

Page 7, after line 11, add the following new subsections:

(d) The chair and ranking minority member of the Select Committee shall receive equal allotments of resources for the expenses and staff necessary to carry out this resolution.

(e) A complete report of the expenditures of the Select Committee shall be made available to the public on a monthly basis.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the

opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

The Republican majority may say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would inform the House that, pursuant to House Resolution 574, the Speaker has certified to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia the refusal of Lois G. Lerner to provide testimony before the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 10, SUCCESS AND OPPORTUNITY THROUGH QUALITY CHARTER SCHOOLS ACT; RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4438, AMERICAN RESEARCH AND COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2014; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 576 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 576

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to amend the charter school program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 90 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from May 12, 2014, through May 16, 2014—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of May 8, 2014, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to the bill (H.R. 4366) to strengthen the Federal education research system to make research and evaluations more timely and relevant to State and local needs in order to increase student achievement.

SEC. 5. The Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Thursday, May 15, 2014, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015.

SEC. 6. During consideration of the bill (H.R. 4438) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify and make permanent the research credit, pursuant to House Resolution 569, the further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted.

SEC. 7. House Resolution 569 is amended by striking ''90 minutes'' and inserting ''one hour''.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

□ 1345

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 576 provides for a structured rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 10, the Success and Opportunity through Quality Charter Schools Act.

My colleagues on the House Education and the Workforce Committee and I have been working to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; and to that end, the House passed H.R. 5, the Student Success Act, last July.

Our efforts in reauthorization have centered on four principles: reducing the Federal footprint in education, empowering parents, supporting effective teachers, and restoring local control. H.R. 10, the Success and Opportunity through Quality Charter Schools Act, takes a small bipartisan step in the reauthorization process and ensures that local communities have the flexibility needed to meet the needs of their students.

While H.R. 5 is languishing in the Senate, the House remains committed to continuing its work and has broken out the charter school programs as an area of agreement between House Republicans and Democrats.

Despite good intentions, there is widespread agreement that the current

law is no longer effectively serving students. My hope is that, after the House passes H.R. 10 this week, our Senate colleagues will follow our lead and will provide the same opportunity to their Members to work together in a bipartisan, bicameral fashion and pass this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, I had the opportunity to visit a remarkable public school in Kernersville, North Carolina. In addition to preparing students academically for college, the North Carolina Leadership Academy, a charter school, is publicly committed to giving students ''the opportunity to develop true leadership qualities and become creative thinkers and problem-solvers while retaining a sense of responsibility for their families, their community, and their country.''

It was a privilege to spend time with the remarkable students and faculty of this public charter school. I was truly impressed by their commitment to scholarship, by the leadership skills of the students and by the remarkable academic progress that was on display.

All NCLA students in grades 7–12 participate in Civil Air Patrol, a program established by Congress in 1946 that uses military-style uniforms, customs, courtesies, ceremonies, and drill in order to improve students' leadership skills, fitness, and character.

This program is working. NCLA places a strong emphasis on family involvement, and the level of commitment demonstrated by parents, families, and the Piedmont community at large was impressive.

H.R. 10 will empower States and local communities to replicate the success of high-quality charter schools like NCLA and encourage choice, innovation, and excellence in education. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we had the opportunity to have a clean rule around a bill that I had the opportunity to work on, along with the gentlelady from North Carolina and with our ranking member and chair, with regards to taking what we can agree on in education, which is reauthorizing the Federal Charter School Program.

We had similar language in both the Republican ESEA reauthorization, as well as in the Democratic substitute. Most Republicans voted for the version that they had, and almost every Democrat, except for two, voted for the Democratic version.

We were able to then work out the very small differences between the two pieces of language with regard to charter schools, present it before the entire House under a reasonable rule that allows for a broad variety of amendments—12 amendments—from both sides of the aisle, many of which improve the bill and some of which I oppose, but which are, by no means, fatal to the bill. The process fundamentally works.

Unfortunately, in this rule, we have now had to alter the way that we are dealing with another unrelated, unpaid-for effort, namely, a bill that could add $155.5 billion to our deficit because of the extension of the R&D tax credit.

Essentially, under the initial effort, the Republicans failed to waive their statutory PAYGO rules. What that means is that they failed to say: we don't have to pay for this bill. They failed to say: this bill will add to the deficit. In a few moments, my colleague, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, will explain what that means.

What the American people need to know is that this rule prevents Congress from doing fake math, and it essentially acknowledges that the Republican proposal to extend the R&D tax credit would be a deficit buster and increase our deficit by $155.5 billion.

It takes away any pretension that somehow this bill would be paid for by some other mechanism; so while the amendments allowed in the content of the bill with regard to charter schools, which I will talk about in a moment, are largely noncontroversial and enjoy support from both sides of the aisle, the budgetary pretense that is removed from this bill, which reveals that the Republican proposal on the R&D tax credit increases our deficit by $150 billion, is a controversial element that now occurs in this same rule.

I now want to talk about the Success and Opportunity through Quality Charter Schools Act. This important bipartisan bill improves and modernizes the Federal Charter Schools Program.

We essentially established a 2.0 version 14 years later, in having learned a lot about what works and doesn't work in the field with regard to public charter schools. We promote equity in opportunity for our students across our country.

I am very pleased and honored that many of the important aspects of the bipartisan bill that I have had the honor to lead, the All-STAR Act, have been included in this underlying bill, as well as almost all of the priorities for the Democrats and Republicans.

When Congress first authorized the Charter Schools Program in 1994, charter schools were very early in their existence. They were an emerging effort to encourage innovation in our public schools.

Public charter schools with the ability to make site-based decisions—and that is essentially what charter schools are, they are public schools with site-based management—now serve more than 2 million students in 42 States and in the District of Columbia.

Sadly, there are over 600,000 students who remain on public charter school waiting lists, unable to attend the schools of their choice.

The promise of public charter schools is that they are free to be innovative when it comes to instruction, scheduling, time-on-task, policies, mission, and hours. Because they have site-based management, rather than being run by a larger entity like a district or a State, they have the flexibility to do what it takes to meet the needs of parents in their communities.

Public charter schools don't charge tuition, nor do they have any entrance requirements, nor are they allowed to discriminate against students on any basis. This bill goes a step further in ensuring transparency and accountability for charter schools to allay the concerns of some on my side of the aisle that they are not fully compliant with many of these areas.

The Charter Schools Program is a crucial lifeline for growing and replicating successful models. Charter school programs are critical to ensuring that every child in this country, regardless of ZIP code or economic background, has access to a free, quality education, which is more important than ever in order for one to succeed in the 21st century.

I am proud to say that H.R. 10, which will be considered under this rule, passed the Committee on Education and the Workforce with a very strong, bipartisan vote of 36–3. This is an example of a bill that has gotten better every step of the way.

A similar bill in the 112th Congress passed overwhelmingly with over 350 votes. Better language with regard to charter schools was included in both the Republican version of the ESEA reauthorization, as well as in the Democratic substitute.

Now, we have a stand-alone bill before us which takes the very best of both, the bill that was in the Republican version and in the Democratic version. It builds on it, and it creates a Federal charter school program that, truly, Democrats and Republicans can be proud of as a legacy for the next decade.

Having founded two innovative public charter schools before I was elected to Congress, I understand firsthand how the freedom to innovate and having the flexibility to pursue a unique mission can truly help serve all kids.

Without the Federal charter school program, many charter schools across our country wouldn't even be able to get off the ground. We owe it to kids who are being underserved or who are unserved today to be able to upgrade this program and ensure it can meet the challenges of the 21st century.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I want to take the opportunity to thank my colleague from Colorado for the work that he has done on charter schools, for understanding the very important nature of charter schools and for bringing his expertise to this issue.

I also want to thank him for acknowledging the bipartisan effort that has gone into bringing this legislation to the floor and for the very good way

that we have gone through regular order to bring this bill to the floor. I appreciate that little history that he has given us.

I now would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), my classmate and colleague.

Mr. REICHERT. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I support charter schools—I want to be clear about that—and I support this bill. However, I also believe that families should be able to choose schools within the public system that best meet their needs.

When it comes to students' education, we definitely know that one size does not fit all. The same is true for charter schools. Different systems work better for different communities.

We agree that it is wrong when the administration forces its vision for education reform on the States through grant programs, like Race to the Top, but that means it is equally wrong when Congress uses grant programs to do exactly the same thing.

This bill seeks to force States to remove existing caps on charter schools by giving priority to grant applications from States that do not have caps.

By doing this, Congress is punishing 20 States and Washington, D.C., whose charter laws have caps, including my home State of Washington.

There may be legitimate reasons these States have caps, but this bill doesn't recognize that. Charter schools for the sake of having charter schools definitely is not the answer. It won't help students.

That is why I am extremely disappointed that my bipartisan amendment was not made in order. It would have simply removed the provision that punishes certain State-designed charter systems, allowing States to compete equally for grants.

As the voice of the people, Congress should do better than the unelected bureaucrats down the street at the Education Department. Let's start saying ''no'' to top-down education reform and ''yes'' to states' rights.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

□ 1400

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague.

I want to start by congratulating the bipartisan effort on the charter school bills. I thank Mr. POLIS for his leadership on that. And I wish that was all there was to say about this rule. Unfortunately, it is not.

You might think this rule was only about charter schools. The title is, Success and Opportunity Through Quality Charter Schools Act. But then if you turn a couple pages in, you will find in paragraph 13 a reference to H.R. 4438. That is not the charter school bill. That is what we call the research and development tax credit bill.

So why is it here in this rule on charter schools, and why does it reference part B of the rule in front of us now, which says that the budgetary effects of this act shall not be entered on either the PAYGO scorecard—and it goes on to say some other things?

Well, the PAYGO scorecard has nothing to do with charter schools. It does have something to do with the R&D tax credit. And I want to explain to people what has happened here because it is important that the public know.

Last night, we were scheduled to have the debate on a bill to extend the R&D tax credit law. We were all ready to go, and all of a sudden the debate stopped and the plug was pulled.

And so I have got to say something for a second about this research and tax development credit.

I think the idea of extending the R&D tax credit bill is broadly supported. That is not the issue on the tax credit bill. The issue is a permanent extension that is not paid for.

There are a number of other bills coming out of the Ways and Means Committee. When you add them all up, they add $310 billion to our deficit. Unpaid for. Put it on our credit card.

It is kind of interesting, Mr. Speaker, because it was only about 3 or 4 weeks ago that here on the floor of this House we had a debate on the Republican budget and they told us the number one priority was to reduce that deficit. Yet now we have a bunch of bills that say let's put it on the credit card.

And, Mr. Speaker, you know that at the end of the day, we all have to pay when we put it on our credit card.

We pointed out that if you don't pay for it by closing some other special interest tax breaks, like tax breaks for big oil companies, someone else is going to have to pay.

Now what we didn't realize is that the Republican plan as of last night was to pay for the R&D tax credit extension by cutting Medicare, Mr. Speaker. Because their failure to come up with offsets in the bill meant that current law would continue in effect.

In the past, we have turned off the trigger that says it is paid for by a sequester to a number of programs, the biggest being Medicare. But our Republican colleagues didn't turn it off.

So when they decided not to pay for the R&D tax credit in the bill and decided not to turn off the sequester, what they were aiming for was to have Medicare pay for that tax extender and to ask the people who depend on that program to foot the bill for the R&D tax credit.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we blew the whistle on that issue last night. We saw our colleagues go scampering back to the Rules Committee to change it.

We will talk a little later today, but the bottom line is the same. When you put stuff on the credit card, someone pays the piper at the end of the day.

We have proposed paying for it, in part, by closing some of the wasteful special interest tax loopholes in the Code. We think the R&D tax credit is a pro-growth policy, but subsidies to big oil companies; no.

And so, because our Republican colleagues don't want to pay for it in the bill, they are going to increase the deficit. In fact, the rule yesterday waived the rules of the House. Because the R&D tax credit bill was inconsistent with the Republicans' own budget.

The budget that was passed 3 or 4 weeks ago, it is inconsistent with it. Even under the Enron accounting in that budget, it throws it out of balance. Our Republican colleagues need to know that. You are putting it on the credit card. At the end of the day, that means if you are not going to ask Medicare to pay for it, which apparently had been the original plan, you are going to be cutting our kids' education, you are going to be cutting research at places like the National Institutes of Health that try to find cures and treatments for diseases. You are going to be letting the infrastructure of this country come to a halt. In fact, the budget calls for allowing the transportation trust fund to go insolvent.

That is what happens when you refuse to take fiscal responsibility and pay for things.

It was interesting to discover that the plan last night was to allow the Medicare cut to go into effect to pay for it. We are glad we are not doing that anymore.

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

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. We are glad that after we called attention to that issue, our Republican colleagues realized that it was not a good idea to have an across-the-board cut in Medicare to pay for business tax incentives. We are glad they woke up to that fact.

But the underlying report here is going to remain the same. Putting $310 billion on the credit card, someone has got to pay. We should take the responsibility in this House to figure out how we are going to do it.

We put forward proposals as to how to do it. Unfortunately, despite having passed a budget a couple of weeks ago, they are now waiving their rules on their own budget for these purposes.

I look forward to the conversation later today.

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

Yesterday, our Democratic colleagues in the Rules Committee properly notice that had the R&D bill would have inadvertently triggered automatic cuts to other programs to offset the bill. We appreciate the spirit of comity that existed and that brought that to our attention.

H. Res. 576 ensures that the bill operates the way it was intended to operate. It was an inadvertent error. Excluding this bill from the PAYGO scorecard will ensure that other programs are not affected, which is consistent with the treatment of other tax bills.

I would like to point out to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle that the PAYGO amendment made by H. Res. 576 is substantially identical to section 401 of Senator WYDEN's extenders bill, S. 2260, the EXPIRE Act. However, they have failed to point that out.

Statutory PAYGO was created by the Democrats when they controlled Congress. Statutory PAYGO maintains a running tally of the cumulative deficit impact for bills signed into law. If the threshold is exceeded, a sequester is triggered to offset the excess.

When Republicans took control of the House, we adopted a new rule known as CUTGO, which requires that any new direct spending be offset by cuts to other direct spending programs.

We should reduce spending and reform our entitlement programs, Mr. Speaker. House Republicans have shown we are willing to do so, and we earnestly desire a partner in the Senate and the White House to do just that. But we should also grow our economy. This bill will help us do just that, and we hope we will find partners on the other side of the aisle.

Again, I want to say that the PAYGO amendment made by H. Res. 576 is substantially identical to section 401 of Senator WYDEN's extenders bill, S. 2260, the EXPIRE Act. My guess is my colleagues will be supporting that.

I now would like to turn our attention back to the subject at hand, charter schools, and I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING).

Mr. HOLDING. I thank the distinguished gentlelady from my home State for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in supporting this rule to bring H.R. 10, the Success and Opportunity Through Quality Charter Schools Act, to the floor.

Education is a key that can open the door to opportunity, which is important to families across America, and especially those in my district in North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, we know that a one-size-fits-all approach to education simply never works for students, as students vary greatly in how they learn. Because of this, I believe we should offer students and their parents every possible opportunity to select a school that best fits their individual needs, their goals, and their aspirations. And, Mr. Speaker, neither a student's ZIP Code nor circumstances should determine the educational opportunities available to them.

In my district, North Carolina's 13th District, we have six charter schools that are serving the local communities, in addition to our quality public schools in North Carolina. While developing and expanding the use of charter schools is certainly not the only answer to the education crisis facing our Nation, it is without a doubt a step in the right direction. The rule before us today to bring H.R. 10 up for debate and a vote does just that by offering more choice to parents and students through the expanded use of charter schools.

The Success and Opportunity Through Charter Schools Act will facilitate the establishment of quality charter schools and support innovation and excellence in education. It also makes necessary improvements to charter school programs to encourage States, and those efforts already underway, to expand the use of charter schools.

I want to thank Chairman KLINE and the committee for their hard work, and I urge support for the rule and H.R. 10.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to come and join in an aspect of our bipartisan work that is working for children, and I thank the Education Committee and Mr. POLIS for their leadership in focusing on the idea that our children need the best education.

I also know the hearts of the Education Committee members and Mr. POLIS in recognizing that public schools are a valuable asset, having been educated throughout my primary and secondary education in public schools. We want to have the opportunity to match excellence with excellence and to ensure that the oversight allows for excellence.

So H.R. 10, the Success and Opportunity Through Quality Charter Schools Act, brings all of this together: respecting teachers, holding children to a higher standard, and giving them the necessary tools.

I am glad that I had an amendment that will be in the manager's amendment that deals with requiring the Secretary to report issues regarding the age, race, and gender at charter schools, and also, the attrition and college acceptance. It has that same requirement for the teachers, as far as teacher attrition. That is important. That is already in the manager's amendment.

I also think more transparency and information to the parents on the Web sites concerning orientation materials, enrollment curriculum, student discipline, and behavior codes adds to this legislation. In that, we can ensure that there will be policies to prevent any bullying or even to have bullying intervention so that our children can have a better quality of life.

This is a holistic approach to educating our children. I believe the underlying bill speaks volumes that our children are our most precious resource. I hope that, as we continue, we will be able to work on other items, such as unemployment insurance and comprehensive immigration reform, because these are ways that we show America that we are working for them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. When we put forward legislation that focuses on the education of our children and the choices that our children can make, balanced alongside of ensuring the lifting of the boats of public education, we are in the right direction.

I am delighted to support this legislation.

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

As my colleague from North Carolina points out, support for school choice is growing. A 2013 public opinion survey found that 73 percent of Americans supported school choice, whereas 67 percent of Americans supported school choice in 2010.

Forty-two States and the District of Columbia have passed legislation to support the funding of public charter schools. They are becoming more popular. In the 2012–2013 academic year, more than 500 new charter schools opened across the country, which means there are now 6,200 charter schools in America and 2 million charter school students.

If recent growth continues, they will double in number by 2025 and will educate 4.6 million children. That amounts to 10 percent of all public school students.

□ 1415

Another sign of their popularity is that charter schools have over 1 million students on their wait lists.

H.R. 10 modernizes and streamlines the current Charter Schools Program authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to ensure that States can support the replication and expansion of high-quality charter schools.

These schools empower parents to play a more active role in their child's education, open doors for teachers to pioneer fresh teaching methods, encourage State and local innovation, and help students escape underperforming schools.

H.R. 10 is a commonsense approach to updating the Charter Schools Program by streamlining multiple charter school programs, improving quality, and promoting the growth of the charter school sector at the State level.

This bill benefits children, their parents, and—ultimately—our economy. By increasing the number of high-quality charter schools, more children will acquire the skills they need to succeed in a competitive global economy.

We owe it to our children to provide them with the best education possible, and that is what this bill was designed to do.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

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

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

How exciting that in a week here of partisan division with regard to Benghazi, with regard to Lois Lerner, with regard to a deficit-busting $155 billion tax expenditure, how exciting that Democrats and Republicans can come together around something that is so important for the next generation of American children—that is, making sure that our limited investment in public charter schools has the maximum positive impact on student achievement across our country.

A 2013 study conducted by Stanford University's Center for Research on Educational Outcomes found that public charter schools often outperform their peers in traditional public schools, and many have demonstrated substantial progress in closing the achievement gap.

The study's findings were particularly impressive for low-income students. The study found that low-income students gained 14 additional days of learning in reading and 22 in math—compared to traditional school peers—and English language learners gained 36 days of learning in reading and in math.

What is clear, however, is just how public charter schools with site-based management have the ability to innovate and succeed. They also have the ability to fail and do poorly.

Not all charter schools are serving students well. Not all charter schools meet their goal of serving at-risk students. That is why this bill improves transparency and accountability for the public charter school sector as a whole, as well as for authorizers—that is, the entity, usually a school district, sometimes a State or special entity—that grants the charter, which is another word for contract, to the provider of educational services at the site-based level.

Mr. Speaker, all public schools, regardless of their governance structure, whether they are public magnet schools, whether they are neighborhood schools, whether they are public charter schools, whether they are schools of choice operated by a school district, every public school should live up to our promise of providing a quality education; and every child should have access to a quality education that allows them to succeed in the workforce, in college, and in life.

In this era of constrained public resources, we need to maximize the impact of every dollar spent by making sure that what we invest in works, and that is exactly what this bill does.

It allows for investment in proven models to expand and replicate success, to serve more kids, many of whom were already on waiting lists and forced to attend a school that is worse than the one that they seek to attend. This bill will help alleviate those waiting lists.

It is important to focus our resources and double down on public charter schools that get great results and ensure that we don't squander our limited resources on public charter schools that fail to meet the needs of their students.

We want to make sure that charter school operators with a strong evidence of student achievement and strong management capacity are able to replicate and expand. That is why, under this bill, we create incentives for schools to achieve and replicate excellence by awarding grants directly to some of the highest performing public charter schools in our country that are helping to allow more and more kids from at-risk backgrounds to achieve the American Dream.

This particular program, which was an important part of the bipartisan All-STAR Act, helps to seed the growth of high-performing public charter schools in States that might otherwise not meet the criteria.

The gentleman from Washington State mentioned that his State and some others have a cap. Well, very importantly, even where a district or State policy environment is not ideal and, therefore, they might not be a priority for receiving grants that they administer, nevertheless, charter schools serving kids in those areas can receive grants because of the networks of charter schools that are high performing in States that might not have policies that are as open to charters as they should be.

Mr. Speaker, what Democrats and Republicans coming together shows the country, shows the public charter school movement, shows the school districts, is that a multistakeholder approach can work for our country.

I want to thank the many individuals who provided input on this important bill, ranging from school districts to States to teachers' unions, to charter school board members, to families who are in charter schools, and families who languish on waiting lists, wanting their child to attend a better school.

The result of this multiyear process is a bill that reflects the very best policies to upgrade the existing charter school authorization program, improve transparency and accountability for public charter schools, ensure that our limited Federal resources are invested in schools that work and ensure that more kids, regardless of their geography and economic background, can attend a school that prepares them to succeed in life.

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

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

Unfortunately, over the last 4 decades, the Federal Government's role in elementary and secondary education has increased dramatically. The Department of Education currently runs more than 80 K–12 education programs, many of which overlap.

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

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

Unfortunately, the Obama administration has refused to work with Congress to address these challenges and has, instead, taken unprecedented action to further expand its authority over America's schools.

Through the President's waiver scheme and pet programs such as Race to the Top, the Secretary of Education has granted himself complete discretion to use taxpayer dollars to coerce States into enacting the President's preferred education reforms.

Adding insult to injury, President Obama continues to push for more Federal education spending, requesting a staggering $82.3 billion in mandatory and discretionary funds for the Department of Education in his fiscal year 2015 budget.

Our children deserve better, Mr. Speaker. It is past time to acknowledge more taxpayer dollars and more Federal intrusion cannot address the challenges facing schools.

H.R. 10 recognizes that local communities know their needs better than any bureaucrat in Washington and supports the sharing of best practices among charter schools and traditional public schools. Our students do better when educators work together to put in place the best strategies to help students learn.

Additionally, H.R. 10 specifically encourages charter schools to reach out to at-risk students in their communities, as well as those who have disabilities or are English learners.

Again, the local officials know best how to serve their communities, and the Federal Government should not tie their hands as they work to make the best decisions for their students.

I urge my colleagues, therefore, Mr. Speaker, to support this rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. FOXX. We do not have further speakers, Mr. Speaker, but I do intend to share some additional information on this bill and the rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about some of my experiences in the charter school movement before joining this body. I had the opportunity to found a public charter school, New America School, now which has five campuses in Colorado and New Mexico. I also had the opportunity to cofound Academy of Urban Learning in Denver, Colorado.

New America School seeks to meet the needs of English language learning students who are a little bit older—15,

16, 18, 19—and far too often didn't have a place in the traditional public school system.

Many of these students work jobs—might work a day job, might work a night job. That means, if they work a day job, the only school that would be a viable option for them would be an evening school. That is why New America school has flexible scheduling, allowing students to attend day or night, depending on their real-world life circumstances.

In addition, many of the young women attending the school have young children of their own, and that is a real-life need that, absent some kind of daycare reimbursement or daycare, many of them would not be able to attend.

So New America School offered daycare reimbursement—in some cases, daycare—so that these young women could continue to attend school and get a high school diploma.

First and foremost, the focus of New America School is to ensure that students can learn to be fluent and literate in the English language, which is so important to be able to succeed in today's economy.

As a result of this innovative approach and the focus on meeting student needs, thousands of students have enrolled in the various campuses of the New America School. I was proud to not only found them, but to have served as superintendent for 2 years.

I can honestly say that, absent this Federal program, the title V grant, we would probably not have been able to get New America School off the ground. Like so many charter schools across the country, until the doors open—and in that first year or two, when you are just beginning to add students, it is absolutely critical to be able to have this investment to open the doors.

Over the medium and long term, the schools need to stand or fall on their own. They need to succeed on their own and meet a market niche. We need to make sure that they are sound from a budgetary perspective, and this bill includes language that ups the bar on authorizers to do just that.

This bill passed the Education and the Work Force Committee with a 36–3 vote. I honestly can't remember another bill that had such strong bipartisan support recently on that committee. It is similar to and actually represents an improvement from H.R. 2218, which passed last Congress, 365–54.

This bill will improve charter school access and services for students; ensures that our limited Federal investment supports the expansion and replication of the very best high-quality charter schools; requires more transparency and accountability for charter schools; gives charter schools additional tools to continue to serve at-risk kids pursuant to their mission, including free and reduced lunch; as well as ensuring that they have the tools they need to serve a pro rata number of special education kids.

Almost every Democrat and Republican in this entire body has already voted for this bill. A very similar, almost identical bill was in both the Republican ESEA reauthorization and the Democratic alternative.

This takes very few differences between those versions, irons them out, and has language that both Chairman KLINE and Ranking Member MILLER agree builds upon the consensus that was reached in each of those bills.

That is why I hope that this bill passes with strong bipartisan support. There is a reason that we need strong bipartisan support. Unlike far too many bills that we call single chamber bills that are considered in this body and languish in the Senate—I understand much of the frustration of the majority party—this bill, with a resounding bipartisan vote, can be sent to the Senate, where a very nearly identical bill has a growing number of bipartisan cosponsors with the message that this body overwhelmingly supports improving our public charter school program; and we encourage the Senate to take it up.

That is why every Member of this body's vote, Mr. Speaker, is so important on this bill. This bill will pass. This bill will have bipartisan support.

For any of my friends on the fence, this is our last great opportunity to leave a positive legacy of improving quality of and accountable for public charter schools.

□ 1430

AFT and NEA have acknowledged that the stronger accountability in this bill will improve the quality and accountability and transparency of charter schools, supported by charter school advocates as well as authorizers, like school districts.

The multistakeholder approach that Chairman KLINE and Ranking Member MILLER have presided over is a model of how this body can come together around legislation that improves our country. I hope that not only this bill is taken up by the Senate after a strong bipartisan vote in this body, but I hope it serves as a model not only for what we can do in education, but what we can do on a number of pressing issues that address this country, whether it is balancing our Federal budget, whether it is reauthorizing Federal transportation programs or establishing an infrastructure bank. There is, in fact, a bipartisan way forward. That is the opportunity that my friends and colleagues on both sides of the aisle have before us now.

Public charter schools are making a difference for kids across our country every day. With a limited Federal role, we can ensure that they make an even bigger difference. The families that are languishing on waiting lists have the opportunity to send their kids to expansion of an existing successful charter school or the replication or a second campus of a charter school that we know works, that we know can transform lives, that we know can help that young kid attend college, get a good job and, guess what, maybe even serve in this august body someday.

The most exciting thing about public education in this country is that there are examples of what works. You could take any at-risk demographic group, whether they are English language learners, whether they are low-income earners, whether they are in the most remote rural part of our country or in the poorest inner city area, and find an educational model that works. Some of them are run by school districts, as in neighborhood schools; some are run by school districts as schools of choice or magnet schools; and some are run as public charter schools under a contract in the school district or other authorizer.

What we need to do to help make sure that more kids have access to opportunity is expand and replicate what is already working in public education. That glimmer of hope, those shining islands of success and excellence with the passage of this bill, can serve more children in our country to ensure that more kids have access and more families have access to choose the public schools that work for them.

I want to thank Ranking Member MILLER, Chairman KLINE, and the majority and minority staff of the committee for working hard to craft a bipartisan bill without poison pills, without gotchas, without partisanship, that recognizes the vital role that strong, accountable, high-performing public charter schools can play in educational success. I was honored to work with them and with the staff on this legislation to improve, upgrade, and modernize this critical program.

I encourage my colleagues to understand that this vote matters. We want to ensure that this bill is not a single Chamber bill. We want to make sure that this bill does not languish in the Senate. And the best way to do that is to send a resounding vote, even stronger than the vote in the last Congress, that in these times of partisan discord, Democrats and Republicans can come together around commonsense legislation that helps kids succeed and helps America's neediest families send their kids to a quality public school. This bill will help maximize the impact of every dollar invested by focusing on the highest quality educational providers.

I strongly urge my Democratic and Republican colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 10 and ensure that our limited Federal dollars go only to quality programs.

As we mentioned earlier, unfortunately, I cannot support this rule. The rule contains a budgetary fix on an unrelated item. I am confident this rule will pass and allow for consideration of the charter school bill and a reasonable set of amendments, and I wish that I could support a rule that did just that. But this bill does include $150 billion in deficit spending which Democrats have not agreed to.

Public school choice is effective and empowering. Families know what is right for their children better than politicians do and better than school district officials do; therefore, parents should have the opportunity to choose the public school of their choice that meets the parents' and the family's need.

H.R. 10 represents the very best promise of bipartisanship in education. For those that embrace school choice, H.R. 10 rewards State policies that contribute to public charter school success. For those who are skeptical of public charter schools, H.R. 10 builds in stronger protections for charter school oversight, transparency, and accountability. There is something for everybody in this bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule but ''yes,'' ''yes,'' ''yes'' on the underlying bill. And I look forward to continuing this tradition of bipartisanship, hopefully extending beyond education to the other pressing national challenges we face. Through this bill, we can improve access to great schools for our Nation's children.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I want to truly thank my colleague from Colorado for his eloquent words of support for charter schools and for his past efforts in this area. I particularly want to thank him for urging the Senate to take up this legislation. As he well knows, we have a lot of good legislation over in the Senate that has not been acted upon, and I hope this bill will have a better fate in the Senate than other bills have had.

Mr. Speaker, it would be imprudent to have a conversation about education and the use of taxpayer money without discussing the need for accountability. Hardworking taxpayers want to see their tax dollars being used in the best way possible and expect the Federal Government to be a wise steward of their dollars.

H.R. 10 builds on the principle of local accountability by modernizing the Charter Schools Program to authorize States to use the funding to replicate and expand high-quality charter schools. The schools with proven student success will have the opportunity to offer those advantages to more students.

States and local educators know their students best, and I urge my colleagues to modernize Federal school programs and respond to these needs by supporting both this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, many of my Republican colleagues and I would prefer we abide by the Constitution and take the Federal Government out of education altogether, but that is not what we are recommending here today because we know we can't achieve that goal. My assumption, though, is that all Members of Congress—all Members of Congress—agree that as long as taxpayer money is being used by the Federal Government to fund education, that Congress has a responsibility to make a strong effort to ensure that those who receive hardworking taxpayer money are being held accountable for how they use it. Washington should live within its means, just as families all across this country do, and limited resources require wise stewardship.

This bill consolidates multiple funding streams and grant programs that support charter schools into the existing State grant program, eliminating a separate authorization for charter school facilities funding. It reduces the overall authorization for charter school programs from $450 million to $300 million. By consolidating the funding streams into the existing State charter school program, the bill removes authority from the Secretary of Education to pick winners and losers and control the growth of the charter school sector. This authority is placed largely in the hands of States, where it belongs.

H.R. 10 promotes high-quality charter schools by updating the Charter Schools Program to reflect the success and growth of the charter school movement. States are authorized to use funds under the program to support the replication and expansion of high-quality charter schools in addition to supporting new innovative charter school models.

Mr. Speaker, my background as an educator, school board member, mother, and grandmother reinforces my belief that students are best served when people at the local level are in control of education decisions. I also believe that education is the most important tool that Americans at any age can have.

I was the first person in my family to graduate from high school and went to college, where I worked full-time and attended school part-time. It took me 7 years to earn my bachelor's degree, and I continued to work my way through my master's and doctoral degrees. From my own experience, I am convinced this is the greatest country in the world for many reasons, not the least of which is that a person like me, who grew up extremely poor in a house with no electricity and no running water, with parents with very little formal education and no prestige at all, could work hard and be elected to the United States House of Representatives.

No legislation is perfect, and that is why I look forward to working with my colleagues to address their concerns and improve this legislation through the amendment process. However, I have never been one to let the perfect be the enemy of the good. And while H.R. 10 isn't perfect, it is a step in the right direction of empowering parents, teachers, and local school districts, and increasing school choice and giving other young people the same opportunities that I and others have had to improve our lot in life. That is why I am a supporter of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak during the House's consideration of the Rule for H.R. 10, the ''Success and Opportunity through Quality Charter Schools Act.''

The Success and Opportunity through Quality Charter Schools Act would revise the Charter School Program and the Public Charter Schools of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

The rule before the House will pave the way for the consideration of a legislative proposal that consolidates two existing federal charter school programs into one:

The Charter School Program, which supports grants for charter school developers to open new charter schools. The program also provides funds to disseminate best practices and provide state facilities aid to charter schools.

The Charter School Credit Enhancement Program assists charter schools in accessing better credit terms to acquire and renovate facilities to operate a charter school.

The rule will allow the consideration of the bill that will create a new federal charter schools program to promote high-quality charter schools at the state and local level; and allows states to use federal funds to start new charter schools as well as expand and replicate existing high-quality charter schools.

The bill adds a new component—a Charter Management Organization grant program to support the opening of additional charter schools nationwide.

H.R. 10 establishes a new Charter School Program that would consist of three parts:

Grants to support high-quality charter schools will be awarded to a State Educational Agency, the State Charter School Board, the Governor, or a Charter School Support Organization.

Facilities Aid will be awarded to continue credit enhancement activities and support state facilities aid for charter schools.

National Activities will allow the secretary of education to operate a grant competition for charter schools in states that did not win or compete for a state grant and a competition for high quality CMOs.

The legislation adds five new definitions: a ''charter management organization, a charter support organization'', a ''high-quality charter school''; the ''expansion of a high-quality charter school''; and a ''replicable, high-quality charter school model.''

H.R. 10 authorizes $300,000,000 for fiscal years 2015 through 2020. The bill permits state-determined weighted lotteries and allows students to continue in the school program of their choice by clarifying students in affiliated charter schools can attend the next immediate grade in that network's school.

JACKSON LEE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 10

I have long supported the need for better data on the experiences of children that Congress could use when deliberating on legislative measures intended to benefit our youngest citizens.

The Education and Workforce Committee included language in the amendment in the form of a substitute for the bill that reflected an amendment I had intended to offer as a separate amendment. The language reflects the intent of my amendment by adding rates of student attrition as a measure to be considered by charter school authorizers in monitoring the successes of schools.

Attrition data would help us better understand the impact of charter schools on student retention. It would also bring additional transparency regarding the drivers of attrition issues such as discipline, counseling, dropouts, bullying, as well as the impact of learning disabilities like dyslexia on student retention.

Although the data reporting is not mandatory, it is my hope that charter school districts and charter schools will take up the challenge of providing hard data to make the case for their approaches to education.

I offered two amendments for consideration by the House Rules Committee that would strengthen the legislative goals of H.R. 10.

The amendments were simple and were an important addition to this strong bipartisan effort from the Education and Workforce Committee to bring clarity and improve transparency of charter schools in communities around the Nation.

JACKSON LEE AMENDMENT NO. 1

The Jackson Lee amendment made in order by the Rules Committee for debate of this bill directs State Education Agencies that award Federally funded grants to charter schools to work with those schools so that they provide information on their websites regarding student recruitment, orientation materials, enrollment criteria, student discipline policies, behavior codes, and parent contract requirements, which should include any financial obligations such as fees for tutoring, and extracurricular activities.

This Amendment will make it possible for parents to learn more about how schools deal with important education issues such as academic performance, enrichment programs, and quality of education life issues like reasonable accommodations for students with learning disabilities like dyslexia or physical disabilities.

Many charter schools already provide this information, and the amendment would support this good transparency practice. This Jackson Lee amendment is good for parents and for charter schools because parents would have access to information that helps them make education decisions for their children; and charter schools would speak to a larger audience regarding their education programs.

JACKSON LEE AMENDMENT NO. 2

The second Jackson Lee amendment was a "Sense of the Congress" on the promotion of, and support for anti-bullying programs in charter schools, including those serving rural communities.

I regret that this amendment was not made in order by the Rules Committee because the prevention of bullying is one of the most challenging problems focusing school officials.

I am disappointed that the Rules Committee did not make this amendment in order for consideration under this bill.

I introduced H.R. 2585, the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Reauthorization and the Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act of 2013 because of the unresolved national epidemic of school bullying. This anti-bullying bill amends the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 by expanding the juvenile accountability block grant program with respect to programs for the prevention of bullying to include intervention programs. The bill's objective is to reduce and prevent bullying and establish best practices for all activities that are likely to help reduce bullying among young people.

This year a million children will be teased, taunted, and physically assaulted by their peers. Bullying is the most common form of violence faced by our Nation's youth.

The frequency and intensity of bullying that young people face are astounding: 1 in 7 students in grades K–12 is either a bully or a victim of bullying; 90% of 4th to 8th grade students report being victims of bullying of some type, 56% of students have personally witnessed some type of bullying at school; 71% of students report incidents of bullying as a problem at their school; 15% of all students who don't show up for school report it to being out of fear of being bullied while at school; 1 out of 20 students has seen a student with a gun at school; 282,000 students are physically attacked in secondary schools each month.

Consequences of bullying: 15% of all school absenteeism is directly related to fears of being bullied at school; According to bullying statistics, 1 out of every 10 students who drops out of school does so because of repeated bullying; Suicides linked to bullying are the saddest statistic.

Statistics on Gun Violence: Homicide is the 2nd leading cause of death for young people ages 15 to 24 years old; Homicide is the leading cause of death for African Americans between ages 10 and 24; Thirteen young people from ages 10–24 become victims of homicide every day; 82.8% of those youths were killed with a firearm; Every 30 minutes, a child or teenager in America is injured by a gun; Every 3 hours and 15 minutes, a child or teenager loses their life to a firearm; In 2010, 82 children under 5 years of age lost their lives due to guns; One of four high school males reportedly carry a weapon to school, with 8.6% of reportedly carry a gun; 87% of youth said shootings are motivated by a desire to "get back at those who have hurt them," and 86% said, "other kids picking on them, making fun of them or bullying them" causes teenagers to turn to lethal violence in the schools; In 2011, over 707,000 young people, aged 10 to 24 years, had to be rushed to the emergency room as a result of physical assault injuries.

I strongly believe that where our children are concerned, Congress is in a unique position to advocate on their behalf in an effective and forceful way. Letting children know by our actions that members of Congress consider the lives of children and their experience to be of the utmost importance would help them in countless ways.

We cannot gamble with our children's future, and ultimately the future of our nation. I am committed to finding ways to make sure that education is as valued as national defense—because education is crucial to our nation's global success in all areas.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, with that, I offer an amendment to the resolution.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

I. section 6, add "at the end of the bill" before the period.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1520

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT) at 3 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Adoption of House Resolution 576, as amended;

The previous question on House Resolution 575;

Adoption of House Resolution 575, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 2548.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 10, SUCCESS AND OPPORTUNITY THROUGH QUALITY CHARTER SCHOOLS ACT; RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4438, AMERICAN RESEARCH AND COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2014; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 576) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to amend the Charter School Program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; relating to consideration of the bill (H.R. 4438) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify and make permanent the research credit; and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 178, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 205]

YEAS—232

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

NAYS—178

Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Delaney
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—21

Bachmann
Bass
Bishop (GA)
Coble
Crawford
Culberson
DeGette
DeLauro
Duffy
Kelly (IL)
Kingston
Lee (CA)
McAllister
Meeks
Nunnelee
Pelosi
Rangel
Reed
Rush
Schwartz
Scott, David

□ 1547

Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. COSTA changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 567, ESTABLISHING SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE EVENTS SURROUNDING THE 2012 TERRORIST ATTACK IN BENGHAZI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 575) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 567) providing for the Establishment of the Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attack in Benghazi, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 192, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 206]

YEAS—223

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crenshaw
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reichert
Renacci

Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—192

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Bachmann
Bishop (GA)
Coble
Crawford
Culberson
DeGette
Duffy
Fattah
Kingston
McAllister
Nunnelee
Pelosi
Reed
Rush
Schwartz
Scott, David

□ 1554

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 192, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]

YEAS—224

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

NAYS—192

Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Bachmann
Bishop (GA)
Coble
Crawford
Culberson
DeGette
Duffy
Kingston
McAllister
Nunnelee
Pelosi
Reed
Rush
Schwartz
Scott, David

□ 1602

Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mr. GARCIA changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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.

ELECTRIFY AFRICA ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2548) to establish a comprehensive United States Government

policy to assist countries in sub-Saharan Africa to develop an appropriate mix of power solutions for more broadly distributed electricity access in order to support poverty alleviation and drive economic growth, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 297, nays 117, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 208]

YEAS—297

Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibson
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Michaud
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—117

Aderholt
Amash
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bishop (UT)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Byrne
Campbell
Capito
Chabot
Chaffetz
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cotton
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hanna
Harris
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Hunter
Hurt
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Latta
Marchant
Massie
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Olson
Palazzo
Pearce
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rothfus
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Tipton
Turner
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wittman
Womack
Woodall

NOT VOTING—17

Bachmann
Bishop (GA)
Coble
Crawford
Culberson
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Duffy
Kingston
McAllister
Meehan
Nunnelee
Pelosi
Reed
Rush
Schwartz
Scott, David

□ 1611

Mr. FINCHER changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. COFFMAN and Ms. KAPTUR changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: ''A bill to establish a comprehensive United States Government policy to encourage the efforts of countries in sub-Saharan Africa to develop an appropriate mix of power solutions, including renewable energy, for more broadly distributed electricity access in order to support poverty reduction, promote development outcomes, and drive economic growth, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1615

ESTABLISHING SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE EVENTS SURROUNDING THE 2012 TERRORIST ATTACK IN BENGHAZI

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 575, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 567) providing for the Establishment of the Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attack in Benghazi, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). Pursuant to House Resolution 575, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 567

Resolved,

SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT.

There is hereby established the Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attack in Benghazi (hereinafter referred to as the ''Select Committee'').

SEC. 2. COMPOSITION.

(a) The Speaker shall appoint 12 Members to the Select Committee, five of whom shall be appointed after consultation with the minority leader.

(b) The Speaker shall designate one Member to serve as chair of the Select Committee.

(c) Any vacancy in the Select Committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

SEC. 3. INVESTIGATION AND REPORT ON THE EVENTS SURROUNDING THE 2012 TERRORIST ATTACK IN BENGHAZI.

(a) The Select Committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study and issue a final report of its findings to the House regarding—

(1) all policies, decisions, and activities that contributed to the attacks on United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya, on September 11, 2012, as well as those that affected the ability of the United States to prepare for the attacks;

(2) all policies, decisions, and activities to respond to and repel the attacks on United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya, on September 11, 2012, including efforts to rescue United States personnel;

(3) internal and public executive branch communications about the attacks on United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya, on September 11, 2012;

(4) accountability for policies and decisions related to the security of facilities in Benghazi, Libya, and the response to the attacks, including individuals and entities responsible for those policies and decisions;

(5) executive branch authorities' efforts to identify and bring to justice the perpetrators of the attacks on U.S. facilities in Benghazi, Libya, on September 11, 2012;

(6) executive branch activities and efforts to comply with Congressional inquiries into the attacks on United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya, on September 11, 2012;

(7) recommendations for improving executive branch cooperation and compliance with congressional oversight and investigations;

(8) information related to lessons learned from the attacks and executive branch activities and efforts to protect United States facilities and personnel abroad; and

(9) any other relevant issues relating to the attacks, the response to the attacks, or the investigation by the House of Representatives into the attacks.

(b) In addition to any final report addressing the matters in subsection (a), the Select Committee may issue such interim reports as it deems necessary.

(c) Any report issued by the Select Committee may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 4. PROCEDURE.

(a) Notwithstanding clause 3(m) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Select Committee is authorized to study the sources and methods of entities described in clause 11(b)(1)(A) of rule X insofar as such study is related to the matters described in section 3.

(b) Clause 11(b)(4), clause 11(e), and the first sentence of clause 11(f) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Select Committee.

(c) Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Select Committee except as follows:

(1) Clause 2(a) of rule XI shall not apply to the Select Committee.

(2) Clause 2(g)(2)(D) of rule XI shall apply to the Select Committee in the same manner as it applies to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

(3) Pursuant to clause 2(h) of rule XI, two Members of the Select Committee shall constitute a quorum for taking testimony or receiving evidence and one-third of the Members of the Select Committee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action other than one for which the presence of a majority of the Select Committee is required.

(4) The chair of the Select Committee may authorize and issue subpoenas pursuant to clause 2(m) of rule XI in the investigation and study conducted pursuant to section 3 of this resolution, including for the purpose of taking depositions.

(5)(A) The chair of the Select Committee, upon consultation with the ranking minority member, may order the taking of depositions, under oath and pursuant to notice or subpoena, by a Member of the Select Committee or a counsel of the Select Committee.

(B) Depositions taken under the authority prescribed in this paragraph shall be governed by the procedures submitted by the chair of the Committee on Rules for printing in the Congressional Record.

(6) The chair of the Select Committee may, after consultation with the ranking minority member, recognize—

(A) Members of the Select Committee to question a witness for periods longer than five minutes as though pursuant to clause (2)(j)(2)(B) of rule XI; and

(B) staff of the Select Committee to question a witness as though pursuant to clause (2)(j)(2)(C) of rule XI.

SEC. 5. RECORDS; STAFF; FUNDING.

(a) Any committee of the House of Representatives having custody of records in any form relating to the matters described in section 3 shall transfer such records to the Select Committee within 14 days of the adoption of this resolution. Such records shall become the records of the Select Committee.

(b)(1)(A) To the greatest extent practicable, the Select Committee shall utilize the services of staff of employing entities of the House. At the request of the chair of the Select Committee in consultation with the ranking minority member, staff of employing entities of the House or a joint committee may be detailed to the Select Committee without reimbursement to carry out this resolution and shall be deemed to be staff of the Select Committee.

(B) Section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i)) shall apply with respect to the Select Committee in the same manner as such section applies with respect to a standing committee of the House of Representatives.

(2) The chair of the Select Committee, upon consultation with the ranking minority member, may employ and fix the compensation of such staff as the chair considers necessary to carry out this resolution.

(c) There shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives such sums as may be necessary for the expenses of the Select Committee. Such payments shall be made on vouchers signed by the chair of the Select Committee and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Administration. Amounts made available under this subsection shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 6. DISSOLUTION AND DISPOSITION OF RECORDS.

(a) The Select Committee shall cease to exist 30 days after filing the final report required under section 3.

(b) Upon dissolution of the Select Committee, the records of the Select Committee shall become the records of such committee or committees designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on consideration of H. Res. 567.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I believe the whole House and the American people deserve to know how I came to the decision that brings us here today.

On September 11, 2012, a terrorist attack on our consulate in Libya left four of our countrymen dead, including our Ambassador.

Since that time, four committees of the House have been investigating these events, and those committees have done exemplary work. Chairman ISSA, Chairman MCKEON, Chairman ROGERS, Chairman ROYCE, and all the members of their respective committees deserve our gratitude; but last week, a line was crossed in two places.

First, it came to light that the White House did more to obscure what happened and why than what we were led to believe.

Second, we now know that the administration defied a formal congressional subpoena.

Our committees sought the full truth, and the administration tried to make sure that they wouldn't find it, which means they tried to prevent the American people from finding the truth as well.

In my view, these discoveries compel the House to respond as one institution and establish one select committee, a committee with robust authority, a committee that will do its work while the House continues to focus on the people's priorities.

I have asked the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY) to chair this panel. He is a well-respected Member of this body, and he has my complete confidence. I will convey to you what I conveyed to him. This doesn't need to be, shouldn't be, and will not be a partisan process.

Four Americans died at the hands of terrorists in a well-coordinated assault, and we will not take any shortcuts to the truth, accountability, or justice; and we will not allow any sideshows that distract us from those goals.

Our system of government depends on transparency and accountability, and either we do this well, or we face the terrifying prospect of our people having less knowledge and less power over their own government. We owe it to future generations to make the right choice.

I ask all the Members of this body to reflect on this matter, and I ask you to support this resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, we all agree—I think all Americans agree, and we certainly understand from the Speaker that he agrees that the attack on Benghazi was a tragedy; but here we are, once again, riling up the community and the country and causing, again, grief to the families of the four people who died, in a pursuit of some kind of truth that they were unable to find in 2 years of hearings, over four committees, 13 congressional hearings, 50 briefings, five reports, 25,000 pages of documentation, and wasted millions of dollars, going nowhere, and that is just in the House.

The Senate has held hearings. The State Department did a thorough report; and yet, now, after all that, we want the truth.

What does it say about the House of Representatives that whatever that was going on over there did not get to the truth?

This is so reminiscent of what we have done in the House of Representatives by doing over and over and over again, like trying to repeal the health care, that we are just going to keep doing it until you reach whatever it is you want.

Well, we know what it is you want with this special committee. We understand that thoroughly. Earlier today—I want to make a comment, that one of my friends on the other side of the aisle—I deeply regret this—cited a report claiming that the Democrats were

fundraising off of the crass Republican fundraising off Benghazi.

Certainly, we looked into that because I was very concerned because I was the one making the charge about the fundraising. It is absolutely false that Democrats are doing that.

That report was from The Daily Caller, a conservative Web site, and all they found was that the chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee posted a statement on his Web site condemning the Republican campaign committee for their attempt to capitalize and fundraise off the tragedy in Benghazi.

Let's stick to the facts here. You are going to continue. As I understand it, several reporters have asked the leadership do they intend to stop fundraising off these people's deaths; and the answer is, no, they don't.

So what we are doing here, again, is an awful waste of time, is looking for another answer to something that—unless you get some answer that you want, I guess we will go on even yet another year or so.

Now, one more committee that will be weighted in favor of the majority, as this one is expected to do, will do absolutely nothing to yield different results.

I had an amendment to this bill that was based on a simple premise, that the investigations and reports on the tragic attack in Benghazi produced by the House committees so far have been nothing but partisan and political.

My amendment would have made membership on the committee equally divided between the minority and the majority and would have guaranteed minority signoff on subpoenas and depositions and guaranteed equal distribution and money and staffing and other resources of the committee and certainly have ensured that the witnesses who come before that committee, unlike the other witnesses that the Oversight and Government Reform Committee has had, who were totally ineligible to even speak on the subject—one of them, I gather, was giving all the details of what happened that night, but he happened to be in Germany at the time.

Had our amendment passed, we could have added some decorum to this process, and we could have worked to ensure the tragedy never happens again, but it is clear that this majority will not allow that.

So we have seen all the reports. We know what everybody thinks; and we know that, once again, we will be going into this because you are the majority, and you have the votes to do it.

I am appalled by this posturing. To use the tragedy of those four deaths for political and financial gain is shameful and contemptible.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the Majority Leader of the House of Representatives.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution, to proceed with a select committee to find out what happened at the American consulate in Benghazi, Libya, on the night of September 11, 2012.

Mr. Speaker, it has been almost 2 years since a terror attack claimed the lives of four brave Americans in Benghazi: Ambassador J. Christopher Stevens; U.S. Foreign Service Information Management Officer Sean Smith; former Navy SEAL Glen Doherty; and former Navy SEAL and Bronze Star recipient, Tyrone Woods.

Over the past 2 years, our committees in the House have aggressively investigated what happened that night in Benghazi and the Obama administration's preparedness and response to those terror attacks.

Unfortunately, the White House has engaged in a pattern of obstruction, consistently ignoring subpoenas, redacting relevant information, and stonewalling investigators. This obstruction gives cause to the grave concerns expressed by countless Americans across the country.

Mr. Speaker, what is worse, as the White House refuses to turn over documents, they go in front of the American people and claim to be transparent. Those in the administration claim to be cooperating. They claim to be focused on bringing the perpetrators of that attack to justice.

Mr. Speaker, the attacks in Benghazi brought the first time an American Ambassador was killed in the line of duty since the 1970s and, to this day, not a single perpetrator of the attacks has been arrested or brought to justice. We should be using every tool necessary to find those responsible and bring them to justice.

After ignoring for nearly a year a lawful congressional subpoena, the White House, under court order, finally released emails showing that administration officials deliberately and deceptively misled Americans, claiming that the attack in Benghazi was the result of an offensive Internet video, rather than the product of a failed foreign policy that allowed radical Islamic terrorists to flourish in post-Qadhafi Libya.

This obfuscation and refusal to come clean to Congress has left us, as well as the people of this country, wondering: What else is the White House hiding?

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle want Americans to believe that this investigation is motivated by politics. No. This investigation would not be necessary had the Obama administration come clean. This investigation would not be necessary had the Obama administration complied with congressional subpoenas.

This investigation would not be necessary had the Obama administration not misled the Congress, the American people, and the media about what happened in Benghazi.

The American people deserve the truth and, most importantly, the families of those four brave men deserve the truth.

This committee will build upon the excellent oversight work conducted to this date and ask questions and demand answers. Constitutional checks and balances were intended to ensure that each branch of government conduct itself with the utmost integrity and do so within the law. That is our duty, and we will solemnly and judiciously carry this out.

Today, we have an opportunity to stand together and take another step closer to accomplishing that goal, to finding the truth; and I urge my colleagues in the House to support this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), my good friend and member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, as its ranking member.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in strong opposition to this resolution.

Benghazi was a tragedy. We lost four brave Americans that night, and I extend my deepest sympathies to their families. In my opinion, we honor their memories best by bringing their killers to justice and by working in a bipartisan way to strengthen security for all U.S. personal overseas.

As family members of Ambassador Stevens have stated, ''What Chris never would have accepted was the idea that his death would have been used for political purposes.''

□ 1630

Unfortunately, that is what House Republicans have been doing for the last year and a half.

On April 23, 2013, the Republican chairmen of five different House committees issued a highly partisan staff report with absolutely no consultation or input from a single Democratic Member of the Congress of the United States of America. Their report included a reckless accusation that Secretary Clinton personally authorized security reductions in Benghazi. Chairman ISSA then went on national television and said, Secretary Clinton ''outright denied security, in her signature, in a cable.''

When we located the cable, however, we discovered that the Republican report distorted the facts. The cable had only a printed stamp of Secretary Clinton's name, the same stamp that appears on hundreds of thousands of cables sent from the State Department every year.

This report was issued under the direction of the Speaker. It was posted on his Web site, and it was prepared only for Members of the House Republican Conference. How is this a bipartisan search for the truth?

House Republicans have also excluded Democratic Members from fact-finding delegations to Libya, in violation of the rules issued by the Speaker. How is that bipartisan?

Democratic Members have been denied equal access to witnesses, and Republicans have selectively leaked documents and cherry-picked transcript excerpts without any official committee consideration. How is that bipartisan?

Republicans have also been doing something worse. They have been using the deaths of these four Americans for political campaign fundraising. I call on the Speaker of the House to end that process right now.

For example, on February 17, Chairman ISSA traveled to New Hampshire to attend a political fundraiser, where he spoke about Benghazi. He suggested during his speech that our military's response on the night of the attacks was deficient because Secretary Clinton ordered Defense Secretary Panetta to ''stand down.'' That was a shocking accusation, and he had absolutely no evidence—none—to support it. In my opinion, his statements were reprehensible not only to the Secretary of State but to our brave men and women in uniform.

And so today, we are here to consider a resolution to create another partisan committee to investigate what the Speaker and his five chairmen have already been investigating.

With all due respect, if the Republicans want to fix the problems with their partisan investigation, they need more than just a new chairman. They need a new approach. I have tremendous respect for the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY), and I am glad that he said that fundraising should not be done on the deaths of these four people, and I hope that the Republican Conference will finally agree with that. We are better than that.

They need a new approach, one that is truly bipartisan, and one that seeks the facts before drawing conclusions, rather than the other way around.

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

Mr. Speaker, today is a historic day for this institution. As a result of the Obama administration's unwillingness to openly work with House Republicans in our ongoing effort to uncover the facts surrounding the events of the 2012 terrorist attack on the American diplomatic mission in Benghazi, Libya, the United States House of Representatives is left with no option except to establish a select committee on Benghazi.

As the author of this resolution, I would like to take the opportunity to provide the American people with a sequence of events that have led us to this point and explain how the newly formed select committee will operate on their behalf.

Immediately following the attacks on Benghazi on September 11, 2012, which took the lives of four brave Americans, including then-U.S. Ambassador to Libya J. Christopher Stevens, four House committees began investigations into the events prior to the attacks, those that occurred during the attacks, and the administration's response afterwards.

And I want to thank our House chairmen and the committees who did what I believe was an outstanding job in supporting this effort—Chairman DARRELL ISSA of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, Chairman BUCK MCKEON of the Armed Services Committee, Chairman ED ROYCE of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and Chairman MIKE ROGERS of the Intelligence Committee—and for their exemplary work that has advanced this issue and brought up new facts. Without their diligent work, we would not be where we are today.

But, Mr. Speaker, that work was thwarted; and by this administration not proactively addressing the issue equally themselves in an open and, I believe, transparent way, they have placed us where we are today. It comes as a result of their being an unwilling partner. It comes as a result of many, many turns. The administration has chosen to build roadblocks to the congressional inquiry. Whether failing to comply completely with opportunities to come speak to Congress, objecting to and not complying with subpoenas, delaying the delivery of important documents, heavily redacting critical information, and retroactively classifying previously unclassified files, this administration earned exactly the title that has been placed on it today, ''uncooperative.''

Mr. Speaker, this will not be tolerated, and this is what has brought us to where we are today. I will tell you that many of the things which you have heard on the floor today are accusations pitched our way; and I will tell you that the American people, through this process, will find out exactly who is after the truth and who is exactly for hiding the truth, because I believe that it is not just mismanagement at the top, but bad decisions that they should and will be embarrassed to have uncovered by the select committee on Benghazi.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I will yield myself 1 minute before yielding to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, last night in the Rules Committee, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) offered an amendment that was supported by all the Democrats on the committee. That amendment would have allowed for membership on the committee to be equally divided between Republicans and Democrats. It would guarantee minority signoff on subpoenas and depositions. It would guarantee equal distribution of money, staffing, and other resources of the committee. It would require the committee to establish written rules, specifically including rules concerning how documents and other information may be obtained, used, or released.

I will offer a caveat there about the intelligence that you are about to get into with the select committee. It would guarantee equal access to evidence and materials of the committee. It provides for transparency of the committee's expenditures and budgeting, and it would ensure that a quorum for taking testimony or receiving evidence includes at least one minority Member.

Finally, it would ensure that the minority has a say in decisions about extended questioning and staff questioning of witnesses. That would produce a bipartisan result that would be credible.

I am very pleased at this time to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), my good friend and a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Mr. CLAY. I thank my friend from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose this misguided, highly partisan select committee that seeks to exploit the tragedy of the attack on our consulate in Benghazi for purely political purposes.

There have already been eight—eight—reviews of that terrible incident. There were legitimate oversight questions about Benghazi, and we explored them in exhaustive detail. More than 25,000 documents have been produced, and dozens of witnesses have been interviewed. Millions of tax dollars have already been spent responding to repetitive and partisan congressional requests. The majority has alleged multiple conspiracy theories, each of which has been dispelled by the facts.

Ambassador Chris Stevens, Sean Smith, Tyrone Woods, and Glen Doherty are American heroes who gave their lives in brave service to our Nation. But instead of honoring their memory, even before it convenes, this sham select committee is already blatantly being used for political purposes. Evidence of that comes directly from the National Republican Congressional Committee, which created an online fundraising solicitation yesterday. And it reads, in part:

> You're now a Benghazi watchdog. Let's go after Obama & Hillary Clinton. Help us fight them now.

So this is not about discovering new facts about Benghazi. This is about creating a partisan vehicle to exploit this tragedy to raise money and to provide the majority's echo chamber on cable TV and talk radio with red meat rhetoric to influence the 2014 midterms and the 2016 Presidential election.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Judge POE.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on September 11, 2012, terrorists stormed the American consulate in Benghazi. Four Americans were murdered. Nineteen months later, the killers are still running loose. One killer was even interviewed on CNN, but this country cannot capture him and his fellow outlaws.

Why? What has been the problem?

Today there are more questions than answers. Americans are still not really sure what happened that night and the days following the attack.

Several House committees launched investigations but were stonewalled. Subpoenas were issued but ignored. And last week, a White House email was disclosed that indicated there may have been coordination to purposely deceive Congress about what really happened.

Did the administration deceive America? If so, why? Let's find out.

We have no choice but to establish this select committee to ensure that the full story is told, even if the evidence reveals an inconvenient truth, to shine light on what happened when Americans overseas were murdered in the darkness of the night.

And to those who oppose this bill, I ask the question, Mr. Speaker: Why don't they want to know all of the facts?

Let's find the truth—the good, the bad, and the ugly truth. Justice demands it, and justice is what we do in this country.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from New York will control the remaining time for the minority.

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago, America suffered an incredible tragedy; 241 Marines in Beirut lost their lives when terrorists bombed the barracks in which they were living. At that time, we had a President whose name was Ronald Reagan, and we had a Speaker of the House whose name was Tip O'Neill. Different parties.

That was an enormous tragedy. An investigation needed to be done, and it was done. It was done on a bipartisan basis. One investigation was done. And there was a presumption that no matter how tragic this was and no matter how important it was to hold people accountable—and that was done—that everybody involved had the best intentions for America's future strength.

And there seems to be a premise, at least to me, that this President of the United States has any less commitment to protecting the lives and safety of the American people than any other President.

□ 1645

I will tell you, I was an opponent of the war in Iraq, and I was critical of the policies and the decisions of our then-President George Bush. But never once did I question that his motivations were anything less than what he thought was best for America.

We are going off the rails here. This is a tragedy. But there is a real question, at least on the part of many of us, and I think many Americans, as to whether we are doing this right. How is it that there is such glee that the decision is made to go forward after seven other committees, 25,000 documents—more work could be done—but how is it that there was such glee on one side that they turned it into a fundraising opportunity? Who would do that?

Mr. GOWDY won't do it, and he is a good man. But do you know what? If we are going to proceed, it has got to be on the level. We have a seven-to-five committee that is being organized. It is not even-handed. You can't have these tough decisions that not only have to be made right but have to be made so that there is credibility with the American people that they are on the level and not political where you don't have a bipartisan approach, you don't have everybody weighing in on subpoenas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, there are lots of questions. The first one is, Why didn't the military come help these men when they were in need over this firefight for several hours? We will just start there.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Dardanelle, Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), who is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, a couple of lessons I learned in the Army were you move to the sound of gunfire, and the most important step in the troop-leading procedures is to supervise the execution of your orders.

When Americans were fighting for their lives in Benghazi, Barack Obama did neither. He sent no Quick Reaction Force, and he didn't even stay in the Situation Room to supervise the execution of his orders. We expect more from lieutenants in the Army than our President gave us that night. For 2 years, he has covered up this failure of leadership by stonewalling. Not anymore. We will now get to the truth.

But what do our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say to this? They express great outrage at politicizing this matter. When I was leading troops in Iraq in 2006, men and women who were being shot at and blown up by al Qaeda, where was the outrage as they fund-raised endlessly off the Iraq war? Where was the outrage as they viciously attacked our commanders? Where was the outrage when they said that soldiers were war criminals? Where was the outrage when they said the war was lost? Where was the outrage when they said that only high school dropouts join the Army?

Forgive me if I don't join my Democratic colleagues in sharing their fake outrage. Four Americans lost their lives that night in Benghazi. They deserve justice, and the American people deserve the truth.

One other lesson I learned in the Army is we leave no man behind, and we will not leave these four men behind.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, let me yield myself 20 seconds to just respond to that.

Mr. Speaker, I would be outraged, too, if anybody did the things that he accused us of doing, and I don't believe a word of it.

I am now pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to urge my colleagues to vote against the creation of this select committee. Because this is not a select committee to investigate what happened in Benghazi, which has been done many times already, it is not a select committee to investigate what we can do to better protect our embassies, consulates, and diplomatic corps, which appears to have generated little interest in the majority, it is not even a select committee to probe where we were in the hunt for those responsible, which involves classified information and is something done best in closed session.

No. This is a proposal to create a select committee on talking points.

I have been involved with the investigation into Benghazi from day one as a member of the Intelligence Committee because, like every other American, I wanted to know what happened, why it happened, and how we can keep it from happening again. And I want to bring to justice those who perpetrated this horrible attack.

But almost 18 months later, and after eight reports from House and Senate committees and the Accountability Review Board, the questions that this select committee purports to investigate have been asked and answered time and time and time again. There is no question that this select committee on talking points will waste potentially millions of taxpayer dollars in a purely partisan exercise and serve as little more than a fundraising vehicle for Republicans.

Up until last Friday, the Speaker of the House resisted the siren call from his base for yet another wasteful committee. Here is what he said just a month ago:

> There are four committees that are investigating Benghazi. I see no reason to break up all the work that has been done and to take months and months and months to create some select committee.

I agree with the Speaker's previous assessment.

Democrats made a proposal to structure the committee so that it had equal numbers of members of each party, so that it required cooperation on subpoenas and depositions, and so that it guaranteed equal access to evidence and material collected by the committee. Yet, in each case, we were rejected.

If this isn't a fair investigation and select committee, there is no reason for Democrats to vote for it or to participate in it. Let's end the political circus and focus our efforts on preventing another Benghazi and accelerating the hunt for the murderers of four Americans, including Ambassador Stevens.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, when pressed last week by a reporter about the tragic events on September 11, 2012, in Benghazi, Libya, the former spokesperson for the National Security Council said this: ''Dude, this was like 2 years ago.''

Now, this juvenile and unprofessional response has only added to the concern that we do not—still do not—have a full understanding of what occurred that night. What we do know is that our Ambassador, Chris Stevens, and three other Americans are dead.

Now, several congressional committees have looked into this question and have concluded different things, and there are many lingering questions still unanswered. They have reached different conclusions. But these lingering questions are made worse by the fact that we now know that emails from the administration may have been withheld from Congress.

This is the reason that we need a select committee, to probe deeply and get clear answers with a singular goal in mind: to restore the public trust.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), the ranking member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee's Subcommittee on Government Operations.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, we don't need a select committee because a particular chairman who is subpoena-happy can't quite draft a subpoena to capture the emails in question.

I rise in strong opposition to H. Res. 567, which represents yet another unfortunate chapter in the majority's relentless commitment to wasting taxpayer dollars on round after round of Benghazi political theater.

There is a reason that State's slogan is ''diplomacy in action.'' To effectively represent our Nation, American personnel overseas and their families make significant sacrifices. Ambassador Stevens' own family knows that. They issued this eloquent statement after his death:

> Chris was not willing to be the kind of diplomat who would strut around in fortified compounds. He amazed and impressed the Libyans by walking the streets with the lightest of escorts, sitting in sidewalk cafes, chatting with passersby. There was a risk to being accessible. He knew it, and he accepted it.
>
> What he would never have accepted was the idea that his death would be used for political purposes. There were security shortcomings, no doubt. Both internal and outside investigations have identified and publicly disclosed them. Steps are being taken to repair them. Chris would not have wanted to be remembered as a victim. He knew and accepted that he was working under dangerous circumstances.
>
> He did so—just as so many of our diplomatic and development professionals do every day—because he believed the work was vitally important.

That is the statement of Chris Stevens, the deceased, murdered Ambassador to Libya, his family.

I deeply understand the demands we place on our Foreign Service, and I know the stakes are high. As a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee staff from 1979 to 1989, I vividly recall shortly after I returned home from a visit to the U.S. barracks in Beirut, a horrific truck bomb was detonated there, killing 241 U.S. members of the Marine Corps. Our Embassy was blown up twice in Beirut in that same timeframe.

The Democrats didn't pile on. The Democrats didn't call for a select committee to investigate Ronald Reagan and his administration for malfeasance and incompetence. We didn't darkly hint there was a conspiracy by the Reagan administration to hide the facts and to deny terrorism had occurred. We were patriots. We came together. We mourned our losses. We worked with a Republican President to make it better. That is the spirit in which we should approach this issue.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, this bill is absolutely necessary when we look at the facts as we know them currently and we look at the information that we are uncertain about. Number one is we have lost four people in an attack that we now know is a terrorist attack. We now know that some things could have been done to save these people, but for some reason they weren't done.

Now, Beirut has been raised a couple of times, showing the cooperation between Speaker Tip O'Neill then and Ronald Reagan when we lost 241 soldiers in that attack. I remember it vividly. But the difference is how the leadership between then and now reacted.

The leadership at the White House responded to this attack by developing a false narrative to—probably, we don't know why they came up with this fake story about an impromptu protest gone bad, therefore causing these deaths, so if they are making up a story, what are they trying to hide? Their own incompetence? We don't know that.

We talked about then in Beirut, as my friends from the other side of the aisle had mentioned, about all of the documents that were received in the Beirut investigation. Well, that is because they were cooperative. The documents that we received, despite what the gentleman from Virginia just said, that they were subpoenaed incorrectly, the documents we received were heavily redacted. They were purposely not providing that information. It was redacted.

Now, why was that redacted? Why was it that we had to find out some of the truth about the coverup that occurred on that narrative about a protest gone bad from an outside group that provided the unredacted? So, now, what we have before us is an email that was redacted from the White House and another one that was obtained through an outside source that provided us the same but unredacted that says now that the White House was telling us something different.

When you have a White House that has gone out of their way to cover up the truth, it is incumbent upon all of us on both sides of the aisle to fight for the truth so that the four people that lost their lives—one of which an Ambassador, for God's sake—they are the ones that deserve justice by this select committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for rebuttal, I am going to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I say to my friend, it is amazing that he claims the White House is covering up when the same White House gave an unredacted version to the Judicial Watch. The easier conclusion——

Mr. TERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNOLLY. I am rebutting what I just heard.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says this is about getting at the truth. Really? Because there have been so many falsehoods propounded on this subject by the other side of the aisle. There was a stand-down order proved conclusively by our own Republican-controlled House Armed Services Committee. There was no such thing.

We could have and should have mobilized the military to intervene and save lives. The military did what it could, but there was not enough timeframe for the military efficaciously to intervene in the tragedy unfolding in Benghazi.

The Secretary of State knew and deliberately covered up. There were talking points that deliberately avoided the word ''terrorism,'' even though the President of the United States a few days later most certainly did use the word ''terrorist'' to describe what happened in Benghazi.

The Islamic video had nothing whatsoever to do with Benghazi. The Islamic video was erupting——

Mr. TERRY. Will the gentleman yield now? Because that is absolutely wrong, and you know it.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Let me remind the other side that the gentleman from Virginia has the floor. He has been unwilling to yield. Let the gentleman have the floor.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the Speaker for returning us to regular order.

Mr. Speaker, these are all falsehoods used to justify a needless expense of taxpayer dollars to beat to death for political purposes the tragedy that occurred in Benghazi. And the invocation of the name of the deceased Ambassador, Chris Stevens, even though his own family has pleaded that he not be used as a political pawn in a political partisan game, is something that is beneath contempt.

□ 1700

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

Mr. Speaker, the reason why Judicial Watch received the information they did in an unredacted basis was because there are criminal penalties associated with that act. Those criminal penalties do not exist in a congressional inquiry. The administration is simply taking advantage of that, and they know that and so do all Members of Congress.

This administration was playing games. They are taking advantage of the structure which has been established in the relationship of trying to have the three branches of government coexist, and that is exactly what this administration did, and that was the trigger point to where the Speaker then said enough is enough.

When we recognized that the documents that we were getting, which are heavily redacted, did not coincide or agree with what outside groups would get because they, Mr. Speaker, asked for it under FOIA, which has criminal penalties associated with it, which meant that those lawyers knew exactly what they were doing and could be held to that criminal penalty point, but in providing them to Congress, they would just redact it and then claim national security, and we might not ever know the difference.

We are not stupid. We have been deliberate. We have been cautious. We have stayed after it. But redaction after redaction after redaction and wrong, wrong direction and trying to lead us down a path that was not correct is exactly where this administration has been, and they deserve what they are getting.

They are the ones that brought this to Congress. We are simply properly and carefully responding.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for bringing this important resolution forward and also Congressman FRANK WOLF, who has been tenacious in insisting that there be a select committee.

There are serious gaps. We all know it. The people who lost their lives who died unnecessarily their loved ones and the American people deserve to know the truth about Benghazi.

When Secretary Clinton came before the Foreign Affairs Committee, I asked her point blank:

You have said, Madam Secretary, that you take full responsibility. How do you define ''full responsibility''?

She defined it from the day of, and all that preceded Benghazi is precluded from that definition.

Despite the fact that there was one cable after another, suggesting that there were serious gaps in security, all of that seemed to have not made its way to either her or her senior staff. That is very much of a lack of attention to detail, and a light needs to be brought to that.

I asked two of the people who headed up the ARB, the Accountability Review Board, why they did not interview Secretary Clinton. They had no good answer. I asked them twice—no good answer.

Back in 1998, when we got hit in Dar es Salaam and in Nairobi, I chaired the hearings of the Accountability Review Board. We looked painstakingly at all of the gaps that existed and I wrote the Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act of 1999.

There were lessons learned. Those lessons were not applied the way they should have been to Benghazi. Requests were made for help. We still don't know the truth. The new select committee will leave no stone unturned. It will get answers.

Again, those who died, their loved ones, and the American people deserve to know the truth.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if my colleague has more requests for time?

Mr. SESSIONS. In fact, I do.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tampa, Florida (Mr. JOLLY).

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, a resolution necessitated today by a crisis in trust, a crisis in trust between this Congress and this administration.

This body has the article I constitutional authority to provide oversight over the administration, an authority that has been repeatedly ignored by this administration, and ignored with an audacity rarely seen in modern politics. Today, with this resolution, we confront that audacity.

Here are the facts. We have a President that rules by pen and a phone. We have an Attorney General that selectively enforces laws when he wishes to and in which States he wishes to. We have a Veterans Affairs administration that is withholding documents about the death of veterans.

We have agencies that legislate by regulation, and we have an Internal Revenue Service that has targeted organizations and refuses to testify about it. So is it any surprise that, last week, additional information comes to light about Benghazi? No, it is not.

This administration has kept information from this Congress, and they have refused to recognize the gravity of this obstructionism. They have done so in the context of a loss of American lives and a loss of life that is personal for a family in my district. That family deserves answers.

Yes, we have a crisis in trust between this Congress and this administration, but this is not political theater. This has not been brought upon this House by this side of the aisle. It has been brought upon this house by the stonewalling of the administration.

It is a rightful execution and a proper execution of the article I oversight authority of this Congress. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I am going to ask a couple of questions. First of all, I have to give a disclaimer that I was one of the Members on this side of the aisle that did not favor a select committee. I actually took my name off of a request by Mr. WOLF. I thought we could handle this matter in regular order. Four committees proceeded to investigate the matter.

I am the senior member of the chief investigative panel of Congress. I have been through many investigations. I have never in my life seen the stonewalling. I have never seen the contempt for Congress displayed by this administration.

Then last week, to make a mockery of the entire system, we saw from an outside party getting information that four committees of Congress had never received and requested. I have never seen anything like this. Why are we doing this? The other side has brought this, the administration has brought this upon themselves.

Let me ask a fundamental question: What difference does it make? What difference does it make?

I want you to tell that to the State Department employees who every day go to work, sometimes put their life at risk. Four American officials were killed—murdered—and no one has been held accountable. No one has been brought to justice, and to have an official come before a committee of Congress and say: What difference does it make? Ask that to the families of the State Department people who work for the American people.

What difference does it make? Ask the military.

Oh, there is no evidence of an order to stand down, but we know our military had the ability to save those Americans. We know that the State Department had the ability to keep those Americans safe, and no one acted.

What difference does it make? What difference does it make to those four families?

What difference does it make? We don't have to investigate anything. We don't have to hold anyone accountable.

No one died in Watergate. Four American officials lost their lives. Under our system, individuals—whether it is the Secretary of State or the President of the United States or any official at any level—need to be and must be held accountable and responsible under our system.

Otherwise, we make a mockery of this whole business of a government of and for and by the people.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. MICA. What difference does it make?

People were asleep at the switch. They need to be held accountable again, regardless of rank. This is the United States of America. This is the Congress. People sent us here. They are out there trying to make a living, provide for their families, pay their taxes. They sent us here to keep this government responsible, accountable.

What difference does it make? It makes a great deal of difference, not only to the men and women of the State Department, our United States military, the families of those slain, but it makes a big difference to the people of the United States who sent us here to keep this a responsible government and accountable, no matter who must be held responsible or accountable.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I reserve the balance of my time as long as my colleague has speakers.

Mr. SESSIONS. We are now through with our speakers, and I am prepared to close.

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

I think probably the best way that I can close would be with another quote from the man who is fast becoming my favorite Member of the House of Representatives, Congressman BUCK MCKEON, Republican chair of the Armed Services Committee.

He said to the Associated Press on April 10:

> I think I pretty well have been satisfied that given where the troops were, how quickly the thing all happened, and how quickly it dissipated, we probably could not have done more than we did. At some point, we think we will have as much of this story as we are going to get and move on.

Mr. MCKEON, it is long past time for us to move on.

I really appreciate so much hearing from Mr. CONNOLLY, the statement from Ambassador Stevens' family—I had not heard it before—and the eloquence with which they talked about him. Remember, he had only been there in Benghazi—was basically there for the day, and everybody said—and all of the things that I have read, he was that kind of man.

He spoke the language, and he wanted to be out with the people. He would not have wanted to be behind the walls of a compound, and he knew what he was doing, and he made his choices.

The thing that rang so strong with me was the one thing that they said that he would not have wanted was to become a political pawn, and that is exactly what we are making of Ambassador Stevens and the other three Americans who died in that tragic event.

Without any question, we are also causing, once again, to those four families of people who loved them most grievous hardship to deal with all this again, and it is being done for politics. It is being done to raise money.

So I want to close by paraphrasing another great American at another time and ask the majority: Have you no shame? At long last, have you no shame?

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I do want to thank the gentlewoman from New York, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, my dear friend, who presided over a very long hearing yesterday, where we went through, in a meticulous fashion, the understanding of why this committee, who this committee might comprise itself of, and what their mission would be.

We intervened into this process as a result of a real problem, Mr. Speaker. We have intervened in this process because the administration and the standing committees here in the House of Representatives were unable to quickly and thoroughly accomplish their goal of providing not only proper oversight, but getting a fair and transparent answer back.

Hiding the ball is one thing; deception is another.

□ 1715

This administration has gone out of their way. They have lawyered up to make sure that they could, I think, mislead Congress. Well, they would make sure that we really could never get involved in anything but a goo ball, and then they would try and explain themselves in such a way that they would blame our insistence upon getting the truth as a political witch-hunt.

Mr. Speaker, that must mean there is a witch somewhere. And I don't have any clue what that answer is. What I will tell you is this: we must get to the bottom of this without it being a political witch-hunt.

So yesterday, I meticulously went through with the committee an understanding, and I stated three important parts of what this resolution is about: a select committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study; and to issue a final report and its findings to the House regarding all policies, decisions, and activities that contributed to the attack on the United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya, on September 11, 2012, as well as those that affected the ability of the United States to prepare for these attacks; and number three, in particular, that information related to lessons learned from the attack and executive branch activities and efforts to protect the United States facilities and personnel must be understood.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER, the Speaker of the House, has announced that the gentleman from South Carolina, a distinguished Federal prosecutor, a reliable person who serves in this body, is not the least bit interested in the political outcome. In fact, he is interested, because I know him and know him well, in doing the things which are under the charge that we at the Rules Committee and that this House today, I believe, will give him, that he will well and faithfully discharge those duties that have been given to him as the chairman of this select committee.

And I believe that the Speaker of the House has met with former Speaker PELOSI, now the minority leader, to ask the minority leader to please offer him the names of those five personnel, Members of Congress, who might represent the Democrats, or the minority in this case, an opportunity to be a full and forthwith member of this committee.

It is our intent that these 12 people will work together, not apart, that they will work with a mandate that is clear and that provides them the necessary information and the discretion to the full extent of the law.

It is also understood by this that these members of this select committee need to be met forthwith by the administration of the United States of America, and that is the office and the executive branch of the Presidency.

It is a full request that I would make at this time for the American people to understand that we are asking this administration to lay down their sword, to lay down those things which have been impediments to properly providing transparency and things that are information that would allow us to get to the bottom of this.

We have heard over and over how people accepted that the buck stopped there and they took full responsibility. In accepting full responsibility, we have not learned enough about what those mistakes were if they are willing to accept the responsibility.

This is not going to be wished away, Mr. Speaker. Our young chairman, TREY GOWDY, will not whitewash this investigation. Our committee is not empowered just to go off and fritter away the time. They will be serious members of this body.

I look forward to finding out who former Speaker PELOSI, minority leader, appoints to the committee. I will be intensely interested to see who Speaker BOEHNER appoints. And I would bet that they will represent the very best from this body, that they will be young men and young women who have been in and a part of understanding how to carefully look for the facts of the case and not an inch beyond, how to ask questions that are fair and those that represent the very best of only learning the truth and not an inch more.

I have confidence that this House of Representatives, through the leadership of Mr. GOWDY, will bring not only excellence, but will stand as a model of how the House of Representatives should conduct itself when they have a problem with an administration, whether it be Republican or Democrat. I will predict today that those people that former Speaker PELOSI brings to the table and that we bring to the table will be prepared to do exactly that.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I know I am ending my time. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will debate and vote on a resolution authorizing a new Select Committee on Benghazi. Indeed, the attack in Libya was a tragedy, as is losing an Ambassador doing official work for the United States abroad, but using these deaths to score political points is politics at its worst. After 9/11, our nation came together to do what is best for all Americans. There were no gotcha politics, no hearings to blame the victims; instead, we worked together as a unified body on Capitol Hill to protect the American people.

There have already been seven reviews of that terrible attack: one by the State Department's Accountability Review Board, two bipartisan reviews in the Senate, and four partisan reviews in the House. It certainly seems as though the Republicans' proposed special committee is nothing more than an attempt to exploit the deaths of four brave Americans to divert attention away from their own do-nothing record here in Washington.

Moreover, this new select committee is in reality, nothing more than a monumental waste of time and taxpayer dollars to help Republicans mobilize their extreme base ahead of the election. According to the Department of Defense in fact, they have already spent millions of dollars and thousands of hours responding to congressional inquiries. Nor will the new select committee have any additional powers that Chairman ISSA doesn't have already—including the ability to issue unilateral subpoenas for any document or any witness, authority he just used to subpoena the Secretary of State.

To be sure, Benghazi was not the first time Americans have been killed in an embassy while in the service to their country. In the last 100 years, there have been 39 attacks on U.S. embassies with at least 44 American deaths. In one Embassy bombing in fact, a constituent of mine, Mr. Julian Bartley, Sr. one of the most senior African Americans in the U.S. Foreign Service, was the highest-ranking U.S. official killed in the August 7th, 1998 explosions at the American Embassies in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. Jay, his son, a sophomore at the U.S. International University in Nairobi, also died in that explosion.

On that day in August, Osama bin Laden and his terrorist group, al-Qaeda, simultaneously set off bombs at the American embassies in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. More than 250 people were killed, including 12 Americans, and 5,000 wounded in the twin bombing attacks: we were all outraged at these coordinated attacks on Americans.

However, as Dana Milbank of the Washington Post put it: 'Benghazi doesn't qualify as a scandal because the Republican allegations, even if true, don't amount to much. It is indeed scandalous that weak security allowed the killings to occur, and that the perpetrators still haven't been brought to justice. But Republicans are focusing on (United Nations Ambassador Susan) Rice's TV talking points, under the theory that she emphasized the role of a provocative video and street protests so the violence wouldn't disprove President Obama's contention before the 2012 election that terrorists were being defeated.'

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 567 and urge the House to approve the measure as soon as possible.

On September 11, 2012, a group of terrorists ruthlessly attacked our consulate in Benghazi and killed four Americans: U.S. Ambassador to Libya Christopher Stevens, Foreign Service Information Management Officer Sean Smith, and two private security contractors and former Navy SEALs, Glen Doherty and Tyrone Woods. The terrorists who perpetrated the attack have still not been brought to justice and the State Department officials, whose failure of leadership contributed to grossly inadequate security In Benghazi, have not been held accountable.

Despite numerous House oversight hearings on this issue, it is clear that there are too many questions that remain unanswered. Additionally, the Administration's unwillingness to present full and accurate information to these Congressional committees show officials are more interested in maintaining their public image than providing real answers.

That is why I am proud the House of Representatives is considering H. Res. 567 that establishes a Select Committee on the events surrounding the 2012 terrorist attacks in Benghazi. In fact, I was a proud cosponsor of a similar measure. I also want to thank you Mr. Speaker for appointing Rep. TREY GOWDY to head the Select Committee. A former federal prosecutor who never lost a case, I know my friend and colleague from South Carolina Rep. GOWDY will help these grieving American families finally get the answers they deserve.

I am hopeful that this Select Committee will finish the much needed work of holding the Administration accountable for its failures surrounding this attack, deliver justice to those terrorists who murdered these four Americans, and bring peace to the families of the victims.

I urge Members to support this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 575, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM CONCERNING PEACEFUL USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113–109)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153(b), (d)) (the ''Act''), the text of a proposed Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy (the ''Agreement''). I am also pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the Agreement, and an unclassified Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement (NPAS) concerning the Agreement. (In accordance with section 123 of the Act, as amended by title XII of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–277), a classified annex to the NPAS, prepared by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, summarizing relevant classified information, will be submitted to the Congress separately.) The joint memorandum submitted to me by the Secretaries of State and Energy and a letter from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission stating the views of the Commission are also enclosed. An addendum to the NPAS containing a comprehensive analysis of Vietnam's export control system with respect to nuclear-related matters, including interactions with other countries of proliferation concern and the actual or suspected nuclear, dual-use, or missile-related transfers to such countries, pursuant to section 102A of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403–1), as amended, is being submitted separately by the Director of National Intelligence.

The proposed Agreement has been negotiated in accordance with the Act and other applicable law. In my judgment, it meets all applicable statutory requirements and will advance the nonproliferation and other foreign policy interests of the United States.

The proposed Agreement provides a comprehensive framework for peaceful nuclear cooperation with Vietnam based on a mutual commitment to nuclear nonproliferation. Vietnam has affirmed that it does not intend to seek to acquire sensitive fuel cycle capabilities, but instead will rely upon the

international market in order to ensure a reliable nuclear fuel supply for Vietnam. This political commitment by Vietnam has been reaffirmed in the preamble of the proposed Agreement. The Agreement also contains a legally binding provision that prohibits Vietnam from enriching or reprocessing U.S.-origin material without U.S. consent.

The proposed Agreement will have an initial term of 30 years from the date of its entry into force, and will continue in force thereafter for additional periods of 5 years each. Either party may terminate the Agreement on 6 months' advance written notice at the end of the initial 30 year term or at the end of any subsequent 5-year period. Additionally, either party may terminate the Agreement on 1 year's written notice. I recognize the importance of executive branch consultations with the Congress regarding the status of the Agreement prior to the end of the 30-year period after entry into force and prior to the end of each 5-year period thereafter. To that end, it is my strong recommendation that future administrations conduct such consultations with the appropriate congressional committees at the appropriate times.

The proposed Agreement permits the transfer of information, material, equipment (including reactors), and components for nuclear research and nuclear power production. It does not permit transfers of Restricted Data, sensitive nuclear technology, sensitive nuclear facilities, or major critical components of such facilities. In the event of termination of the Agreement, key nonproliferation conditions and controls continue with respect to material, equipment, and components subject to the Agreement.

Vietnam is a non-nuclear-weapon state party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Vietnam has in force a comprehensive safeguards agreement and an Additional Protocol with the International Atomic Energy Agency. Vietnam is a party to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, which establishes international standards of physical protection for the use, storage, and transport of nuclear material, and has ratified the 2005 Amendment to the Convention. A more detailed discussion of Vietnam's intended civil nuclear program and its nuclear nonproliferation policies and practices, including its nuclear export policies and practices, is provided in the NPAS and in a classified annex to the NPAS submitted to you separately. As noted above, the Director of National Intelligence will provide an addendum to the NPAS containing a comprehensive analysis of Vietnam's export control system with respect to nuclear-related matters.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the interested departments and agencies in reviewing the proposed Agreement and have determined that its performance will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the Agreement and authorized its execution and urge that the Congress give it favorable consideration.

This transmission shall constitute a submittal for purposes of both sections 123b. and 123d. of the Act.

My Administration is prepared to begin immediately the consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee as provided for in section 123b. Upon completion of the 30 days of continuous session review provided for in section 123b., the 60 days of continuous session review provided for in section 123d. shall commence.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 8, 2014.*

AMERICAN RESEARCH AND COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2014

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 569, I call up the bill (H.R. 4438) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify and make permanent the research credit, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 569 and House Resolution 576, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, and the further amendment printed in part B of House Report 113–444, are adopted. The bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 4438

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 ''American Research and Competitiveness Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. RESEARCH CREDIT SIMPLIFIED AND MADE PERMANENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 41 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 38, the research credit determined under this section for the taxable year shall be an amount equal to the sum of—

''(1) 20 percent of so much of the qualified research expenses for the taxable year as exceeds 50 percent of the average qualified research expenses for the 3 taxable years preceding the taxable year for which the credit is being determined,

''(2) 20 percent of so much of the basic research payments for the taxable year as exceeds 50 percent of the average basic research payments for the 3 taxable years preceding the taxable year for which the credit is being determined, plus

''(3) 20 percent of the amounts paid or incurred by the taxpayer in carrying on any trade or business of the taxpayer during the taxable year (including as contributions) to an energy research consortium for energy research.''.

(b) REPEAL OF TERMINATION.—Section 41 of such Code is amended by striking subsection (h).

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subsection (c) of section 41 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(c) DETERMINATION OF AVERAGE RESEARCH EXPENSES FOR PRIOR YEARS.—

''(1) SPECIAL RULE IN CASE OF NO QUALIFIED RESEARCH EXPENDITURES IN ANY OF 3 PRECEDING TAXABLE YEARS.—In any case in which the taxpayer has no qualified research expenses in any one of the 3 taxable years preceding the taxable year for which the credit is being determined, the amount determined under subsection (a)(1) for such taxable year shall be equal to 10 percent of the qualified research expenses for the taxable year.

''(2) CONSISTENT TREATMENT OF EXPENSES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding whether the period for filing a claim for credit or refund has expired for any taxable year taken into account in determining the average qualified research expenses, or average basic research payments, taken into account under subsection (a), the qualified research expenses and basic research payments taken into account in determining such averages shall be determined on a basis consistent with the determination of qualified research expenses and basic research payments, respectively, for the credit year.

''(B) PREVENTION OF DISTORTIONS.—The Secretary may prescribe regulations to prevent distortions in calculating a taxpayer's qualified research expenses or basic research payments caused by a change in accounting methods used by such taxpayer between the current year and a year taken into account in determining the average qualified research expenses or average basic research payments taken into account under subsection (a).''.

(2) Section 41(e) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking all that precedes paragraph (6) and inserting the following:

''(e) BASIC RESEARCH PAYMENTS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'basic research payment' means, with respect to any taxable year, any amount paid in cash during such taxable year by a corporation to any qualified organization for basic research but only if—

''(A) such payment is pursuant to a written agreement between such corporation and such qualified organization, and

''(B) such basic research is to be performed by such qualified organization.

''(2) EXCEPTION TO REQUIREMENT THAT RESEARCH BE PERFORMED BY THE ORGANIZATION.—In the case of a qualified organization described in subparagraph (C) or (D) of paragraph (3), subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) shall not apply.'',

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively, and

(C) in paragraph (4) as so redesignated, by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C) and by redesignating subparagraphs (D) and (E) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively.

(3) Section 41(f)(3) of such Code is amended—

(A)(i) by striking '', and the gross receipts'' in subparagraph (A)(i) and all that follows through ''determined under clause (iii)'',

(ii) by striking clause (iii) of subparagraph (A) and redesignating clauses (iv), (v), and (vi), thereof, as clauses (iii), (iv), and (v), respectively,

(iii) by striking ''and (iv)'' each place it appears in subparagraph (A)(iv) (as so redesignated) and inserting ''and (iii)'',

(iv) by striking subclause (IV) of subparagraph (A)(iv) (as so redesignated), by striking '', and'' at the end of subparagraph (A)(iv)(III) (as so redesignated) and inserting a period, and by adding ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (A)(iv)(II) (as so redesignated),

(v) by striking ''(A)(vi)'' in subparagraph (B) and inserting ''(A)(v)'', and

(vi) by striking ''(A)(iv)(II)'' in subparagraph (B)(i)(II) and inserting ''(A)(iii)(II)'',

(B) by striking '', and the gross receipts of the predecessor,'' in subparagraph (A)(iv)(II) (as so redesignated),

(C) by striking '', and the gross receipts of,'' in subparagraph (B),

(D) by striking '', or gross receipts of,'' in subparagraph (B)(i)(I), and

(E) by striking subparagraph (C).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

(2) SUBSECTION (b).—The amendment made by subsection (b) shall apply to amounts paid or incurred after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 3. PAYGO SCORECARD

(a) PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 4438.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, our current Tax Code is broken. It is hurting families and hurting our ability to create good-paying jobs in this country.

Last week we learned that the economy grew 0.1 percent in the first quarter of 2014. One-tenth of a percent of growth is unacceptable. Hardworking families and small businesses are struggling in this economy, wages are flat, and businesses are not growing.

Beyond having the dubious distinction of the highest corporate rate in the world, the United States is the only country that also allows important pieces of its Tax Code, like the research and development tax credit, to expire on a regular basis.

Businesses can't grow and invest when the Tax Code is riddled with instability and uncertainty. The research and development credit, the permanent extension we have before us today, has been part of the U.S. Tax Code since 1981. Renewed year after year, the credit has long been bipartisan and an effective way to incentivize U.S. companies to innovate, create new products, and invest in the United States.

The bill we have before us is a result of years of work that the Ways and Means Committee members have put into tax reform. By simplifying the credit, we eliminate the burden on businesses to do substantial amounts of recordkeeping, maintain countless receipts, and perform complex calculations.

Notably, the R&D credit has been historically bipartisan. In fact, just a few years ago, Congressman LEVIN, now ranking Democrat on Ways and Means, and I cosponsored the House bill to extend the research and development tax credit. Today the bill is led by Mr. BRADY and Mr. LARSON and has many other Republican and Democrat cosponsors.

Many on the other side of the aisle have commented about the fact that this job-creating provision is unpaid for. I would note that this provision, among other extenders, has historically not been paid for. All together, Ways and Means Democrats have cast 71 votes on this floor in favor of unpaid extensions of this policy. That amounts to 15 years' worth of extensions.

While the change of tune may be for political reasons, I think we can all agree that this is the right policy. Making the R&D tax credit permanent is an important first step to achieving growth and putting us on a path toward comprehensive reform that lowers rates and makes the Code simpler and fairer. It also supports good-paying jobs. According to the National Association of Manufacturers, 70 percent of R&D credit dollars are used to pay salaries of R&D workers.

The United States was once the world leader in providing research incentives to U.S. companies so that U.S. companies could innovate and create new technologies and products, but we have fallen far behind. Other countries are moving past the United States, putting American companies at risk of falling further behind. Countries like Japan, the United Kingdom, Canada, Russia, and Slovenia have all invested more in research and development support than the United States.

□ 1730

This is unacceptable and we can do better. A strong permanent credit not only provides the certainty employers need, but the Joint Committee on Taxation estimates that making the R&D credit permanent will increase the amount of research and development American companies undertake by up to 10 percent. That translates into more workers, higher wages, and increased innovation here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia, Leader CANTOR.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the American Research and Competitiveness Act.

Mr. Speaker, right now, America isn't working for too many people. Last month alone, 800,000 people left the workforce, and many more continue to search for a job. Working people are having a tough time too. They are having a tough time climbing the economic ladder of success, partly because America is struggling to remain competitive in the global marketplace.

However, we have an opportunity to change that today by passing this legislation and improving the R&D tax credit and making it permanent.

This action will grant the U.S. a chance to compete for more research and development investment dollars while manufacturers are being courted by other countries that have more stable R&D tax incentives and lower corporate tax rates. But the positive economic impact will not be constrained to manufacturing alone. It will also bring new investments to the energy industry, medical research, STEM advancements, and information technology, among others.

A 2011 study by Ernst & Young found that strengthening the R&D tax credit would raise wages by up to $3 billion in the short term and $8 billion in the long term. It would also increase employment related to research by 130,000 in the short term and over 300,000 jobs in the long term. With the American economy sputtering along, this bill creates an opportunity that we simply cannot afford to pass up.

Mr. Speaker, to put it simply, this legislation is about jobs. This legislation is about giving American workers and middle class families a chance at new opportunities. This legislation is about creating an America that works again, an America that works again for everybody.

Let's stand together in a bipartisan fashion and pass this bill so that we can help turn this economy around and begin to move in the right direction once again.

I want to thank Chairman CAMP for his leadership in bringing this bill forward, for Congressman BRADY in the Chamber from Texas, and the rest of the Ways and Means Committee for their hard work on this issue.

I urge my colleagues in the House to support this bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member on the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague, the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, for all the work he has done on tax policy to make sure we have a tax policy that is both pro-growth and works for the country. And I want to commend the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee for his efforts on tax reform.

I wish what we were doing today was talking about real tax reform. Many of us agree that we need to reform our corporate Tax Code, that we do need to deal with the rates and we need to deal with the base.

But that is not what this is about. The Speaker decided not to bring before this full House the tax reform bill

that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has worked on, and that is not what we are dealing with today. Nor is what we are dealing with today whether we are for or against the research and development tax credit.

The chairman of the committee said there is bipartisan support for the R&D tax credit. I agree, it is a pro-growth tax policy.

The issue is whether we extend it on a permanent basis and unpaid for, not one penny of it paid for. The chairman mentioned that we had raised this on an annual basis in the past. That is true. One of the reasons we didn't take it up on a permanent basis was because everybody realized what impact it would have on our long-term deficit and said, you know, that is not good fiscal policy, that is not good fiscal discipline, let's try and work together to get it done in a fiscally responsible way.

But instead of doing that, we now have our colleagues coming forth and doing it in a way that puts it on a credit card, puts it on a credit card. Not one penny is paid for. We have this R&D tax credit bill before us today. There are four other business tax incentive bills that are coming out of the Ways and Means Committee. Together they add $310 billion to the deficit. That means $310 billion on our national credit card.

Now, what is interesting is it was probably less than a month ago that on the floor of this very House we had a debate on the Republican budget. We were told then that the most important thing we could do for long-term economic growth was to reduce long-term deficits. That was the be-all and end-all. It is important. And do you know what? We agree it is important to reduce the long-term deficits. The question is not whether, it is how.

So we proposed, in addition to some of the cuts we have already made in this House, that we also close some of the unproductive wasteful special interest tax breaks that happen to go to different interests around the country, not because it is important to our economy, not because it helps the economy grow, but because they happen to have a lot of influence here in Washington. So we should get rid of some of those to help pay for pro-growth tax policy like the R&D tax credit. But our Republican colleagues said no. They wouldn't close one, not one special interest tax break to help reduce the deficit, not one.

So here we are today after all that talk just a few weeks ago about reducing the deficit doing a permanent and unpaid-for extension of the R&D tax credit—the first installment of, as I said, five bills that will add $310 billion to the deficit, all on a credit card.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I don't know if all the Members know, they had to waive their own rules because this bill is inconsistent with the budget that was passed in this House a few weeks ago—inconsistent. In fact, if you look at the five bills coming forward, they put the Republican budget at a balance even on its own terms. They used funny math to claim that their budget was balanced. They actually used the revenue from the Affordable Care Act—ObamaCare—even when they said they are getting rid of it. But let's give them that for a moment.

By their own terms, these five bills now mean that their own budget, Republican budget, is not in balance anymore. We are in favor of the R&D tax credit. We would like to find a way to permanently extend it, but let's do it in a fiscally responsible manner.

Here is the thing, Mr. Chairman—all of us know this. When you don't pay for it, when you put it on a credit card, at the end of the day somebody is paying for it. Now, last night we pointed out that the Republican proposal was actually going to pay for it by hitting Medicare. They left in place a Medicare sequester under statutory PAYGO. They were going to ask Medicare to pay for these tax credits. I am glad they reconsidered that. But at the end of the day someone has got to pay. Who pays?

Let's go back and look at the Republican budget from a few weeks ago. I will tell you who pays. Because that budget refuses to close any of those wasteful tax breaks, whether it is for corporate jets—whether it is for big oil companies, whether it is for hedge fund owners—because they refuse to do any of those to reduce the deficit they come after our kids' education: deep cuts in Head Start, deep cuts in K through 12, deep cuts in helping more students afford college, deep cuts in medical research, scientific research. We are talking about the importance of giving the private sector incentives to invest in R&D—that is right.

But when you cut the nondefense discretionary budget by 25 percent compared to now over the next 10 years, you are also cutting our capacity as a country to invest in cutting-edge R&D. After all, there were Federal Government investments that helped launch the Internet, which has had huge economic benefits. Investments in scientific research at NIH, huge benefits.

That's why it is so important to do this in a fiscally responsible manner. Because when you add $310 billion to the deficit somebody pays at the end of the day.

What we have said is, let's pay for it in a way that makes sense, a combination of cuts, many of which have been made, but also getting rid of the unproductive wasteful tax breaks that are in the Tax Code, which are there not because of the economic benefit, but because of the power of a lobby here in Washington.

I would hope we would go back to what the chairman of the committee actually wanted to do when he started the effort of tax reform a couple of years ago and beyond, which was, yes, let's do real tax reform, let's do it in a way that makes sense, let's do it in a way that doesn't bust the deficit wide open and leave our kids having to pick up the tab either through higher interest rates or cuts to their education. That is not right.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I would just note for the record that the previous speaker, the gentleman from Maryland, has voted four times to extend the research and development tax credit, none of them paid for, for a total of 7½ years.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee and chairman of the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for bringing this important bill, the American Research and Competitiveness Act, to the House floor.

This is a bipartisan bill. I am glad not only to be the lead sponsor, but to be working with my friend, a Democrat, JOHN LARSON from Connecticut, on this important bill. We follow in the footsteps of two other bipartisan leaders, Chairman DAVE CAMP and Ranking Member SANDY LEVIN, who carried this bill together in a bipartisan way with strong support from Republicans and Democrats.

In the day and age where we look at our smart phone or our tablet and we see sort of the impact of technology on our lives, many of us have family members and parents for whom medical breakthroughs have saved lives, lengthened lives, given back quality of life. We see people who are disabled through technology now able to live full lives and work full lives because America is innovative. This is about jobs, but it is about people as well.

America used to lead the world in research incentives, but today we have fallen to 27th. China, Russia, and other global competitors are quickly surpassing us in their share of the economy devoted to research. If we don't permanently commit to encouraging new innovation in technology, in manufacturing, in energy, in medical breakthroughs, over time we will lose our place as the largest economy in the world.

We need to make permanent this key tax incentive that encourages American companies to increase their investments in America in research and development of new product breakthroughs. When we do that, when we make this temporary provision—temporary for 34 years by the way—when we make it permanent we will create over 300,000 new American jobs and raise workers' wages by almost $10 billion.

What this bill does is it simplifies this provision so that small- and medium-size businesses can also take advantage of this credit.

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

Mr. CAMP. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, making it permanent will lead to a 10 percent increase in new research here in America. The fact is American companies are going to invest in research. The question is, are they going to do it in America or are they going to do it overseas? We can't allow foreign countries to take this research, the jobs that go with technology. It is time to come together—Republicans and Democrats—to make this law permanent.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), another distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation.

H.R. 4438 would add $156 billion to the deficit to provide permanent tax breaks for businesses while doing nothing for the 2.6 million Americans living the constant nightmare of long-term unemployment.

H.R. 4438 does nothing to help low-income working families by permanently extending the earned income tax credit or the child tax credit used by over 100,000 of my constituents and credits that keep millions of Americans out of poverty.

□ 1745

Further, H.R. 4438 does nothing to incentivize businesses to hire hard-to-employ workers via the work opportunity tax credit, to help revitalize distressed communities via the new markets tax credit, to help the elderly donate to charities via the IRA charitable rollover, to create affordable housing via the low-income housing tax credit, to reimburse the 3.7 million teachers the hundreds of dollars a year that they pay out of their own pockets.

In the name of fiscal responsibility, the Republican leadership has justified refusing to help the unemployed and slashing food stamps for poor families, cutting health care and services for seniors and limiting services for foster use.

Even worse, the Republican leadership understands that, as a law, H.R. 4438's failure to pay for its $156 billion price tag will cause automatic cuts to Medicare, to student loans, and to other mandatory safety net programs because the bill violates PAYGO.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this business giveaway.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. REICHERT), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. REICHERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the American Research and Competitiveness Act. This bill takes a couple of important steps in improving a tax credit that supports tens of thousands of jobs in my home State of Washington State.

First of all, it makes the credit permanent. This credit has been extended 15 times since it was first enacted in 1981, making it impossible for businesses to plan their research and development activities in the future.

When businesses have certainty, they can plan for the future, and when they can plan for the future, they have the confidence to hire workers and to create jobs.

Second, Mr. Speaker, there was a time when it was understood that businesses would perform their research and development activities right here in the United States of America. Today, that is not the case.

In my home State of Washington, we don't have to look too far to see exactly what other countries are doing to attract research and development. Let's just take Canada, for example, which is just right north of Washington State.

In Canada, not only have they reduced their federal corporate tax rate to 15 percent, but they have made it permanent. On top of this, the various provinces and territories have added their own research tax incentives.

For example, in British Columbia, there is an additional 10 percent research and development tax credit. We can't compete with that in the United States of America. We can't compete with that in Washington State.

Mr. BRADY's bill helps get us back in the game of competing for research and development dollars. It provides a permanent tax credit of 20 percent and allows expenditures on supplies and software to be a part of the credit's base.

This bill represents a step in the right direction of fixing our Tax Code, making our economy competitive. Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, this bill is about creating jobs for Americans, so I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), a member of our committee.

Mr. KIND. I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the goal to permanently extend the research and development tax credit. Our businesses, large and small, need that certainty. They can't be trying to make budgetary decisions in order to help grow the economy and create jobs on these short-term measures that have been coming through Congress.

What I have an objection to this evening and where the problem lies with this legislation before us today is that none of it is paid for. We have been to this dance before. We know what works and what doesn't work when it comes to the fiscal management of our Nation.

What works is pay-as-you-go budgeting rules. If there is going to be a revenue reduction or a spending increase, you have to find an offset in the budget to pay for it to maintain balance.

We had that system in place during the 1990s, thanks to the budget agreement of 1990 that President George H.W. Bush signed into law and then followed by the budget agreement of 1993, when President Clinton was in office.

Subsequently, with the strength of a vibrant, growing economy in which 24 million private sector jobs were created, along with pay-as-you-go budgeting rules that were in place, President Clinton saw 4 years of budget surpluses at the end of his term, when we were paying down the national debt, rather than adding to it.

Thank God we were at that time because, when September 11 hit—that unexpected disaster against our Nation—we had financial resources with which to respond.

After my Republican colleagues took complete control of the Federal Government during the 2000s, with President Bush's election, they reverted back to bad habits—with two large tax cuts that weren't paid for; with two major wars that weren't paid for; with the passage of a new prescription drug bill, which was the largest expansion of entitlement spending since Medicare was created in '65—and not a nickel of it paid for; the largest increase in discretionary spending since the Great Society—none of it paid for.

When President Obama took office, he inherited a $1.5 trillion budget deficit in his first year. They have not been shy in laying the blame of fiscal mismanagement in the structural annual budget deficits at the current President's doorstep, and yet this is exactly what gets us into this spot.

Now, with regard to the policy behind the permanent extension, you are not going to hear much dispute or much debate about that. This is all about who is going to be fiscally responsible and do the hard work of trying to find offsets in the budget to do it the right way, so we are not leaving a legacy of debt to our children, so we are not continuing to borrow from China.

We can go back over the last 4 years and repeat the same statements that we have heard from my Republican friends about the need for fiscal management and tough decisions in budgeting.

What is perhaps the height of cynicism this evening is that, in a few short weeks after having passed the Republican Ryan budget resolution, they are violating it here tonight. It called for offsets for any permanent extension in the Tax Code, and that is not what we are doing here.

What is really disheartening is there is a plan B. To Chairman CAMP's credit, a few weeks ago, he released a comprehensive tax reform draft discussion in order to simplify the Code, to make us more competitive, to broaden the base, and to lower the rates; but he paid for it through some tough decisions with expenditures that don't make sense to help us be competitive in the 21st century.

We can go back to that proposal and look for some of the items that Chairman CAMP, himself, was proposing as a

way to pay for this permanent extension tonight. Earlier this year, President Obama, in the budget he submitted, had items of pay-fors within the Tax Code that we can scrub because there is overlap between the two.

Really, what this comes down to is who is serious about doing the tough stuff, which is finding offsets in order to do the good policy that we are missing here this evening. Yes, we should be finding a way to permanently extend the R&D credit. Our businesses, large and small, need that certainty.

My name is on this bill, but it was always under the proviso that we would be fiscally responsible in moving forward and not leave this legacy for future generations. I also think we ought to be doing a permanent 179 expensing for our small businesses and family farmers.

It is another expensive item, but there are areas in the Tax Code we can look to in order to find offsets to pay for it, which I also think is important for the job creation and economic growth we need in this Nation.

We are $17 trillion in debt, and people are wondering who is to blame. You can look this evening at a bill before us today that calls for $156 billion over the next 10 years—not a nickel of it paid for.

We can do better. We have to do better for our children and for future generations. The clock is ticking on all of this. We don't have this luxury of delaying the tough decisions anymore.

There are other avenues that we can take, and I am confident, if we were to sit down and talk to each other, we could find some common ground and bipartisan agreement of what would be acceptable offsets in the Revenue Code in order to do this permanent extension here tonight.

That requires a little more effort, and that requires—God forbid—having to say no to some constituents and powerful special interest groups in this town from time to time.

The easiest thing in the world is to offer a tax cut without paying for it. Who doesn't want tax relief? That is not difficult, but it is also not the tough budget decisions that they were talking about just a few weeks ago on the floor, when they were passing the Ryan Republican budget resolution.

If you would go back and look at it again, to its credit, it called for offsets for permanent extensions.

So what is true here? Are they truly committed to the fiscal responsibility that is called for in that budget resolution? Or is that all just a numbers game, in order to make the numbers add up?

With the first opportunity they have to violate that resolution, they are going to do so tonight with an unpaid-for permanent extension, and that is just $156 billion in the first 10 years. This will be a gift that keeps on giving, if we don't find offsets in the future.

I would encourage my colleagues to think hard and long about this because this is just the first of six tax extenders that will inevitably be coming up. I hope this isn't the pattern we are going to be seeing with the five additional ones, in that they are going to come forward without any pay-fors and say: let's load up the debt, and let's claim that the economy is going to grow and that everything is going to be fine afterwards.

We know that hasn't worked in the past. It is not going to work tonight. I encourage my colleagues to vote ''no.''

We have got time. We can work with the Senate, and we can work with what Chairman CAMP was proposing and with what the administration was proposing in its budget. We can find the appropriate offsets and do the responsible thing.

Let's end this legacy of deficit financing, and let's give our children the hope and opportunity that they deserve.

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

I would just say that the previous speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin, has voted five times to extend the research and development tax credit—for 12½ years—with not a nickel of it paid for, to use his words.

Let me just say that our friends in the Senate are advancing an ''unpaid-for'' extension of all of the extenders to the tune of $85 billion. I just think, to follow their line of logic, they would say we need to raise taxes to keep taxes the same. That makes no sense. We haven't done it for almost 30 years, and we shouldn't do it now.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the chairman of the committee—and I do respect him, and he is a friend of mine—he knows as well as anyone that there is a big difference between permanency in the Tax Code and short-term measures to give us some time in order to find out what the appropriate permanent solution will be.

That is, really, what we ought to be doing right now, is trying to find that permanent solution once and for all, but in a fiscally responsible manner. That is how we should be approaching this.

Again, to the chairman's credit, the discussion draft he just released a few weeks ago calls for offsets to the Revenue Code in order to do comprehensive reform, so he belies his own argument from just a minute ago that tax cuts shouldn't be met with corresponding offsets.

I mean, if that is true, then what have we been doing for the last 3 years in trying to do comprehensive reform while still paying for it, so we are not blowing a hole in future budget deficits?

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I regrettably rise in opposition to H.R. 4438, a bill that would simplify and make the research and development tax credit permanent.

As ranking member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, I have been a longtime supporter and advocate for making the R&D tax credit permanent. The R&D tax credit promotes innovation and encourages the creation and retention of jobs in the United States.

Unfortunately, since being created in the early 1980s, the R&D tax credit has been allowed to lapse and has needed to be extended year after year. The business community needs certainty when planning long-term research and development investments, and many have called for this important tax credit to be made permanent.

In the famous National Academies' ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm'' report, making the R&D tax credit stronger and permanent was one of their 10 recommendations on congressional actions to improve our Nation's competitiveness.

Private sector leaders also agree that there is a clear and necessary role for government in all aspects of our innovation ecosystem, from the direct funding of fundamental research, to incentives for the private sector to increase their R&D investments.

Often, private sector R&D investments are built upon years of direct government research funding. For example, the Internet and the GPS were developed with DARPA and National Science Foundation funding, but private sector innovation carried these technologies to their full commercial potential, with immeasurable benefit for our Nation.

However, the conversation about how best to modify the R&D tax credit and make it permanent should be part of a larger conversation about tax reform and tax extenders, and that conversation should include other tax provisions that are important for millions of working families and students, including the earned income tax credit, the child tax credit, and education tax credits.

Further, we should be debating how to offset this tax credit, instead of ignoring how it would add $156 billion to the deficit over the next 10 years.

□ 1800

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), the chairman of our Caucus.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Today's vote on H.R. 4438 and on five other Republican bills to come that would permanently extend other tax breaks without paying for them will increase the deficit by $310 billion and

lead to Republican cuts to services like Medicare, health research, and school funding.

How much is $310 billion?

That is five times what we spend on services to our veterans. We have over 21 million Americans who have served in uniform who are veterans of this country.

That $310 billion is three times what the Federal Government invests in education, job training, and social services for an entire year. It is over 10 times what we spend annually on medical research to come up with the innovations and the lifesaving treatments that Americans rely upon.

We hear from our colleagues on the Republican side that they are fiscally responsible, that they are fiscal hawks, but they pass these severe budgets that would cut schools, that would cut medical research, that would cut Medicare funding for our seniors, that would cut Social Security, but they have to do it because we have to get rid of that deficit.

Here we have the fiscal pretenders.

In this bill, H.R. 4438, our Republican colleagues propose to blow the deficit wide open by adding $310 billion to that deficit by passing these unpaid-for tax breaks. Yet when it is time to make the tough choices, when it comes to providing the services that our middle class families want for their children to go to college, they can't do it. But there is a free pass for these corporate tax breaks.

What American citizen and taxpayer would trust this Republican math from our colleagues?

I urge colleagues to vote against this budget-busting legislation and turn our focus to building an economy that works for all Americans, not just a select few.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I would just say the gentleman from California voted three times to extend the R&D tax credit unoffset for a length of time of 8 years.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 4438 is postponed.

ESTABLISHING SELECT COMMITTEE ON BENGHAZI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 567) providing for the Establishment of the Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attack in Benghazi, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 186, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

YEAS—232

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

NAYS—186

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Bachmann
Bishop (GA)
Coble
Crawford
DeGette
Duffy
Kingston
McAllister
Nunnelee
Pelosi
Reed
Rush
Schwartz
Scott, David

□ 1829

Mr. BLUMENAUER changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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.

MODIFICATION OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that H. Res. 567 be modified in the manner I have placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification offered by Mr. SESSIONS of Texas:

Page 6, line 3, strike ''clause (2)'' and insert ''clause 2''.

Page 6, line 6, strike ''clause (2)'' and insert ''clause 2''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the modification is agreed to.

There was no objection.

AMERICAN RESEARCH AND COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 4438 will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When proceedings were postponed earlier today, 28¾ minutes of debate remained on the bill.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 19¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 9 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

Mr. CAMP. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distinguished whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a great deal of sadness. We are punting. USA Today said, ''House action on tax extenders forfeits credibility on deficits and national debt.'' They are right.

The distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, who is my friend, offered a real bill on tax reform. The problem with that real bill was it had tough choices to make. Congratulations to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) for having the courage to suggest those tough choices.

This vote today requires absolutely no courage at all. It gives the ice cream and says forget about the spinach. It is the reason that we have trillions of dollars in debt today on our national debt, because we didn't pay for the '01 or '03 tax cuts.

Now, Mr. CAMP will tell me that I voted for R&D tax cuts six times that were temporary, that were annual, that were not a permanent change in the base. That is what the Republicans want to do. That is what they did in '01 and '03, and that is all inside jargon. And yes, they didn't waive statutory PAYGO, which we passed, which USA Today says was one of the reasons we got to balance 4 years in a row. That is why.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have 3 minutes to discuss with the American public why their country is going to be put deeper into debt by passing this legislation.

It would be good legislation if it were paid for. It was good legislation when it was included in Mr. CAMP's overall tax reform bill. But it is very bad policy and very bad legislation in this unpaid-for, discreet form. And, by the way, there is about another $160 billion of debt to follow.

What a sad day for America. What a sad day for this House. What a sad day for the Ways and Means Committee. What a sad day for fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues not to vote for the temporary political benefit of saying you gave somebody a tax cut, but vote for fiscal responsibility. Vote to keep on a path of a big deal to solve the fiscal challenges that confront our country. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

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

Well, I would just say that the gentleman from Maryland is correct. He has voted six times to extend the research and development tax credit without paying for it, for a total of 14 years.

Look, I think it is time we are honest with the American people. If we are going to extend these policies again and again and again—in this case, 30 years—and not pay for it, look, we shouldn't have to raise taxes to keep taxes the same.

So, again, I would urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), a distinguished member of our committee, to put it mildly.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill because I didn't think it was honest with the American people, and the chairman says he wants to be honest. I am just surprised that he is responding to this, because I don't think too many people believe this is on the level.

The Senate has spoken on this issue. This is not going to become law. It is not Benghazi. It is not affordable care. So I would think that this has to be something else that we are preparing for in 2014. And I really don't think that the American people are going to go to sleep tonight wondering whether or not we take this billion-dollar bill—even though all of us love the concept of research and development. But so many people are going to be going to sleep hungry. They haven't got extended unemployment insurance. They need a variety of affordable housing. And now we are doing this for 2014. It doesn't fly. It doesn't get off the ground.

Well, what I am saying to the chairman is that he has such a great start with the tax reform, something that we could have worked on together, to pick out one good thing that we have, even though we don't have money to pay for it, is an ideal thing for Democrats and Republicans to sit down and wonder, ''How can we make certain that America stays ahead in research and development?'' but to do this because we are running out of things to try to embarrass Democrats on is really not fair to our Nation. I really think our national security is being impacted because of our inability to work and get something done.

So I oppose this, as any other thing that is just trying to find something to embarrass us, but I do hope for 2014 that we find something, anything—immigration, unemployment compensation—so that when we do get there there will be a Republican Party.

I really love Democrats. But this used to be the party of Dixiecrats. Now they left us, and I want to make certain that they don't come back.

Mr. CAMP. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a most distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this bill represents only the first of many installments of hundreds of billions of dollars that the Republicans plan to finance with more debt, borrowing from the Chinese or whoever will lend it to us. Surely we don't need any more research this afternoon to know that such an irresponsible approach is the wrong way to go.

In January of last year, Republicans came to this floor and they told us that they had reserved H.R. 1 for a bill that would do it all. It was going to simplify the Tax Code, it was going to lower the rates, and it would not add a penny to the debt because it would all be financed by closing loopholes.

Where is that bill? It is still reserved, and it will be reserved until the end of this term because the truth of the matter is Republicans could not stand up to the special interests that like those loopholes, that like the complexity of the Tax Code, that benefit from that complexity. They would not stand up to pass a bill that was fiscally responsible.

Both parties, as the chairman has indicated, have repeatedly supported temporary extensions, but neither has had the audacity to come to this floor and say we are going to borrow enough to make it permanent without closing a single loophole. They are doing exactly the opposite of what they have repeatedly promised us and the American people that they would do.

I support a permanent research and development credit to incentivize research for new products. It has never been a question of whether to support research, but how to do it and how to pay for it. And if the only goal is to encourage more job growth, there are ways we can redesign this credit to get even more growth than it does now.

The Government Accountability Office said the credit in its current form is a windfall for some corporations, and some multinationals have used it as a way to get the taxpayer to subsidize research here and then shift the benefits overseas.

I believe a better research credit on a permanent basis is the best way to encourage growth, not an irresponsible unpaid tax credit.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee and the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I was touring a hospital in the Rio Grande Valley the other day, and we were going through the critical care unit, with young babies 25, 26 weeks old who in past years would, frankly, have never survived. But

today, because of medical breakthroughs, they will not only not have a lifetime of chronic diseases and disabilities, but they will live a full life because the medical breakthroughs and innovations developed here in America are giving them a life, frankly, their parents never hoped for.

I see our veterans coming back from war, some of them with such terrible injuries, who not only are having their lives restored but, through these remarkable prosthetics, are living full lives that, again, wouldn't have been possible in recent years, even, because we are doing innovation here in America.

Each day, we read of another U.S. company being courted to move those medical breakthroughs and that research overseas to other countries, to China, to Europe, to others. We are seeing America lose our edge in innovation, even though everyone knows—Republicans and Democrats—that the country that innovates the most will lead the world in economic growth, period. We know it.

And I look at statements such as this. And I will read this. It is a direct quote:

> I believe it is critical that our tax system provide strong incentives to help our manufacturing base. One of the most important tax incentives for the manufacturing sector is the research and development tax credit. Manufacturers do about 70 percent of the private sector R&D conducted in the United States. I have long been a strong and persistent voice for making the R&D credit a permanent part of our Tax Code and strengthening it so that all companies have a strong incentive to do R&D here in the United States.

□ 1845

That wasn't me; that wasn't Chairman CAMP. That was our distinguished ranking member, SANDY LEVIN.

He is not alone. Democrats and Republicans together long have sought a permanent R&D tax credit to make America competitive again. Make no mistake. Today, you have heard people say this really isn't about supporting innovation, technology, biosciences and medical breakthroughs; today, it is about fiscal responsibility and payfors; yesterday, it was some other bills we wanted. The truth is that we can't afford these excuses, and that is what they are.

Today, it is a clear choice between those who will stand for medical innovation in America, technology innovation in America, and energy innovation and manufacturing innovation that will create good-paying jobs and good-paying wages for Americans.

I ask our Democrat colleagues to set aside the politics. We know it is an election year. Set that aside. Stay consistent with the values that you have said over and over again that the research and development tax credit needs to be made permanent, and let's send a bill to the Senate so that they, too—we can discover and learn whether they are willing to stand with their past, longtime statements that the R&D tax credit should be permanent.

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

Mr. Speaker, I support R&D. Mr. Speaker, I support it now. I have never voted to make it permanent without paying for it. So this bill is a dangerous dodge.

Mr. CAMP, you paid for what you suggested was permanent, and I salute your being forthright. That isn't what is happening, is not happening today. So this isn't only fiscally irresponsible. What it does is to threaten programs that we care about. What was not done with one hand yesterday, automatic cuts, will be done by the Republicans with the other. They will use this deficit to cut programs we care about mentioned earlier: medical research, Head Start, Pell Grants, and other extenders that we deeply care about.

This bill today is, as I said, a dangerous dodge. We should not be party to it. We should not be party to it. It is irresponsible, it is hypocritical, and it is harmful to what we really care about and what the American people care about.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the research and development tax credit has been extended repeatedly by members of the other side and members of this side for nearly 30 years, and it has not been paid for in those extensions.

But what does that really mean? Well, what we have done in America, which no other country has done, is we have taken a valuable tax policy like that, something that should be certain and dependable, and made it temporary. Not only do we make it temporary, we allow it to expire for a year at a time. So over this 30-year period, employers, innovators, businesses, and companies have not known whether they can count on this policy in order to do something really important.

I heard Mr. BRADY talk about the medical innovation and how critical that is to making peoples' lives better. I think of Big Rapids, Michigan, and Wolverine Worldwide, which makes military footwear and boots. They are constantly innovating that so that our military servicemen and -women have the best possible equipment on their feet. You can imagine the kinds of climates that we find our military in and how important this is.

But if companies like that don't know whether this tax policy is dependable, yet we extend it 30 years backwards retroactively and forward for a year, then we allow it to expire for a year, it absolutely makes no sense. By allowing it to expire repeatedly, we have called into question whether this R&D credit is available at all.

I would just say by supporting permanent policies—the reason it is so important to make this permanent, we can actually promote certainty for American businesses, and we need to generate certainly greater economic growth. The reason we are seeing the worst recovery since the Depression, 0.1 percent economic growth, none of us should be satisfied with that, and I don't think any of us are. We can generate more growth by making these things permanent. So we need to wake up to the reality and start offering some concrete solutions that really strengthen the economy and help hard-working taxpayers.

Let me just say the nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation, which is our referee on these matters, says that if we make the credit permanent that actually more research and development will take place, the kind of innovation that really puts America at the forefront of job creation and an economy that is strong and vibrant, that up to 10 percent more research and development will occur. We certainly need more of that, because that is more jobs, more innovation, and higher wages.

Let me just say that the President of the United States voted to extend the research and development tax credit unpaid for when he was a Senator. He signed legislation twice to extend the research and development tax credit unpaid for. I think 30 years of uncertainty has actually been a detriment—a detriment to U.S. business employers and certainly their employees because the jobs they provide are so dependent on our being at the cutting edge.

Look, this is the 21st century. We can't live in the past as if these policies don't matter. This is a very competitive world, and most of our constituents understand the kind of competition that we face. We need to make this permanent. We need to do it now. Let's do something positive and good for America, something that we have repeatedly done. Let's be honest about it.

Since we are going to extend it at some point temporarily another 2 years, let's make this permanent. Let's make this certain. Let's make this something that our employers can depend on so they can create the kind of jobs that we haven't seen.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time. Vote ''yes'' on this legislation.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the American Research and Competitiveness Act of 2014, a bill to simplify and permanently extend the U.S. research and development (R&D) tax credit. Over the past thirty years, the R&D tax credit has been a key economic tool for businesses in my Silicon Valley district and across our country by directly rewarding business investment in R&D.

At a time of great partisanship in Congress, I think the R&D we speak of today can be said to be 'Republicans and Democrats' because of the bipartisan support this legislation enjoys. For years the R&D tax credit has been essential for out-innovating and out-competing the rest of the world, but now other countries are catching up or already have. While the U.S.

was the first nation to offer a tax incentive for research and development in 1981, according to a study by the Information Technology & Innovation Foundation (ITIF), we now rank 27th out of 42 countries in terms of the generosity of the R&D incentives we offer.

Congress needs to do so much more to improve our national economy, and updating the R&D tax credit is an important policy that will encourage businesses to invest in new technologies which in turn will create jobs and shape a better economy in our future.

Nearly six months have passed since the R&D tax credit expired. To maintain our nation's competitiveness, let's not wait another day to give businesses the certainty they need to continue innovating and investing in America's future.

I thank Representatives KEVIN BRADY and JOHN LARSON for their leadership in bringing this bill to the floor today and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4438.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 569 and House Resolution 576, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 4438 is postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

STRENGTHENING EDUCATION THROUGH RESEARCH ACT

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4366) to strengthen the Federal education research system to make research and evaluations more timely and relevant to State and local needs in order to increase student achievement, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4366

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 ''Strengthening Education through Research Act''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—EDUCATION SCIENCES REFORM

Sec. 101. References.
Sec. 102. Definitions.

PART A—THE INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SCIENCES

Sec. 111. Establishment.
Sec. 112. Functions.
Sec. 113. Delegation.
Sec. 114. Office of the Director.
Sec. 115. Priorities.
Sec. 116. National Board for Education Sciences.
Sec. 117. Commissioners of the National Education Centers.
Sec. 118. Transparency.
Sec. 119. Competitive awards.

PART B—NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION RESEARCH

Sec. 131. Establishment.
Sec. 132. Duties.
Sec. 133. Standards for conduct and evaluation of research.

PART C—NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

Sec. 151. Establishment.
Sec. 152. Duties.
Sec. 153. Performance of duties.
Sec. 154. Reports.
Sec. 155. Dissemination.
Sec. 156. Cooperative education statistics systems.

PART D—NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION EVALUATION AND REGIONAL ASSISTANCE

Sec. 171. Establishment.
Sec. 172. Commissioner for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.
Sec. 173. Evaluations.
Sec. 174. Regional educational laboratories for research, development, dissemination, and evaluation.

PART E—NATIONAL CENTER FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION RESEARCH

Sec. 175. Establishment.
Sec. 176. Commissioner for Special Education Research.
Sec. 177. Duties.

PART F—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 182. Prohibitions.
Sec. 183. Confidentiality.
Sec. 184. Availability of data.
Sec. 185. Performance management.
Sec. 186. Authority to publish.
Sec. 187. Repeals.
Sec. 188. Fellowships.
Sec. 189. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE II—EDUCATIONAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Sec. 201. References.
Sec. 202. Definitions.
Sec. 203. Comprehensive centers.
Sec. 204. Evaluations.
Sec. 205. Existing technical assistance providers.
Sec. 206. Regional advisory committees.
Sec. 207. Priorities.
Sec. 208. Grant program for statewide longitudinal data systems.
Sec. 209. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE III—NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS

Sec. 301. References.
Sec. 302. National assessment governing board.
Sec. 303. National assessment of educational progress.
Sec. 304. Definitions.
Sec. 305. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE IV—EVALUATION PLAN

Sec. 401. Research and evaluation.

TITLE I—EDUCATION SCIENCES REFORM

SEC. 101. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 (20 U.S.C. 9501 et seq.).

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

Section 102 (20 U.S.C. 9501) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking ''Affairs'' and inserting ''Education'';

(2) in paragraph (10)—

(A) by inserting ''or other information, in a timely manner and'' after ''evaluations,'' and

(B) by inserting ''school leaders,'' after ''teachers,'';

(3) in paragraph (12), by inserting '', school leaders,'' after ''teachers'';

(4) by striking paragraph (13);

(5) by redesignating paragraphs (14) and (15) as paragraphs (13) and (14), respectively;

(6) by inserting after paragraph (14), as so redesignated, the following:

''(15) MINORITY-SERVING INSTITUTION.—The term 'minority-serving institution' means an institution of higher education described in section 371(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1067q(a)).'';

(7) by amending paragraph (18) to read as follows:

''(18) PRINCIPLES OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH.—The term 'principles of scientific research' means principles of research that—

''(A) apply rigorous, systematic, and objective methodology to obtain reliable and valid knowledge relevant to education activities and programs;

''(B) present findings and make claims that are appropriate to, and supported by, the methods that have been employed; and

''(C) include, appropriate to the research being conducted—

''(i) use of systematic, empirical methods that draw on observation or experiment;

''(ii) use of data analyses that are adequate to support the general findings;

''(iii) reliance on measurements or observational methods that provide reliable and generalizable findings;

''(iv) strong claims of causal relationships, only with research designs that eliminate plausible competing explanations for observed results, such as, but not limited to, random-assignment experiments;

''(v) presentation of studies and methods in sufficient detail and clarity to allow for replication or, at a minimum, to offer the opportunity to build systematically on the findings of the research;

''(vi) acceptance by a peer-reviewed journal or critique by a panel of independent experts through a comparably rigorous, objective, and scientific review; and

''(vii) consistency of findings across multiple studies or sites to support the generality of results and conclusions.'';

(8) in paragraph (20), by striking ''scientifically based research standards'' and inserting ''the principles of scientific research''; and

(9) by adding at the end the following:

''(24) SCHOOL LEADER.—The term 'school leader' means a principal, assistant principal, or other individual who is—

''(A) an employee or officer of—

''(i) an elementary school or secondary school;

''(ii) a local educational agency serving an elementary school or secondary school; or

''(iii) another entity operating the elementary school or secondary school; and

''(B) responsible for the daily instructional leadership and managerial operations of the elementary school or secondary school.''.

PART A—THE INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SCIENCES

SEC. 111. ESTABLISHMENT.

Section 111 (20 U.S.C. 9511) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''and wide dissemination activities'' and inserting ''and, consistent with

section 114(j), wide dissemination and utilization activities'' and

(ii) by striking ''(including in technology areas)''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''disability,'' after ''gender,''.

SEC. 112. FUNCTIONS.

Section 112 (20 U.S.C. 9512) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting ''(including evaluations of impact and implementation)'' after ''education evaluation''; and

(B) by inserting before the semicolon the following ''and utilization''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting '', consistent with section 114(j),'' after ''disseminate''; and

(B) by adding before the semicolon the following: ''and scientifically valid education evaluations carried out under this title''.

SEC. 113. DELEGATION.

Section 113 (20 U.S.C. 9513) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1);

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (5) as paragraphs (1) through (4), respectively; and

(C) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated, by striking ''of the National Assessment of Educational Progress Authorization Act'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''Secretary may assign the Institute responsibility for administering'' and inserting ''Director may accept requests from the Secretary for the Institute to administer''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) CONTRACT ACQUISITION.—With respect to any contract entered into under this title, the Director shall be consulted—

''(1) during the procurement process; and

''(2) in the management of such contract's performance, which shall be consistent with the requirements of the performance management system described in section 185.''.

SEC. 114. OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR.

Section 114 (20 U.S.C. 9514) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''Except as provided in subsection (b)(2), the'' and inserting ''The'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting before the period the following: '', except that if a successor to the Director has not been appointed as of the date of expiration of the Director's term, the Director may serve for an additional 1-year period, beginning on the day after the date of expiration of the Director's term, or until a successor has been appointed under subsection (a), whichever occurs first'';

(B) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) REAPPOINTMENT.—A Director may be reappointed under subsection (a) for one additional term.''; and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the heading, by striking ''SUBSEQUENT DIRECTORS'' and inserting ''RECOMMENDATIONS''; and

(ii) by striking '', other than a Director appointed under paragraph (2)'';

(3) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by inserting before the period the following: '', and, as appropriate, with such research and activities carried out by public and private entities, to avoid duplicative or overlapping efforts'';

(B) in paragraph (4), by inserting '', and the use of evidence'' after ''statistics activities'';

(C) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by inserting ''and maintain'' after ''establish''; and

(ii) by inserting ''and subsection (h)'' after ''section 116(b)(3)'';

(D) in paragraph (7), by inserting ''disability,'' after ''gender,'';

(E) in paragraph (8), by striking ''historically Black colleges or universities'' and inserting ''minority-serving institutions'';

(F) by amending paragraph (9) to read as follows:

''(9) To coordinate with the Secretary to ensure that the results of the Institute's work are coordinated with, and utilized by, the Department's technical assistance providers and dissemination networks.'';

(G) by striking paragraphs (10) and (11);

(H) by redesignating paragraph (12) as paragraph (10);

(4) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i);

(5) by inserting after subsection (g), the following:

''(h) PEER-REVIEW SYSTEM.—The Director shall establish and maintain a peer-review system involving highly-qualified individuals, including practitioners, as appropriate, with an in-depth knowledge of the subject to be investigated, for—

''(1) reviewing and evaluating each application for a grant or cooperative agreement under this title that exceeds $100,000; and

''(2) evaluating and assessing all reports and other products that exceed $100,000 to be published and publicly released by the Institute.'';

(6) in subsection (i), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking ''the products and''; and

(B) by striking ''certify that evidence-based claims about those products and'' and inserting ''determine whether evidence-based claims in those''; and

(7) by adding at the end the following:

''(j) RELEVANCE, DISSEMINATION, AND UTILIZATION.—To ensure all activities authorized under this title are rigorous, relevant, and useful for researchers, policymakers, practitioners, and the public, the Director shall—

''(1) ensure such activities address significant challenges faced by practitioners, and increase knowledge in the field of education;

''(2) ensure that the information, products, and publications of the Institute are—

''(A) prepared and widely disseminated—

''(i) in a timely fashion; and

''(ii) in forms that are understandable, easily accessible, and usable, or adaptable for use in, the improvement of educational practice; and

''(B) widely disseminated through electronic transfer, and other means, such as posting to the Institute's website or other relevant place;

''(3) promote the utilization of the information, products, and publications of the Institute, including through the use of dissemination networks and technical assistance providers, within the Institute and the Department; and

''(4) monitor and manage the performance of all activities authorized under this title in accordance with section 185.''.

SEC. 115. PRIORITIES.

Section 115 (20 U.S.C. 9515) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''(taking into consideration long-term research and development on core issues conducted through the national research and development centers)'' and inserting ''at least once every 6 years''; and

(ii) by striking ''such as'' and inserting ''including'';

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting ''ensuring that all children have the ability to obtain a high-quality education, particularly'' before ''closing'';

(ii) by striking ''especially achievement gaps between'';

(iii) by striking ''nonminority children'' and inserting ''nonminority children, disabled and nondisabled children,'';

(iv) by striking ''and between disadvantaged'' and inserting ''and disadvantaged'';

(v) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(C) by striking paragraph (2); and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) improving the quality of early childhood education;

''(3) improving education in elementary and secondary schools, particularly among low-performing students and schools; and

''(4) improving access to, opportunities for, and completion of postsecondary education.''; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking ''by means of the Internet'' and inserting ''by electronic means such as posting in an easily accessible manner on the Institute's website''.

SEC. 116. NATIONAL BOARD FOR EDUCATION SCIENCES.

Section 116 (20 U.S.C. 9516) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''to guide the work of the Institute'' and inserting '', and to advise, and provide input to, the Director on the activities of the Institute on an ongoing basis'';

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''under section 114(h)'' after ''procedures'';

(C) in paragraph (8), by inserting ''disability,'' after ''gender,''

(D) in paragraph (9)—

(i) by striking ''To solicit'' and inserting ''To ensure all activities of the Institute are relevant to education policy and practice by soliciting, on an ongoing basis,''; and

(ii) by striking ''consistent with'' and inserting ''consistent with section 114(j) and'';

(E) in paragraph (11)—

(i) by inserting ''the Institute's'' after ''enhance''; and

(ii) by striking ''among other Federal and State research agencies'' and inserting ''with public and private entities to improve the work of the Institute''; and

(F) by adding at the end the following:

''(13) To conduct the evaluations required under subsection (d).'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting ''Board,'' before ''National Academy'';

(ii) by striking ''and the National Science Advisor'' and inserting ''the National Science Advisor, and other entities and organizations that have knowledge of individuals who are highly-qualified to appraise education research, statistics, evaluations, or development'';

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in clause (i), by striking '', which may include those researchers recommended by the National Academy of Sciences'';

(II) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii);

(III) by inserting after clause (i), the following:

''(ii) Not fewer than 2 practitioners who are knowledgeable about the education needs of the United States, who may include school based professional educators, teachers, school leaders, local educational agency superintendents, and members of local boards of education or Bureau-funded school boards.''; and

(IV) in clause (iii), as so redesignated—

(aa) by striking ''school-based professional educators,'';

(bb) by striking ''local educational agency superintendents,'';

(cc) by striking ''principals,'';

(dd) by striking ''or local''; and

(ee) by striking ''or Bureau-funded school boards''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting ''beginning on the date of appointment of the member,'' after ''4 years,'';

(II) by striking clause (i);

(III) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (i);

(IV) in clause (i), as so redesignated, by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(V) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) in a case in which a successor to a member has not been appointed as of the date of expiration of the member's term, the member may serve for an additional 1-year period, beginning on the day after the date of expiration of the member's term, or until a successor has been appointed under paragraph (1), whichever occurs first.'';

(iii) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(iv) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C);

(C) in paragraph (8)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (E) as subparagraphs (B) through (F), respectively;

(ii) by inserting before subparagraph (B), as so redesignated, the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the exercise of its duties under section 116(b) and in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.), the Board shall be independent of the Director and the other offices and officers of the Institute.'';

(iii) in subparagraph (B), as so redesignated, by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''for a term of not more than 6 years, and who may be reappointed by the Board for 1 additional term of not more than 6 years''; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

''(G) SUBCOMMITTEES.—The Board may establish standing or temporary subcommittees to make recommendations to the Board for carrying out activities authorized under this title.'';

(3) by striking subsection (d);

(4) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d);

(5) in subsection (d), as so redesignated—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ''ANNUAL'' and inserting ''EVALUATION'';

(B) by striking ''The Board'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board'';

(C) by striking ''not later than July 1 of each year, a'' and inserting ''and make widely available to the public (including by electronic means such as posting in an easily accessible manner on the Institute's website), a triennial''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—An evaluation report described in paragraph (1) shall include—

''(A) subject to paragraph (3), an evaluation of the activities authorized for each of the National Education Centers, which—

''(i) uses the performance management system described in section 185; and

''(ii) is conducted by an independent entity;

''(B) a review of the Institute to ensure its work, consistent with the requirements of section 114(j), is timely, rigorous, and relevant;

''(C) any recommendations regarding actions that may be taken to enhance the ability of the Institute and the National Education Centers to carry out their priorities and missions; and

''(D) a summary of the major research findings of the Institute and the activities carried out under section 113(b) during the 3 preceding fiscal years.

''(3) NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION EVALUATION AND REGIONAL ASSISTANCE.—With respect to the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, an evaluation report described in paragraph (1) shall contain—

''(A) an evaluation described in paragraph (2)(A) of the activities authorized for such Center, except for the regional educational laboratories established under section 174; and

''(B) a summative or interim evaluation, whichever is most recent, for each such laboratory conducted under section 174(i) on or after the date of enactment of the Strengthening Education through Research Act or, in a case in which such an evaluation is not available for a laboratory, the most recent evaluation for the laboratory conducted prior to the date of enactment of the Strengthening Education through Research Act.''; and

(6) by striking subsection (f).

SEC. 117. COMMISSIONERS OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION CENTERS.

Section 117 (20 U.S.C. 9517) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Except as provided in subsection (b), each'' and inserting ''Each'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''Except as provided in subsection (b), each'' and inserting ''Each''; and

(ii) by inserting '', statistics,'' after ''research'';

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking ''Except as provided in subsection (b), each'' and inserting ''Each'';

(2) by striking subsection (b);

(3) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively; and

(4) in subsection (c), as so redesignated, by striking '', except the Commissioner for Education Statistics,''.

SEC. 118. TRANSPARENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 119 (20 U.S.C. 9519) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 119. TRANSPARENCY.

''Not later than 120 days after awarding a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under this title in excess of $100,000, the Director shall make publicly available (including through electronic means such as posting in an easily accessible manner on the Institute's website) a description of the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement, including, at a minimum, the amount, duration, recipient, and the purpose of the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1 of the Act of November 5, 2002 (Public Law 107–279; 116 Stat. 1940) is amended by striking the item relating to section 119 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 119. Transparency.''.

SEC. 119. COMPETITIVE AWARDS.

Section 120 (20 U.S.C. 9520) is amended by striking ''when practicable'' and inserting ''consistent with section 114(h)''.

PART B—NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION RESEARCH

SEC. 131. ESTABLISHMENT.

Section 131(b) (20 U.S.C. 9531(b)) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(1) to sponsor sustained research that will lead to the accumulation of knowledge and understanding of education, consistent with the priorities described in section 115;'';

(2) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (3);

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) consistent with section 114(j), to widely disseminate and promote utilization of the work of the Research Center.''.

SEC. 132. DUTIES.

Section 133 (20 U.S.C. 9533) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''peer-review standards and'';

(B) by striking paragraph (2);

(C) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2);

(D) by striking paragraph (4);

(E) by redesignating paragraphs (5) through (9) as paragraphs (3) through (7), respectively;

(F) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated, by inserting ''in the implementation of programs carried out by the Department and other agencies'' before ''within the Federal Government'';

(G) in paragraph (5), as so redesignated, by striking ''disseminate, through the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance,'' and inserting ''widely disseminate, consistent with section 114(j),'';

(H) in paragraph (6), as so redesignated—

(i) by striking ''Director'' and inserting ''Board''; and

(ii) by striking ''of a biennial report, as described in section 119'' and inserting ''and dissemination of each evaluation report under section 116(d)'';

(I) in paragraph (7), as so redesignated, by inserting ''and which may include research on social and emotional learning,'' after ''gap,'';

(J) by inserting after paragraph (7), as so redesignated, the following:

''(8) to the extent time and resources allow, when findings from previous research under this part provoke relevant follow up questions, carry out research initiatives on such follow up questions;'';

(K) by redesignating paragraphs (10) and (11) as paragraphs (9) and (10), respectively;

(L) by amending paragraph (9), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

''(9) carry out research initiatives, including rigorous, peer-reviewed, large-scale, long-term, and broadly applicable empirical research, regarding the impact of technology on education, including online education and hybrid learning;'';

(M) in paragraph (10), as so redesignated, by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(N) by adding at the end the following:

''(11) to the extent feasible, carry out research on the quality of implementation of practices and strategies determined to be effective through scientifically valid research.'';

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

''(b) PLAN.—The Research Commissioner shall propose to the Director and, subject to the approval of the Director, implement a research plan for the activities of the Research Center that—

''(1) is consistent with the priorities and mission of the Institute and the mission of the Research Center described in section 131(b), and includes the activities described in subsection (a);

''(2) is carried out and, as appropriate, updated and modified, including through the use of the results of the Research Center's most recent evaluation report under section 116(d);

''(3) describes how the Research Center will use the performance management system described in section 185 to assess and improve the activities of the Center;

''(4) meets the procedures for peer review established and maintained by the Director under section 114(f)(5) and the standards of research described in section 134; and

''(5) includes both basic research and applied research, which shall include research conducted through field-initiated research and ongoing research initiatives.'';

(3) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d);

(4) by inserting after subsection (b), as so amended, the following:

''(c) GRANTS, CONTRACTS, AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Research Commissioner may award grants to, or enter into

contracts or cooperative agreements, with eligible applicants to carry out research under subsection (a).

''(2) ELIGIBILITY.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'eligible applicant' means an applicant that has the ability and capacity to conduct scientifically valid research.

''(3) APPLICATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible applicant that wishes to receive a grant, or enter into a contract or cooperative agreement, under this section shall submit an application to the Research Commissioner at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Research Commissioner may require.

''(B) CONTENT.—An application submitted under subparagraph (A) shall describe how the eligible applicant will address and demonstrate progress on the requirements of the performance management system described in section 185, with respect to the activities that will be carried out under the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement.''; and

(5) in subsection (d), as redesignated by paragraph (3)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(1) SUPPORT.—In carrying out activities under subsection (a)(2), the Research Commissioner shall support national research and development centers that address topics of importance and relevance in the field of education across the country and are consistent with the Institute's priorities under section 115.'';

(B) by striking paragraphs (2), (3), and (5);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (6), and (7) as paragraph (2), (3), and (4), respectively;

(D) by amending paragraph (2), as so redesignated—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''5 additional'' and inserting ''2 additional'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) demonstrates progress on the requirements of the performance management system described in section 185.'';

(E) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated, by striking ''paragraphs (4) and (5)'' and inserting ''paragraph (2)''; and

(F) by amending paragraph (4), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

''(4) DISAGGREGATION.—To the extent feasible and when relevant to the research being conducted, research conducted under this subsection shall be disaggregated and cross-tabulated by age, race, gender, disability status, English learner status, and socioeconomic background.''.

SEC. 133. STANDARDS FOR CONDUCT AND EVALUATION OF RESEARCH.

Section 134 (20 U.S.C. 9534) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''based'' and inserting ''valid''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and wide dissemination activities'' and inserting ''and, consistent with section 114(j), wide dissemination and utilization activities'';

(2) by striking subsection (b); and

(3) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

PART C—NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

SEC. 151. ESTABLISHMENT.

Section 151(b) (20 U.S.C. 9541(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''and consistent with the privacy protections under section 183'' after ''manner''; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''disability,'' after ''cultural,''; and

(B) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

''(B) consistent with section 114(j), is relevant, timely, and widely disseminated.''.

SEC. 152. DUTIES.

Section 153 (20 U.S.C. 9543) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting '', consistent with the privacy protections under section 183,'' after ''Center shall'';

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by amending subparagraph (D) to read as follows:

''(D) secondary school graduation and completion rates, including the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (as defined in section 200.19(b)(1)(i)(A) of title 34, Code of Federal Regulations, as such section was in effect on November 28, 2008) and the extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (as defined in section 200.19(b)(1)(v)(A) of title 34, Code of Federal Regulations, as such section was in effect on November 28, 2008), and school dropout rates, and adult literacy;'';

(ii) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''and opportunity for,'' and inserting ''opportunity for, and completion of'';

(iii) by amending subparagraph (F) to read as follows:

''(F) teaching, including information on pre-service preparation, professional development, teacher distribution, and teacher and school leader evaluation;'';

(iv) in subparagraph (G), by inserting ''and school leaders'' before the semicolon;

(v) in subparagraph (H), by inserting '', climate, and in- and out-of-school suspensions and expulsions'' before '', including information regarding'';

(vi) by amending subparagraph (K) to read as follows:

''(K) the access to, and use of, technology to improve elementary schools and secondary schools;'';

(vii) in subparagraph (L), by striking ''and opportunity for,'' and inserting ''opportunity for, and quality of'';

(viii) in subparagraph (M), by striking ''such programs during school recesses'' and inserting ''summer school''; and

(ix) in subparagraph (N), by striking ''vocational'' and inserting ''career'';

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking ''when such disaggregated information will facilitate educational and policy decisionmaking'' and inserting ''so long as any reported information does not reveal individually identifiable information'';

(D) in paragraph (4), by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', and the implementation (with the assistance of the Department and other Federal officials who have statutory authority to provide assistance on applicable privacy laws, regulations, and policies) of appropriate privacy protections'';

(E) in paragraph (5), by striking ''promote linkages across States,'';

(F) in paragraph (6)—

(i) by striking ''Third'' and inserting ''Trends in''; and

(ii) by inserting ''and the Program for International Student Assessment'' after ''Science Study'';

(G) in paragraph (7), by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', ensuring such collections protect student privacy consistent with section 183'';

(H) by amending paragraph (8) to read as follows:

''(8) assisting the Board in the preparation and dissemination of each evaluation report under section 116(d); and'; and

(I) by striking paragraph (9);

(2) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

''(b) PLAN.—The Statistics Commissioner shall propose to the Director and, subject to the approval of the Director, implement a plan for activities of the Statistics Center that—

''(1) is consistent with the priorities and mission of the Institute and the mission of the Statistics Center described in section 151(b);

''(2) is carried out and, as appropriate, updated and modified, including through the use of the results of the Statistic Center's most recent evaluation report under section 116(d); and

''(3) describes how the Statistics Center will use the performance management system described in section 185 to assess and improve the activities of the Center.''.

SEC. 153. PERFORMANCE OF DUTIES.

Section 154 (20 U.S.C. 9544) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''In carrying'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) ELIGIBILITY.—For purposes of this section, the term 'eligible applicant' means an applicant that has the ability and capacity to carry out activities under this part.

''(3) APPLICATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible applicant that wishes to receive a grant, or enter into a contract or cooperative agreement, under this section shall submit an application to the Statistics Commissioner at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Statistics Commissioner may require.

''(B) CONTENTS.—An application submitted under subparagraph (A) shall describe how the eligible applicant will address and demonstrate progress on the requirements of the performance management system described in section 185, with respect to the activities that will be carried out under the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement.'';

(2) in subsection (b)(2)(A), by striking ''vocational and'' and inserting ''career and technical education programs,''; and

(3) in subsection (c), by striking ''5 years'' the second place it appears and inserting ''2 years if the recipient demonstrates progress on the requirements of the performance management system described in section 185, with respect to the activities carried out under the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement received under this section''.

SEC. 154. REPORTS.

Section 155 (20 U.S.C. 9545) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''(consistent with section 114(h))'' after ''review''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''2003'' and inserting ''2015''.

SEC. 155. DISSEMINATION.

Section 156 (20 U.S.C. 9546) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following: ''Such projects shall adhere to student privacy requirements under section 183.''; and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following: ''Before receiving access to educational data under this paragraph, a Federal agency shall describe to the Statistics Center the specific research intent for use of the data, how access to the data may meet such research intent, and how the Federal agency will protect the confidentiality of the data consistent with the requirements of section 183.'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting ''and consistent with section 183'' after ''may prescribe''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following: ''Before receiving access to data under this paragraph, an interested party shall describe

to the Statistics Center the specific research intent for use of the data, how access to the data may meet such research intent, and how the party will protect the confidentiality of the data consistent with the requirements of section 183.''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) DENIAL AUTHORITY.—The Statistics Center shall have the authority to deny any requests for access to data under paragraph (1) or (2) for any scientific deficiencies in the proposed research design or research intent for use of the data, or if the request would introduce risk of a privacy violation or misuse of data.''.

SEC. 156. COOPERATIVE EDUCATION STATISTICS SYSTEMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 157 (20 U.S.C. 9547) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking ''**SYSTEMS**'' and inserting ''**PARTNERSHIPS**'';

(2) by striking ''national cooperative education statistics systems'' and inserting ''cooperative education statistics partnerships'';

(3) by striking ''producing and maintaining, with the cooperation'' and inserting ''reviewing and improving, with the voluntary participation'';

(4) by striking ''comparable and uniform'' and inserting ''data quality standards, which may include establishing voluntary guidelines to standardize'';

(5) by striking ''adult education, and libraries,'' and inserting ''and adult education''; and

(6) by adding at the end the following: ''No student data shall be collected by the partnerships established under this section, nor shall such partnerships establish a national student data system.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1 of the Act of November 5, 2002 (Public Law 107–279; 116 Stat. 1940) is amended by striking the item relating to section 157 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 157. Cooperative education statistics partnerships.''.

PART D—NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION EVALUATION AND REGIONAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 171. ESTABLISHMENT.

Section 171 (20 U.S.C. 9561) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1);

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively;

(C) in paragraph (1), as so redesignated, by striking ''of such programs'' and all that follows through ''science)'' and inserting ''and to evaluate the implementation of such programs'';

(D) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated, by striking ''and wide dissemination of results of'' and inserting ''and, consistent with section 114(j), the wide dissemination and utilization of results of all''; and

(2) by striking subsection (c).

SEC. 172. COMMISSIONER FOR EDUCATION EVALUATION AND REGIONAL ASSISTANCE.

Section 172 (20 U.S.C. 9562) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) widely disseminate, consistent with section 114(j), all information on scientifically valid research and statistics supported by the Institute and all scientifically valid education evaluations supported by the Institute, particularly to State educational agencies and local educational agencies, to institutions of higher education, to the public, the media, voluntary organizations, professional associations, and other constituencies, especially with respect to the priorities described in section 115;'';

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting '', consistent with section 114(j)'' after ''timely, and efficient manner'';

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking ''development and dissemination'' and inserting ''development, dissemination, and utilization''; and

(ii) by striking ''the provision of technical assistance,'';

(D) in paragraph (5), by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon;

(E) in paragraph (6)—

(i) by striking ''Director'' and inserting ''Board'';

(ii) by striking ''preparation of a biennial report'' and inserting ''preparation and dissemination of each evaluation report''; and

(iii) by striking ''119; and'' and inserting ''116(d).'';

(F) by striking paragraph (7);

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) by inserting ''all'' before ''information disseminated''; and

(B) by striking '', which may include'' and all that follows through ''of this Act)'';

(3) by striking subsection (c) and redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(4) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) PLAN.—The Evaluation and Regional Assistance Commissioner shall propose to the Director and, subject to the approval of the Director, implement a plan for the activities of the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance that—

''(1) is consistent with the priorities and mission of the Institute and the mission of the Center described in section 171(b);

''(2) is carried out and, as appropriate, updated and modified, including through the use of the results of the Center's most recent evaluation report under section 116(d); and

''(3) describes how the Center will use the performance management system described in section 185 to assess and improve the activities of the Center.

''(d) GRANTS, CONTRACTS, AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the duties under this part, the Evaluation and Regional Assistance Commissioner may—

''(A) award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to eligible applicants to carry out the activities under this part; and

''(B) provide technical assistance.

''(2) ELIGIBILITY.—For purposes of this section, the term 'eligible applicant' means an applicant that has the ability and capacity to carry out activities under this part.

''(3) ENTITIES TO CONDUCT EVALUATIONS.—In awarding grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under paragraph (1) to carry out activities under section 173, the Evaluation and Regional Assistance Commissioner shall make such awards to eligible applicants with the ability and capacity to conduct scientifically valid education evaluations.

''(4) APPLICATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible applicant that wishes to receive a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under paragraph (1) shall submit an application to the Evaluation and Regional Assistance Commissioner at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Commissioner may require.

''(B) CONTENTS.—An application submitted under subparagraph (A) shall describe how the eligible applicant will address and demonstrate progress on the requirements of the performance management system described in section 185, with respect to the activities carried out under such grant, contract, or cooperative agreement.

''(5) DURATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements under paragraph (1) may be awarded, on a competitive basis, for a period of not more than 5 years, and may be renewed at the discretion of the Evaluation and Regional Assistance Commissioner for an additional period of not more than 2 years if the recipient demonstrates progress on the requirements of the performance management system described in section 185, with respect to the activities carried out under the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement.'';

(5) in subsection (e), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''There is established'' and all that follows through ''Regional Assistance'' and inserting ''The Evaluation and Regional Assistance Commissioner may establish'';

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by inserting ''all'' before ''products''; and

(C) in paragraph (2)(B)(ii), by striking ''2002'' and all that follows through the period and inserting ''2002.''.

SEC. 173. EVALUATIONS.

Section 173 (20 U.S.C. 9563) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''may'' and inserting ''shall'';

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''evaluations'' and inserting ''high-quality evaluations, including impact evaluations that use rigorous methodologies that permit the strongest possible causal inferences,'';

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: '', including programs under part A of such title (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq.)'';

(iv) by striking subparagraph (C) and redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C);

(v) by striking subparagraphs (E) and (G), and redesignating subparagraph (F) as subparagraph (D);

(vi) in subparagraph (D), as so redesignated, by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(vii) by inserting after subparagraph (D), as so redesignated, the following:

''(E) provide evaluation findings in an understandable, easily accessible, and usable format to support program improvement;

''(F) support the evaluation activities described in section 401 of the Strengthening Education through Research Act that are carried about by the Director; and

''(G) to the extent feasible—

''(i) examine evaluations conducted or supported by others to determine the quality and relevance of the evidence of effectiveness generated by those evaluations, with the approval of the Director;

''(ii) review and supplement Federal education program evaluations, particularly such evaluations by the Department, to determine or enhance the quality and relevance of the evidence generated by those evaluations;

''(iii) conduct implementation evaluations that promote continuous improvement and inform policymaking;

''(iv) evaluate the short- and long-term effects and cost efficiencies across programs assisted or authorized under Federal law and administrated by the Department; and

''(v) synthesize the results of evaluation studies for and across Federal education programs, policies, and practices.''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period and inserting ''under section 114(h); and''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) be widely disseminated, consistent with section 114(j).''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''contracts'' and inserting ''grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements''.

SEC. 174. REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LABORATORIES FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, DISSEMINATION, AND EVALUATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 174 (20 U.S.C. 9564) is amended—

(1) in the section heading by striking ''**TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**'' and inserting ''**EVALUATION**'';

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''Director'' and inserting ''Evaluation and Regional Assistance Commissioner'';

(B) by striking ''contracts'' and inserting ''grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements''; and

(C) by inserting ''not more than'' before ''10 regional'';

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking ''The Director'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Evaluation and Regional Assistance Commissioner'';

(B) by striking ''contracts under this section with research organizations, institutions, agencies, institutions of higher education,'' and inserting ''grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under this section with public or private, nonprofit or for-profit research organizations, other organizations, or institutions of higher education,'';

(C) by striking ''or individuals,'';

(D) by striking '', including regional entities'' and all that follows through ''107–110))''; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term 'eligible applicant' means an entity described in paragraph (1).'';

(4) by striking subsections (d) through (j) and inserting the following:

''(d) APPLICATIONS.—

''(1) SUBMISSION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible applicant desiring a contract grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under this section shall submit an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Evaluation and Regional Assistance Commissioner may reasonably require.

''(B) INPUT.—To ensure that applications submitted under this paragraph are reflective of the needs of the regions to be served, each eligible applicant submitting such an application shall seek input from State educational agencies and local educational agencies in the region that the award will serve, and other individuals with knowledge of the region's needs. Such individuals may include members of the regional advisory committee for the region under section 206(a).

''(2) PLAN.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each application submitted under paragraph (1) shall contain a plan for the activities of the regional educational laboratory to be established under this section, which shall be updated, modified, and improved, as appropriate, on an ongoing basis, including by using the results of the laboratory's interim evaluation under subsection (i)(3).

''(B) CONTENTS.—A plan described in subparagraph (A) shall address—

''(i) the priorities for applied research, development, evaluations, and wide dissemination established under section 207;

''(ii) the needs of State educational agencies and local educational agencies, on an ongoing basis, using available State and local data, including the relevant results of the region's assessment under section 206(e); and

''(iii) if available, demonstrated support from State educational agencies and local educational agencies in the region, such as letters of support or signed memoranda of understanding.

''(3) NON-FEDERAL SUPPORT.—In conducting a competition for grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under subsection (a), the Evaluation and Regional Assistance Commissioner shall give priority to eligible applicants that will provide a portion of non-Federal funds to maximize support for activities of the regional educational laboratories to be established under this section.

''(e) AWARDING GRANTS, CONTRACTS, OR COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

''(1) ASSURANCES.—In awarding grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under this section, the Evaluation and Regional Assistance Commissioner shall—

''(A) make such an award for not more than a 5-year period;

''(B) ensure that regional educational laboratories established under this section have strong and effective governance, organization, management, and administration, and employ qualified staff; and

''(C) ensure that each such laboratory has the flexibility to respond in a timely fashion to the needs of the laboratory's region, including—

''(i) through using the results of the laboratory's interim evaluation under subsection (i)(3) to improve and modify the activities of the laboratory before the end of the award period; and

''(ii) through sharing preliminary results of the laboratory's research, as appropriate, to increase the relevance and usefulness of the research.

''(2) COORDINATION.—To ensure coordination and prevent unnecessary duplication of activities among the regions, the Evaluation and Regional Assistance Commissioner shall—

''(A) share information about the activities of each regional educational laboratory with each other regional educational laboratory, the Department, the Director, and the National Board for Education Sciences;

''(B) ensure, where appropriate, that the activities of each regional educational laboratory established under this section also serve national interests;

''(C) ensure each such regional educational laboratory establishes strong partnerships among practitioners, policymakers, researchers, and others, so that such partnerships are continued in the absence of Federal support; and

''(D) enable, where appropriate, for such a laboratory to work in a region being served by another laboratory or to carry out a project that extends beyond the region served by the laboratory.

''(3) COLLABORATION WITH TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDERS.—Each regional educational laboratory established under this section shall, on an ongoing basis, coordinate its activities, collaborate, and regularly exchange information with the comprehensive centers (established in section 203) in the region in which the center is located, and with comprehensive centers located outside of its region, as appropriate.

''(4) OUTREACH.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In conducting competitions for grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under this section, the Evaluation and Regional Assistance Commissioner shall—

''(i) by making information and technical assistance relating to the competition widely available, actively encourage eligible applicants to compete for such an award; and

''(ii) seek input from the chief executive officers of States, chief State school officers, educators, parents, superintendents, and other individuals with knowledge of the needs of the regions to be served by the awards, regarding—

''(I) the needs in the regions for applied research, evaluation, development, and wide-dissemination activities authorized by this title; and

''(II) how such needs may be addressed most effectively.

''(B) REGIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—The individuals described in subparagraph (A)(ii) may include members of the regional advisory committees established under section 206(a).

''(5) PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT.—Before the Evaluation and Regional Assistance Commissioner awards a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under this section, the Director shall establish measurable performance indicators for assessing the ongoing progress and performance of the regional educational laboratories established with such awards that address—

''(A) the requirements of the performance management system described in section 185; and

''(B) the relevant results of the regional assessments under section 206(e).

''(6) STANDARDS.—The Evaluation and Regional Assistance Commissioner shall adhere to the Institute's system for technical and peer review under section 114(h) in reviewing the applied research activities and research-based reports of the regional educational laboratories.

''(7) REQUIRED CONSIDERATION.—In determining whether to award a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under this section to an eligible applicant that previously established a regional educational laboratory under this section, the Evaluation and Regional Assistance Commissioner shall consider the results of such laboratory's summative evaluation under subsection (i)(2).

''(f) MISSION.—Each regional educational laboratory established under this section shall—

''(1) conduct applied research, development, and evaluation activities with State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and, as appropriate, schools funded by the Bureau;

''(2) widely disseminate such work, consistent with section 114(j); and

''(3) develop the capacity of State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and, as appropriate, schools funded by the Bureau to carry out the activities described in paragraphs (1) and (2).

''(g) ACTIVITIES.—To carry out the mission described in subsection (f), each regional educational laboratory established under this section shall carry out the following activities:

''(1) Conduct, widely disseminate, and promote utilization of applied research, development activities, evaluations, and other scientifically valid research.

''(2) Develop and improve the plan for the laboratory under subsection (d)(2) for serving the region of the laboratory, and as appropriate, national needs, on an ongoing basis, which shall include seeking input and incorporating feedback from the representatives of State educational agencies and local educational agencies in the region, and other individuals with knowledge of the region's needs. Such representatives and other individuals may include members of the regional advisory committee for the region established under section 206(a).

''(3) Ensure research and related products are relevant and responsive to the needs of the region, including by using the relevant results of the region's assessment under section 206(e).

''(h) GOVERNING BOARD.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each regional educational laboratory established under this section may establish a governing board to improve the management of activities that the laboratory carries out under this section.

''(2) BOARD DUTIES.—A Board established under paragraph (1) shall coordinate and align its work with the work of the regional advisory committee for the region established under section 206.

''(i) EVALUATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Evaluation and Regional Assistance Commissioner shall—

''(A) provide for ongoing summative and interim evaluations described in paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively, of each of the regional educational laboratories established under this section in carrying out the full range of duties described in this section; and

''(B) transmit the results of such evaluations, through appropriate means, to the appropriate congressional committees, the Director, and the public.

''(2) SUMMATIVE EVALUATIONS.—The Evaluation and Regional Assistance Commissioner shall ensure each regional educational laboratory established under this section is evaluated by an independent entity at the end of the period of the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement that established such laboratory, which shall—

''(A) be completed in a timely fashion;

''(B) assess how well the laboratory is meeting the measurable performance indicators established under subsection (e)(5); and

''(C) consider the extent to which the laboratory ensures that the activities of such laboratory are relevant and useful to the work of State and local practitioners and policymakers.

''(3) INTERIM EVALUATIONS.—The Evaluation and Regional Assistance Commissioner shall ensure each regional educational laboratory established under this section is evaluated at the midpoint of the period of the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement that established such laboratory, which shall—

''(A) assess how well such laboratory is meeting the performance indicators described in subsection (e)(5); and

''(B) be used to improve the effectiveness of such laboratory in carrying out its plan under subsection (d)(2).

''(j) CONTINUATION OF AWARDS; RECOMPETITION.—

''(1) CONTINUATION OF AWARDS.—The Evaluation and Regional Assistance Commissioner shall continue awards made to each eligible applicant for the support of regional educational laboratories established under this section prior to the date of enactment of the Strengthening Education through Research Act, as such awards were in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Strengthening Education through Research Act, for the duration of those awards, in accordance with the terms and agreements of such awards.

''(2) RECOMPETITION.—Not later than the end of the period of the awards described in paragraph (1), the Evaluation and Regional Assistance Commissioner shall—

''(A) hold a competition to make grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under this section to eligible applicants, which may include eligible applicants that held awards described in paragraph (1); and

''(B) in determining whether to select an eligible applicant that held an award described in paragraph (1) for an award under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, consider the results of the summative evaluation under subsection (i)(2) of the laboratory established with the eligible applicant's award described in paragraph (1).'';

(5) by striking subsection (l);

(6) by redesignating subsections (m), (n), and (o) as subsections (l), (m), and (n), respectively;

(7) in subsection (l), as so redesignated, by inserting ''and local'' after ''achieve State'';

(8) by amending subsection (m), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

''(m) ANNUAL REPORT.—Each regional educational laboratory established under this section shall submit to the Evaluation and Regional Assistance Commissioner an annual report containing such information as the Commissioner may require, but which shall include, at a minimum, the following:

''(1) A summary of the laboratory's activities and products developed during the previous year.

''(2) A listing of the State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools the laboratory assisted during the previous year.

''(3) Using the measurable performance indicators established under subsection (e)(5), a description of how well the laboratory is meeting educational needs of the region served by the laboratory.

''(4) Any changes to the laboratory's plan under subsection (d)(2) to improve its activities in the remaining years of the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement.''; and

(9) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(o) APPROPRIATIONS RESERVATION.—Of the amounts appropriated under section 194(a), the Evaluation and Regional Assistance Commissioner shall reserve 16.13 percent of such funds to carry out this section, of which the Commissioner shall use not less than 25 percent to serve rural areas (including schools funded by the Bureau which are located in rural areas).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1 of the Act of November 5, 2002 (Public Law 107–279; 116 Stat. 1940) is amended by striking the item relating to section 174 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 174. Regional educational laboratories for research, development, dissemination, and evaluation.''.

PART E—NATIONAL CENTER FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION RESEARCH

SEC. 175. ESTABLISHMENT.

Section 175(b) (20 U.S.C. 9567(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and children'' and inserting ''children, and youth'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) to promote quality and integrity through the use of accepted practices of scientific inquiry to obtain knowledge and understanding of the validity of education theories, practices, or conditions with respect to special education research and evaluation described in paragraphs (1) through (3); and

''(5) to promote scientifically valid research findings in special education that may provide the basis for improving academic instruction and lifelong learning.''.

SEC. 176. COMMISSIONER FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION RESEARCH.

Section 176 (20 U.S.C. 9567a) is amended by inserting ''and youth'' after ''children''.

SEC. 177. DUTIES.

Section 177 (20 U.S.C. 9567b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by inserting ''and youth'' after ''children'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''scientifically based educational practices'' and inserting ''educational practices, including the use of technology based on scientifically valid research,'';

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking ''based'' and inserting ''valid'';

(D) in paragraph (10), by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', including how secondary school credentials are related to postsecondary and employment outcomes'';

(E) by redesignating paragraphs (11) through (15) and paragraphs (16) and (17) as paragraphs (12) through (16), respectively, and paragraphs (18) and (19), respectively;

(F) by inserting after paragraph (10), the following:

''(11) examine the participation and outcomes of students with disabilities in secondary and postsecondary career and technical education programs;'';

(G) in paragraph (14), as so redesignated, by inserting ''and professional development'' after ''preparation'';

(H) in paragraph (16), as so redesignated, by striking ''help parents'' and inserting ''examine the methods by which parents may'';

(I) by inserting after paragraph (16), as so redesignated, the following:

''(17) assist the Board in the preparation and dissemination of each evaluation report under section 116(d);'';

(J) in paragraph (18), as so redesignated, by striking ''and'' at the end;

(K) by amending paragraph (19), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

''(19) examine the needs of children with disabilities who are English learners, gifted and talented, or who have other unique learning needs; and''; and

(L) by adding at the end the following:

''(20) examine innovations in the field of special education, such as multi-tiered systems of support.'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting ''for the activities of the Special Education Research Center'' after ''research plan''; and

(ii) by inserting ''and, subject to the approval of the Director, implement such plan'' after ''Services'';

(B) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''described in section 175(b)'' after ''Center'';

(C) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) is carried out, and, as appropriate, updated and modified, including by using the results of the Special Education Research Center's most recent evaluation report under section 116(d);'';

(D) by striking paragraph (5);

(E) by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), and (6) as paragraphs (4), (5), and (7), respectively;

(F) by inserting after paragraph (2), as so amended, the following:

''(3) provides for research that addresses significant questions of practice where such research is lacking;'';

(G) in paragraph (5), as so redesignated, by striking ''and types of children with'' and inserting '', student subgroups, and types of''; and

(H) by inserting after paragraph (5), as so redesignated and amended, the following:

''(6) describes how the Special Education Research Center will use the performance management system described in section 185 to assess and improve the activities of the Center; and'';

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Director'' and inserting ''Special Education Research Commissioner'';

(B) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

''(3) APPLICATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible applicant that wishes to receive a grant, or enter into a contract or cooperative agreement, under this section shall submit an application to the Special Education Research Commissioner at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Special

Education Research Commissioner may require.

''(B) CONTENTS.—An application submitted under subparagraph (A) shall describe how the eligible applicant will address and demonstrate progress on the requirements of the performance management system described in section 185, with respect to the activities that will be carried out under such grant, contract, or cooperative agreement.''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) DURATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements under this section may be awarded, on a competitive basis, for a period of not more than 5 years, and may be renewed at the discretion of the Special Education Research Commissioner for an additional period of not more than 2 years if the recipient demonstrates progress on the requirements of the performance management system described in section 185, with respect to the activities carried out under the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement received under this section.'';

(4) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

''(e) DISSEMINATION.—The Special Education Research Center shall synthesize and, consistent with section 114(j), widely disseminate and promote utilization of the findings and results of special education research conducted or supported by the Special Education Research Center.''; and

(5) in subsection (f), by striking ''part such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2010.'' and inserting ''part—

''(1) for fiscal year 2015, $54,000,000;

''(2) for fiscal year 2016, $54,108,000;

''(3) for fiscal year 2017, $55,298,376;

''(4) for fiscal year 2018, $56,625,537;

''(5) for fiscal year 2019, $58,154,426; and

''(6) for fiscal year 2020, $65,645,169.''.

PART F—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 182. PROHIBITIONS.

Section 182 (20 U.S.C. 9572) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''or control'' and inserting ''control, or coerce''; and

(B) by inserting ''specific academic standards or assessments,'' after ''the curriculum,''

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by inserting ''coerce,'' after ''approve,'' and

(B) by striking ''an elementary school or secondary school'' and inserting ''early education, or in an elementary school, secondary school, or institution of higher education''.

SEC. 183. CONFIDENTIALITY.

Section 183 (20 U.S.C. 9573) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''their families, and information with respect to individual schools,'' and inserting ''and their families''; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', and that any disclosed information with respect to individual schools not reveal such individually identifiable information'';

(2) in subsection (d)(2), by inserting '', including voluntary and uncompensated services under section 190'' after ''providing services''; and

(3) in subsection (e)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting ''and Director'' after ''Secretary''.

SEC. 184. AVAILABILITY OF DATA.

Section 184 (20 U.S.C. 9574) is amended by striking ''use of the Internet'' and inserting ''electronic means, such as posting to the Institute's website in an easily accessible manner''.

SEC. 185. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT.

Section 185 (20 U.S.C. 9575) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 185. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT.

''The Director shall establish a system for managing the performance of all activities authorized under this title to promote continuous improvement of the activities and to ensure the effective use of Federal funds by—

''(1) developing and using measurable performance indicators, including timelines, to evaluate and improve the effectiveness of the activities;

''(2) using the performance indicators described in paragraph (1) to inform funding decisions, including the awarding and continuation of all grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements under this title;

''(3) establishing and improving formal feedback mechanisms to—

''(A) anticipate and meet stakeholder needs; and

''(B) incorporate, on an ongoing basis, the feedback of such stakeholders into the activities authorized under this title; and

''(4) promoting the wide dissemination and utilization, consistent with section 114(j), of all information, products, and publications of the Institute.''.

SEC. 186. AUTHORITY TO PUBLISH.

Section 186(b) (20 U.S.C. 9576) is amended by striking ''any information to be published under this section before publication'' and inserting ''publications under this section before the public release of such publications''.

SEC. 187. REPEALS.

(a) REPEALS.—Sections 187 (20 U.S.C. 9577) and 193 (20 U.S.C. 9583) are repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents in section 1 of the Act of November 5, 2002 (Public Law 107–279; 116 Stat. 1940) is amended by striking the items relating to sections 187 and 193.

SEC. 188. FELLOWSHIPS.

Section 189 (20 U.S.C. 9579) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''and the mission of each National Education Center authorized under this title'' after ''related to education''; and

(2) by striking ''historically Black colleges and universities'' and inserting ''minority-serving institutions''.

SEC. 189. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 194 (20 U.S.C. 9584) is amended—

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

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to administer and carry out this title (except part E)—

''(1) for fiscal year 2015, $337,343,000;

''(2) for fiscal year 2016, $338,017,686;

''(3) for fiscal year 2017, $345,454,075;

''(4) for fiscal year 2018, $353,744,974;

''(5) for fiscal year 2019, $363,296,087; and

''(6) for fiscal year 2020, $368,745,528.''.

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) RESERVATIONS.—Of the amounts appropriated under subsection (a) for each fiscal year—

''(1) not less than the amount provided to the National Center for Education Statistics (as such Center was in existence on the day before the date of enactment of the Strengthening Education through Research Act) for fiscal year 2014 shall be provided to the National Center for Education Statistics, as authorized under part C; and

''(2) not more than the lesser of 2 percent of such funds or $2,000,000 shall be made available to carry out section 116 (relating to the National Board for Education Sciences).''.

TITLE II—EDUCATIONAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 201. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002 (20 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.).

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

Section 202 (20 U.S.C. 9601) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1), the following:

''(2) SCHOOL LEADER.—The term 'school leader' has the meaning given the term in section 102.''.

SEC. 203. COMPREHENSIVE CENTERS.

Section 203 (20 U.S.C. 9602)—

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

''(a) AUTHORIZATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), the Secretary is authorized to award not more than 17 grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to eligible applicants to establish comprehensive centers.

''(2) MISSION.—The mission of the comprehensive centers is to provide State educational agencies and local educational agencies technical assistance, analysis, and training to build their capacity in implementing the requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) and other Federal education laws, and research-based practices.

''(3) REGIONS.—In awarding grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under paragraph (1), the Secretary—

''(A) shall establish at least one comprehensive center for each of the 10 geographic regions served by the regional educational laboratories established under section 941(h) of the Educational Research, Development, Dissemination, and Improvement Act of 1994 (as such provision existed on the day before the date of enactment of this Act); and

''(B) may establish additional comprehensive centers—

''(i) for one or more of the regions described in subparagraph (A); or

''(ii) to serve the Nation as a whole by providing technical assistance on a particular content area of importance to the Nation, as determined by the Secretary with the advice of the regional advisory committees established under section 206(a).

''(4) NATION.—In the case of a comprehensive center established to serve the Nation as described in paragraph (3)(B)(ii), the Nation shall be considered to be a region served by such Center.

''(5) AWARD PERIOD.—A grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under this section may be awarded, on a competitive basis, for a period of not more than 5 years.

''(6) RESPONSIVENESS.—The Secretary shall ensure that each comprehensive center established under this section has the ability to respond in a timely fashion to the needs of State educational agencies and local educational agencies, including through using the results of the center's interim evaluation under section 204(c), to improve and modify the activities of the center before the end of the award period.'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting '', contracts, or cooperative agreements'' after ''Grants'';

(ii) by striking ''research organizations, institutions, agencies, institutions of higher education,'' and inserting ''public or private, nonprofit or for-profit research organizations, other organizations, or institutions of higher education,'';

(iii) by striking '', or individuals,'';

(iv) by striking ''subsection (f)'' and inserting ''subsection (e)''; and

(v) by striking '', including regional'' and all that follows through ''107–110))''; and

(B) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting the following:

''(2) OUTREACH.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In conducting competitions for grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under this section, the Secretary shall—

''(i) by making widely available information and technical assistance relating to the competition, actively encourage eligible applicants to compete for such awards; and

''(ii) seek input from chief executive officers of States, chief State school officers, educators, parents, superintendents, and other individuals with knowledge of the needs of the regions to be served by the awards, regarding—

''(I) the needs in the regions for technical assistance authorized under this title; and

''(II) how such needs may be addressed most effectively.

''(B) REGIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—The individuals described in subparagraph (A)(ii) may include members of the regional advisory committees established under section 206(a).

''(3) PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT.—Before awarding a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under this section, the Secretary shall establish measurable performance indicators to be used to assess the ongoing progress and performance of the comprehensive centers to be established under this title that address—

''(A) paragraphs (1) through (3) of the performance management system described in section 185; and

''(B) the relevant results of the regional assessments under section 206(e).

''(4) REQUIRED CONSIDERATION.—In determining whether to award a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under this section to an eligible applicant that previously established a comprehensive center under this section, the Secretary shall consider the results of such center's summative evaluation under section 204(b).

''(5) CONTINUATION OF AWARDS.—

''(A) CONTINUATION OF AWARDS.—The Secretary shall continue awards made to each eligible applicant for the support of comprehensive centers established under this section prior to the date of enactment of the Strengthening Education through Research Act, as such awards were in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Strengthening Education through Research Act, for the duration of those awards, in accordance with the terms and agreements of such awards.

''(B) RECOMPETITION.—Not later than the end of the period of the awards described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall—

''(i) hold a competition to make grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under this section to eligible applicants, which may include eligible applicants that held awards described in subparagraph (A); and

''(ii) in determining whether to select an eligible applicant that held an award described in subparagraph (A) for an award under clause (i) of this subparagraph, consider the results of the summative evaluation under section 204(b) of the center established with the eligible applicant's award described in subparagraph (A).

''(6) ELIGIBLE APPLICANT DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'eligible applicant' means an entity described in paragraph (1).'';

(3) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

''(c) APPLICATIONS.—

''(1) SUBMISSION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible applicant seeking a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under this section shall submit an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such additional information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

''(B) INPUT.—To ensure that applications submitted under this paragraph are reflective of the needs of the regions to be served, each eligible applicant submitting such an application shall seek input from State educational agencies and local educational agencies in the region that the award will serve, and other individuals with knowledge of the region's needs. Such individuals may include members of the regional advisory committee for the region under section 206(a).

''(2) PLAN.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each application submitted under paragraph (1) shall contain a plan for the comprehensive center to be established under this section, which shall be updated, modified, and improved, as appropriate, on an ongoing basis, including by using the results of the center's interim evaluation under section 204(c).

''(B) CONTENTS.—A plan described in subparagraph (A) shall address—

''(i) the priorities for technical assistance established under section 207;

''(ii) the needs of State educational agencies and local educational agencies, on an ongoing basis, using available State and local data, including the relevant results of the regional assessments under section 206(e); and

''(iii) if available, demonstrated support from State educational agencies and local educational agencies, such as letters of support or signed memoranda of understanding.

''(3) NON-FEDERAL SUPPORT.—In conducting a competition for grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under subsection (a), the Secretary shall give priority to eligible applicants that will provide a portion of non-Federal funds to maximize support for activities of the comprehensive centers to be established under this section.'';

(4) in subsection (d), by inserting ''the number of low-performing schools in the region,'' after ''economically disadvantaged students,'';

(5) by striking subsection (e) and redesignating subsections (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (e), (f), and (g), respectively;

(6) in subsection (e), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''support dissemination and technical assistance activities by'' and inserting ''support State educational agencies and local educational agencies, including by'';

(ii) in subparagraph (A)(i), by inserting ''and other Federal education laws'' before the semicolon;

(iii) in subparagraph (A)(ii)—

(I) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking ''and assessment tools'' and inserting '', assessment tools, and other educational strategies'';

(II) in subclause (I), by striking ''mathematics, science,'' and inserting ''mathematics and science, which may include computer science or engineering,''; and

(III) in subclause (III), by inserting '', including innovative tools and methods'' before the semicolon;

(iv) by striking subparagraph (A)(iii) and inserting the following:

''(iii) the replication and adaptation of exemplary practices and innovative methods that have an evidence base of effectiveness; and'';

(v) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by inserting '', consistent with section 114(j),'' after ''disseminating''; and

(II) by striking ''(as described'' and all that follows through ''is located''; and

(vi) by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

''(C) ensuring activities carried out under this section are relevant and responsive to the needs of the region being served, including by using the relevant results of the regional assessments under section 206(e).''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting '', on an ongoing basis,'' after ''this section shall''; and

(ii) by inserting ''or other regional educational laboratories or comprehensive centers, as appropriate,'' after ''center is located,''; and

(7) by amending subsections (f) and (g), as each so redesignated, to read as follows:

''(f) COMPREHENSIVE CENTER ADVISORY BOARD.—A comprehensive center established under this section may establish an advisory board to support and monitor the priorities and activities of such center. An advisory board established under this subsection shall coordinate and align its work with the work of the regional advisory committee of the region served by such center established under section 206.

''(g) REPORT TO THE SECRETARY.—Each comprehensive center established under this section shall submit to the Secretary an annual report, at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, which shall include the following:

''(1) A summary of the center's activities and products developed during the previous year.

''(2) A listing of the State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools the center assisted during the previous year.

''(3) Using the measurable performance indicators established under subsection (b)(3), a description of how well the center is meeting educational needs of the region served by the center.

''(4) Any changes to the center's plan under subsection (c)(2) to improve its activities in the remaining years of the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement.''.

SEC. 204. EVALUATIONS.

Section 204 (20 U.S.C. 9603) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 204. EVALUATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

''(1) provide for ongoing summative and interim evaluations described in subsections (b) and (c), respectively, of each of the comprehensive centers established under this title in carrying out the full range of duties of the center under this title; and

''(2) transmit the results of such evaluations, through appropriate means, to the appropriate congressional committees, the Director of the Institute of Education Sciences, and the public.

''(b) SUMMATIVE EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall ensure each comprehensive center established under this title is evaluated by an independent entity at the end of the period of the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement that established such center, which shall—

''(1) be completed in a timely fashion;

''(2) assess how well the center is meeting the measurable performance indicators established under section 203(b)(3); and

''(3) consider the extent to which the center ensures that the technical assistance of such center is relevant and useful to the work of State and local practitioners and policymakers.

''(c) INTERIM EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall ensure that each comprehensive center established under this title is evaluated at the midpoint of the period of the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement that established such center, which shall—

''(1) assess how well such center is meeting the measurable performance indicators established under section 203(b)(3); and

''(2) be used to improve the effectiveness of such center in carrying out its plan under section 203(c)(2).''.

SEC. 205. EXISTING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDERS.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 205 (20 U.S.C. 9604) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1 of the Act of November 5, 2002 (Public Law 107–279; 116 Stat. 1940) is amended by striking the item relating to section 205.

SEC. 206. REGIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES.

Section 206 (20 U.S.C. 9605) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''Beginning in 2004, the'' and inserting ''The''; and

(B) by striking ''of the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002'';

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

(3) by inserting the following after subsection (a):

''(b) MISSION.—The mission of each regional advisory committee established under subsection (a) shall be to—

''(1) support, strengthen, and, as appropriate, align the work of the regional educational laboratories established under section 174 and the comprehensive centers established under this title; and

''(2) ensure that the regional educational laboratories and comprehensive centers are meeting the needs of their regions.

''(c) DUTIES.—Each advisory committee established under subsection (a) shall—

''(1) conduct, on at least a biennial basis, a needs assessments of the region served by the committee, as described in subsection (e);

''(2) to ensure the activities of the regional educational laboratory and comprehensive centers serving the region of the committee are responsive to the needs of such region, provide ongoing input to the laboratory and centers on planning and carrying out their activities under section 174 and this title, respectively;

''(3) maintain a high standard of quality in the performance of the activities of the laboratory and centers, respectively; and

''(4) support the continuous improvement of the laboratory and centers in the region served by the committee, especially in meeting the measurable performance indicators established under sections 174(e)(4) and 203(b)(3), respectively.'';

(4) by amending subsection (d), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

''(d) MEMBERSHIP.—

''(1) COMPOSITION.—The membership of each regional advisory committee shall—

''(A) not exceed 25 members;

''(B) include the chief State school officer, or such officer's designee, or other State official, of States within the region of the committee who have primary responsibility under State law for elementary and secondary education in the State;

''(C) include representatives of local educational agencies, including rural and urban local educational agencies, that represent the geographic diversity of the region; and

''(D) include researchers.

''(2) ELIGIBILITY.—The membership of each regional advisory committee may include the following:

''(A) Representatives of institutions of higher education.

''(B) Parents.

''(C) Practicing educators, including classroom teachers, school leaders, administrators, school board members, and other local school officials.

''(D) Representatives of business.

''(E) Policymakers.

''(F) Representatives from the regional educational laboratory and comprehensive centers in the region.

''(3) RECOMMENDATIONS.—In choosing individuals for membership on a regional advisory committee, the Secretary shall consult with, and solicit recommendations from, the chief executive officers of States, chief State school officers, local educational agencies, and other education stakeholders within the applicable region.

''(4) SPECIAL RULE.—The total number of members on each committee who are selected under subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1), in the aggregate, shall exceed the total number of members who are selected under paragraph (2), collectively.'';

(5) in subsection (e), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting '', at least on a biennial basis,'' after ''assess''; and

(ii) by inserting '', strengths, and weaknesses'' after ''educational needs'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''State school officers,'' and all that follows through ''within the region)'' and inserting ''State school officers, local educational agencies, representatives of public charter schools, educators, parents, and others within the region'';

(ii) by striking ''of the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 and section 203 of this title'' and inserting ''and section 203''; and

(iii) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(C) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4);

(D) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

''(3) use available State and local data, consistent with privacy protections under section 183, to determine regional educational needs; and''.

SEC. 207. PRIORITIES.

Section 207 (20 U.S.C. 9606) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''Director and'' before ''Secretary shall establish'';

(2) by striking ''of the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002'';

(3) by striking ''of this title'';

(4) by striking ''to address, taking onto account'' and inserting '', respectively, using the results of''; and

(5) by striking ''relevant regional'' and all that follows through ''Secretary deems appropriate'' and inserting ''relevant regional and national surveys of educational needs''.

SEC. 208. GRANT PROGRAM FOR STATEWIDE LONGITUDINAL DATA SYSTEMS.

Section 208 (20 U.S.C. 9607) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following: ''State educational agencies receiving a grant under this section may provide subgrants to local educational agencies to improve the capacity of local educational agencies to carry out the activities authorized under this section.'';

(2) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (d), (e), and (g), respectively;

(3) by inserting after subsection (b), the following:

''(c) PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT.—Before awarding a grant under this section, the Secretary shall establish measurable performance indicators—

''(1) to be used to assess the ongoing progress and performance of State educational agencies receiving a grant under this section; and

''(2) that address paragraphs (1) through (3) of the performance management system described in section 185.'';

(4) in subsection (d), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking '', promotes linkages across States,'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting ''supports school improvement and'' after ''data that'';

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and other reporting requirements and close achievement gaps; and'' and inserting '', other reporting requirements, close achievement gaps, and improve teaching;'';

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and close achievement gaps'' and by inserting '', close achievement gaps, and improve teaching''; and

(iv) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) to align statewide longitudinal data systems from early education through postsecondary education (including pre-service preparation programs), and the workforce, consistent with privacy protections under section 183;''; and

(C) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) ensures the protection of student privacy, and includes a review of how State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and others that will have access to the statewide data systems under this section will adhere to Federal privacy laws and protections, consistent with section 183, in the building, maintenance, and use of such data systems;

''(4) ensures State educational agencies receiving a grant under this section support professional development that builds the capacity of teachers and school leaders to use data effectively; and

''(5) gives priority to State educational agencies that leverage the use of longitudinal data systems to improve student achievement and growth, including such State educational agencies that—

''(A) meet the voluntary standards and guidelines described in section 153(a)(5);

''(B) define the roles of State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and others in providing timely access to data under the statewide data systems, consistent with privacy protections in section 183; and

''(C) demonstrate the capacity to share teacher and school leader performance data, including student achievement and growth data, with local educational agencies and teacher and school leader preparation programs.'';

(5) by inserting after subsection (e), as so redesignated, the following:

''(f) RENEWAL OF AWARDS.—The Secretary may renew a grant awarded to a State educational agency under this section for a period not to exceed 3 years, if the State educational agency has demonstrated progress on the measurable performance indicators established under subsection (c).''; and

(6) by amending subsection (g), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

''(g) REPORTS.—

''(1) FIRST REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Strengthening Education through Research Act, the Secretary shall prepare and make publicly available a report on the implementation and effectiveness of the activities carried out by State educational agencies receiving a grant under this section, including—

''(A) information on progress in the development and use of statewide longitudinal data systems described in this section;

''(B) information on best practices and areas for improvement in such development and use; and

''(C) how the State educational agencies are adhering to Federal privacy laws and protections in the building, maintenance, and use of such data systems.

''(2) SUCCEEDING REPORTS.—Every succeeding 3 years after the report is made publicly available under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall prepare and make publicly available a report on the implementation and effectiveness of the activities carried out by State educational agencies receiving a grant under this section, including—

''(A) information on the requirements of subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (1); and

''(B) the progress, in the aggregate, State educational agencies are making on the measurable performance indicators established under subsection (c).''.

SEC. 209. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 209 (20 U.S.C. 9608) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 209. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title—

''(1) for fiscal year 2015, $82,984,000;

''(2) for fiscal year 2016, $83,149,968;

''(3) for fiscal year 2017, $84,979,268;

''(4) for fiscal year 2018, $87,018,769;

''(5) for fiscal year 2019, $89,368,277; and

''(6) for fiscal year 2020, $90,708,801.''.

TITLE III—NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS

SEC. 301. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the National Assessment of Educational Progress Authorization Act (20 U.S.C. 9621 et seq.).

SEC. 302. NATIONAL ASSESSMENT GOVERNING BOARD.

Section 302 (20 U.S.C. 9621) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''shall formulate policy guidelines'' and inserting ''shall oversee and set policies, in a manner consistent with subsection (e) and accepted professional standards,'';

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(L)—

(A) by striking ''principals'' and inserting ''leaders''; and

(B) by striking ''principal'' both places it appears and inserting ''leader'';

(3) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph (4);

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''the Assessment Board after consultation with'' before ''organizations''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking ''Each organization submitting nominations to the Secretary with'' and inserting ''With''; and

(II) by inserting '', the Assessment Board'' after ''particular vacancy''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''that each organization described in paragraph (1)(A) submit additional nominations'' and inserting ''additional nominations from the Assessment Board or each organization described in paragraph (1)(A)''; and

(ii) by striking ''such organization'' and inserting ''the Assessment Board''; and

(5) in subsection (e)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by inserting ''in consultation with the Commissioner for Education Statistics,'' before ''select'';

(ii) by inserting ''and grades or ages'' before ''to be''; and

(iii) by inserting '', and determine the year in which such assessments will be conducted'' after ''assessed'';

(B) in subparagraph (D), by inserting ''school leaders,'' after ''teachers,'';

(C) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''design'' and inserting ''provide input on'';

(D) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (I);

(E) by redesignating subparagraph (J) as subparagraph (K);

(F) by inserting after subparagraph (I), the following:

''(J) provide input to the Director on annual budget requests for the National Assessment of Educational Progress; and'';

(G) in subparagraph (K), as so redesignated—

(i) by striking ''plan and execute the initial public release of''; and

(ii) by inserting ''release the initial'' before ''National''; and

(H) in the matter following subparagraph (K), as so amended and redesignated, by striking ''subparagraph (J)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (K)''.

SEC. 303. NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS.

Section 303 (20 U.S.C. 9622) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''with the advice of the Assessment Board established under section 302'' and inserting ''in a manner consistent with accepted professional standards and the policies set forth by the Assessment Board under section 302(a)'';

(2) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (D), by inserting ''and consistent with section 302(e)(1)(A)'' after ''resources allow'';

(B) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (G);

(C) by striking the period and inserting ''; and'' at the end of subparagraph (H); and

(D) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(I) determine, after taking into account section 302(e)(1)(I), the content of initial and subsequent reports of all assessments authorized under this section and ensure that such reports are valid and reliable.'';

(3) in subsection (c)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''of Education'' after ''Secretary''; and

(B) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by striking ''Chairman of the House'' before ''Committee on Education'';

(ii) by inserting ''of the House of Representatives'' after ''Workforce'';

(iii) by striking ''Chairman of the Senate'' before ''Committee on Health''; and

(iv) by inserting ''of the Senate'' after ''Pensions'';

(4) in subsection (d)(1), by inserting before the period, the following: '', except as required under section 1112(b)(1)(F) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6312(b)(1)(F))'';

(5) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''or age''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking ''shall'' and all that follows through ''be'' and insert ''shall be'';

(II) by redesignating subclauses (I) and (II) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively (and by moving the margins 2 ems to the left); and

(III) in clause (ii) (as so redesignated), by striking '', or the age of the students, as the case may be'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking ''After the determinations described in subparagraph (A), devising'' and inserting ''The Assessment Board shall, in making the determination described in subparagraph (A), use''; and

(II) by inserting after ''approach'' the following: '', providing for the active participation of teachers, school leaders, curriculum specialists, local school administrators, parents, and concerned members of the general public''; and

(iii) in subparagraph (D), by inserting ''Assessment'' before ''Board''; and

(6) in subsection (g)(2)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''AFFAIRS'' and inserting ''EDUCATION''; and

(B) by striking ''Affairs'' and inserting ''Education''.

SEC. 304. DEFINITIONS.

Section 304 (20 U.S.C. 9623) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''(1)'' and inserting ''(1) DIRECTOR.—'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''(2)'' and inserting ''(2) STATE.—''; and

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) (as so amended) as paragraphs (2) and (5), respectively;

(4) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated) the following new paragraph:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The terms 'elementary school', 'local educational agency', and 'secondary school' have the meanings given those terms in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).''; and

(5) by inserting after paragraph (2) (as so redesignated), the following new paragraphs:

''(3) SCHOOL LEADER.—The term 'school leader' has the meaning given the term in section 102.

''(4) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Education.''.

SEC. 305. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 305(a) (20 U.S.C. 9624(a)) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated—

''(1) for fiscal year 2015—

''(A) $8,235,000 to carry out section 302 (relating to the National Assessment Governing Board); and

''(B) $132,000,000 to carry out section 303 (relating to the National Assessment of Educational Progress);

''(2) for fiscal year 2016—

''(A) $8,251,470 to carry out section 302 (relating to the National Assessment Governing Board); and

''(B) $132,264,000 to carry out section 303 (relating to the National Assessment of Educational Progress);

''(3) for fiscal year 2017—

''(A) $8,433,002 to carry out section 302 (relating to the National Assessment Governing Board); and

''(B) $135,173,808 to carry out section 303 (relating to the National Assessment of Educational Progress);

''(4) for fiscal year 2018—

''(A) $8,635,395 to carry out section 302 (relating to the National Assessment Governing Board); and

''(B) $138,417,979 to carry out section 303 (relating to the National Assessment of Educational Progress);

''(5) for fiscal year 2019—

''(A) $8,868,550 to carry out section 302 (relating to the National Assessment Governing Board); and

''(B) $142,155,266 to carry out section 303 (relating to the National Assessment of Educational Progress); and

''(6) for fiscal year 2020—

''(A) $9,001,578 to carry out section 302 (relating to the National Assessment Governing Board); and

''(B) $144,287,595 to carry out section 303 (relating to the National Assessment of Educational Progress).''.

TITLE IV—EVALUATION PLAN

SEC. 401. RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Institute of Education Sciences shall be the primary entity for conducting research on and evaluations of Federal education programs within the Department of Education to ensure the rigor

and independence of such research and evaluation.

(b) FLEXIBLE AUTHORITY.—

(1) RESERVATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. et seq. 6301 et seq.) related to evaluation, the Secretary of Education, in consultation with the Director of the Institute of Education Sciences—

(A) may, for purposes of carrying out the activities described in paragraph (2)(B)—

(i) reserve not more than 0.5 percent of the total amount of funds appropriated for each program authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.), other than part A of title I of such Act (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq.) and section 1501 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 6491); and

(ii) reserve, in the manner described in subparagraph (B), an amount equal to not more than 0.1 percent of the total amount of funds appropriated for—

(I) part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq.); and

(II) section 1501 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 6491); and

(B) in reserving the amount described in subparagraph (A)(ii)—

(i) shall reserve up to the total amount of funds appropriated for section 1501 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6491); and

(ii) may, in a case in which the total amount of funds appropriated for such section 1501 (20 U.S.C. 6491) is less than the amount described in subparagraph (A)(ii), reserve the amount of funds appropriated for part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq.) that is needed for the sum of the total amount of funds appropriated for such section 1501 (20 U.S.C. 6491) and such amount of funds appropriated for such part A of title I (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq.) to equal the amount described in subparagraph (A)(ii).

(2) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—If funds are reserved under paragraph (1)—

(A) neither the Secretary of Education nor the Director of the Institute of Education Sciences shall—

(i) carry out evaluations under section 1501 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6491); or

(ii) reserve funds for evaluation activities under section 3111(c)(1)(C) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 6821); and

(B) the Secretary of Education, in consultation with the Director of the Institute of Education Sciences—

(i) shall use the funds reserved under paragraph (1) to carry out high-quality evaluations (consistent with the requirements of section 173(a) of the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 (20 U.S.C. 9563(a)), as amended by this Act, and the evaluation plan described in subsection (c) of this section) of programs authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.); and

(ii) may use the funds reserved under paragraph (1) to—

(I) increase the usefulness of the evaluations conducted under clause (i) to promote continuous improvement of programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.); or

(II) assist grantees of such programs in collecting and analyzing data and other activities related to conducting high-quality evaluations under clause (i).

(3) DISSEMINATION.—The Secretary of Education or the Director of the Institute of Education Sciences shall disseminate evaluation findings, consistent with section 114(j) of the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 (20 U.S.C. 9514(j)), as amended by this Act, of evaluations carried out under paragraph (2)(B)(i).

(4) CONSOLIDATION.—The Secretary of Education, in consultation with the Director of the Institute of Education Sciences—

(A) may consolidate the funds reserved under paragraph (1) for purposes of carrying out the activities under paragraph (2)(B); and

(B) shall not be required to evaluate under paragraph (2)(B)(i) each program authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) each year.

(c) EVALUATION PLAN.—The Director of the Institute of Education Sciences, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, shall, on a biennial basis, develop, submit to Congress, and make publicly available an evaluation plan, that—

(1) describes the specific activities that will be carried out under subsection (b)(2)(B) for the 2-year period applicable to the plan, and the timelines of such activities;

(2) contains the results of the activities carried out under subsection (b)(2)(B) for the most recent 2-year period; and

(3) describes how programs authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) will be regularly evaluated.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect section 173(b) of the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 (20 U.S.C. 9563(b)), as amended by this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4366.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of the Strengthening Education Through Research Act, legislation to improve the quality and usefulness of education research.

Mr. Speaker, more than a decade ago, Congress approved the Education Sciences Reform Act, legislation that established the Institute of Education Sciences to gather information on education progress, conduct research on education practices in schools, and evaluate the effectiveness of Federal education programs and initiatives.

Like many of my colleagues, I believe the Federal Government's role in education needs to be significantly reduced. And that is why we passed the Student Success Act last summer, comprehensive education reform legislation that will actually shrink the Federal footprint in the classroom and return control to the parents, the teachers, and community leaders who, in fact, know our children best. In fact, I would challenge anyone here on the floor to say that any person or bureaucrat in the Department of Education knows our kids better than their own teachers, parents, and the local taxpayer.

So while we continue to await Senate action on the Student Success Act, we have additional opportunities now to act on commonsense proposals that will make the Federal role in education more effective and efficient. The research produced by the Institute sheds critical light on how taxpayer dollars are being used in our education system and can provide important information on what is and is not working in our schools.

Mr. Speaker, the Strengthening Education Through Research Act will improve education research, protect taxpayers by enhancing program accountability, and help ensure more schools and students can benefit from effective education practices.

This law provides information that helps States and school districts identify successful education practices and allows taxpayers and congressional leaders to monitor the Federal investment in education. However, the Education Sciences Reform Act is overdue for reform, with several weaknesses in the law that must be addressed now.

For example, according to a report by the Government Accountability Office, the Institute does not always properly evaluate the effectiveness of its programs and research arms. So we run into an issue where we could be throwing good money after bad, and that needs to stop. It could lead to unnecessary costs and redundancies, something we must be particularly wary of in these times of fiscal restraint. Additionally, although the Institute has dramatically improved the quality of education research in recent years, there is often a significant delay in disseminating key data and findings to education leaders nationwide. What good does it do for us to pay to conduct this research, to collect the data, but fail to disseminate it so it can be used?

The Supporting Education Through Research Act will address these weaknesses and help school leaders access more timely, more relevant, and useful information on the most effective educational practices. It is called transparency, Mr. Speaker, and that is good for the students, it is good for the teachers, it is good for the parents, and it is good for the taxpayers. It is good for all of us.

First, H.R. 4366 will enhance the relevancy of education research, ensuring teachers, students, parents, and policymakers can access and actually use more useful information about what is successful, what is working and what isn't.

Second, the legislation will take steps to streamline the education research system and reduce overlap and duplicative research efforts. Now, this bill will also require the Institute to regularly evaluate its research and review the efficacy of Federal education programs, ensuring taxpayer resources are being put to good use.

Finally, H.R. 4366 will ensure that the Institute and the National Assessment Governing Board, which administers the Nation's Report Card, remain autonomous entities that are free from political influence and bias. Unfortunately, that political influence and bias exists in our education system and could exist in our research arms if we don't, as Congress, make clear what is expected of them.

Not only does this legislation help teachers, school leaders, and State and local governments, it also helps families. Families, particularly military families, can change school districts several times during their child's education. Our experience with the free market tells us that informed consumers are, in fact, the best consumers and the best-protected consumers.

□ 1900

As consumers of education, families deserve the best information possible in making decisions regarding their child's education.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Strengthening Education Through Research Act will improve education research, protect taxpayers by enhancing program accountability, and help ensure more schools and students can benefit from effective education practices.

I urge my colleagues to support the Strengthening Education Through Research Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY), who is the lead author on the Democratic side on this legislation.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Ranking Member MILLER for allowing me to speak in support of this important bipartisan legislation.

First, I want to take a moment and also thank my good friend, Mr. ROKITA, for his great work and leadership on behalf of our students and the educational system. It has been a pleasure working with you, sir.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4366, the Strengthening Education Through Research Act. Now, I firmly believe that, in order to successfully prepare our students for the workforce, our Nation's educators must be able to identify and have access to successful and proven techniques.

In 2002, I proudly supported the passage of the Education Sciences Reform Act which, among other things, ensured that education research be conducted free of political bias and focus on improving student achievement.

Last year, the Government Accountability Office released a report highlighting the successes of the law, but also detailed several areas that could be improved to better impact outcomes for our students.

Today, along with Mr. ROKITA, we have built upon the success of that bill through H.R. 4366. The Strengthening Education Through Research Act is a perfect example of what bipartisanship and a commitment to good government can yield, and I am proud to support this legislation today.

The bill improves, among other things, the quality of education research by enhancing the timeless and relevancy of research, limiting duplication and overlap, improving accountability, and refocusing our commitment to equity in education for our most vulnerable student populations.

The bill also provides critical funding to strengthen special education research, which has been unfairly cut in recent years.

Moreover, the bill meets one of my top priorities by reaffirming a Federal commitment to States and localities to provide teachers, principals, and educational leaders with the latest research products to improve educational equity and effectiveness for students without bias.

Especially under difficult budgetary circumstances, this Congress has an obligation to explore opportunities that will most effectively deliver results for our students and our taxpayers, and this bill does just that.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4366, as it represents another strong step toward improving our Nation's educational landscape and preparing our students with the necessary skills to compete in the global economy.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Indiana for his leadership on this bill. I also want to thank my colleague from New York, Representative MCCARTHY, for her leadership on this bill.

One of the most important assets that we have in education is our teachers, but our teachers need proven tools. That is why we are here today. This bill is about making sure that we are providing best practices, data-based tools, in terms of teaching methods.

The Strengthening Education Through Research Act seeks to bolster one of our most fundamental education priorities—improving outcomes and raising student achievement.

In 2002, Congress passed the Education Sciences Reform Act, establishing the Institute of Education Sciences, which is responsible for gathering data on educational best practices in the Nation's schools. The intent of the law was to enable States and school districts to identify and improve upon successful education practices.

Although IES has meaningfully improved the quality of education research over the last decade, it also faces shortcomings, one being the significant delay in disseminating key data and findings to local education stakeholders, especially in more rural areas of the country.

Despite the law's successes, improvements can and must be made, and that is the business we are about here this evening. The Strengthening Education Through Research Act reforms our Federal research structure so that States, local school districts, parents, and policymakers have greater access to data—data that is better organized, more reliable, and more useful for our local schools and communities.

As a member of the House Education Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bipartisan reauthorization.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of this bill, so that we can fulfill the Federal Government's commitment to provide States and localities with the latest and best available evidence-based research in a timely fashion.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the subcommittee chairman, Mr. ROKITA, for bringing this bill to the floor, and to Congresswoman MCCARTHY, the ranking member on the subcommittee, for all of their effort to make sure that this legislation was considered in this session of Congress.

The Strengthening Education Through Research Act, SETRA, bolsters education research in a way that benefits both students and teachers. Congress passed the Education Sciences Reform Act, commonly known as ESRA, in 2002 to strengthen the quality and rigor of education research.

Twelve years later, we have a wealth of information that can be used to determine what is working for students, make corrections, and drive long-lasting improvements; but research is not effective if it stays locked in computer files or is only published in abstract trade journals. Research must be relevant, timely, and useful. It must be used to solve real problems faced by students and teachers.

I am pleased that this legislation will address this challenge, making education research more valuable. At the same time, it will ensure that research remains accurate, rigorous, and scientific.

I am also pleased SETRA increases the Federal investment in education research. In particular, our teachers need better actionable research on educating students with disabilities.

To address that need, SETRA includes a large increase in the funding of special education research, helping to make up for the devastating cuts in 2011.

The historic Federal role in education is protecting and promoting equity. SETRA maintains that commitment in three key ways. This bill keeps a laserlike focus on closing the achievement gap and ensuring that all students obtain a high-quality education.

The bill ensures that we collect data such as graduation rates and student achievement, but also vital information on school climate, student safety

and discipline, and student access to great teachers. This bill helps States and school districts use data systems to improve teaching and learning.

Mr. Speaker, I have often said that we, in the Federal Government, must get back to partnering with schools to improve students' lives. I am proud to say that this legislation takes a solid step in that direction, providing research that helps teachers and schools improve the student learning environment.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation. Again, I want to thank Mr. ROKITA for bringing this legislation to the floor.

Before I yield the floor, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment of this debate time that has been allocated to pay tribute and say thank you to Jeremy Ayers of our staff, who will be leaving the committee at the end of this month.

This is Jeremy sitting right here, in case anybody didn't know who he was. Bring the cameras in a little closer.

Jeremy skillfully managed the negotiations on the bill before us today and led the committee work on education technology, accountability in elementary, and secondary education and oversight in the administration's waiver policy, among other issues.

Jeremy is a strong advocate of what is best in the interest of students and has always maintained a focus on equity and civil rights. His humor and quick wit were always a welcomed addition to what sometimes can be hard and tedious policy work.

Jeremy has been a valued policy adviser and member of our education team, and he will be missed by the committee members on both sides of the aisle and all of his colleagues.

Thank you, Jeremy, for all of your service to our committee and to our education establishment in this country.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I would also like to recognize Jeremy and thank him for his service and hope that I wasn't the subject of any of that quick wit during the time I was chairman.

I also thank Congressman MILLER for the work he has done on this bill and the bill yet to come tonight, as well as his general leadership on the committee. It is appreciated. From a newer guy on the other side of the aisle, he is someone who I respect and I am going to miss a lot.

I also want to thank Mrs. MCCARTHY for her work and leadership on elementary and secondary education issues generally and for her service on the committee. I know she cares about these issues, particularly improving education options for women.

She has been a joy to work with as ranking member on the subcommittee through the easy issues and, frankly, through some of the harder ones. As a newer member and, frankly, a green chairman, I would often rely on the honest comment and the kind smile of CAROLYN MCCARTHY and would simply say that if more of us did that, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, more work like the bill we are discussing right now would get done in Congress.

One of the top priorities of this Congress—certainly one of my top priorities is helping people to build better lives for themselves and their families, whether that is through more flexible work schedules, stronger job training programs, or smarter student loan terms, advancing commonsense policies that will make life work for more Americans is our primary goal.

The Strengthening Education through Research Act is part of this effort. In classrooms nationwide, teachers and school leaders need quality research to identify the best ways to raise student achievement and progress.

By passing the Strengthening Education through Research Act today, we can help these educators gain access to the timely and useful information necessary to raise student achievement levels across the board.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 4366.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, Education policy suffers because policy maker were all once students themselves. As a result, they think they know what works and how students learn. The best antidote for self-serving, self-centered policy makers is evidence. Evidence has a way of puncturing the statements and paradigms of misguided, but well-meaning policy makers. The Strengthening Education through Research Act (SETRA) would produce rigorous, relevant, and useful evidence. Rigorous in that it mandates education research uses good methodology and a peer review process. Relevant in that it speaks to today's education issues that teachers and students face in urban, suburban, and rural schools. Useful in that teachers, principals, schools, and states can use the research to improve instruction and student achievement.

Additionally, SETRA increases the emphasis school districts and states should place on longitudinal data systems as a way to improve instruction. Efforts to create P–20 data systems that link early learning with professional outcomes will help gather the data necessary to help teachers improve student learning and help states prioritize investments in impactful initiatives.

I strongly support SETRA and urge my colleagues to voice their support as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4366, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUCCESS AND OPPORTUNITY THROUGH QUALITY CHARTER SCHOOLS ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 10.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 576 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 10.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1913

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to amend the Charter School Program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, with Mr. BISHOP of Utah in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 45 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and rise today in strong support of the Success and Opportunity through Quality Charter Schools Act, legislation that will support the growth and expansion of successful charter schools.

Mr. Chairman, for many children and their parents, charter schools are a beacon of hope for a better education and a better life. The schools are extraordinarily in demand.

Wait lists for charter schools have grown steadily in recent years, with more than 1 million students' names on wait lists for the 2013–2014 school year.

□ 1915

Charter schools have a proven track record of success, encouraging higher academic achievement in even the most troubled school districts.

I recently had the opportunity to visit two impressive charter schools in my home State of Minnesota. At both of the schools, without exception, students were engaged, excited, and eager to learn. I know firsthand this is not a trend unique to charter schools in Minnesota. In fact, each time I visit quality charter schools, whether here in Washington, D.C., or in Prairie Lake, Minnesota, or even Harlem, New York, I have been amazed by the creative curriculum, the outstanding educators,

and the students' incredible progress. Clearly, these institutions are a valuable part of a successful education system.

However, the Federal Charter Schools Program is in need of key reforms to enhance access and ensure continued educational quality. That is why I partnered with my colleague, the senior Democrat on the House Education and the Workforce Committee, Mr. MILLER, to advance the success and opportunity through the Quality Charter Schools Act. This bipartisan legislation will encourage more States and families to embrace charter schools, while also including several provisions to urge these schools to reach out to special populations, including at-risk students, children with disabilities, and English learners.

The bill will streamline the Federal Charter Schools Program, while ensuring these institutions remain accountable to families and taxpayers. The bill also expands the allowable use of Federal resources to support not just new charter schools, as under current law, but also replication and expansion of successful charter schools.

Additionally, H.R. 10 will direct charter schools to share best practices with traditional public schools, helping to ensure school leaders are working together to implement successful education practices throughout the community.

Mr. Chairman, as we work to help more students access a quality education, we must support charter schools as a valuable alternative to failing public schools and work together to encourage their growth. This act is a commonsense proposal that will improve educational opportunities for students across the board and provide families with additional school choice options.

I am very pleased that members of the Education and the Workforce Committee have put their differences aside and worked through a very bipartisan process to develop an exceptional piece of legislation. I would like to thank members and staff for these efforts.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join with us in supporting legislation that can have a hugely positive effect on children nationwide.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 10.

I want to thank the chairman of the committee for all of his cooperation so we could arrive at this legislation to bring to the floor. I want to thank the staff on both sides of the aisle for all of the time that they spent negotiating this legislation. I am delighted that we are here tonight to consider it.

The Success and Opportunity Through Quality Charter Schools Act, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. I guess we will be voting tomorrow on it, to vote in support of the legislation.

My support of H.R. 10 is grounded in my commitment to our Nation's public schools and my firm belief that every child in every neighborhood deserves access to a high-quality public education.

This bipartisan legislation would take us one step closer to making the promise of quality public schools for every child a reality.

In many ways, the innovations coming out of the charter school sector are helping to disprove some of the false assumptions about kids who happen to be from the wrong ZIP Code. Charter schools continue to prove that all children, from any background, can succeed. H.R. 10 seeks to build on that success. It will expand opportunities for all children to benefit from charter school innovations.

Along with Chairman KLINE, I authored similar legislation last Congress. That legislation served as the basis for this bill which we are considering today and passed out of this Chamber with more than 360 votes.

I am pleased once again to collaborate with Chairman KLINE on this reauthorization of the Charter Schools Program. By working together, we have been able to produce a truly bipartisan bill that will bring much-needed improvements to the only Federal program that supports the startup of public charter schools.

This existing Federal program provides startup funding for public charter schools from States where the public charter schools are permitted that win a competitive grant.

While the Charter Schools Program is in a small, competitive funding stream that reaches a limited number of schools, the program can and should be used as a lever to ensure the quality within the charter school sector, drive collaboration between charter and noncharter public schools, improve State oversight of charter schools to make sure that every public school is equitably serving the most disadvantaged students.

H.R. 10 would refocus the Charter Schools Program to achieve these goals while recognizing and supporting the success of public charter schools. Much of that success comes from the autonomy and flexibility that charter schools have in implementing innovative curricula and instruction. The research is clear: Access to great schools, fantastic instruction, and a safe learning environment matters.

Thousands of public schools across the country, both charter and noncharter, are great schools supported by millions of wonderful educators. Unfortunately, some of our Nation's public schools, both charter and noncharter, fall short.

I have been working on this issue for a long time. For me, it isn't about the quantity of charter schools; it is about the quality of all public schools. Over the years, I have requested numerous GAO reports that examine activities of public charter schools to look at the quality of the services for students who are traditionally underserved, including those with disabilities and English language learners. The results have pointed to the flaws in the charter implementation that shortchanged disadvantaged students.

Our Federal investment in charters must help support and drive improvements in the charter sector. For example, in Denver, when the data showed a discrepancy in the charter school services for students with complex disabilities as compared to noncharters, the district leaders said, ''We can do better.'' Instead of pointing fingers and placing blame, the district leaders and charter leaders collaborated on bringing needed programs and support to students with complex disabilities to all Denver public schools, including the charter schools.

Federal dollars that support charter schools must incentivize this type of collaboration on behalf of our most vulnerable students. The improvements in the Charter Schools Program that are embodied in H.R. 10 would do just that. That is why groups such as National Council of Learning Disabilities and the Consortium of Citizens with Disabilities enthusiastically support this bill. No public school, charter or otherwise, gets a pass when it comes to serving all kids.

H.R. 10 would also ensure that our Federal investment in public charter schools supports only high-quality charters that are serving all students and have demonstrated that they are accountable to parents and communities.

H.R. 10 includes unprecedented quality controls and mechanisms to improve charter authorizing activity and oversight. It challenges States to support and transfer the best practices among all public schools in order to ensure that the benefits of charter schools are reaching all students, not just a few.

This isn't a debate about charter schools. Charter schools are here and they aren't going anywhere. This is about increasing the quality, the equity, and the transparency in the charter sector. The sector is vibrant, and it is now serving more than 2 million students in 42 States and the District of Columbia.

A ''yes'' vote on H.R. 10 is a vote for much-needed program improvements that will help ensure that the Federal dollars supporting public charter schools only flow to quality schools and that those schools live up to the promise of the equitable education of all students.

I urge you to join me, Mr. Chairman, in supporting this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, who has been doing yeoman's work not

only today in the furtherance of a better education for our Nation's children, but every day.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and the ranking member as well. Both the chairman and the ranking member have a great bill here, and it deserves the support of this entire body, in my humble opinion.

As chairman of the colloquially called K–12 Subcommittee on Education, it has been my high honor to travel throughout Indiana, and really across the country, to see our public school system, our public charter school system, and the entire framework of how our great American children are educated.

I have come to the conclusion early on, and it is the same one that the chairman and the ranking member have come to, that is, charter schools empower parents to play a more active role in their child's education. It opens doors for teachers to pioneer fresh teaching methods. Charter schools encourage State and local innovation. It helps students escape underperforming schools. The charter school program facilitates the establishment of high quality charter schools and it encourages choice, innovation, and excellence in education.

The current Charter Schools Program, however, does not support the funding for the replication and expansion of high-quality charter schools. The ranking member said it himself that charter schools are here to stay. And we are not about to have a debate over whether or not they should exist. They do. It is about the replication and expansion of them because they work.

This bill is a commonsense approach to updating the Charter Schools Program by streamlining multiple charter school programs, improving their quality, and promoting the growth of the charter schools sector at the State level. The bill also consolidates multiple funding streams and grant programs that support charter schools into the existing State grant program, eliminating a separate authorization for charter school facilities funding.

By consolidating the funding streams into the existing State charter school program, the bill removes authority from the Secretary of Education to pick winners and losers and control the growth of the charter school sector. This authority is placed largely in the hands of States, frankly, where it belongs in the first place.

The bill updates the Charter Schools Program to reflect the success and growth of the charter school movement. States are authorized to use funds under the program to support the replication and expansion of high-quality charter schools in addition to supporting new innovative charter school models.

Finally, Mr. Chair, I would say that this is not a new issue, in fact, this is not a new bill for us. This bill is very similar to charter school provisions included in H.R. 5, the Students Success Act, and to H.R. 2218, the Empowering Parents Through Quality Charter Schools Act, the latter of which passed the House by an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote 365–44.

So for all these reasons, I simply urge my colleagues to support H.R. 10.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

There is no more enthusiastic and informed advocate of public charter schools in this Congress than the gentleman from Colorado. I thank him for all of the work that he put in on both sides of the aisle, working with us to make the improvements in this legislation, and for his support of it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman and Mr. Ranking Member, thank you for the kind words.

I want to thank Chairman KLINE and Ranking Member MILLER for their hard work. Particularly in a week where this body has been divided over issues like Benghazi and Lois Lerner, how wonderful that we can come together around our most underserved kids and families to help extend the hope and opportunity of a quality charter school to more families.

Most Members of this House have already voted for the provisions of this bill. Substantially, a nearly identical bill was included in the Republican ESEA reauthorization, H.R. 5. All but 12 Republicans voted for that bill. Almost identical language was included in the Democratic substitute for ESEA reauthorization as well. Only two Democrats voted against that bill. The vast majority, everybody in this body, except for 14 people in this session, this 113th Congress, have voted for the provisions of this bill.

Those bills, the Democrat substitute and ESEA reauthorization, have an enormous gap between where they were. Democrats and Republicans had a different vision for accountability, the role of the Federal Government, so many issues within that. So why not take language that is nearly identical in both of those bills with regard to reauthorization of the Federal Charter Schools Program and combine it into a standalone bill that can actually pass this body and pass the Senate.

We have done enough of these one-party bills. I know when we were in the majority we did them as well, where the House acts, and we yell at the Senate for not acting; they act, and they yell at us for not acting. Here is a bill, Mr. Chairman, that, with a strong vote on the floor of the House, can send a message to the Senate that while perhaps we cannot agree on the entirety of ESEA reauthorization, yes, we can agree on upgrading the Federal Charter Schools Program first conceived in 1994 to the 2.0 version.

What does that mean, Mr. Chairman? What do these improvements in this bill mean? They are commonsense improvements. They are neither Republican nor Democratic. They simply make the bill better to make sure that our very limited Federal investment that we have, the limited resources we have, is spent and invested in a way to have the maximum possible outcome in ensuring that kids across the country have access to a quality public charter school.

For instance, rather than just supporting the formation of entirely new charter schools that are innovative, under this bill we now allow the funds to be used for expansion and replication of successful models, models that we know work, schools that we know work, schools that are transforming lives and restoring hope to families across our country if only they can expand, if only we can have more to serve kids.

We have also heard from our constituents across the country complaints that some charter schools perhaps don't serve enough special ed students or enough English language learners or enough free and reduced lunch students.

□ 1930

Under the old language of this authorization that we still have, charter schools that receive these funds are actually prevented from remedying that. They are not allowed to have anything other than a pure lottery with regard to determining their student composition.

What we now allow with this bill is a weighted lottery to give charter schools, in concert with their authorizing entity, the ability to make sure that they can serve the most at-risk kids, pursuant to their mission; they can serve special-needs kids, commensurate with the district averages; they can serve English language learners, and make sure that they can fulfill their mission, rather than have some of those students squeezed out by those who are in a better position to exercise their school choice because they are better informed and better connected.

The underlying bill improves charter school access and services for all students. It truly will help ensure that the limited Federal investment we have makes the biggest single difference for families across our country.

Mr. Chairman, public charter schools are simply public schools with site-based governance. Public charter schools are free to innovate when it comes to scheduling the learning day, uniforms, staffing, curriculum, and yet they are accountable for student outcomes, and this bill adds additional layers of accountability and transparency to ensure that this Federal investment has the maximum possible effect.

I am proud that before I served in this body, Mr. Chairman, I founded two public charter schools—New America School in Colorado, and now New Mexico, and the Academy of Urban Learning in Denver. New American School works with 16- to 21-year-old new immigrants to help them learn the English language and even how to access a college education.

Mr. Chairman, absent a Federal charter school program I don't think I even could have started that charter school. Hundreds and thousands of charter schools that have benefited from this program across the country will tell you the same story.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Before the State or district money for a public charter school begins, before the doors open, there are expenses. Principals and teachers have to be hired, classrooms have to be configured and outfitted. That is what this money allows. Coupled with strong support from the nonprofit sector and from foundations, we have helped give with this program life to the ideas that have existed in the minds of social entrepreneurs and that have been transformative in the lives of kids and families.

However, Mr. Chairman, not all public charter schools are high quality, just as all district schools are not high quality. That is why H.R. 10 adds strong protections to ensure that public charter schools are accountable that they serve low-income kids and English language learners and at-risk kids.

We invest in quality authorizing practices. What does that mean? Well, there are two possible thoughts in authorizing. An authorizing entity like a district can hand out charters. Too easy? Hand out them out like candy to every Tom, Dick, and Harry that comes in, including low quality providers who have no sense of how to put together a school budget. Or they can lack quality by never handing one out to anybody because they view them as competition with the district.

But a quality authorizing practice is if you have a great idea and evidence that it will work, sound budgetary policy, and a team that will make a public school work for kids, you should be able to receive that charter and operate that school. We raised the bar on authorizing practices, something on which the original authorization for this program was silent.

For those on my side of the aisle who are skeptical of public charter schools, this bill brings stronger protections for oversight, transparency, and accountability. This program, the Federal charter school program, will exist under the old authorization or the new authorization.

I implore my colleagues on my side of the aisle to support the new and better 2.0 version for all of the Democratic priorities. Whether you like charter schools or not, this program is simply better under this bill. This bill has gotten better through every phase of the process—better than the bill in last Congress, better than the bill as part of the ESEA reauthorization of the Republican bill, better than the Democratic substitute. And now as a standalone bill, we have the ability to send a message to the Senate and a bill to President Obama's desk.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I must say I so appreciate the depth of knowledge and the enthusiasm and the passion of the gentleman from Colorado. Always a pleasure.

Another great pleasure for me is to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER), another gentleman from Indiana who was traveling with me in my home State visiting charter schools only a few weeks ago.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10, the Success and Opportunity Through Quality Charter Schools Act.

I want to commend Chairman KLINE and Ranking Member MILLER for coming together on this important bipartisan legislation.

I also want to thank my good friend from Indiana, TODD ROKITA, who chairs the Subcommittee on Elementary and Secondary Education, for his work on this bill, and thank the good Member POLIS for his comments as well, and appreciate the opportunity to work with him.

Every child deserves the opportunity to learn. But too many families in America today live in neighborhoods with struggling schools where their children don't have access to a high-quality education. That is why education choice matters.

Lots of kids live in communities with great schools, but too many don't. Parental choice is the ultimate local control. It allows parents to choose the best educational environment for their child, regardless of income, geographic location, or lot in life. The freedom provided by school choice levels the playing field and helps ensure all children have a chance to achieve success in life. As the founder and chairman of the Congressional School Choice Caucus, I am a proponent of all forms of educational choice, including magnet schools, online schools, private schools, home schooling, and traditional public schools.

Charter schools certainly play an integral role in expanding educational freedom. I am very encouraged by this bipartisan legislation which will update the charter school program to reflect the success and growth of successful charter models by supporting the replication, expansion, and opening of new, innovative, high-quality charter schools.

Encouraging the expansion of charter schools is important because they empower parents with another free public school option and are a driving force in creating classroom innovation.

Over the past couple of months, I have had the opportunity to visit several charter schools that are preparing students for success. Just this last month, as the chairman mentioned, I was fortunate enough to join Chairman KLINE on his trip to visit the Aspen Academy and the Global Academy charter schools in Minnesota. More recently, I toured the Inspire Academy of Muncie in my district, one of 74 charter schools in Indiana serving more than 28,000 Hoosier students. I was impressed with what I saw: a diverse group of students actively engaged in learning, teachers pioneering fresh teaching methods, and parents heavily involved in their child's education.

In the Declaration of Independence, our Founding Fathers wrote that all men are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights. Chief among those rights is the right to pursue happiness. In modern America, that pursuit begins with a high-quality education. We cannot rest until every child in America has that chance.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 10, the Success and Opportunity Through Quality Charter Schools Act, demonstrating that Congress can actually work together to get something done.

I want to thank Chairman KLINE and my good friend from California, Ranking Member GEORGE MILLER, for bringing this forward. I am still waiting for you guys to bring the ESEA to the floor, but I am really thrilled that we are making some critical improvements to the public charter school system.

Charter schools were never meant to replace our traditional public school system, but I have to tell you that they have grown over the last 20 years and I see several of them in my area, just down the street really, making a difference in my community—the Orange County High School of the Arts, for example, and an elementary school called El Sol—all doing great work just under a mile away from me.

It is really great for us to take a look at the Federal law and say: How can we make this even better? Because even though we have great schools, like the ones I just mentioned, there are also some charter schools that have failed or some charter schools that are actually failing our kids, they are not really getting the work done that we thought they would do or that the people who envisioned them thought would be done.

While charter schools work towards encouraging innovation in our public schools, we really need to take a look and see what these schools are doing. H.R. 10 is the first step in highlighting the need for charter schools that improve student outcomes while expanding those schools that are currently utilizing our best practices.

I am also pleased to see that the legislation requires greater charter authorizer accountability and even more pleased that we are finally addressing the under-enrollment of some of our most vulnerable students through the

weighted lotteries provision. This is incredibly important in the area where I live, as I have a very urban area.

We hold our traditional public schools accountable for the education of our future leaders, and we expect charter schools to involve the community in their efforts to improve the charter school system. That is why I am happy to have worked with both the majority and the minority on an amendment that I will have tomorrow which will hold public charter schools accountable in fostering and promoting community involvement. We all know that when people are involved, when they are involved in their school, when parents are involved, we see a mass difference in the students who come out of those schools.

Charter schools must be engaged with a local community to understand the students they teach, and my amendment will strengthen that role.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield an additional minute to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. While it is not the final solution, H.R. 10 positively contributes to the promise of a quality education for every child in every neighborhood.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for the time.

Mr. Chairman, as we celebrate National Teachers Week, I do rise in support of charter schools and the remarkable job they do in advancing high-quality education through innovative approaches in our classrooms across the country. With an increasingly competitive workforce, quality education is more important than ever, and charter schools play a valuable role in the education field.

Charter schools provide parents and students a choice for what best meets the child's needs, classrooms that offer more personalized education, and accountability if the school's achievement goals and metrics are not met.

When I was home over Easter, I had the opportunity to visit the Phoenix Charter School located in Greenville, Texas. Built in 1986, Phoenix Charter School serves over 600 students by providing a creative educational experience, one that integrates fine arts into a strong traditional curriculum.

During my visit, I talked with students who were excited to share their experiences at the school. They told me they were happy to receive a hands-on education in a place that makes them feel at home. More importantly, they are thankful to attend a school that meets their individual living needs. I walked around the campus and was able to see teachers interact with students, and you could see the students were fully engaged in the classroom.

Phoenix Charter School has been recognized by the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools for providing exceptional education to its students, and this recognition is well-deserved.

Parents and educators know best what their students need. If a student can benefit most from a charter school, that student should be able to have that access to that education. I encourage my colleagues to join me in efforts to provide students full access to charter schools and the innovative way they prepare our students for successful futures.

□ 1945

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss today some of the priorities that Democrats have, which are important to Members of my party, which are included in this bill.

I hope that those on my side of the aisle who are listening tonight—or the capable Education LAs who are listening tonight, who will hopefully advise their bosses to vote ''yes'' tomorrow—will listen to how so many of our Democratic priorities are in the bill.

First of all, this bill makes sure that charter schools do not have entrance requirements, that they don't charge tuition, are not religious, and don't discriminate against students on any basis.

We also make sure that low-performing or financially irresponsible charter schools are closed and that the authorizer intercedes. We also have language in here that gives public charter schools additional tools to make sure that they recruit and serve students with disabilities.

We also improve performance oversight and the management for public charter schools, new provisions about transparency, and evaluation practices. We make sure that each public charter school considers input from parents and community members with regard to the operation of the school.

The public charter schools abide by civil rights laws, in that they can't charge tuition. We make sure that public charter schools have the same audit requirements as traditional public schools, in order to prevent fiscal mismanagement and fraud.

These are some of the reasons, Mr. Chairman, that I encourage my colleagues on my side of the aisle to upgrade this authorization—to upgrade from the version passed in 1994—to a new and better version that incorporates almost two decades of learning about what works and doesn't work within the public charter school movement.

Those on my side of the aisle support good public schools, whether they are district schools, whether they are neighborhood schools, whether they are public magnet schools, whether they are public charter schools, whether they are schools of choice operated by the district. We want to make sure that every family has access to a good, high-quality public education.

Public charter schools are not the silver bullet alone. They are not going to fix everything that is wrong and that needs to be improved about public education in the country.

What they do offer are examples of hope and opportunity for the kids they serve. Too many families, Mr. Chairman—almost a million families across the country—are languishing on the waiting lists for public charter schools; and they are forced to attend worse schools because the capacity doesn't exist to serve them.

This bill will allow quality public charter schools to expand, to replicate, and to serve more children, in order to help reduce that number. It will make sure that other generations of Americans—particularly Americans in poverty—are not consigned to lives of reliance on government programs or on an inability to attend college, but to, instead, have every opportunity that this country can provide because they have had a good education.

In the 21st century, Mr. Chairman, a good education is more important than ever for one to be in the American middle class and to live the American Dream. At the very time that it is becoming more important than ever, we need to redouble our efforts to ensure that every family has access to a high-quality school. That is why I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this bill.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), a man who comes from a State that has learned a great deal about the value of charter schools in these few years.

Mr. SCALISE. I want to thank Chairman KLINE and Ranking Member MILLER for bringing this legislation to the floor, as it is so important when you talk about the things that we need to do to help give our children better opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, the charter school movement has literally transformed the public education system in New Orleans. If you look at what was happening in the city of New Orleans before Hurricane Katrina, it was the most failed and corrupt public school system in the country.

After Hurricane Katrina—I was in the legislature at the time—many of my colleagues came together, and we passed a charter system that empowered communities to get involved in the education of their children.

What we saw was revolutionary. What we saw were parents finally having options and choices to send their kids to schools that were competing for those children, schools that were actually providing better opportunities.

Before Hurricane Katrina, 75 percent of the students in New Orleans' public schools were attending failing schools, schools that were giving them no opportunity and no hope for their future.

What has happened since with this revolution of the charter school movement in New Orleans? What we have

seen is that, now, over 91 percent of the public school students in New Orleans attend charter schools.

What does that really mean for quality? That is ultimately what really matters. What kind of education are these children now being able to get?

As I said before, before Katrina, 75 percent of the students in the public schools in New Orleans were attending failing schools. Today, fewer than 15 percent of those students are attending schools with either a D or an F rating because, now, there is competition.

Parents have multiple options of where to send their kids, and those schools are competing for the students. I visited Hynes Elementary School last week in my district, in the Lakeview part of New Orleans. It is a charter school that is incredibly successful.

You see such enthusiasm from these young kids. They have an over 450-person waiting list to go to this charter school. It really is working, the fact that you have invoked this competition.

I want to applaud Majority Leader CANTOR. Majority Leader CANTOR actually came down and toured a number of the charter schools in New Orleans.

Of course, New Orleans is not the only place, but it is probably the place in which you have such a dramatic change—again, a revolution—that has literally served as the model for how you can transform failed public education systems that were denying students the opportunity to have a future, to achieve that American Dream.

When we talk about opportunities for children, this is not a Republican idea or a Democrat idea. This is our ability to pass on the franchise of the American Dream to our children.

Charter schools have helped expand that opportunity, and that is why it is so important that we pass H.R. 10, so as to help replicate those successful programs and to help highlight what is working with the charter school movement.

You can look to New Orleans and see just how it has transformed people's lives for the better. This is something we need to do. It is great that this is a bipartisan effort.

Again, I applaud Chairman KLINE for bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I am now very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), my colleague from the State of Minnesota, which is where charter schools originated.

Mr. PAULSEN. I would like to thank both Chairman KLINE for his leadership, along with Ranking Member MILLER, and for their working together to bring this very important legislation to the floor today.

I also need to thank my colleague, Congressman POLIS, with whom I cochair the Charter Schools Caucus, for his leadership and passion on education issues.

Mr. Chairman, we need to pass this legislation. This is an opportunity to work together because H.R. 10 will ensure that students' ZIP codes do not determine the quality of their education.

There are too many students across the country who are trapped in failing schools, with little hope of ever escaping. Parents want the best for their children, but many parents are often left with only two options: either an expensive private school or a failing public school. Thankfully, many more families now have this third option of a high-quality charter school.

Recently, I had the chance to visit Beacon Preparatory School in Bloomington, Minnesota, which is in my district. While there, I saw students who were thriving in their classes. I saw dedicated teachers. I saw challenging academics.

Charter schools are not tied down by a lot of bureaucratic red tape or by outdated traditions. In fact, charter schools are creating very new and innovative ways of learning that can help grab students' attention and make them more excited to learn.

Mr. Chairman, in too many States, that debate has sometimes been public schools versus charter schools, but it does not have to be that way. Public schools and charter schools can coexist to make the system better.

As Chairman KLINE noted, in our home State of Minnesota, we were the pioneers for the charter school movement 22 years ago. It is an example of how this system can absolutely work, and we have a rich tradition of providing a world-class education to our students in both public schools and charter schools.

Charter schools are continuing to grow. In 2007, there were nearly 1.3 million students enrolled in charter schools around the country. As we debate this legislation today, there are 6,500 charter schools that are now enrolling 2.5 million students across the country, but here is the thing: there are 1 million students on waiting lists to enter into these charter schools.

The legislation before us today focuses on the expansion and replication of high-quality charter schools. It concentrates on charter school models that have had a proven record of success in order to raise the bar for everyone and to ensure that those who attend charter schools will receive the best education possible.

Mr. Chairman, this is an opportunity that we have today to show the American people we are committed at the Federal level in helping to produce the best educational opportunities for all students, so let's vote to make sure that a child's ZIP code does not determine the quality of his education.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, Dr. ROE, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 10, the Success and Opportunity through Quality Charter Schools Act, and I am going to sound like a recording because you are going to hear a lot of the same themes in this.

Today, there are an estimated 1 million students on waiting lists to attend public charter schools. These students and their families believe that their educational needs are not being met by their current schools.

While many of our public schools are doing a great job, too many others are failing our children. These kids deserve the opportunity to receive a top-notch education, and they cannot wait as we work to improve these underperforming schools. They don't have the time.

Public charter schools provide students with the opportunity to escape underperforming schools, while also giving parents more control over their children's education. To ensure more access to these innovative institutions, the Success and Opportunity through Quality Charter Schools Act supports the replication or expansion of existing high-quality charter schools.

H.R. 10 streamlines and modernizes our charter schools program, providing our Nation's public charter schools with the flexibility needed to encourage innovation at the State and local levels.

H.R. 10 supports the sharing of best practices between charter and traditional public schools. In this way, all public school students, not just charter school students, benefit from the innovation at these institutions.

I am proud of the educators and students in my home State of Tennessee and of their accomplishments in improving education in our State. Since 2003, Tennessee has increased its high school graduation rate by 17 points to 87 percent. This is commendable, but it is not enough. We can and should do more, and charter schools must be part of the discussion.

Since 2002, Tennessee has opened more than 45 charter schools, giving nearly 12,000 students the opportunity to attend these innovative institutions.

Tennessee's public charter schools serve 87 percent low-income and 96 percent minority students from economically disadvantaged areas, providing school choice to the students who need it the most.

Just like Tennessee, we, as a Nation, must fully embrace all of the tools available, including charter schools, to ensure our students' success.

Mr. Chairman, I spent 24 years in the public school system. I never attended a private school. The opportunity for students like me who are first generation students—college students—to be

able to get a great, basic public education is really the future of our country. I think our very future depends on that.

Also, while I am here, I want to thank both the chairman, Ranking Member MILLER, Mr. POLIS, and the rest of the committee for circling around this extremely important piece of legislation because students in the first or second or third grade cannot afford a failing school. They have to be allowed to go into a school where they can be successful.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 10.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I would now like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill.

I would just like to thank, indeed, the chairman and the members of the committee for their great work on it. At the end of the day, it represents expanded choice in education, and that whole notion of increasing and expanding the marketplace in education, I think, is vital for a couple of different reasons.

I think it is vital, one, because it is better for students. I think it is vital because the local control of education matters. Ultimately, I think it is vital from the standpoint of improving and increasing the level of innovation that we see in the educational marketplace. Let me expand on those thoughts just over a couple of minutes.

One is that it is vital for students because God makes every child different. When I was working in politics in South Carolina, we passed a rather major charter school bill.

We now have over 60 charter schools in South Carolina—right at 60 charter schools in South Carolina. What it did was it tailor-made for students applications that fit who they were.

□ 2000

So, in some cases, if they wanted to work on leadership, they could do so. In some cases, if they wanted to work on mathematics or English or technology or the arts, they had venues by which to specialize in that which God wired them to do.

So, one, this idea of increased choices for the students that are out there, I think it is vital.

Two, I think it is absolutely vital to the larger notion of local control.

People invest in things that they have a say in, that they have a voice in. What we saw in choice in South Carolina and expanded choices on the charter school front was that parents indeed got more deeply involved.

I have not just seen that in South Carolina. I have seen it in different spots across the country, whether that is KIPP Academy or whether that is the old Marva Collins School up toward Milwaukee. It is interesting to see the way in which parents would invest in their child's education when they had a little bit more control and a little bit more voice. That is true, again, at Bridges Academy in Beaufort, South Carolina, or KIPP Academy out toward Houston.

Finally, I would make this point. It is absolutely vital to innovation in education, because the old saying is, the definition of insanity is keep on doing the same thing and expect a different result.

This idea of changing the educational paradigm so that there are more choices for kids and parents out there is absolutely critical to competitiveness in this country.

Look at the numbers. I pulled some of them. We are behind Liechtenstein, Vietnam, and Iceland with regard to mathematics in global scores. We are behind Poland, Luxembourg, and Estonia with regard to reading scores in global scores.

We are behind Canada, we are behind the United Kingdom, we are behind Slovenia, we are behind France. We are behind a whole host of different places in scores on the science front.

And so if we are going to change that, if we are going to be competitive in this global competition for jobs, capital, and the way of life, it is vital that we have bills like this.

For that reason, I applaud the work of the committee.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that it has been a pleasure to work on this legislation. We have heard compelling stories here today from around the country—compelling stories of transformation of entire cities and school systems, and lives being changed through the charter school system. And we have legislation here today and tomorrow which will make that Federal charter school law better and make the opportunities more available and give more kids a chance for success and opportunity.

This should be an easy vote for Republicans and Democrats. I urge my colleagues to lend their support to H.R. 10, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise to speak during House consideration of H.R. 10, the "Success and Opportunity through Quality Charter Schools Act."

JACKSON LEE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 10

I have long supported the need for better data on the experiences of children that Congress could use when deliberating on legislative measures intended to benefit our youngest citizens.

Charter Schools are a new addition to education options available to parents and their children. It is important that Congress ensures that the benefit of a good free pre-K–12 education is available to all parents and children of this nation.

The Education and the Workforce Committee included language in the amendment in the form of a substitute for the bill that reflected an amendment I intended to offer. The language in the bill that adds rates of student attrition as a measure to be considered by charter school authorizers in monitoring the successes of schools is appreciated and will help gain additional insight into children's education.

Attrition data would help us better understand the impact of charter schools on student retention. It would also bring additional transparency regarding the drivers of attrition issues such as discipline, counseling, dropouts, bullying, as well as the impact of learning disabilities like dyslexia on student retention.

Although the data reporting is not mandatory, it is my hope that charter school districts and charter schools will take up the challenge of providing hard data to make the case for their approaches to education.

I offered two amendments for consideration by the House Rules Committee that would strengthen the legislative goals of H.R. 10.

The amendments were simple and were an important addition to this strong bipartisan effort from the Education and Workforce Committee to bring clarity and improve transparency of charter schools in communities around the nation.

JACKSON LEE AMENDMENT NO. 1

The Jackson Lee amendment made in order by the Rules Committee for debate of this bill directs State Education Agencies that award federally funded grants to charter schools under this bill to work with those schools so that they provide information on their websites regarding student recruitment, orientation materials, enrollment criteria, student discipline policies, behavior codes, and parent contract requirements, which should include any financial obligations such as fees for tutoring, and extra-circular activities.

This amendment will make it possible for parents to learn more about how schools deal with important education issues such as academic performance, enrichment programs, and quality of education life issues programs for children with learning disabilities like dyslexia are taught.

Many charter schools already provide this information, and the amendment would support this good transparency practice. This Jackson Lee amendment is good for parents and for charter schools because parents would have access to information that helps them make education decisions for their children; and charter schools would speak to a larger audience regarding their education programs.

JACKSON LEE AMENDMENT NO. 2

The second Jackson Lee amendment was a "Sense of the Congress" on the promotion of, and support for anti-bullying programs in charter schools, including those serving rural communities. I regret that this amendment was not made in order by the Rules Committee because the prevention of bullying is one of the most challenging problems facing school officials.

Bullying is not a new behavior. Kids have been exposed to bullying in school for generations. Now, however, bullying has taken on new heights and sometimes victims of bullies suffer severe and lasting consequences.

For victims of bullying, they go to school every day facing harassment, taunting, and

humiliation. Studies show that 25–35% of teens encountered some type of bullying in their lifetime. Bullying is a form of violent behavior that happens not only in the schools but everywhere.

The National Center for Educational Studies reports show that 14 percent of 12- to 18-year-olds surveyed report being victims of direct or indirect bullying. 1 out of 4 kids is bullied. The Department of Justice reports that 1 out of every 4 kids will be abused by another youth.

I introduced H.R. 2585, the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Reauthorization and the Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act of 2013. This bill amends the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 by expanding the juvenile accountability block grant program with respect to programs for the prevention of bullying to include intervention programs. The bill's objective is to reduce and prevent bullying and establish best practices for all activities that are likely to help reduce bullying among young people.

This year a million children will be teased, taunted, and physically assaulted by their peers. Bullying the most common form of violence faced by our nation's youth.

The frequency and intensity of bullying that young people face are astounding: 1 in 7 Students in Grades K–12 is either a bully or a victim of bullying; 90% of 4th to 8th Grade Students report being victims of bullying of some type; 56% of students have personally witnessed some type of bullying at school; 71% of students report incidents of bullying as a problem at their school; 15% of all students who don't show up for school report it to being out of fear of being bullied while at school; 1 out of 20 students has seen a student with a gun at school; 282,000 students are physically attacked in secondary schools each month.

Consequences of bullying: 15% of all school absenteeism is directly related to fears of being bullied at school; according to bullying statistics, 1 out of every 10 students who drops out of school does so because of repeated bullying; suicides linked to bullying are the saddest statistic.

Statistics on Gun Violence: homicide is the 2nd leading cause of death for young people ages 15 to 24 years old; homicide is the leading cause of death for African Americans between ages 10 and 24; thirteen young people from ages 10–24 become victims of homicide every day; 82.8% of those youths were killed with a firearm; every 30 minutes, a child or teenager in America is injured by a gun; every 3 hours and 15 minutes, a child or teenager loses their life to a firearm; in 2010, 82 children under 5 years of age lost their lives due to guns; one of four high school males reportedly carry a weapon to school, with 8.6% of reportedly carry a gun; 87% of youth said shootings are motivated by a desire to ''get back at those who have hurt them, and 86% said, ''other kids picking on them, making fun of them or bullying them'' causes teenagers to turn to lethal violence in the schools; in 2011, over 707,000 young people, aged 10 to 24 years, had to be rushed to the emergency room as a result of physical assault injuries.

Victims of bullying often suffer in silence and parents are the last ones to know that their child is being bullied or may be a bully. What once was thought to be a childhood ritual has been proven by school psychologists, law enforcement officials, parents, and students to be much more serious.

Anti-bullying programs can help children understand the seriousness of bullying; and assist parents in learning the signs of bullying as well as learning how to speak to their children about the issue of bullying.

H.R. 10 will consolidate two existing federal charter school programs into one:

The Charter School Program, which supports grants for charter school developers to open new charter schools. The program also provides funds to disseminate best practices and provide state facilities aid to charter schools.

The Charter School Credit Enhancement Program assists charter schools in accessing better credit terms to acquire and renovate facilities to operate a charter school.

The rule will allow the consideration of the bill that will create a new federal charter schools program to promote high-quality charter schools at the state and local level; and allows states to use federal funds to start new charter schools as well as expand and replicate existing high-quality charter schools.

The bill adds a new component—a Charter Management Organization grant program to support the opening of additional charter schools nationwide.

H.R. 10 establishes a new Charter School Program that would consist of three parts:

Grants to support high-quality charter schools will be awarded to a State Educational Agency, the State Charter School Board, the Governor, or a Charter School Support Organization.

Facilities Aid will be awarded to continue credit enhancement activities and support state facilities aid for charter schools.

National Activities will allow the secretary of education to operate a grant competition for charter schools in states that did not win or compete for a state grant and a competition for high quality CMOs.

The legislation adds five new definitions: a ''charter management organization, a charter support organization'', a ''high-quality charter school''; the ''expansion of a high-quality charter school''; and a ''replicable, high-quality charter school model.''

H.R. 10 authorizes $300,000,000 for fiscal years 2015 through 2020. The bill permits state-determined weighted lotteries and allows students to continue in the school program of their choice by clarifying students in affiliated charter schools can attend the next immediate grade in that network's school.

I strongly believe that where our children are concerned, Congress is in a unique position to advocate on their behalf in an effective and forceful way. Letting children know by our actions that members of Congress consider the lives of children and their experience to be of the utmost importance would help them in countless ways.

We cannot gamble with our children's future, and ultimately the future of our nation. I am committed to finding ways to make sure that education is as valued as national defense—because education is crucial to our nation's global success in all areas.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Chair, education remains one of the greatest keys to success in our society, yet there are children across the nation without access to a good school.

There is no single cure. No child or community is the same. And often the educational solutions in one community won't fit those in another.

But there are local solutions already working across the nation.

Recently, I spoke with my friend, Barbara Grimm-Marshall, a successful businesswoman with their family company Grimmway Farms.

For years her family funded college scholarships for the children of her employees, but every year applications for that scholarship were low.

She found that when kids in Arvin, CA were old enough to go to college, most were not ready. Committed to the belief that every child should have a bright future, she took action.

That is why, in 2011, Barbara took it upon herself to offer children in the community the opportunity to achieve a successful. She opened a charter school.

She had never run a school herself, so she did what we are trying to promote today; she replicated a successful school, Rocketship Charter School in San Jose.

After only 3 years, Grimmway Academy was a California Distinguished School whose students had the highest test scores in the district. Grimmway Academy is proof that new ideas and innovation works to help our children.

Sadly, the lack of educational opportunity exists in too many towns. We have an obligation to expand educational opportunities and school choice so that every child has the chance to attend a successful school.

I applaud my colleagues JOHN KLINE and GEORGE MILLER for coming together and sponsoring this legislation.

Education transcends political boundaries, and this House will continue to work toward solutions to ensure the next generation, no matter their circumstance, is afforded every opportunity for a better life.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 10, the ''Success and Opportunity Through Quality Charter Schools Act.''

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill because it strengthens the Federal Charter School Program (CSP) and promotes quality, accountability and equity for public charter schools participating in the Federal Charter School Program.

H.R. 10 requires public charter schools to be of ''high quality'' in order to receive Charter School Program funds to open, replicate or expand. Under this bill, ''high quality'' charter schools must show evidence of strong academic results for all students.

H.R. 10 promotes quality in charter school authorizing. This bill requires state entities to have in place or be working toward a charter school authorizing system that utilizes a process for approval, monitoring, re-approval or revocation of authority of public charter school authorizers in the state, based on performance of the schools authorized by the agency.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill prioritizes equity of access and services for disadvantaged students, including english learners and students with disabilities.

H.R. 10, for example, allows grantees to utilize weighted lotteries, when permitted by state law, to preference admissions for educationally disadvantaged students.

Along the same lines, this legislation requires that state entities receiving a CSP grant provide technical assistance to any charter schools receiving funds to ensure they fully understand federal requirements for serving underserved student populations.

Finally, I am pleased that the underlying bill requires that state entities receiving a Charter School Program grant describe how they will ensure that all charter schools receiving CSP funds through its grant will meet the educational needs of students with disabilities and english language learners.

In my view, these improvements to the Federal Charter School Program enhance quality, accountability, and equity for charter schools participating in the federal CSP program and ensure that only states with strong oversight will receive CSP federal dollars.

In my congressional district, public charter schools like IDEA public schools are transforming lives. Under the extraordinary leadership of Tom Torkelson and JoAnn Gama, IDEA public schools are closing achievement gaps, increasing high school graduation rates, and preparing students for college and careers. At this time, I personally want to thank them for their outstanding work in the Río Grande Valley of South Texas.

In closing, I commend Chairman KLINE and ranking member MILLER for their tremendous leadership on this bipartisan bill and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the passage of H.R. 10.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support for H.R. 10, the Student Success and Opportunity through Quality Charter Schools Act, and the promise that charter schools hold to ensure that all students are able to reach their full potential.

Let me also take this opportunity to congratulate Washington State and the eight charter schools that have been certified to open in the state within the next two years, including PRIDE Prep Charter School in Spokane. Washington State has made significant reforms to its educational system and should be recognized for its efforts.

Charter schools are about empowerment and opportunity. Giving parents the ability to meet the needs of their children, particularly those students who are disadvantaged, have special needs, or are English Language Learners.

I know firsthand the benefits of a charter school education. My own son, Cole, was enrolled in Apple Tree charter school here in DC and he flourished. Apple Tree was able to provide him with an innovative education that was targeted to meet his needs. All parents should have this choice and opportunity for their children.

H.R. 10 moves us in that direction by encouraging states to expand and replicate high performing charter schools. It gives security to states and school boards that space will be available to build schools or rehabilitate them. Finally, H.R. 10 encourages the distribution of best of practices to ensure all schools have access to critical information.

No one in this Chamber would argue that a strong education system is foundational to keeping our nation competitive and a leader in the 21st century and beyond. And, no one will argue that a strong, quality education for our children is integral for their growth, their development and their success for whatever path they choose. H.R. 10 takes us toward that goal.

I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 10.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MASSIE) having assumed the chair, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10) to amend the charter school program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, had come to no resolution thereon.

CANCER RESEARCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, tonight, my colleagues and I rise to discuss a matter that has touched virtually every family America and is one of the great public health challenges of our time—or indeed, of any time—and that is the challenge of cancer, the diagnosis no person wants to hear and the battle no one should face alone.

From those in treatment to those working toward prevention to friends and family dealing with the terrible illness of a loved one, everyone knows someone who has been afflicted with cancer. Cancer has been the great health menace of the last century.

But now, here in the 21st century, medical advancement, innovative treatments, and the genius of many scientists and medical doctors are everyday bringing us closer to a cure.

We await the advent of new technologies and of work here in Congress to deliver the tools and resources both to public and to private industry to spur the research and collaborations that will change the health of the world.

It is my judgment that the United States is really the medical center of the entire world and that its brilliant medical doctors and scientists here in this country will lead the charge in the new century.

Clinical oncologists are on the cutting edge of that research and are responsible for many of the advances in cancer care that are improving the lives and prognoses for many cancer patients.

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the American Society of Clinical Oncology, a group which represents nearly 35,000 oncology professionals across the world.

When ASCO was founded in 1964, it dedicated itself to a challenging mission: a commitment to conquer cancer through research, education, prevention, and the delivery of high-quality patient care.

When ASCO was founded, cancer was widely regarded as an untreatable disease, with fewer than one-half of patients alive 5 years after diagnosis. There was an undeniable stigma associated with a cancer diagnosis that left many patients to suffer in silence, with minimal support, and worse, few effective therapies.

But because of the work of passionate advocates and tireless champions, the expertise of talented medical professionals, including those at the American Society of Clinical Oncology, today the survival rate is higher than two-thirds.

Better cancer prevention and detection, improved care coordination, and the use of palliative care have proven to improve patients' quality of life dramatically and to increase survival rates dramatically.

ASCO has put forward new technologies such as nanotechnology, medical imaging, and health information technology that are leading to entirely new ways to develop therapies. If these advances are fully realized, people with cancer will be able to receive more personalized and more effective treatment.

In my work on the Energy and Commerce Committee, and particularly on its Health Subcommittee, I am sure that the wave of the future is personalized medical care. In a coordinated capacity, the members of the committee, and particularly of the subcommittee, are working together to create that new wave of the future regarding personalized medicine.

Federal investments in cancer research have also resulted in a massive increase in the number and the quality of treatments available to cancer patients.

I have the highest confidence in Dr. Francis Collins and his team at the National Institutes of Health. I have toured NIH's magnificent facility in Bethesda, the best of its kind on the face of the Earth. I can report that some of the best doctors, the greatest intellects, and dedicated professionals are working every day to course the future of medicine and tackle this terrible disease.

We must continue our Nation's commitment to NIH to keep the United States as the global center of medical innovation.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. UPTON of Michigan, convened a roundtable with many of the most brilliant doctors regarding issues affecting the NIH. We were privileged that Dr. Collins joined us.

But the work will not be done alone by public entities such as the Federal Government and NIH. In fact, great minds from across this Nation and around the world have brought their desire to rid the world of cancer to some of the finest companies on the forefront of this research.

I am honored to say that many of these life science leaders in the medical and biopharmaceutical research and development field call the district I serve and the State I serve, New Jersey, home. There is work on cancer solutions every day in labs I have the honor of representing.

The district I serve, Mr. Speaker, has more pharmaceutical and medical device employees than any other district in the United States. But that is not to say we are alone. There are magnificent facilities across this country. They will be described, I believe, by colleagues of mine this evening.

I know there is great interest and commitment in the House of Representatives, as demonstrated by the participation this evening of distinguished Members, including Mr. HIGGINS of western New York. And certainly, without a doubt, Buffalo is one of the leading centers not only in this Nation but across the globe in medical technology and medical research, and extremely high-quality institutions of medical care.

Of course, there is the work of the House Energy and Commerce Committee. Our committee has broad jurisdiction over Federal agencies and policies important to health care, to medical research, and to the life sciences sectors.

I also have the honor of serving as the Republican chair of the Rare Disease Caucus, another mantle by which we discuss needs and ideas in the cancer support community. I am joined in that caucus with the Democratic chair, Congressman CROWLEY of the great city of New York.

One of the major endeavors of the Energy and Commerce Committee will be to pursue an initiative of Chairman UPTON's that he has titled, ''The 21st Century Cures,'' an effort that aims to accelerate the pace of cures and medical breakthroughs here in the United States.

For the first time, Congress will take a comprehensive look at the full arc of accelerating cures, from the discovery of clues in basic science to streamlining the drug and device development process to unleashing the power of medicine in the treatment delivery phase.

□ 2015

In one of the inaugural hearings this week, the incredible advancements in cancer research were discussed, and the great opportunities presented to advance new cures and treatments for other diseases were discussed.

The committee will focus on the cycle of discovery, development, and delivery that saves lives. We, in Congress, want to work effectively and efficiently and ensure that there is no gap between 20th century science and the Washington regulatory process.

ASCO is well-positioned for the type of 21st century science the committee is working to facilitate: accelerating the pace of clinical cancer research, establishing a new approach to therapeutic development and new technologies to obtain a greater understanding of cancer biology, and the needs that Congress and the administration are willing to work together for solutions to the market.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that we are anxious to work with the administration, and we want to be a partner with the executive branch, making sure that we work as effectively as possible in fighting cancer.

This is, by no means, a partisan matter; and, indeed, it goes beyond being a bipartisan matter. It is really nonpartisan in nature.

Besides providing better outcomes for patients, benefits of more rigorous trial designs include the ability to design smaller and smarter clinical trials that can be conducted faster than larger trials that aim for smaller benefits for patients.

These steps represent significant new momentum toward a 21st century research system that realizes the potential of precision medicine. As we personalize medicine in this country, it is based, in no small measure, on precision medicine; and this, again, is the wave of the future.

On these critical public health issues, the public and private sector have worked together to make a difference in improving the highest quality of health care, the highest quality that the American people deserve.

Congress is contributing by giving public research the 21st century tools to compete on the global stage and empowering private innovators to solve these great complexities in American laboratories. This is how Congress should work, together, on issues that make a lasting difference.

Too often, Mr. Speaker, we are viewed as divisive, as overly partisan, as not coming together on the great issues confronting the American Nation. Let me make as clear as possible, on the fight against cancer, we are working closely together; and we are working with our partners in the nonprofit sector and our partners in the private sector.

This is a three-legged stool. One of those legs—indispensable—is the involvement of the Federal Government, particularly through NIH, but through other agencies as well and through our oversight capacity here in Congress, making sure that drugs are brought to market as quickly as possible with, of course, recognizing that paramount is the safety of those drugs brought to market.

ASCO and those of us in the Congress and leaders in the life science industries renew our commitment to the millions of patients and their families who will benefit from more timely access to innovative medical technologies.

More than 40 years ago, President Nixon declared a war on cancer, and tremendous advances have been made from that initial declaration of war; but the war has not yet been fully won, and it is our responsibility, in our generation, to make sure we do as much as possible so that that war will be won.

While we do not know the cure for all cancers, we do know that awareness is the best protection, and well-rounded care during and after treatment is the best therapy.

These burdens often fall on loved ones. I am thankful for the families and the advocates whose challenges we may never understand fully, but whose commitment to loved ones is unyielding and inspiring.

To ASCO and the other heroes of cancer care, I thank you for all that you have done and all that you will continue to do. We are here, in Congress, in a bipartisan capacity, to help give you the tools you need to succeed in the fight against cancer.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from New Jersey for his leadership on this issue, for his eloquent opening, and I want to echo his sentiments in congratulating the American Society of Clinical Oncology.

As my colleague has said, we have made major advancements in cancer research in this country. Thirty years ago, less than 50 percent of those who were diagnosed with cancer lived beyond 5 years of their diagnosis. Today, it is over 65 percent for adults and over 80 percent for children.

Historically, you had, really, three options with cancer. You could burn it out through radiation, you could cut it out through surgery, or you could poison the fast-growing cancer cells; but the problem is you were also killing healthy cells, as well, through chemotherapy.

Today, because of medical research, we now have smart drugs, drugs that will attack fast-growing cancer cells, without attacking fast-growing healthy cells.

We also have a number of clinical trials going on, including right in Buffalo, New York, at Roswell Park Cancer Institute, clinical trials for vaccines that treat the body's dendritic cells toward the goal of helping the body naturally fight cancer.

We have made major progress, but as my friend from New Jersey has said, we still have much further to go.

People realize that early detection is very, very important in effectively treating cancer. Less than 10 percent of cancer deaths occur from the original tumor.

It is when cancer metastasizes, when it grows, when it advances to a vital organ that we need, is when cancer becomes lethal. That is why it is important for early detection, which will dramatically increase the survival rate of cancer patients.

As the gentleman from New Jersey also indicated, Buffalo and western New York is home to Roswell Park Cancer Institute, the first comprehensive cancer center in the entire Nation.

Roswell Park gave the Nation and the world chemotherapy in 1904. It gave the Nation and the world the prostate-specific antigen test, the PSA test, to detect prostate cancer; and it also did groundbreaking work in the link between tobacco use and smoking and cancer.

One of every three women in this Nation will develop invasive cancer in their lifetime. One of every two men, during their lifetime, will develop invasive cancer. The incidence is higher for men because they smoke more.

We have a long way to go. We have made major progress. The gentleman had said Richard Nixon had declared a war on cancer in 1971, and that was a major, major initiative on the part of the Federal Government.

What we know also, from cancer research, is the only failure in that research is when you quit or you are forced to quit because of lack of funding.

A lot of these new drugs that are coming to market today have been in various phases of discovery for the past 20 years, so to sustain cancer research is to produce promising new therapies, but to also encourage young researchers to stay in the field.

That is our obligation, as Democrats and Republicans of this body, in recognizing that we must fully fund the National Institutes of Health and the National Cancer Institute.

Mr. LANCE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, to my distinguished colleagues from New Jersey and from New York, I thank both of you all for addressing this issue, which is of national importance.

What both of my colleagues have said, Mr. Speaker, is correct. Cancer is a hideous disease, and we need a national commitment to beat this horrific disease.

I want to talk tonight to the American people about a personal experience that I had with cancer. At the same time, I want to also, as my distinguished colleagues did, honor the American Society of Clinical Oncology for their efforts to fight cancer.

When I was 9 years old, my mother developed breast cancer. I was more worried about playing baseball, being a kid; and I can remember vividly the doctor saying: your mother has cancer.

My parents were from the World War II generation. My mother was born in 1922, my dad in 1925, and they did not have a formal education; but I knew something was very wrong that night, and I knew my mother was going to have breast cancer surgery, but I didn't know what cancer was.

We had hoped and prayed that she would get better. Well, about 2 years later, unfortunately, that cancer did metastasize. At the time, my father was working away several hundred miles to keep a job, and I was an only child, and I can remember my mother waking up screaming in pain.

Actually, I didn't realize the cancer had come back, and actually, I called my dad, at that time, who was working in Pittsburgh; and basically, he called the surgeon, and the surgeon said: bring her on in, but I think the cancer is back.

Unfortunately, despite some chemotherapy and treatment, she lost that battle to cancer when I was 13 years old. I was a freshman in high school. That so impacted my life, my father's life, our entire outlook about cancer.

My father came from a generation where a cancer diagnosis was a death sentence, sadly. I can remember him crying when my mother was first diagnosed. He was crying uncontrollably, and I didn't understand why.

He said: no, no, no, this is going to be awful.

Sadly, it was. Interestingly enough, my father did live to the ripe old age of 87½, but I was before my subcommittee—and for the people watching tonight, I serve on the House Appropriations Committee, and one of my subcommittees is the Labor, Education, and Health and Human Services Committee, which actually funds the National Institutes of Health and the National Cancer Institute.

So for those watching—and I applaud my colleague from New Jersey when he was talking about all the other committees, but this committee actually funds research, and it is so, so critically important.

I was actually talking to the head of the NIH at that day and went outside and got a call from my father's doctor. He indicated that my father had an esophageal cancer.

Again, despite the fact that I was almost 50 years old and had a law degree, I didn't understand the gravity of that.

Fortunately, in this great body, in the House of Representatives, I serve with some very fine doctors, men and women who are outstanding doctors. I sat down with some of them, and they told me the gravity of the situation.

Sadly, my father lost that battle to esophageal cancer in 3 months. I went with him to the doctor, and I saw him through that process, and it was a sad process.

□ 2030

What we all know, this story that I have shared and that I have experienced has been experienced by millions of Americans. And sadly, the statistics show that cancer is on the rise, the incidence of cancer is on the rise.

Again, my colleagues alluded to the fact that President Nixon declared war on cancer many years ago. Well, this is a war that is ongoing, and this is a fight that we cannot lose. America ought to lead the way.

In this body, we control spending. We should control the spending. But I think sometimes about all of the waste, fraud, and abuse, duplicative programs and the like where we could actually show a great resolve—not as Republicans, not as Democrats, but as Americans—to beat this hideous disease. And I do want to commend the men and women who are oncologists who fight this fight every day.

In my district, the Third District of Tennessee, I have some very fine cities. One of those cities is Oak Ridge. And in Oak Ridge is the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and that laboratory is doing groundbreaking cancer research. So there is a Federal component to this. Our great universities are fighting this great fight.

And when I have young men and women come to me and say, ''What should I do when I grow up?'' I suggest medicine. It is a noble profession. It still is.

I feel sorry for a lot of the folks who are doctors today because they are facing a lot of challenges, and I think this body ought to resolve to help that profession so that profession, including the oncologists, can continue to provide the health care necessary to fight cancer and other diseases.

But as we move forward as a nation, I would just hope that we would stop and think about the magnitude of the effect of this horrific disease. Cancer one is not cancer two. There is no question about that. We have made tremendous strides toward several cancers, and that is great. We need to defeat breast cancer, but we need to defeat all cancers.

I was so sad to learn that the fight against so many cancers has still been futile. There are so many cancers out there that the success or survival rate is still so low. And I have learned that, actually, as a Congressman.

For those watching, I know our popularity and our numbers in this body sometimes are not that high, but I want to assure the American people that one of the things I do best and I think my colleagues do best is we get educated. People come from around the world, from around the country, constituents, oncologists, doctors, scientists, and they educate us, Mr. Speaker. They educate us about the progress being made on cancer or, sadly, in some cases, the lack of progress being made.

So it is my commitment not only to my constituents, but to all Americans. And I am proud to serve in this body. This is the people's House. This is a wonderful, wonderful body. Our Founding Fathers gave us this body, and our men and women who are fighting to preserve our freedoms in uniform every day allow us to have the great debates that go on in this Chamber.

But there must be a resolve, Mr. Speaker, to defeat cancer. We can do it. The cure for cancer is out there. The strides are being made. And as we work together as Americans, I sincerely hope that we can beat this hideous disease and help the men and women who are going through this and their families. The toll on families is horrific. I saw that as a young boy. I saw it as an adult man.

So, again, I want to thank the oncologists for fighting the good fight. I want to thank my colleagues for allowing me to address this issue tonight. And it is my fervent hope and prayer that we address this, as Americans, and defeat this hideous disease.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlelady from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the distinguished Congressman from New Jersey, Congressman LANCE, for having this very special Special Order this evening and my friends, Congressmen BRIAN HIGGINS, CHUCK FLEISCHMANN, and JOHN CARNEY, for sponsoring this evening's Special Order to recognize the 50th anniversary of the American Society of Clinical Oncology.

One would wonder what seven physicians were doing some 50 years ago. And I am glad that they came together to recognize the vibrance and the vitality of their specialty and the importance of gathering together. They had their first real meeting with 51 physicians in November of 1964. And I am glad that they organized because, as we watch the progression of research and care in the treatment of cancer, we owe a great deal to them. Let me tell you why: because when they founded this organization in 1964, cancer was perceived as largely untreatable. In fact, even today, we still have the remnants of that fear when you get that diagnosis.

Many people call it the big C. There is trepidation and fear. And I would say to you that when those physicians organized in 1964, they understood the awesome and ominous task that they had. Only a handful of hard-to-tolerate and mostly ineffective therapies were even available. And they organized to provide for physicians with proper professional educational background material and the opportunity to come together to facilitate their own improved management of patients with neoplastic diseases, supporting collaborations in medical and research organizations, and initiating and coordinating and cooperating on projects of investigation.

So I am glad to celebrate them today because, in the cancer hospitals across America—and I have the privilege of having in my community MD Anderson. And among the work that MD Anderson does, it collaborates with our local clinics and other hospitals because everyone knows that everyone cannot get into a specific cancer hospital, but they may be in a general hospital in which there is a cancer unit. Those oncologists collaborate with the oncologists in the major cancer centers of America.

And I simply want to thank my colleagues here because MD Anderson has benefited from your understanding of the need for cancer research dollars.

The NIH is an entity that we should fully fund, and I am on record to have that funding. $32 billion is what will put that entity in a position to do its work.

I was interested to listen to the gentleman who spoke of both his mother and his father. And I believe when Members come to the floor and speak of their personal and human experiences, it draws us closer to our constituents and to our colleagues who have walked some of the similar territories.

So as I have listened to his story, mine is different, for I heard that diagnosis—cancer, breast cancer. And I didn't hear it quickly, because when I suspected that my physician was calling to say that, all of a sudden, my phone didn't work, and it was quite difficult to reach me. I was on an airplane. I was in a meeting.

And even in this era of new research, to hear that is a startling and overwhelming experience. But the good news is that oncologists have grown in their research, working with the NIH over these 50 years, and they have been able to give families and children not 100 percent, maybe not even 90 percent, but they have been able to cut the mortality rate of pediatric cancer. All of us know how heart-wrenching that is, how difficult it is to see a child suffer with cancer.

There was a story in my local newspaper. I talked with one of my neighbors a distance away from my community who, sadly, lost their 3-year-old. The community gave that 3-year-old a princess parade some months ago; and, sadly, she lost her life. It is heart-wrenching to see a family member suffer without relief.

But yet, through the oncologists and their research and the work that we are doing here in the United States Congress to support that research, we have been able to impact pediatric cancer. We have been able to work to impact breast cancer. And I have continued to work to highlight the idea that cancer, in all of its forms, can ultimately be cured.

I would like to cite the physicians at MD Anderson. I visited with one today who talked about the new attitude that they have and wanting to get woven into care a large sector of preventative care because they realize that we are living longer. And by living longer, that is a plus, but they are recognizing that more elderly are now susceptible to cancer in their older years and, therefore, we need research, preventative care to be able to get in front of that so that the cost of saving their life can be the amount needed to do so, but that we can put a stop to them losing their life because we have engaged in preventative care.

So I have offered amendments on something called the triple-negative breast cancer. It is one of the most deadly aspects of breast cancer. It impacts minority women, African American and Hispanics, white women and Asians, all women.

I remember being in a breast cancer walk, and a young woman came up to me who, I guess, had been reading everything about it. She hugged me and said, ''I am here to walk for my mother. I saw what you are doing for triple-negative''—a Hispanic young woman. ''She did not make it, but thank you.''

That is how families are. They are so grateful for any recognition of the pain that they went through, that even if they lost their loved one, they are so happy that maybe you are doing something to help others. So I am glad that we are here tonight to be able to acknowledge oncologists who are the very ones who would come and bring forward these new ideas.

Might I just briefly say these few points: one, with respect to triple-negative breast cancer, between 10 and 17 percent of female breast cancer patients have triple-negative. It is three times more likely to cause death than the most common form of breast cancer. Seventy percent of women with metastatic triple-negative breast cancer do not live more than 5 years after being diagnosed. There is no targeted treatment available. The American Cancer Society calls this particular strain of breast cancer ''an aggressive subtype associated with lower survival rates.''

But the good news is that in my conversations with MD Anderson, among the many finite research areas that they are doing, they have included triple-negative breast cancer. I know that those oncologists are going to give us a new day.

So Congressman LANCE, I thank you for honoring now 50 years of oncologists working to ensure that there is a cure. And I want to acknowledge Dr. DePinho, who is the new CEO of MD Anderson, his wife and the amazing research that she is doing, and all of the oncologists there.

But as I close, I would like to recognize a dear friend, MD Anderson oncologist Dr. John Mendelsohn, who served as the CEO for any number of years. Many of my colleagues here in the United States Congress know him well. I call John a friend. He will be honored by the American Society of Clinical Oncology for its 50th anniversary through the organization's Oncology Luminary series. He is an oncologist, as we know. He served as president of MD Anderson through an incredibly productive period of nearly 15 years. The institution doubled in size during his tenure and aimed at higher excellence. He has an international reputation. And he and his collaborators in California produced monoclonal antibody 225, which inhibits human cancer cell proliferation by blocking the signal and pathways that are activated by the receptors for epidermal growth factor.

There are many whom we can cite tonight, but I simply want to celebrate that there is a specialty called oncology that could cause more of us to answer that phone call when we are called and to receive that diagnosis in a way that we know there is hope and that family members will know there is hope and other family members who are now facing a diagnosis of cancer of their loved one will have hope.

Oncologists have given us that hope as they continue to research, and I stand ready with my colleagues to provide the right kind of research and

funding for them to continue to look to save lives.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues Congressmen LEONARD LANCE, BRIAN HIGGINS, CHUCK FLEISHMANN, and JOHN CARNEY for sponsoring this evening's special order to recognize the 50th anniversary of the American Society of Clinical Oncology.

On April 9, 1964, the American Society of Clinical Oncology held its first organizational meeting when 7 physicians who are known as the founders of the organization.

Fifty-one physicians attended the first meeting of the American Society of Clinical Oncology in Chicago in November of 1964.

The ASOC supports oncologists by: providing physicians with proper professional educational background material and the opportunity to facilitate their own improved management of patients with neoplastic diseases; supporting collaborations with other medical and research organizations, national and otherwise, with a view of enhancing professional education in the area of diagnosis and treatment of patients with neoplastic diseases; and initiating, coordinating and cooperating in projects of investigation of human neoplastic disease.

At the time ASCO was established in 1964, cancer was largely untreatable. Only a handful of hard-to-tolerate and mostly ineffective therapies were available.

I want to thank and recognize the Oncologists who serve the residents of the City of Houston for their work and dedication in providing treatment and care to cancer patients.

CONGRESSWOMAN JACKSON LEE'S WORK ON WOMEN'S HEALTH AND SAFETY

I introduced H.R. 80, the Triple-Negative Breast Cancer Research and Education Act.

The bill requires the Director of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to expand, intensify, and coordinate programs for the conduct and support of research on triple-negative breast cancer (breast cancers whose cells are negative for estrogen receptors, progesterone receptors, and the HER2 protein on their sources).

Directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS), acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), to develop and disseminate to the public information regarding triple-negative breast cancer, including information on: (1) the incidence and prevalence of such breast cancer among women, (2) the elevated risk for minority women, and (3) the availability of a range of treatment options.

Requires the Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA), to develop and disseminate information on triple-negative breast cancer to health care providers.

Last year, I offered an amendment that was added to the House of Representatives' Department of Defense Authorization bill that directs the Department of Defense Office of Health to collaborate with the National Institutes of Health to provide resources to identify specific genetic and molecular targets and biomarkers for TNBC.

TRIPLE NEGATIVE BREAST CANCER (TNBC)

Triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC) is a term used to describe breast cancers whose cells do not have estrogen receptors and progesterone receptors, and do not have an excess of the "HER2" protein on their cell membrane of tumor cells.

Between 10–17% of female breast cancer patients have the triple negative subtype.

Three times more likely to cause death than the most common form of breast cancer, 70% of women with metastatic triple negative breast cancer do not live more than five years after being diagnosed.

There is no targeted treatment available for TNBC. The American Cancer Society calls this particular strain of breast cancer "an aggressive subtype associated with lower survival rates."

Triple Negative Breast Cancer (TNBC) cells are usually of a higher grade and size; Onset at a younger age; More aggressive; and more likely to metastasize

TNBC is in fact a heterogeneous group of cancers with varying differences in prognosis and survival rate between various subtypes. This has led to a lot of confusion amongst both physicians and patients.

Apart from surgery, cytotoxic chemotherapy is the only available treatment; targeted molecular treatments while being investigated are not accepted treatment.

POPULATIONS AFFECTED BY TNBC

TNBC disproportionately impacts younger women, African American women, Hispanic/Latina women, and women with a "BRCA1" genetic mutation, which is prevalent in Jewish women.

TNBC usually affects women under 50 years of age.

More than 30% of all breast cancer diagnoses in African American women are of the triple negative variety. Black women are far more susceptible to this dangerous subtype than white or Hispanic women.

Women with TNBC are more likely to have distance metastases in the brain and lung and more common subtypes of breast cancer.

Breast cancers with specific, targeted treatment methods, such as hormone and gene based strains, have higher survival rates than the triple negative subtype, highlighting the need for a targeted treatment.

HOUSTON IS HOME TO MD ANDERSON

I would like recognize MD Anderson Oncologist Dr. John Mendelsohn who will be honored by the American Society of Clinical Oncology for its 50th anniversary through the organization's "Oncology Luminaries" series.

Dr. Mendelsohn is an Oncologist at MD Anderson, which is located in the city of Houston Texas.

Dr. Mendelsohn served as president of MD Anderson through an incredibly productive period of nearly 15 years. The institution more than doubled in size during his tenure, while aiming for even higher excellence in patient care and research.

Dr. Mendelsohn brought to MD Anderson an international reputation for his research on how the binding of growth factors to receptors on the surface of cells regulates cell functions.

He and his collaborators in California produced monoclonal antibody 225, which inhibits human cancer cell proliferation by blocking the signaling pathways that are activated by the receptors for epidermal growth factor.

His subsequent research in the laboratory and the clinic pioneered the universally adopted concept of anti-receptor therapy that targets key cell signaling pathways as a new form of cancer treatment.

I join my colleagues in honoring and recognizing the important contribution to advances in cancer treatment made possible by the American Society of Clinical Oncology.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I think the impassioned remarks of my distinguished colleague from Texas are an indication of her tremendous advocacy on behalf of this issue, not only for her constituents, not only for all of the residents of the great State of Texas, but, indeed, for the entire American people.

□ 2045

Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from Texas spoke movingly about breast cancer. Yesterday, I spoke to a group of advocates dedicated to the treatment of breast cancer and working to ensure that women are educated about breast reconstruction surgery and care options following cancer treatments.

These advocates, working out of love for their mothers, daughters, sisters, and wives, have championed the Breast Cancer Patient Education Act, which will take an educational approach to breast cancer treatment and allow women to have full access to their options.

Since 1998, health care plans that offer breast cancer coverage have been required to provide breast reconstruction surgery and prostheses. Surprisingly, however, Mr. Speaker, recent studies report that up to 70 percent of women eligible for breast reconstruction following cancer treatment are not fully informed of their reconstruction and care options by their general surgeon, and this is particularly true in minority communities.

Many of these advocates have been through great challenges personally, and I have heard both here in Washington and in my offices in New Jersey the stories of fear and insecurity that come with the diagnosis, as the distinguished gentlelady from Texas has indicated, and the despair of having so many questions and too few answers. I hope that at an early date the Congress will pass the Breast Cancer Patient Education Act to work to change that.

In another area of cancer that we have not mentioned this evening, I have worked with colleagues on both sides of the aisle regarding pancreatic cancer, and I know oncologists are fighting hard against this very virulent form of cancer. The survival rate for pancreatic cancer, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, has not increased in 40 years, and the 5-year survival rate, as I understand it, is 7 percent.

It is incumbent upon those of us here in Congress to ensure that NIH and those involved in cancer research at the Federal level do as good a job as possible regarding pancreatic cancer. I acknowledge this evening all of those who are working in that area, as well. The ASCO founded 50 years ago has a great, great history over these last five decades, but much more needs to be done, and we will do it together.

I conclude this evening, Mr. Speaker, on a personal note. I have a twin brother, and we lost our mother to breast

cancer when we were 12 years old. Now, this was almost 50 years ago. Just think of the tremendous progress that has been made in the last 50 years, certainly with the leadership of the ASCO. But more progress needs to be made. And to all of us who have been affected, either personally or familially, based upon our family, regarding the issue of cancer, we stand here on the floor of the House to work together in this bipartisan capacity—and might I suggest nonpartisan capacity—to make sure that as we move forward we move forward together in what I know will be a successful fight.

We will win the war against cancer. We will win it working together in the best traditions of the American Nation. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

RECOGNIZING CHALLENGE ENTERPRISES AND THE ABILITYONE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO) for 17 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Challenge Enterprises of north Florida and the AbilityOne program.

Challenge Enterprises employs more than 300 citizens in my district alone, 179 of whom are disabled persons employed on projects acquired directly as a result of the AbilityOne program. This program has been of great assistance in helping our disabled citizens achieve meaningful employment.

Challenge Enterprises' motto is ''The power of people and possibilities.'' I have visited their facilities to meet their staff, workers, and the wounded warriors to learn what they do and saw firsthand how the AbilityOne program enhances the quality of their lives.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I thank the staff, the workers, and the volunteers of Challenge Enterprises and the AbilityOne program for helping disabled citizens of my district and of north central Florida become productive, self-reliant citizens of their community and of the Third Congressional District.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. COTTON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of the funeral of a friend.

Mr. MCALLISTER (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. PALAZZO (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for the balance of the week on account of the death of a close friend.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and May 9.

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of he following title which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3627. An act to require the Attorney General to report on State law penalties for certain child abusers and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 9, 2014, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5594. A letter from the Director, Issuances Staff, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Eligibility of the Republic of Korea To Export Poultry Products to the United States [Docket No.: FSIS-2012-0019] (RIN: 0583-AD49) received April 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5595. A letter from the Associate Director, National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hispanic-Serving Agricultural Colleges and Universities (RIN: 0524-AA39) received April 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5596. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the 2014 Major Automated Information System (MAIS) Annual Reports (MARs); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5597. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the annual report on operations of the National Defense Stockpile (NDS) in accordance with section 11(a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act as amended (50 U.S.C. 98 et seq.) detailing NDS operations during FY 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5598. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General John F. Mulholland, Jr., United States Army, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5599. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting Report to Congress on Corrosion Policy and Oversight Budget Materials for FY 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5600. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 2013 Actuarial Report on the Financial Outlook for Medicaid; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5601. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a certification of export to China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5602. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report entitled, ''Advancing Freedom and Democracy''; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5603. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report entitled ''Report to Congress on Iran-Related Multilateral Sanctions Regime Efforts'' covering the period from August 7, 2013 to February 6, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5604. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report for the period ending January 15, 2014 on the activities of the Multinational Force and Observers (MFO) and U.S. participation in that organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5605. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5606. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy, transmitting Report to Congress on High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas (HIDTA) Program Funds to Address Methamphetamine Trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5607. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0331; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-170-AD; Amendment 39-17792; AD 2014-05-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5608. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0089; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-166-AD; Amendment 39-17806; AD 2014-06-02](RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5609. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of VOR Federal Airway V-625, Arizona [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0093; Airspace Docket No. 14-AWP-1] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5610. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Regional Aircraft Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1012; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-037-AD; Amendment 39-17807; AD 2014-06-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5611. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rockwell Collins, Inc. Transponders [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0966; Directorate Identifier 2013- CE-040-AD; Amendment 39-17799; AD 2014-05-27] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5612. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; SOCATA Airplanes

[Docket No.: FAA-2013-1019; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-038-AD; Amendment 39-17810; AD 2014-06-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5613. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1253; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-079-AD; Amendment 39-17723; AD 2013-26-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5614. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Prohibition Against Certain Flights Within the Tripoli Flight Information Region (FIR); Extension of Expiration Date [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0246; Amendment No. 91-321A; SFAR No. 112] (RIN: 2120-AJ93) received April 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5615. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Requirements for Chemical Oxygen Generations Installed on Transport Category Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0812; Amendment No. 25-138] (RIN: 2120-AK36) received April 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5616. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30945; Amdt. No. 3579] received April 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5617. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30946; Amdt. No. 3580] received April 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5618. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30947; Amdt. No. 3581] received April 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5619. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30948; Amdt. No. 3582] received April 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5620. A letter from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, transmitting the 2013 report on Security Clearance Determinations; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

5621. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Medicare National Coverage Determinations for Fiscal Year 2013"; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. ELLMERS (for herself and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 4605. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide States an option to cover a children's program of all-inclusive coordinated care (ChiPACC) under the Medicaid program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, and Mrs. CAPITO):

H.R. 4606. A bill to provide an additional authorization of appropriations for the Brookwood-Sago Mine Safety Grants to be used specifically to fund programs that provide hands-on mine safety skills training and certification in mine rescue and mine emergency response; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. NUGENT):

H.R. 4607. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to issue oleoresin capsicum spray to officers and employees of the Bureau of Prisons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. YOHO, Mr. JONES, Mr. AMASH, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 4608. A bill to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 4609. A bill to amend SAFETEA-LU to ensure that projects that assist the establishment of aerotropolis transportation systems are eligible for certain grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 4610. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a grant program to assist the development of aerotropolis transportation systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. BISHOP of New York):

H.R. 4611. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to ensure that employees are not misclassified as non-employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DESANTIS (for himself, Mr. SALMON, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. BENTIVOLIO):

H.R. 4612. A bill to amend the eligibility requirements for funding under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GARCIA (for himself and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 4613. A bill to authorize the Small Business Administrator to establish a grant program to empower encore entrepreneurs; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself and Mrs. LUMMIS):

H.R. 4614. A bill to enhance and clarify the ability of the National Park Service to work cooperatively with Park Partners to better use philanthropic and other non-Federal investments to achieve common objectives, public purposes and benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. PETERS of California):

H.R. 4615. A bill to improve the accuracy of mortgage underwriting used by Federal mortgage agencies by ensuring that energy costs are included in the underwriting process, to reduce the amount of energy consumed by homes, to facilitate the creation of energy efficiency retrofit and construction jobs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 4616. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to provide veterans the option of using an alternative appeals process to more quickly determine claims for disability compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. NUNES, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana):

H.R. 4617. A bill to condition the eligiblity of disabled children aged 16 or 17 for supplemental security income benefits on school attendance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BASS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. MOORE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 4618. A bill to develop and implement national standards for the use of solitary confinement in the Nation's prisons, jails, and juvenile detention facilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 4619. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the rule allowing certain tax-free distributions from individual retirement accounts for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. VELA):

H.R. 4620. A bill to ensure the humane treatment of persons detained pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 4621. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income certain combat zone compensation of civilian employees of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. CHU, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CLAY, Ms. HAHN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. COOK, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HIMES, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LATHAM, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. VEASEY):

H. Res. 577. A resolution recognizing National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges of children in the foster care system, and encouraging Congress to implement policy to improve the lives of children in the foster care system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H. Res. 578. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of May 11, 2014, through May 17, 2014, as ''National Police Week''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

199. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to Legislative Resolution 440 urging the Congress to reauthorize federally provided terrorism reinsurance for insurers in order to maintain stability in the insurance and reinsurance markets; to the Committee on Financial Services.

200. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, relative to House Memorial 2001 urging the Congress to restore the presumption of a service connection between Agent Orange exposure and subsequent illnesses to United States Vietnam War veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 4605.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 4606.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution: the Congress shall have the power to provide for the general welfare of the United States.

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 4607.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 9 and Section 1 of Article 3 of the Constitution to create and regulate Federal Courts.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 4608.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 4609.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 4610.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 4611.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced under the powers granted to Congress under Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. DESANTIS:

H.R. 4612.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GARCIA:

H.R. 4613.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to clause 3 of section 8 of article 1 of the U.S. Constitution and clause 18 of section 8 of article 1 of the U.S. constitution.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 4614.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: ''The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular state.''

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 4615.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 4616.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, ''To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 4617.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 4618.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority for this bill stems from Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 4619.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 4620.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 4621.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 24: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 274: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 455: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 494: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 523: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 543: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 647: Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 721: Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 831: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 958: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H. R. 962: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1008: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1020: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
H.R. 1129: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1146: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1148: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1250: Mr. RICE of South Carolina and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1354: Mr. RUNYAN.
H.R. 1373: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1427: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 1449: Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 1461: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1462: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 1518: Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 1528: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 1573: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 1601: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1717: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 1761: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 1801: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1840: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1843: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1878: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 2146: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2315: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2415: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2429: Ms. FOXX and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 2484: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 2495: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2500: Mr. ROSS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BERA of California, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 2520: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 2536: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 2607: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 2647: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 2692: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 2744: Mrs. BACHMANN and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2807: Mr. GIBBS and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2827: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 2870: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 2969: Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 3077: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 3118: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 3184: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 3279: Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 3320: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 3339: Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 3344: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 3395: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 3398: Mr. DELANEY, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 3407: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3510: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3530: Mr. PETERS of California, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 3543: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3548: Mr. MORAN, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. JENKINS, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 3610: Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 3649: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 3698: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 3708: Ms. ESTY and Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 3723: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 3742: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 3747: Mr. NOLAN and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3749: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 3782: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 3852: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 3877: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 3905: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 3930: Mr. YODER and Mr. DAINES.
H.R. 3969: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 3988: Mr. BERA of California, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4008: Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 4067: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 4068: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 4119: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 4143: Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 4158: Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 4190: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 4216: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 4221: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4225: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 4232: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 4234: Mr. VISCLOSKY and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 4237: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 4261: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4265: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H.R. 4351: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 4370: Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 4374: Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 4382: Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 4383: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 4395: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 4411: Mr. BERA of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. GARCIA.
H.R. 4426: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 4430: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. LONG, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 4436: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 4440: Mr. SIRES, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 4443: Mr. TONKO, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. MENG, and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 4447: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. FINCHER.
H.R. 4450: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BARBER, and Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 4459: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 4460: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 4461: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4489: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 4491: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 4509: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 4510: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 4515: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOLT, and Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 4522: Mr. MORAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 4523: Mr. VELA and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 4531: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 4544: Mr. COSTA, Ms. BASS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 4547: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 4552: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 4557: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 4567: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 4578: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 4587: Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 4604: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
H.J. Res. 20: Ms. SPEIER.
H. Con. Res. 87: Mr. JONES and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H. Res. 98: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 221: Mr. ELLISON.
H. Res. 231: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. JORDAN, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H. Res. 329: Mr. GOWDY.
H. Res. 440: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. RENACCI.
H. Res. 540: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H. Res. 562: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H. Res. 571: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 573: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. ESTY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. TITUS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. PAULSEN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. COOK, Mr. KEATING, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. MENG, and Mr. ISRAEL.