United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 23, 2014 No. 116

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 23, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CYNTHIA M. LUMMIS 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.

THE HUNGRY RUSSIAN BEAR

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, in the sky above eastern Ukraine, a surface-to-air missile was launched, and it destroyed a Malaysian civilian airliner. The dastardly deed killed—rather, murdered—298 people.

It appears the missile and launcher were Russian. The individuals shooting down the plane were so-called ''Russian-backed separatists'' in Ukraine. Apparently, the crash, which is a crime scene on the ground, is controlled by pro-Russian sympathizers, and it has been compromised by unknown malcontents.

It seems to me the Russian emperor, Putin—the Napoleon of Siberia—has his pitiful, complicit fingerprints all over this *Lusitania*-type incident. This is the latest in a series of aggressive acts by the Russian bear. In 2008, the Russians invaded the sovereign nation of Georgia. The bear gobbled up one-third of the nation. The world leaders protested loudly, but they were glad it wasn't their homelands. Then the world moved on.

Madam Speaker, the Russian tanks are still in Georgia. I have seen them.

Then the bear hibernated and woke up hungry in 2013 and invaded Crimea—a part of the country of Ukraine—to satisfy its appetite for more aggression. Now the Russians unlawfully occupy Crimea. The world leaders, once again, voiced opposition but went back to their policy of appeasement.

But Crimea did not fill the belly of the bear. So, still hungry, the bear of the north moved into eastern Ukraine and looked for more prey. It subversively has supported insurrection against the Ukrainian Government to gain more territory. Reports indicate Russian special forces are playing the role of pro-Russian separatists. Battles are being fought. People are dying. Russian imperialism persists in its aggression.

Then, recently, the Malaysian airplane was shot down over Ukraine. Also, in the last 24 hours, two Ukrainian military jets were shot down by Russian-backed rebels. The world leaders are self-righteously outraged. However, nothing has stopped the Russian bear.

What will the heads of state do? Will the leaders continue to take the position that, since the bear hasn't eaten them, they will do little but pontificate and hope the bear's appetite is satisfied?

Maybe the bear will hibernate again, Madam Speaker, but when it wakes up, like it always does, it will wake up hungry. Then, when it roars, who will be devoured next, the rest of Ukraine?—or maybe Moldova or Latvia or Estonia or Poland?—or just another innocent group of men, women, and children on a civilian airline?

Only Putin knows what the awakening roar of the Russian bear will bring to the rest of humanity. Appeasement certainly doesn't seem to be working, and it is not the answer to stopping aggression.

Madam Speaker, is there not one bold Churchill to be found amidst the overpopulated, boastful Chamberlains among us?

And that's just the way it is.

FULL-SERVICE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS ACT

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

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I rise today, alongside my Republican colleague from Illinois, Representative AARON SCHOCK, who is here to speak about the Full-Service Community Schools Act of 2014, which we will be introducing later today. This is an issue that I have been working on, Madam Speaker, for several years, one that will help us close the achievement gap that too many of our children face.

Our bipartisan bill creates a competitive grant program to expand the full-service community schools model across the country. Full-service community schools are an innovative approach to help students and their parents access a full range of critical services all in one place. Let me emphasize these are services that are currently available but that are not as accessible because they are not centralized. We will encourage communities to put together the services that they already

Printed on recycled paper.

provide in an accessible way for children and their families.

For low-income parents who are working multiple jobs as they send their kids to school, finding time to provide them with adequate medical checkups and dental screenings is often very difficult. The full-service community schools model locates these services at their children's schools, along with nutritional counseling, financial literacy education, and adult classes—services that in most communities are already offered—to make it easier for both students and parents to access these services under one roof. It also helps ensure parents have the tools they need to support their children's learning—so critically important to the children's success. Studies show that when children are healthy they learn better and have a better chance at academic success.

Maryland has been employing this model for several years now in the form of Judy Centers, named for my late wife, Judy Hoyer, who was an early childhood administrator in Prince George's County. The Maryland State Department of Education has found that children accessing services at Judy Centers perform better than their peers who did not when tested for kindergarten readiness. I know the gentleman from Illinois has similar evidence from a full-service community school program in his State. In his district, in fact, his university from which he graduated partners with that full-service school, Bradley University in Peoria.

The results are clear that the full-service community schools model has the potential—and in fact, in our own State, we have realized that potential—to help millions of low-income families across the country ensure that their children can do well in school and have a better shot at being college or career ready when they graduate. This is good for America. It is good for the children. It is good for their families. It is good for our competitiveness. This legislation, Madam Speaker, is an example of what is possible when we set differences aside and work together.

Now, AARON SCHOCK is a good friend of mine. He is a Republican and I am a Democrat, and some say, well, that doesn't really happen in Washington—but it does. Outside of the ambit of this bill, AARON and I have worked on a number of pieces of legislation, and I am proud of the fact that we are working on this legislation together on behalf of children, on behalf of families, on behalf of our country. This legislation is an example of what is possible when we set our differences aside, as I said. We work together across the aisle to make progress for those who are trying to make it in America for themselves and for their families.

I want to thank Representative SCHOCK for partnering with me on this effort, and I hope this Congress can come together, as the two of us have done, and work in a bipartisan fashion to pass this bill without delay.

FULL-SERVICE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS ACT

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

Mr. SCHOCK. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Full-Service Community Schools Act of 2014, which I am pleased to be introducing with my friend, Mr. HOYER.

A strong education is the foundation our children need to succeed in life. Unfortunately, issues affecting students' home lives often interfere with their ability to achieve their true potential.

One innovation that seeks to overcome these burdens is full-service community schools. As Mr. HOYER mentioned, in my hometown of Peoria, Illinois, three of these schools have been created and are operated with the support of Bradley University. The Harrison full-service community school has many of these diverse programs.

Harrison promotes events such as Fitness with Firemen, which teaches students the importance of a healthy lifestyle, or Hawkeye News, which is another program that uses smart boards to let students write, produce, and read the news in both English and Spanish. LEGACY is yet another program that gives young people the skills they need to transition from grade school to high school and beyond.

The utility of these schools is further illustrated by the Trewyn full-service community school in Peoria. At Trewyn, the Riding Tigers Horse Club allows financially disadvantaged students to learn how to ride and take care of horses. The riding program has been so successful that it has attracted the attention of parents, many of whom have never had the privilege of riding a horse themselves. Trewyn is also committed to getting parents more actively involved in their children's educations with programs like the Parent Advisory Council. We all know that parental engagement is key to a child's success and learning, and successful alternative programs like this deserve a chance to positively impact our communities.

The program that best captures the collaboration between a full-service community school and the local community is Manual Academy's Academic Progress Conference, the APC. The APC program provides a platform for students to share their academic progress reports with the community and receive feedback from local community members. These gatherings have given community members greater insight to the challenges these students face in their community while also strengthening the ties between the students and the students' neighborhoods.

You see, full-service community school programs have received positive feedback from both school leaders and the parents. For example, parents have expressed to me that they have seen that full-service community schools have promoted students' creativity outside the classroom, and school leaders have credited the program for allowing students to experience relevant school activities that are matched to their personal interests.

I can tell you, as a former school board member and as the youngest school board president in Illinois' history at District 150, I know the challenges that these parents, teachers, and school administrators face every day. Motivating these children to learn, teaching them and meeting their basic needs are a daily reality for everybody involved. If we don't do it, it doesn't happen. The full-service community schools are an important tool in this effort, and although relatively new to the Peoria area, these schools are making a difference to educators, to parents, and, most importantly, to the students.

The Full-Service Community Schools Act of 2014 will expand the opportunity for more schools to become full-service community schools and to see the benefit to the neighborhoods as well. As Congress continues to seek innovative solutions to address our national educational needs, the full-service community schools should play an important role.

Again, I want to thank my friend from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for his leadership on this important cause. On a personal note, I want to join him in a fitting tribute to his late wife, without whom full-service community schools may never have enjoyed the remarkable success they have in his home State or in mine.

I look forward to working with Mr. HOYER on this effort, and I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this important program throughout our country.

□ 1015

CRISES IN UKRAINE AND NIGERIA

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, on Monday, I joined other Houstonians to express our sympathy by greeting citizens from the Netherlands and Malaysia after the enormous tragedy that occurred just 4 days ago, or more than 4 days ago, the shooting-down of the Malaysian flight over Ukraine territory, manned by an illegitimate government that thought it was appropriate to shoot missiles where no knowledge, allegedly, was gained or understood as to what it was, and hundreds of souls lost their lives.

I hope that today, as the remains will be reaching the soil of the Netherlands, we will all take a moment to reflect on that enormous tragedy.

As a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I am, obviously, extraordinarily disturbed because it pierced the sanctity of the international airways, and it says that

there is no respect, dignity, or protocol as relates to the commercial flights and international airway.

That, first of all, for all countries, must be abhorrent and outrageous. And then, we must take knowledge of the atrocious behavior of Russia. And it should not be silenced; their behavior is outrageous.

It is inappropriate because Mr. Putin is a head of State. Bodies of another sovereign nation lay in a field, many sovereign nations. Mr. Putin did absolutely nothing to avoid the desecration and the insult and the indignities given to those lost souls.

I am reminded of crashes over the years when countries or airlines were able to take the family members, within days, to the site for prayer or acknowledgment, giving them added comfort.

So I think it is important to understand, and I refer my colleagues to an article, yes, in The Wall Street Journal, on why Putin is taking major risks in Ukraine. He is still living in the world of the Soviet Union.

But it is imperative to know that we have something that we can offer, besides a request of peace, reconciliation, and international investigation unfettered. We have something that we can acknowledge.

Even the Transportation Secretary indicated that energy resources, natural gas, oil and gas, natural gas, LNG, are resources that we can utilize to substitute for the despotic hold that he has over Europe.

The Secretary of Transportation indicated it is a creator of jobs. But we need to start having Europe turn to the United States to ensure the opportunity for freedom and ceasing this atrocious hold on Europe.

Let me state, just for a moment, to acknowledge a tragedy and the terrorism of Boko Haram. I will go to the Nigerian Embassy today, Madam Speaker, to acknowledge that the girls in captivity have been held for almost 100 days.

I will look to introduce legislation that will use some of the seized Nigerian assets that have been seized through criminal activity to establish a real victims funded, even though I congratulate President Jonathan for creating one, but there has been no money given to these victims.

And I will say that we need to watch this place because Boko Haram has now seized a whole town in the Northern State, the very State we were in when we went to Nigeria and spoke to the Governor. Now, a whole city, like New York or Chicago or Houston, has been seized.

We have elements that we can do something about: Russia and its misbehavior, mistreatment of lost souls, and the terrorists and terrorist activities of Boko Haram.

I implore my colleagues to work together to find a solution so that souls may be buried in dignity and never have this happen to them again and, as well, so that Boko Haram, is in essence, brought to justice.

ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF AMERICAN EXCEPTIONALISM

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a truly extraordinary and exceptional American, a man by the name of John Kanzius, and to recognize a major milestone in John's dream to find a better way to treat cancer: that is the completion of the Kanzius Cancer Research Foundation's mission.

When I first came to Washington, I was absolutely amazed by the number of academicians, researchers, thinkers, and intellectuals that work and reside in our Nation's Capitol. You know, you listen to these people and you say, my goodness, we are so blessed, as a country, to have this great wealth of knowledge and the sheer brain power, the collection of brain power around here is incredible.

Then you learn about something even more incredible and even more remarkable, and it happens right in your own home district and in a town that you represent. And you say, wait a minute. In Erie, Pennsylvania, a guy named John Kanzius recognized that there had to be a better way to treat cancer.

Now, John is truly an inspiration, not just to me and to his family, but to the entire country and, especially, to the cancer community.

Let me tell you a little bit about John. John was born in Washington, Pennsylvania, in 1944. John made a living as a radio and TV engineer, and was a onetime station owner.

When he retired, John and his wife, Marianne, they had already completed their successful professional life and had raised two adult children. They headed to Florida like a lot of Americans do to enjoy their retirement. But that is not what was in store for John.

In 2002, John was diagnosed with terminal leukemia and had undergone countless treatments of toxic chemotherapy. And this is the worst kind of luck that put John on a new path, and a miraculous path, because it gave John the idea that maybe you could use radio waves to kill cancer cells.

Now, while John didn't have a medical background, he did understand radio waves. And when he was diagnosed with terminal leukemia in 2002, his knowledge of the deficiencies in modern cancer treatment became firsthand.

But it wasn't John's sickness that motivated him. It was the sad and helpless eyes of all those children he would see in the cancer ward when he went in for his chemo and he would see these kids sitting there, their hands bandaged up, their frail bodies, knowing that they couldn't go outside and play the way other children did.

He looked at that and said, there has got to be a better way to treat this horrible disease. And that is what motivated him.

Now, I want you to think about something, because John Kanzius—and anybody who has been through this—my own sister died of pancreatic cancer—as you go through that, as the person, whether it happens to you or somebody in your family, you start to feel what they are going through.

John couldn't sleep at night. And rather than wake Marianne up, you know what he decided to do?

One morning, at 2 a.m. he got up and he went downstairs. So he grabbed some copper wire, some boxes, some antennas, and Marianne's pie pans, and he starts to build a machine.

This is just an average, everyday guy who just got it. He understood that technology. Now, he is weak and weary from his own cancer, but John continued to work. By the spring of 2004, John was feeling a little better and he started to get the word out about his discovery and he started to raise money for more expansive research.

Could radio waves be the key to a nontoxic, noninvasive way to treatment?

If one could find a way to direct metal to cancer cells, could radio waves be the answer to the prayers of countless people, young and old, suffering health failure and an uncertain future on account of this cancer?

Now, confronted with his own battle and the suffering of so many young people, John Kanzius' can-do attitude kicked in, and he set out to demonstrate that radio waves, indeed, could kill cancer cells without harming any other tissue. No collateral damage. And this endeavor became the mission of the Kanzius Cancer Research Foundation in Erie, Pennsylvania.

Now, in the midst of undergoing dozens of rounds of toxic chemotherapy, he encountered so many sick young people facing a similar ordeal. The cancer and the chemo were stealing these children's health, and John was tormented by the reality that was reflected in their faces. He just knew that there had to be a better way, and he went about it.

Last month, on June 30, the Kanzius Cancer Research Foundation announced that the organization would be closing its doors, after raising more than $15 million in donations, a day that John Kanzius had only dreamed about.

And why?

Because the Kanzius research team is now entering into the next phase by submitting up an application to the FDA to initiate human trials to test the possibility of John's vision of curing and treating cancer.

The Kanzius Foundation has funded all the research necessary for the team to demonstrate how the technology works and begin the first phases of these trials, which will target pancreatic and liver cancers, two of the

particularly deadly forms of cancer. If successful, the treatment will be a game-changer for so many of these people with these two types of cancer.

Now, while John is not around to see the culmination of his life work because he passed away in 2009 at the age of 64, I don't only trust, I know that John is seeing what is going on today. And I am so happy to be here and be able to talk about the Kanzius Research Center.

Some of the people are in the gallery actually: my good friend, Mark Neidig, who is the executive director; board president, Maryann Yochim; and D.C. board member, Debra Thornton, to name a few. Again, an exceptional American.

WINDS OF CHANGE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, today, Oregon begins a campaign that may turn the corner, once and for all, on our illogical, ill-advised approach to marijuana.

We have reached a critical point, where, over the last 40 years, a misguided policy of prohibition has patently failed. It simply doesn't work. It criminalizes behavior that most Americans feel should be legal. It costs taxpayers billions of dollars a year in the futile enforcement of prohibition. It feeds billions more into the coffers of drug cartels, which destabilize Mexico while they terrorize Central American countries, sending tens of thousands of children fleeing to our borders.

Imagine a situation so desperate that a parent would send a child on a treacherous journey, thousands of miles away.

The current policy undermines the credibility of government drug prevention programs. How do we expect people to respect an authority that pretends marijuana is more dangerous than methamphetamine or cocaine, that cannot answer the simple question: Has anybody ever died of a marijuana overdose?

Why respect an agency that wastes time and money that should be spent on drugs that are much more deadly and addictive?

The winds of change are blowing through the Capitol. We have seen, in the recent weeks, we have had five consecutive victorious votes on the House floor to have a more rational policy.

But the real leadership is at the State level. Forcing the issue are 23 States and the District of Columbia, where, now, over a million patients have access to medical marijuana, often in programs authorized by the voters.

In 2012, voters in Colorado and Washington both legalized adult use and have now started commercial markets, in Washington State just this month.

The campaign in Oregon is going to be key. It is a carefully-drawn statute which will be considered by the voters.

Now, make no mistake, the one-size-fits-all prohibition fanatics will be out in force, and we will hear about any hiccups in the neighboring State of Washington, largely blown out of proportion.

But we are going to hear everybody talk about their legitimate concern for keeping marijuana out of the hands of children. We all agree that young brains should not be subjected to marijuana. But, frankly, this is one of the biggest failures of our current program of prohibition.

We have a huge underground, shadow market. No one thinks that a 12-year old has a harder time getting a joint than a case of beer. Nobody checks ID. No one has a license to lose.

The success in Oregon will usher in, I think, a new era where the States have the right to regulate marijuana, just like alcohol. There will be more money for things we care about, like education, drug treatment, and drug enforcement, to keep and protect our children.

The failure of the current Federal prohibition is obvious. I am hopeful that voters in Oregon can help usher in this new era of regulation for adults and protections for children.

I think it is going to be a fascinating public policy debate.

□ 1030

WATERS OF THE U.S.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, the Environmental Protection Agency's regulatory attack on our economy and way of life in central and northwestern Pennsylvania has been growing for some time.

In recent months, the EPA moved forward with an egregious power grab to redefine the Agency's jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act through a new proposed rule commonly known as the Waters of the United States.

In Pennsylvania, agriculture is our number one industry. As in other parts of the country, our farmers and ranchers know that clean air, clean water, and being good stewards of the environment in which they live and work is of fundamental importance to their livelihoods.

Despite local prerogatives and successful State and regional initiatives to protect our natural resources, the Federal Government, once again, has chosen to undercut these efforts with punitive Federal regulations.

In March, the EPA issued the Waters of the U.S. proposal, explaining that the rule expands neither Federal authorities, nor the amount of water or land under the Agency's jurisdiction.

Well, the EPA has argued the action is necessary to eliminate ambiguity over which bodies of water are jurisdictional under the law. Unfortunately, this is a far cry from the truth. In reality, the EPA's plan represents an unprecedented expansion of Federal power that will harm our economy and erode the rights of both States and private landowners.

Enacted in 1972, the Clean Water Act was created as a partnership between the States and the EPA in order to better manage identified pollution sources through a range of pollution control programs, such as setting wastewater standards.

The scope of the law is limited to navigable waters, and for the first time, it made it unlawful to discharge any pollutants into these bodies, unless a permit was obtained.

The law was never intended to impinge upon States' authority as the primary managers of water resources within their borders. The law was never intended to regulate small, noncontiguous bodies of water, such as streams, ditches, ponds, and creek beds, which would impose unnecessary burdens on economic activity. Unfortunately, that is exactly what the EPA has proposed.

Despite Supreme Court rulings interpreting the regulatory scope of the Clean Water Act more narrowly than what the Federal Government has asserted, the EPA's new rule moves in the opposite direction.

In fact, essentially all waters in the country under the EPA's proposed rule could potentially be subject to regulation and permitting approval by the Federal Government.

The Obama administration and the EPA have argued the rule is intended to eliminate ambiguity and offer greater protections for States, farmers, and landowners when, in fact, it will create new regulatory burdens, more ambiguity, and less certainty.

EPA Chief Gina McCarthy earlier this month characterized the growing opposition to the Waters of the U.S. rule—which has come from both Republicans and Democrats—as ''ludicrous'' and ''silly'' and recently summarized the backlash as a ''growing list of misunderstandings.''

Madam Speaker, it is no misunderstanding. EPA's new Waters of the U.S. rule is a historic power grab that poses a fundamental threat to our economy and way of life in Pennsylvania and for communities across the country.

Unfortunately, the only thing ludicrous is how the EPA continues to believe a punitive one-size-fits-all approach to environmental stewardship is the only way forward.

RECOGNIZING BOY SCOUT TROOP 772

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

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding group from my district, Boy Scout Troop 772 of Fort Pierce, Florida.

Troop 772 was established last year at Dan McCarty Middle School as a community effort to keep young men in the area engaged in positive after-school activities by providing support and guidance. Troop 772 is no ordinary Boy Scout troop. It is much more.

For too long, Fort Pierce has been plagued by gangs, by rampant violent crime that has taken the lives of neighbors and colleagues, friends and loved ones. For the young men of Troop 772, this violence isn't just something they see on the television or hear about in the abstract. It is the terrifying reality they face every day of their lives.

I want to share what these Scouts have said about what it is like in their community in their own words: ''I want you to get rid of gangs in my community. I want to be able to wear any colors I want without having to change. It would be good to go a week or so without hearing a gunshot. We will be better if people stop fighting.''

When I hear this, I am both saddened and outraged. No one—let alone our youth—should have to live in constant fear of violence, but at the same time, I am hopeful. What brings me hope for Fort Pierce is Troop 772. Troop 772 was born out of violence, but in them, I see a solution to that violence.

When Troop 772 was just an idea, there was a lot of skepticism. There was skepticism about whether the troop could move these young men away from the violence and into their community, but the troop, the community, and, in particular, the adult leadership of the troop has given much-needed support to these young men.

They have been a constant presence in the lives of these Scouts at a time when they need them the most, at a time when others in their community would only do them harm. It is clear that this troop will help make the community a safer and better place to live.

These young men who had struggled or had bad behavior are starting to thrive as a result of Troop 772 and the positive environment it provides.

Earlier this year, I was privileged to visit with the troop and see their hard work and dedication firsthand while they worked on a local environmental project.

It is this kind of hard work and commitment that will help these young men succeed and become the leaders of tomorrow. It is this kind of hard work and commitment that has brought Troop 772 to Washington today to receive their Citizenship in the Nation merit badges. It is truly an honor to recognize them with this major accomplishment and the dedication that has brought them here.

I also want to take a moment to recognize all of those individuals who helped them reach this monumental point today. I want to thank Scoutmaster Rusty Hines and Assistant Scoutmasters Dan Hafner and Bob Taylor for teaching Troop 772 leadership and Scouting skills, as well as for making the Scouting experience so enjoyable for these young men.

Thanks to all of the members of the community who helped make this trip of a lifetime possible and State Representative Larry Lee, Jr., and St. Lucie County Commissioner Kim Johnson for showing their continued support of these young men by joining them here today.

Of course, I also want to thank Scott Van Duzer, who made Troop 772 a reality. Through his Van Duzer Foundation, his dedication to helping these young men and bettering our community is unwavering. Our community will be forever grateful for all of their work, which has touched so many lives and inspired an entire community.

Lastly and most importantly, I want to thank the Scouts of the troop. Our community is so proud of what they have achieved, individually and together. This troop is a testament to what can be accomplished when youth are given the chance to succeed.

ARTICLES OF IMPEACHMENT AGAINST ERIC HOLDER

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

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, last November, I filed Articles of Impeachment against our Attorney General, Eric Holder. This was a serious action. I am not happy that I had to do it.

The trust of the American people in their government is at an alltime low. They wonder: Where is the Constitution? Is it still law? Is it alive?

It is still law. It is still alive. I took a sacred oath to defend it. All of my colleagues took that same oath. Mr. Holder took that oath. Sadly, he has broken that oath many times.

He has a long record of enforcing laws he likes and ignoring laws he doesn't like. The oath he took doesn't give him that choice. He is the number one law enforcement official in America.

We are having an immigration crisis on our border with Mexico. Kids are coming across in record numbers. Next year, our Border Patrol thinks that 150,000 kids will cross illegally. That is roughly the same number of Allied Forces that invaded Normandy on D-day.

We have laws on the books to stop this crisis, and yet Mr. Holder won't enforce those laws. Instead, he made up new rules that refuse to deport people who have come here illegally. He chose to break our laws. He chose to break his oath.

The Internal Revenue Service has been using our Tax Code to harass Americans because their political views oppose the administration's. The watchdog over the IRS begged Mr. Holder to investigate because crimes may have been committed within the IRS by senior officials. Mr. Holder chose not to investigate the IRS. He chose politics over our laws. He chose to break his oath.

Finally, Mr. Holder, under oath to tell the truth, told Congress that he had no involvement in an operation against a reporter working for a network Mr. Holder didn't like, yet Mr. Holder's signature was on the paper approving that operation. He chose to break our laws. He chose to break his oath.

Hoping to remind Mr. Holder about his oath and his duty to enforce all of our laws, Congress held Mr. Holder in contempt in June of 2012. He made history, with two bipartisan votes holding him in contempt of Congress. Sadly, 2 years later, Mr. Holder continues to break his oath.

The only weapon Congress has for Federal officials who break their oath and our law is impeachment. I have 28 cosponsors of my resolution to impeach Mr. Holder. I ask my colleagues to remember that we are a Nation of laws.

Show the American people that our Constitution is alive and well—cosponsor H. Res. 411, Articles of Impeachment against Eric Holder.

THE BLAME BARACK OBAMA CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, we have a humanitarian crisis at our border that challenges the capacity of the United States of America to address it from both a resource perspective and from a compassionate perspective.

Tens of thousands of unaccompanied minors are seeking entry into this country, children who are fleeing extreme violence in the northern triangle countries of Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala.

Now, there are some in this institution who want to lay blame for this crisis at the feet of the Obama administration. This is not a surprising development because these individuals are members of the BBO caucus, the blame Barack Obama caucus.

Whenever anything happens in this country or in this world, they want to blame the President of the United States. Something goes wrong in Iraq, a war that was prosecuted, that was botched, that was mismanaged by the previous administration, the BBO caucus blames Barack Obama.

So we are seeing a similar phenomenon as it relates to this humanitarian crisis. First, they claim it was brought about by the President's decision related to deferred action connected to individuals falling into the DREAMer category.

□ 1045

But they failed to note that in order to be eligible for deferred action, you have to be in this country continuously since 2007. That claim has no basis in reality.

Then they say, well, the President refuses to enforce our Nation's immigration laws. How silly is that argument? Hundreds of thousands of individuals have been deported by the Obama administration each and every year in

record numbers, particularly when compared to the previous Republican President. The unenforcement argument has no basis in reality.

Then, lastly, they say, well, this has to do with comprehensive immigration reform. Comprehensive immigration reform is not the law of the land. The bill was passed by the Senate. It hasn't even been acted upon by the House, let alone sent to the President for his signature. And even if a pathway toward citizenship were created, if you look at the legislation, only individuals in this country since December of 2011 would be eligible.

Yet the blame Barack Obama caucus doesn't care about the facts. Well, here are the facts. The individuals, the children who are fleeing and who are coming to this country, are trying to escape extreme violence, gang activity, drug trafficking, sexual abuse, and intimidation. The Northern Triangle countries of Central America—El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras—are among the most violent in the world. Honduras is the murder capital of the world—number one. El Salvador is number four, and Guatemala is number five.

How do we know that this phenomenon is not simply Uncle Sam throwing his hands up saying come into our country? Well, here is another reason. All of the Central American neighbors to our south outside of these Northern Triangle countries have also experienced an exponential increase in unaccompanied minors. Mexico, Belize, Panama, Costa Rica, and Nicaragua have all experienced significant increases in children coming to those countries, more than a 400 percent increase collectively in asylum applications in 2012.

This is not a pull from the United States. These children are running for their lives. And so we have got to address it with an understanding of what is the root cause of the humanitarian crisis.

Several of us on the Judiciary Committee have introduced the Vulnerable Immigrant Voice Act because we believe that the unaccompanied children should have access to counsel. It would benefit the taxpayer in making immigration proceedings more efficient and ensuring expedited removal when merited and in making sure that unnecessary detention doesn't take place.

Now, many of these children will not have a valid legal basis to remain, but some will. Some will have asylum claims, U visa, or Special Immigrant Juvenile Status, and for that reason we should give them access to counsel and do what is right for these children.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of a package of human trafficking legislation to be considered by the House today. I also rise to recognize and support all the good work done by my colleagues to combat the hideous crime of human trafficking.

Madam Speaker, as a former United States Ambassador, I was exposed firsthand to the horrors of human trafficking on an international level. I witnessed and reported on the devastating consequences of human trafficking, but never in my wildest dreams did I ever think human trafficking was so rampant right here in the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, right now, there are young women and children being forced into prostitution in virtually every district across this Nation. In fact, I was shocked to learn that my own hometown of St. Louis has been identified as one of the top 20 areas for sex trafficking in the United States.

Madam Speaker, this problem is hiding in plain sight. Every year, thousands of young Americans' lives are impacted by this despicable crime. However, I take hope from all the good work being done by law enforcement and those who work in victims' services. Most importantly, I take hope from all the survivors of this hideous crime. Their strength gives us strength; their resolve gives us inspiration; and their steadfast commitment to ending sex trafficking gives us all the courage to fight.

Madam Speaker, because of the efforts of many individuals and groups, I am happy to report that Congress has taken notice of this very serious problem. Years of work have raised awareness of this issue and have laid the foundation for the long overdue action that Congress is presently taking. I applaud these efforts, and I look forward to continuing this work for years to come.

However, Madam Speaker, there is much work yet to be done. As legislators, we have an obligation to come together and do something because we can, because we should, and because we must. I urge Senator REID to take up the bills that the House has already passed that take steps to address this horrible crime, including the Stop Advertising Victims of Exploitation, or SAVE, Act, which I had the pleasure of passing with overwhelming bipartisan support.

THE CRISIS IN FOREST FIRE FUNDING

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, we have a crisis in firefighting funds here in the United States of America, and what has this Congress done about it? Nothing. Absolutely nothing. Zero. Nada. It hasn't even held a hearing.

Right now there are 11 major fires burning in Oregon, five in Washington—one the largest in the history of the State—two in Utah, two in Idaho, one in California, and one in Arizona. There are forecasts for a substantial amount of new lightning storms moving through, and that means more fires. Our resources are about at their maximum, and the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service are about to run out of funds. Now, this was predictable.

The budget set by the Republicans and PAUL RYAN was totally inadequate. There was a proposal, which is the rarest of things in this town, a bipartisan—Republicans and Democrats—bicameral—Senate and House—proposal supported by the President of the United States, and that was to look at what has happened over the last 10 years of the dramatic increase in the severity and the occurrence of fires, particularly in the Western United States, on public lands and to give the Forest Service a budget adequate to fight those fires year in and year out. And also, for those extraordinary fires, the ones that are pretty much unprecedented in history because of mismanagement, climate change, and a number of other things, to fight those with emergency funds just like we deal with tornadoes, hurricanes, and earthquakes.

That money should not come out of the budget of the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior, because what do they have to do? Starting later this month, they are going to devastate the remainder of their budget. That means, instead of going out and reducing fuels on fires through contracts, using private contractors and mitigating the future risk of fire, they are going to have to cancel those contracts for this year because they are going to have to spend the money to fight the fires.

Then, it is not only firefighting contracts they have to cancel, they have to devastate all across their budget, including recreation programs and their timber sale programs, things that bring in revenue to the Federal Government. Any State that has Federal lands administered by the Department of the Interior or the Forest Service—most of the States in the Union, much more of an impact in certain States than others—will see a detrimental impact because the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior are going to have to rob their budgets to pay for the costs of these fires.

It also means that we didn't have as many people pre-deployed; we didn't have as much equipment pre-deployed; and we didn't have all the resources we needed ready. We also need a whole new firefighting fleet. We are using World War II aircraft. They are kind of at the end of their useful life. And we are now pressing into service planes that are not particularly efficient at fighting fires because we don't have a fleet of planes, a modern fleet of planes, to assist our firefighters to help save their lives on the ground and help save the lives of people in the communities that are affected.

And what has this House of Representatives done? Nothing. Not even a hearing. Now, we can blather on forever about all sorts of things. We can have 50 investigations of this or that day in and day out. But can we take an action on something that is staring us in the face, which is the forest fire crisis in the Western United States right now?

Come on. Wake up and smell the smoke before it is too late. Take action. Pass this bicameral, bipartisan reform supported by the President of the United States. Give us the resources we need to fight these fires and to prevent future fires so we won't have more years like this.

PUERTO RICO'S POLITICAL STATUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Madam Speaker, I rise to provide an update on Puerto Rico's political status, which is an issue of national significance.

Puerto Rico is an unincorporated territory of the United States. Territory status is undemocratic. Although Puerto Rico is home to more American citizens than 21 States, island residents cannot vote for President, are not represented in the Senate, and have one nonvoting Delegate in the House.

Territory status is also unequal. As a recent GAO report confirms, Puerto Rico is deprived of billions of dollars each year because it is treated worse than the States under a range of Federal programs. Every objective observer understands that territory status is the underlying cause of the economic, fiscal, and demographic crisis that has enveloped Puerto Rico. History teaches a simple lesson: no people have ever reached their potential while being deprived of political rights and denied equality under the law. Puerto Rico is no exception to this rule.

If the people of Puerto Rico wish to discard territory status, there are two—and only two—paths forward. The territory can become a State on equal footing with the other States, or the territory can become a sovereign nation, either fully independent from the U.S., like the Philippines, or with a compact of free association with the U.S. that either nation can terminate, like the Republic of Palau. If Puerto Rico becomes a sovereign nation, future generations of island residents would not be American citizens and would receive reduced Federal support.

In a 2012 referendum sponsored by the Government of Puerto Rico, a majority of my constituents expressed their opposition to territory status, which means that Puerto Rico is being governed without its consent. Statehood received more votes than territory status, which is unprecedented. And statehood obtained far more votes than either of the two nationhood options, which demonstrates that Puerto Rico has no desire to weaken or break the bonds forged with the United States over nearly 12 decades.

At my urging and in response to this landmark vote, the Obama administration proposed an appropriation of $2.5 million to fund the first federally sponsored referendum in Puerto Rico's history with the stated goal being to resolve the territory's status. Earlier this year, Congress approved this appropriation with bipartisan support.

Although the law does not specify how the ballot should be structured, it does require the Department of Justice to ensure that any option on the ballot is compatible with the Constitution, laws, and public policy of the United States. Therefore, the ballot cannot contain the status proposal known as ''enhanced commonwealth'' that one political party in Puerto Rico has consistently put forward over the years and that Federal officials—including the Obama administration, Senators WYDEN and MURKOWSKI—have just as consistently rejected as impossible.

Moreover, the ballot should not contain the current territory status as an option because it was rejected in the 2012 referendum. It is the primary source of Puerto Rico's problems, and it does not resolve the island's status since, as long as Puerto Rico remains a territory, it has the potential to become either a State or a sovereign nation.

Last week, the Governor of Puerto Rico announced his intention to use the $2.5 million to conduct a federally sponsored vote by the end of 2016. I have proposed that the Federal funding be used to hold a yes-or-no vote on whether Puerto Rico should be admitted as a State, just as Alaska and Hawaii did. This approach would yield a definitive result that nobody could reasonably question, and it has broad congressional backing, garnering support from 135 Members of the House and the Senate.

If the Governor of Puerto Rico resists this approach, he will face a problem. The party he leads has never been able to agree upon a status proposal that does not conflict with U.S. law and policy.

□ 1100

But let me be clear. If a vote does occur, statehood advocates will show up in force. Any time, any place, an army of men and women will be there to seek equality and justice, and we will prevail.

PASS TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE ACT REAUTHORIZATION

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

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of a clean Terrorism Risk Insurance Act reauthorization. Many of us on the House Financial Services Committee have worked on a bipartisan basis. Let me repeat that and let me emphasize that. We have worked on a bipartisan basis for more than a year to put a bill before this House that can pass. We have worked cooperatively because the lessons of 9/11 revealed to us the raw exposure that this country faces and our economy faces as insurers exited terrorism risk insurance after 9/11.

But, unfortunately, some other Members are working on a partisan basis to derail the terrorism risk insurance program. Now, unfortunately, this fringe minority is more interested in promoting antigovernment ideology than governing on behalf of the American people and securing for Americans a safe harbor in the event of nuclear, biological, chemical, or other acts of terrorism. The dysfunction of the Tea Party-driven agenda—it thrives on crisis after crisis, whether it is flood insurance or the debt ceiling or keeping the government open or passing a transportation bill. They just thrive on keeping this place in chaos.

And here we have, once again, some must-pass legislation. Terrorism risk insurance has bipartisan consensus, bicameral support, and how does the Tea Party-driven leadership in this House respond to the attempts to reason with them regarding the urgency of passing a clean reauthorization of TRIA without the unworkable triggers and the bifurcation provisions? What we get is an arrogant rebuff, channeling Dirty Harry: You gotta ask yourself, do you feel lucky?

Colleagues, this is not instructive. And be clear, colleagues, the Tea Party is not just symbolically throwing tea overboard, but their antigovernment agenda is again throwing the American economy overboard. I mean, we have real world knowledge of what happens if TRIA is not reauthorized.

Following the September 11 attacks, the insurance industry met their claims and liabilities related to the attacks, but quickly, reinsurers and primary insurers withdrew from terrorism risk insurance. The resulting lack of coverage led to the loss of 300,000 jobs as economic activity slowed without coverage.

You hear them say that they want more private capital in the market, but their bill has exactly the opposite impact by diminishing market capacity. In fact, the RAND Corporation estimates that the terrorism risk insurance saves the government and taxpayers money that otherwise would be spent on disaster assistance following an attack. In the case of an attack as destructive as 9/11, the study estimates TRIA saves the Federal Government $7.2 billion.

At this point, not even the majority of the Republican majority can have their voice heard in this House. I just don't understand why this House has to be constantly held hostage to a fringe minority of the majority that has no interest in governing.

I can tell you, Madam Speaker, that TRIA is the orderly response to a

major terrorist attack. Why are we providing confusion, uncertainty, and partisanship to helping this country recover in the unthinkable event of another successful large-scale terrorist attack?

I hope that the voice of the American people prevails and a bipartisan TRIA bill can be brought swiftly to the floor.

STATE MEDICAID EXPANSION

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, as cochair of the State Medicaid Expansion Caucus, I rise this morning to talk about how important expanding Medicaid is for my State and for the country.

First, I want to thank my good friend from North Carolina, Congressman G.K. BUTTERFIELD, for agreeing to cochair this caucus. He is the driving force behind Medicaid expansion, that portion of the Affordable Care Act. There are few people in Congress who understand this issue as well as G.K. does, and it means a lot that he would agree to work on this issue with me.

I am also proud that 33 Members of Congress have joined the State Medicaid Expansion Caucus. We want to have an ongoing conversation about why it is so critical that every State expand Medicaid. Medicaid expansion is a choice that States can make because of the Supreme Court's ruling. However, when the Court struck down the requirement and gave States the choice to expand Medicaid, it did not strike the facts that make Medicaid expansion the correct budgetary, economic, health, and, yes, moral choice. Twenty-seven States, a majority of the States of this great country, looked at the facts and made the choice to help their people become healthier and therefore better able to lead productive lives. Expanding Medicaid in those States provided health coverage to approximately 10.5 million people who otherwise wouldn't have had it, according to Families USA.

Despite the political winds that swirl around the Affordable Care Act, Medicaid expansion should be a bipartisan issue. The Republican Governor of Arizona, for instance, pushed her State legislature to expand Medicaid because Governor Brewer and her allies knew that expansion would allow the program to help 300,000 low-income Arizonans who otherwise would not have had health coverage.

In Ohio, that State's Republican Governor expanded Medicaid, grounding the move in his faith and his belief that Ohioans should benefit from their Federal tax dollars. Because of the Governor's action, Ohio will see $13 billion from the Federal Government over the next 7 years to cover those newly eligible Medicaid recipients, and approximately 366,000 Ohio residents are thus eligible for coverage beginning this year. According to some estimates, as many as 789,000 people will ultimately benefit from the Governor's decision.

In California, almost 3 million people have benefited by getting access to health care when that State expanded Medicaid. These are just a few of the success stories.

The Federal Government will cover 100 percent of the cost of expanding Medicaid during the first 3 years, and 90 percent of the cost for the duration of the program in every State. Like in Ohio, this investment will bring billions of Federal tax dollars back into the State, which will help States develop their health care infrastructures and, thus, improve those States' economies. It will also help low-income Americans access our health care system. We must remember that the people who will benefit from expanding Medicaid are no less deserving of health care than anyone else.

According to a recent Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services report, States that have expanded Medicaid have seen 17 percent more people enrolled in the Medicaid and CHIP programs. Those are children across the country who now have the option for a healthier life. Unfortunately, millions of low-income Americans are being denied health care by their State legislators and Governors. They are being punished for being poor and for living where they do.

The New York Times recently ran a story entitled, ''In Texarkana, Uninsured and on the Wrong Side of a State Line.'' It describes the harsh realities for those who live on the wrong side of the State line. The author wrote:

> Texarkana is perhaps the starkest example of how President Obama's health care law is altering the economic geography of the country. The poor living in the Arkansas half of the town won access to a government benefit worth thousands of dollars annually, yet nothing changed for those on the Texas side of the State line.

In my home State of Georgia, expanding Medicaid would mean access to health care for 684,000 people, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. My Governor reacted to this news by signing a bill eliminating his authority to expand Medicaid. I can't think of anything better than the State of Georgia going ahead and insuring our people with Medicaid.

MEDICAID EXPANSION

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

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Madam Speaker, let me begin by commending my fellow Congressmen, HANK JOHNSON and Congressman BUTTERFIELD, for their initiative and their advocacy in fighting for and speaking up for Medicaid expansion in each of our States that have not taken it.

More than 5 million people in this country now have health coverage using Federal dollars available to every State to expand Medicaid eligibility to hardworking Americans and their families, but not in my home State of Pennsylvania. Instead, hundreds of thousands of people in Pennsylvania are left out. Madam Speaker, 305,000 people in Pennsylvania could have health coverage today but for the decision of our Governor. This is morally unconscionable and economically shortsighted.

Months have gone by, people are sicker, hospital bills go unpaid, and health providers struggle to stay at the forefront of innovation. Health care, whether it is to detect an illness or to treat a chronic condition or to save a life, is not optional. Consider the working mother who earns just enough to cover her basic expenses but not enough to get that mammogram so her breast cancer is detected early, and once it is, it is well advanced and life threatening.

Or the 9-year-old girl whose parents work full time at minimum wage and neither can afford to lose a day's pay to visit a pediatrician, so her need for glasses, something simple and correctable, or the early detection of diabetes, something more serious, is delayed or missed, with serious consequences not only for her health but her success in school.

Or the 52-year-old man who knows he should get that test that his doctor recommended, but simply does not have the $2,000 it costs. So he puts it off, thinking he will get it one of these days, and never gets that simple prescription, that medication that can well save his life. These are hardworking men, women, and children across this country and in Pennsylvania who could have health coverage today but do not.

With $8.2 billion available to Pennsylvanians, these are Federal dollars, dollars that Pennsylvanians have paid that are not coming back to Pennsylvania but would be available to us, are available to us. Over the next 3 years, we should use these funds to get health care to our people, to hire tens of thousands of health care workers to contain costs, to improve the health status of the people of our State, and yes to save lives.

There is no more time to waste. Pennsylvania should seize this opportunity. So should the other States that have Federal dollars available to them to do the same thing for the people of their State. We should use these Federal resources to expand lifesaving health coverage, to help our kids succeed, and to help us be healthy, to create jobs, and to ensure our economic growth. Let's do the right thing in Pennsylvania and across this country. These States should take Medicaid expansion and do right for the economy of our States, for the people of our States, and for the Nation.

□ 1115

STATE MEDICAID EXPANSION CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to announce to my colleagues the formation of a new House caucus to be known as the State Medicaid Expansion Caucus. I am delighted to cochair this caucus, along with my good friend, Congressman HANK JOHNSON, from the State of Georgia.

Madam Speaker, this caucus is 33 members strong. We want to demonstrate to recalcitrant Governors and State legislatures across the country the overwhelming public support to provide health care to low-income single adults, particularly those ages 18 to 65.

The majority of our caucus members are from States that have made the shortsighted and politically-motivated decision to exclude the very people the Medicaid program was established to help in the first place.

To date, 26 States and the District of Columbia have seized the opportunity to expand coverage to millions of Americans. These States made the wise and moral decision to not only ensure that their residents can get the care that they deserve, but they made a smart economic decision to pull billions of dollars in additional Federal funding into their economies.

These funds have the triple benefit of yielding better health outcomes for the low-income and poor, creating health care-related jobs, and driving down the aggregate cost of health care over time.

In contrast, 24 States have not yet expanded Medicaid. They have irresponsibly chosen to turn their backs on more than 5 million Americans that need this coverage. What are those 5 million Americans going to do when they get sick? What are 500,000 North Carolinians going to do when they need medical care?

Madam Speaker, I will tell you what they are going to do. They will either not seek the treatment that they need, causing their condition to get worse, which will lead to missed work and, therefore, unable to pay their bills. Ultimately, they will find themselves in a much worse situation than if they had coverage that they deserve.

The other option is that they will do what many uninsured people have always done out of necessity: go to an emergency room, be treated, and walk out with a bill that they have no ability to pay. Hospitals will then write the cost of treatment off as uncompensated care.

In order to recoup some of the lost money, hospitals will then increase the cost of their procedures, which results in higher premiums for the insured. Medicaid expansion isn't just good for our insurance premiums, but it is also good for the State's bottom line.

In North Carolina alone, expanding Medicaid will save the State more than $65 million over the next 8 years. Expansion would benefit our economy in North Carolina, adding nearly $1.5 billion to the State's revenue.

North Carolina drugmakers and medical device manufacturers will need to expand their workforce, adding a total of 23 jobs to the State. That is just in our State. The benefits of expansion nationally are far greater, yet the same scenario is playing out in nearly half of all of the States.

Twenty-four States' decision to not accept billions of dollars in Federal support defies logic and will prove catastrophic for the very people the Medicaid program is intended to help.

A critical point that many people overlook is the fact that, under the act, the Federal Government will pay 100 percent of the cost of expansion through the year 2016 and 90 percent of the costs thereafter.

The public demands action in States that have not expanded, and members of this caucus are tired of inaction. We are disgusted that these States have such careless disregard for poor people. We will continue to press this issue until all 50 States have expanded their Medicaid program.

Again, I thank Congressman HANK JOHNSON, the 31 other members of the State Medicaid Expansion Caucus, and the many advocacy organizations for their courage to fight for those who are being blocked from the most basic level of health care.

STATE MEDICAID EXPANSION CAUCUS

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

Mr. GARCIA. Madam Speaker, today, I am proud to be one of the founding members of the State Medicaid Expansion Caucus, and I want to thank Congressman BUTTERFIELD and Congressman JOHNSON for their leadership.

In my home State of Florida, there are more than 750,000 people who would benefit from Medicaid expansion. These are people who fall within the coverage gap, people who make too much to receive Medicaid, but too little to receive subsidies. This makes a difference in Florida and in many States who have rejected Medicaid coverage.

Just like in many States across the country, our Governor, Governor Scott, rejected $51 billion of Federal tax dollars—our tax dollars—money that could have provided insurance to those in need and could have created over 60,000 jobs.

This is money that will strengthen our economy and help Florida grow jobs by supporting hospitals and individuals who need help.

I urge Governor Scott and Florida's leaders in the State legislature to do what is right and take action and accept this funding.

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 11 o'clock and 20 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

Reverend Matthew Schramm, Westminster Presbyterian Church, Bay City, Michigan, offered the following prayer:

Holy and merciful God, maker of Heaven and Earth, we come before You in thanksgiving for Your many blessings.

For the liberty to worship freely and live securely, for the freedom to pursue Your will for our lives, and for the honor of service to the peoples and nations of the Earth, we give You thanks.

We thank You that we live in a land of opportunity, and we pray that You would help us to be mindful of opportunities to help, to share, to protect, to welcome, and to proclaim what is just and what is good.

We ask Your blessing on this House, this government, and all those who serve the common good. By Your Holy Spirit, grant that they might have the courage to do just that; and may all that we do or say give honor and glory to You, Almighty Father, now and forever.

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 Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas 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.

WELCOMING REVEREND MATTHEW SCHRAMM

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Reverend Matthew Schramm, Pastor of Bay City's Westminster Presbyterian Church in my district, who delivered this morning's opening and very inspiring prayer.

I am pleased to welcome Pastor Schramm and his family to the U.S. Capitol, and to thank him for his continued service to our community. Westminster Presbyterian Church is one of the oldest churches in Bay City, helping to share love, faith, and hope with its congregants and others across Michigan.

In addition to serving his congregation, Reverend Schramm served as the youngest-ever chair of the Presbyterian Mission Agency Board, the ministry agency and the board of trustees for the Nation's largest body of Presbyterians.

Reverend Schramm not only serves at the church altar, but also in the community as well. He serves on Bay County's Federal Emergency Food and Shelter Board, the Do-Care Family Enrichment Center advisory board, and the McLaren Bay medical region's Medical Ethics Advisory Board.

Pastor Schramm, on behalf of the U.S. Congress, thank you for being here today. I hope that your uplifting words that you shared with us will give us the courage to work together in pursuit of the common good for all Americans.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

THE MANMADE CRISIS ON THE TEXAS BORDER

(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, I have been to the border many times, but I never expected to witness what I saw last Friday, a real manmade crisis. The President's failure to secure our border and uphold the rule of law has led to this mess, and now he is failing to deal with it.

While President Obama is nowhere to be found, Texas Governor Rick Perry has made stopping the crisis his number one priority. I commend him on his latest decision to deploy the Texas National Guard to help secure the southern border. I am also grateful for the men and women working around the clock to control the crisis.

Securing the border will help send a clear message to countries that, if you enter illegally, you will not be allowed to stay. And that is the right thing to do. We are a Nation of laws, and there is a process for coming to America.

Texans and the American people deserve real border security now.

PARKS AND RECREATION MONTH

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Parks and Recreation Month. This month plays an important role in engaging in educating Americans on the many advantages of parks and recreation facilities and how they play a vital role in the health, safety, and economies of our Nation's communities.

This nationally celebrated month aims to connect Americans with their natural outdoor environment through exercise, recreation, relaxation, and congregation. It is also an opportunity to recognize those tasked with the design, management, and conservation of our parks and recreational spaces, such as landscape architects, city planners, nonprofit organizations, and parks and recreation professionals.

Unfortunately, too many Americans, including children, live in communities with deteriorating parks and outdoor facilities, which hinders their ability to enjoy outside activities. According to the National Recreation and Parks Association, nearly three out of every 10 adults in our country do not spend time outside on a daily basis.

I believe that all cities, neighborhoods, and communities should have access to parks, which is why I introduced H.R. 2424, the Community Parks Revitalization Act. This legislation would help rehabilitate existing and develop new community parks.

EPA'S WATERS OF THE U.S. RULE

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

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to the EPA's proposed Waters of the U.S. rule.

This rule will dramatically expand the Clean Water Act's jurisdiction by changing current law that limits EPA's authority to ''navigable waters.'' Under this new rule, EPA authority will apply to any body of water that has a bed, a bank, or a high water mark.

Hoosier farmers explain to me that this new rule means that large puddles left after a storm will fall under the EPA's jurisdiction. Farmers may have to get a permit to perform even the most basic tasks on their own land.

My constituents brought me these photos to show what changing the rule will mean. As you can see, this is not a stream, it is not a navigable body of water or a longstanding body of water. It should not be regulated by the EPA. It happened just after a large rainfall.

Mr. Speaker, this rule change will prevent farmers from doing their jobs, put people out of work, and increase food prices. It is bad for our Nation's landowners, it is bad for our Nation's farmers, and it is bad for Americans trying to put an affordable meal on the table.

Mr. Speaker, I ask EPA to withdraw this rule.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ROBERT HAMILTON

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, southeastern Connecticut last Friday suffered a terrible loss with the sudden passing of Bob Hamilton, a long time military affairs reporter for the New London Day.

Over the years, Bob covered the Groton sub base and earned a well-deserved reputation for accuracy, intelligence, and fairness. And that is the reason why the U.S. Navy selected him as the first reporter to be on a combat submarine in the opening days of Operation Enduring Freedom, when the opening salvo of tomahawk missiles brought down the Taliban regime.

In the last few years, Bob has been director of communications at Electric Boat shipyard, and was part of the team effort to boost submarine shipbuilding that resulted in the largest contract in the Navy to build Virginia class submarines, at two submarines a year.

Again, he passed away suddenly last Friday, leaving his wife, Kathryn, and three children, a terrible loss.

I would ask the Chamber to join me in expressing condolences to Kathryn, and salute the great example that Bob set in terms of good journalism, great advocacy for the national defense, and for being an outstanding human being.

THE VETERANS ADMINISTRATION IS FAILING OUR VETERANS

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

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to highlight a tragic story that emerged last week that captures how the failures of the Veterans Administration, those failures are hurting our veterans.

For 2 years, Vietnam veteran Michael Sulsona, from Graniteville, New York, a double amputee, had been waiting for a new wheelchair from the VA. His request was ignored.

On July 7, his wheelchair fell apart again while he was shopping at his local Lowe's home improvement center. What happened next captures the essence of American compassion and concern for our Nation's veterans.

Three of Lowe's employees immediately jumped into action and said to the veteran, ''We're going to make this chair like new.'' Forty-five minutes after the store closed, they delivered on their promise.

These three men embodied the American spirit by immediately helping this

veteran because they knew it was the right thing to do, and because they knew that this veteran had made tremendous sacrifices in defense of their freedom.

These three men should be commended for their selfless action, and the VA should be embarrassed for its failure to meet the needs of this veteran.

FIX OUR BROKEN IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

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

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, over the last few months, we have seen an unprecedented number of unaccompanied children coming across our border. While many of my colleagues want to rail at the lack of border enforcement, these kids are immediately being caught and turned over to the Border Patrol.

Just throwing more money at the border isn't going to fix the problem. Sending the National Guard to the border isn't going to do it either. In fact, it is pure political posturing.

What we need is comprehensive immigration reform now. Fixing our broken immigration system will clear the backlog so that we can process these children fairly and efficiently.

Instead of adding to the $18 billion we already spend on immigration enforcement a year, we need a comprehensive strategy based on reliable metrics to allocate resources where they are actually needed.

This crisis isn't going to be solved by scare tactics. These are children. We need a wide-ranging plan to ensure the fair and humane treatment of the children, and a long-term strategy to address the root causes of the crisis.

THE BORDER CRISIS DEMANDS MEANINGFUL POLICY CHANGES

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I just visited the Texas-Mexico border for the third time. I saw, firsthand, a real manmade crisis, a crisis created by an administration that urges amnesty.

I spent time with our Nation's border agents. They are doing an incredible job under the extreme circumstances. Despite their hard work, wave after wave of illegal immigrants is coming in from Central America.

I also witnessed the State of Texas Department of Public Safety's heroic efforts to combat drug trafficking.

Sending these illegal immigrants back to their home country promptly is one of the most humane things that we can do. Failure to do so will only encourage others to risk their own safety to pursue the false promise of amnesty.

My constituents in Texas demand a permanent border security solution. The law blocking a fast return of illegal immigrants to their home countries must be changed.

Until our President supports this major part of the solution, he will remain a major source of the problem.

THE MIDDLE CLASS JUMPSTART ACTION PLAN

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last week I stood with House Democrats to unveil the Middle Class Jumpstart Action Plan. This plan focuses on creating good jobs for the 21st century, empowering Americans to manage work and family, and making higher education affordable.

That same day, the majority showed where their priorities lie, by handing out unpaid-for, debt-raising tax breaks that will benefit the wealthiest Americans.

There is something wrong when folks can fight so vigorously on the House floor to protect corporate persons, but fail to defend real unemployed Americans by passing an unemployment insurance bill and raising the national minimum wage.

Yesterday, I met with labor groups to discuss how Congress can grow manufacturing and promote job creation. We discussed the need to invest in American workers by providing quality training, the need to invest in infrastructure, and how fair wages and a skilled workforce will help restore the American Dream.

I urge my colleagues to stop legislating for the 1 percent of Americans, and help jump-start and grow the middle class.

□ 1215

PRESIDENT OBAMA CAN SOLVE BORDER CRISIS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Border Security Caucus, composed of over 80 members and growing, met yesterday, and many of us have concerns about the administration's immigration proposals.

We feel the President is trying to make Congress take ownership of the border crisis. We should reject that by pointing out that the President right now—today—could stop the illegal surge by enforcing current immigration laws.

We should put the well-being of the children first and encourage them to stay in their home countries with their families.

The President, allowing over 500,000 people illegally in the United States to stay indefinitely, has enticed tens of thousands more to undertake a dangerous journey to cross the southern border. The President's policies are deadly.

The House should not send any immigration bill to the Senate, unless we know what is coming back. Otherwise, it is just a Trojan horse waiting to be used by those who favor amnesty.

NIAGARA FALLS AIR RESERVE STATION

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today, I will meet with the Niagara Military Affairs Council here in Washington, D.C., to discuss the future of the Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station.

The Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station is critical not only to western New York, but to our Nation's security. The Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station employs over 3,500 people and has an annual economic impact of over $200 million.

Next month, the station will start construction on a new C–130 flight simulator, which I was proud to fight for with the western New York delegation. Additionally, Customs and Border Protection has chosen the base as the preferred location for construction of a new Border Patrol station.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to fight to make sure that the mission at the Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station is preserved and that it is allowed to diversify through innovative partnerships.

Continued investment in the base and expansion of the mission ensures that the Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station will remain a fixture in our community for many years to come.

CONSTITUTIONAL CHECKS AND BALANCES

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the House is considering a lawsuit to stop the President from unilaterally rewriting the ObamaCare statute. Some have criticized the lawsuit by saying that if House Republicans are opposed to the ObamaCare individual mandate, why are they suing President Obama for delaying that mandate?

The Constitution requires that if the President wants to change a law, he must come to Congress to ask for a change. He did not do that in this case, even though House Republicans agreed with the underlying change. The case is about following constitutional process.

Another objection is that President Obama has not issued as many executive orders as other Presidents, but the issue is not the number of executive orders, but the impact of the executive orders.

This lawsuit is about constitutional governance, not politics. We must maintain the checks and balances established by the Constitution.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to talk about the Democrats' plan to get the middle class working in America again. The Democrats' Make It In America plan will boost job growth by giving employers tax incentives for jobs created in the U.S. It also raises the minimum wage and updates our current infrastructure.

I want the constituents that I serve in the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex to know that me and other Democrats are here, working hard for America to bring back these good-paying jobs.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I wanted everyone to know that I started my Marc Means Business initiative, where I work spending time at different jobs in the district that I serve.

This month, I worked at a concrete batch plant as a laborer at a downtown highway construction site in Dallas. Not only do I get to see what the constituents that I serve go through every day on the site, but this also highlights just how important rebuilding our infrastructure is to the U.S. economy.

Let's give middle class Americans a jump-start and continue to work on policies that expand our economy and get Americans back to work.

100TH BIRTHDAY OF ST. STEPHEN, MINNESOTA

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

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, it is such a thrill to be a Member of the United States House of Representatives. We are privileged to represent the great people in our districts, and I am obviously very biased that for 8 years, I have been privileged to represent what are the greatest people I think in the United States.

We truly embody in Minnesota's Sixth District the great, good-humored, full values of this country that are represented in that district, and this is a feel-good story, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to honor the people of St. Stephen, Minnesota, as they are celebrating their 100th birthday as a community. You see, it was in the late 1800s when Slovenian settlers came to this wonderful area in Minnesota and built the foundation of what later came to be called St. Stephen, Minnesota. It is what America fondly refers to as Lake Wobegon.

Today, led by Mayor Cindy VanderWeyst, St. Stephen boasts a very close-knit community of families and farmers and businesspeople. It is fitting that the town motto is ''A Place to Call Home'' and that it truly is.

St. Stephen is a shining example of small-town life in the United States. Congratulations, St. Stephen, on your 100th birthday.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, far too many of our young girls have fallen victim to modern day slavery. Last fall, I witnessed human trafficking firsthand during a visit to Costa Rica with my colleague from Texas, TED POE.

The stories we heard were heartwrenching. Girls—8, 9, 10, 13 years old—were being victimized and abused by grown men. This is not just a problem outside our borders. This is happening in our backyards.

In my community in Los Angeles, African American girls are overwhelmingly at a greater risk, making up 92 percent of youth sex trafficking victims. This is alarming and shameful.

On the average, victims are recruited between the ages of 12 and 14. These girls are victims, not criminals, and we must do everything in our power to protect them.

Recently, we have seen a paradigm shift in the protection of these victims. L.A. District Attorney Jackie Lacey has implemented the First Step diversion program, which will give victims the opportunity to rebuild their lives through counseling and education, an alternative to prosecution.

Programs like this and my colleague KAREN BASS' legislation that is on the floor today will help protect victims of human trafficking and not punish them.

HAPPY 91ST BIRTHDAY, BOB DOLE

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, Senator Bob Dole, born and raised in Russell, Kansas, and a graduate of the University of Kansas, has spent his life in the service of the American people and today remains the embodiment of public service. On Tuesday, Kansans from all across the Sunflower State wished him a happy 91st birthday.

Senator Dole enlisted in the Army once the U.S. entered World War II and was stationed in Italy. While leading an assault on a German machine gun nest, Senator Dole's unit was heavily fired upon.

Without hesitation, Senator Dole courageously returned to help rescue an injured radioman—he, himself, suffering life-threatening injuries. Many Army medics didn't think Senator Dole would survive.

With a strong spirit and steadfast resolve common to many Kansans, Senator Dole not only survived, but he returned home to the Sunflower State and spent many years in elected service on behalf of Kansans, including in the State house, as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, the U.S. Senate, and runs as Vice President and President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of pride to that I wish my good friend and fellow Jayhawk, Senator Bob Dole, a happy 91st birthday and many more to come.

Happy birthday, Senator Dole.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REAUTHORIZATION

(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, earlier this month, I was honored to bring together New Hampshire business leaders to discuss the importance of the Export-Import Bank and to call for its immediate reauthorization.

I thank leaders from BAE, Boyle Energy, Conductive Components, and other Granite State employers for joining this important discussion on how supporting U.S. exports grows our economy and creates good jobs here at home.

The Export-Import Bank provides essential risk management services to American businesses selling their products in an unstable global economy. Dozens of Granite State firms have used these services, which have supported over $350 million in New Hampshire exports in recent years, and in New Hampshire's Second Congressional District, the top destination for American exports is China.

Because of the Export-Import Bank, more consumers across the world are buying goods stamped ''Made in America,'' and more American families are able to make it here in America. Granite State exporters, like Mountain Corporation, Arch Energy, and Centorr Vacuum are counting on Congress to act, but time is running out.

In just over 2 months, authorization for the bank will expire, and I have heard from New Hampshire exporters who are already losing business because of uncertainty over the bank's future.

So let's renew this commonsense program that grows our economy, reduces the budget deficit, and helps create jobs.

MEDICAID EXPANSION

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise today as member of the new congressional State Medicaid Expansion Caucus, and I call on my colleagues to join us in encouraging States to close the coverage gaps by expanding Medicaid.

Texas, my home State, has the option to accept Federal Medicaid funding to provide affordable health insurance to more than 1.4 million uninsured Texans. For many of these citizens, there is no affordable option, as

long as Texas refuses the Federal funds.

Texas could extend insurance through Medicaid to residents with incomes up to 138 percent of the Federal poverty level, less than $28,000 for a family of three for whom there is no current alternative. Fifty-eight percent of the uninsured in our State would benefit, and if Texas does accept funding, the Federal Government will virtually pay for all of the costs in the expansion.

Closing the coverage gap is the right thing to do and is a sound investment for the State, by creating a healthier workforce, strengthening the State's economy, and improving our health care system.

I urge my colleagues to work with their home States and encourage Medicaid expansion.

RECOGNIZING THE OKONITE COMPANY

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the employees, staff, and leadership at Okonite Company's facility in Cumberland, Rhode Island.

I am proud that Okonite's Rhode Island manufacturing facility, which supports 90 jobs, is located in my home district. Led by plant manager Eric Dodge, the 90 workers in Cumberland produce high-quality power line cables that are sold all across America and the entire world.

In May, I toured Okonite's Cumberland manufacturing plant as part of my Congress at Your Company series. I was delighted to meet with their talented employees and discuss ways to grow Rhode Island's manufacturing sector and support existing manufacturers.

I am thrilled that Okonite is expanding its operations in Rhode Island and that its plans for expansion are underway. Okonite has made a smart investment that is good for business and is good for Rhode Island.

I look forward to touring Okonite's new facility once it is completed, and I thank Eric and the rest of his team for working to strengthen Rhode Island's manufacturing sector. This is another great example of why it is important to make things in America and make things in Rhode Island.

#100 DAYS

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, over 100 days have gone by, and the kidnapped schoolgirls in Nigeria are still not home. The consequences of their absence and the lack of formal action to find the girls is unimaginable.

Eleven parents of the abducted girls have died—died from the heartbreak, died from fighting for their girls, died from international silence. A father slipped into a coma, repeating his daughter's name until he passed away. These stories are real.

In the meantime, Boko Haram has continued to kidnap more girls. Last week, they took over a whole town. This issue is real. We cannot ignore Boko Haram and the plight of these missing girls.

Mr. Speaker, with a tweet and a hashtag, you are showing the Nigerian people, Boko Haram, the missing girls, and the world that we have not forgotten. We have to keep tweeting. We have to keep talking. This is not an African problem. This is a world problem. These are our girls, and we will bring them home.

I urge you every day to join my Twitter storm and tweet: #joinrepwilson and #bringbackourgirls.

Tweet, tweet, tweet. Tweet, tweet, tweet.

□ 1230

COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, right now students all over America are enjoying their much-earned summer vacation. We all know the enormous pressures today's youth face, and it hardly seems they get a chance to breathe anymore. Yet students all across the country are attending college in record numbers.

That, unfortunately, is where the good news stops. As our college students settle into their internships over the summer, many are running into old classmates who recently graduated, and all of them are asking the same question: How do you live with such debt?

We face a student debt crisis of truly mind-blowing proportions, but instead of working to give middle class families a fair chance at making college affordable, some of my colleagues are arguing over what to sue the President for.

Later today, we are going to vote for a tax credit—it is unpaid for—and that will barely make a dent in what is quickly becoming the economic challenge of our era. I ask my colleagues, all of us who are talking often, constantly about the need to care for future generations, is this really the best we can do?

THE BRING JOBS HOME ACT

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge Speaker BOEHNER to allow a vote on the Bring Jobs Home Act. I cosponsored this bill to help businesses create jobs in my home district and across America. In the Coachella Valley, there are unacceptable high unemployment rates, in some areas over 17 percent.

The Bring Jobs Home Act will create critical tax incentives for businesses to bring jobs back to the United States and close tax loopholes for corporations who ship jobs overseas.

Over the last decade, America lost 6 million manufacturing jobs. That is millions of jobs families can gain if Congress does their job and votes to bring jobs home. Congress must put hardworking families above corporations that ship jobs overseas.

This week, the Senate will vote on legislation. The House must act. Mr. Speaker, Congress must put people before politics, solutions above ideology, and allow a vote on the Bring Jobs Home Act.

Let's put people back to work.

THE TRAVEL AND TOURISM FOR ALL ACT

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, everyone deserves the opportunity to travel and explore the many incredible destinations located throughout our country, but individuals with disabilities, however, face much greater difficulties when they try to arrange travel.

Now, Las Vegas, my district, is a world leader in disability access. We have more handicap-accessible guest rooms than any other American city. Our casinos offer gambling tables and slot machines designed for wheelchair users, and all our show venues have designated handicapped seating.

Other places could benefit from our example, and that is why I have introduced the Travel and Tourism for All Act that would require the National Council on Disability to conduct a review of existing disability standards in the tourism and hospitality industries and provide recommendations to help Congress ensure that people with disabilities are able to enjoy traveling throughout the U.S.

This act would ensure that we continue to set the international standard for disability accommodation in the hospitality industry, and it will attract tourists from other parts of the world where accommodations are less welcoming.

THE SUPPORT THE FAMILIES OF FALLEN HEROES SEMIPOSTAL STAMP ACT

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

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5085, the Support the Families of Fallen Heroes Semipostal Stamp Act.

The brave men and women serving in uniform put their lives on the line for

our country every single day, and they deserve to know that America will support and care for any loved ones they leave behind. That is why I salute organizations like the USO and the Tragedy Assistance Program for Survivors, known as TAPS. I salute them for providing assistance to the families of fallen heroes.

But we can do even more to help them. My bipartisan bill would create a families of fallen heroes stamp directing proceeds to the USO and to TAPS for supporting our military families in their time of need.

Let's honor the families of our fallen heroes and show them that our country will be there when they need us most.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3136, ADVANCING COMPETENCY-BASED EDUCATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECT ACT OF 2013, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4984, EMPOWERING STUDENTS THROUGH ENHANCED FINANCIAL COUNSELING ACT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 677 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 677

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. 3136) to establish a demonstration program for competency-based education. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided 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. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-52. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part 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 amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4984) to amend the loan counseling requirements under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour 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. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-53. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B 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 amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The 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.

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, H. Res. 677 provides for structured rules for consideration of H.R. 3136, the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act, and H.R. 4984, the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act.

The Rules Committee was pleased to work with Members on both sides of the aisle to provide for floor consideration of a number of their amendments. The resolution makes in order 11 amendments to H.R. 3136 and seven amendments to H.R. 4984. In total, the committee made in order nine Democrat amendments, three Republican amendments, and six bipartisan amendments.

As a member of the Rules Committee, it is a privilege to see the number of amendments we have been able to make in order this Congress and the openness of the legislative process. My hope is that we will continue to work together in a bipartisan fashion to advance good legislation.

My colleagues on the House Education and the Workforce Committee and I have been working to reauthorize the Higher Education Act. We have held 14 hearings and invited dozens of witnesses to discuss a wide variety of issues facing students, families, and institutions of higher education.

Since the last reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, the landscape has been constantly evolving with the student population rapidly changing and institutions developing more cost-effective modes for delivering academic content.

The upcoming reauthorization provides policymakers an opportunity to improve the law and strengthen America's postsecondary system to ensure Federal policies are flexible enough to allow future developments and innovations to occur.

Based on feedback received from the public and the committee's desire to reform the law in a way that will assist students in obtaining an affordable higher education that leads to employment opportunities, the committee will promote reforms that adhere to the following principles: empowering students and families to make informed decisions; simplifying and improving student aid; promoting innovation, access, and completion; and ensuring strong accountability and a limited Federal role.

Reform will help more Americans achieve their dreams of a postsecondary education and help secure a more prosperous future for the country.

The rule before us today provides for consideration of two bills that will inform the reauthorization process. H.R. 3136 creates a demonstration project for competency-based education. Competency-based education allows students to demonstrate what they already know and learn at their own pace

by mastering specific skills and knowledge that translate to real-world application for their degrees.

H.R. 4984 ensures that students have the information needed to make good choices with their financial aid dollars and understand how to use that money well by increased financial counseling and services.

□ 1245

Education is a great opportunity in this country, and we have the most diverse system of postsecondary education in the world, with more than 6,000 public, private, nonprofit, and proprietary institutions of higher education. This diversity affords students from all backgrounds an opportunity to find an institution that meets their unique needs and helps them pursue personal goals of continuing their education.

The rule before us today starts that reform process, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the rule and the underlying bills.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the two underlying bills, H.R. 3136, the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act of 2013, and H.R. 4984, the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act. I do rise in opposition to the rule for reasons that I will go into regarding preventing us from addressing many of the major issues within public education and higher education.

While I am supportive of these two bills, I am disappointed that the House is not embarking on a full reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. We can nip around the edges in certainly a constructive way to reduce costs, as these bills do, to be helpful, but none of them are game-changers or, dare I say, even a substantial part of making college more affordable like we could through the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

Since the last reauthorization in 2007, higher education has become more and more expensive. The cost of attending a university per student has risen by almost five times the rate of inflation since 1983. At the very time that an advanced degree is more important than ever for somebody to have a good job in today's increasingly complex global economy, it is getting further and further from the price range and affordability for American middle class families.

While a 4-year university isn't always the best choice, some form of postsecondary education is increasingly important—whether that is community college, whether it is a certification program—to be able to ensure that young people, and people of all ages, have access to a good-paying job in the 21st century workforce. Only by pursuing a full scale reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, soliciting ideas from Democrats and Republicans across the aisle, can we truly be able to help put college more in reach for students. As many of my colleagues from across the aisle say, we need to examine how or if many of the student loan programs only contribute to the increasingly high cost of college education. We need to take ideas from our side of the aisle, including some that I cosponsor regarding reducing textbook costs or looking at new and better ways that we can look at income-based repayment for student loans.

Through a comprehensive reauthorization, we can streamline payments by replacing our complicated student loan system with a simplified income-based program, which is part of a bipartisan bill that I sponsor with Congressman PETRI called the ExCEL Act. We could also improve articulation and transfer agreements so that students can move quickly and efficiently towards a credential from less expensive community colleges, if necessary, to colleges that offer 4-year degrees.

Furthermore, Representative HINOJOSA's open textbook legislation would help keep costs down so students can concentrate on their studies rather than having to work additional jobs just to be able to afford the textbooks. Finally, we can make sure that we improve accountability for colleges and universities that are not serving students well so that our limited Federal resources are used in a way to provide incentives to States and universities that support public education and they keep public education, higher education, affordable.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the Higher Education Act, which this Congress does not appear to be moving forward on and this bill does not allow amendments to, our Nation's landmark kindergarten through 12th grade education law, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, sometimes referred to as No Child Left Behind, is long overdue to be replaced with a new reauthorization.

And this week, I was pleased to hear the President signed another work product of this body, the Workforce Investment and Opportunity Act, another long overdue, bipartisan bill to improve our workforce development system that many of my colleagues on the Education and Workforce Committee have worked on for many years. That bill started in a partisan way. The first iteration on the House floor received zero Democratic votes. The compromise, however, received the support of every Democrat and nearly every Republican. It passed by a margin of 415–6.

Just a few months ago, we passed bipartisan bills to substantially improve the charter schools program and Federal investment in education research with a strong bipartisan vote. So, Mr. Speaker, this body has shown it can pass bipartisan Education and Workforce bills. These two bills coming before us today are additional examples of that. So why haven't we undertaken the hard work to make a full-fledged bipartisan effort to reauthorize No Child Left Behind?

Like with the Workforce Investment Act, we had a partisan version come to the floor. Not a single Democrat voted for it, just as not a single Democrat voted for the first iteration of the Workforce Investment Act. Anybody can pass partisan legislation that no one else supports, but that is not a constructive step towards lawmaking. Lawmaking entails making the tough decisions, working with the other side to create a work product. Again, with WIA, we had a 415–6 vote. With No Child Left Behind, whether it is that high or not, let's get a majority of Democrats and Republicans working together to reauthorize it. They began that hard work in the Senate Health Committee, where they have a bipartisan education reform bill that they have not brought to the full floor of the Senate, but at least they began that work of working in a bipartisan manner towards replacing No Child Left Behind with a new Federal education law.

This bill which passed the House, the Student Success Act, the Republican-only education bill, was opposed by Democrats for many reasons. First of all, it would have locked in education funding at sequester levels. Secondly, it would have locked many of our critical programs that support STEM, literacy, and the arts, support English language learners, and left students trapped in failing schools with little recourse for action. It was opposed not only by Democrats but also by the Chamber of Commerce, the Business Roundtable, and also every major education organization.

This process was unlike all other previous efforts to reauthorize the ESEA, when under the strong leadership of my colleagues, like now-Speaker BOEHNER and Ranking Member MILLER, Democrats and Republicans came together to strengthen and improve our education system. As Ranking Member MILLER enters retirement, with his last year in the House, we need to learn from his success in building consensus and forging compromise, in keeping students across our country first to ensure that we get the most bang for our buck with our limited Federal investment and students and young people receive the skills they need to compete in the 21st century workforce.

I urge my colleagues to recognize that our opportunity to build on the success of No Child Left Behind, which shined a light on the achievement gaps for minority and low-income students, is now, more than ever, critical. But just as it had successes, it also had failures that are recognized across the aisle. The superficial formula for adequate yearly progress is defended by nobody, and yet continues to be the law of the land.

I hope that this body can come together, just as we have for WIA, for charter schools, for ESRA, just as we are doing for the bills we are considering today, to update and improve the ESEA. That is what our students deserve and what we were elected to do. Rather than let these bills we are passing today stand out as an aberration, let us build upon them, let them form momentum for higher ed reauthorization and ESEA reauthorization so we can begin the substantive work that the voters of this country have hired us to do.

Despite the fact that we are not considering a full reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, despite the fact that we are not considering a full reauthorization of No Child Left Behind, I am nevertheless pleased that we are considering H.R. 3136, a bill that I coauthored with Representative SALMON. This bill allows innovative colleges and universities to shorten the time and cost of earning a degree through self-paced programs based on learning rather than seat time. This innovation, called competency-based education, allows students to work at their own pace and earn credit by mastering the knowledge, rather than sitting in a seat and, let's be honest, sometimes not even being awake. This growing trend of innovation around competency-based education is particularly important because it provides a way to increase innovation and reduce the costs of a college degree.

Today's students come to college with different backgrounds and learn at different rates and different times of day. The competency-based education program allows an institution to tailor a program of study to an individual student. By measuring and assessing competencies, or what a student can demonstrate that they know, students are guaranteed to matriculate with the knowledge of the skills they need to master. Businesses will know what to expect upon hiring these students, and students will be incentivized to learn as quickly and as inexpensively as they can.

While the Department of Education currently has some latitude to explore this model through the experimental sites' programs, the current regulations need to be updated and streamlined to better support these innovative programs, which is what this bill does.

I am proud to say that in my district, institutions like Colorado State University's Global Campus are demonstrating that online public universities with competency-based programs can lead the way in attracting, educating, and graduating young learners and adult learners to succeed in the 21st century workforce. But CSU-Global and programs like it currently need to adhere to existing higher education structure, which limits the schedules of students and limits when students can achieve financial aid because traditional higher education is based on the Carnegie unit, or credit hour, rather than what the students learn.

As Congress considers the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, this project, this innovation that this bill will unleash is more crucial than ever. In 1998, Congress recognized the importance of the growing trend towards distance education and the opportunity for students to learn online. Now once again, we have the opportunity to learn from, to study, and to innovate around competency-based education, to learn about the changes that we need to make to maintain quality, to reduce costs, and to increase the number of students that have access to these programs.

That is why I was proud to work with Representative SALMON, Chairman KLINE, Ranking Member MILLER, and Ms. FOXX on this legislation, which would permit institutions to waive certain regulations that stand in the way of them adopting a competency-based model. We will learn a lot. We will learn what works, and we will learn what doesn't work. They are both important as we seek to expand innovation across the higher education sector to reduce costs and increase quality.

This legislation will allow Congress and the general public to learn more about the opportunities that competency-based education offers for students to increase access and opportunity in higher education.

I am also pleased that the House is considering under this rule H.R. 4984, the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act. Financial counseling is an important method for students to learn about the most effective and least expensive way for them to finance their higher education, both before, during, and after their college experience. Many students simply don't have the knowledge or the resources or the help to make sound decisions in their own interests about their opportunities to finance their postsecondary education.

To the degree that we don't provide a high quality standard of counseling, first-generation students in particular are the students who stand to benefit the most from improving access to higher education and they often lose out. H.R. 4984 makes many improvements to our financial counseling obligations under current law. The bill ensures that all students and parents who participate in the Federal loan program receive proactive counseling each year that is personalized to meet their own financial needs. Students will receive information about the terms and conditions of Pell Grants and various other loan programs. The bipartisan bill also directs the Secretary of Education to create and disseminate online tools to provide annual loan counseling, helping to bring our financial aid counseling system into the 21st century and put useful, relevant information into the hands of students.

One place in particular that financial counseling can play an important role is when determining whether to take out Federal loans or private student loans. Private student loans often have variable interest rates, as high or higher than 14 percent. They are not eligible for the important deferment, income-based repayment, or loan forgiveness options that come with Federal student loans, but half of private student loan borrowers borrowed less than they could have in Federal Stafford loans. So without realizing it in many cases, people are turning to the higher priced, less beneficial private market place when they still have unused capacity on the Federal student loan side. It is clear that there is an information gap and students need information about the terms and conditions of these loans.

That is why I am thrilled that this underlying bill contains an important part of my Know Before You Owe Act, which I first introduced last session and reintroduced this session, along with Representative BISHOP and Representative SCHWARTZ, to ensure that financial counseling includes additional disclosures on private education loans, with information about college financing options and warnings about riskier private loans to help students make informed decisions about their choices so that they get the best deal that is available to them under current law.

□ 1300

I am also pleased the underlying bill will improve exit counseling for student loan repayment. Unfortunately, many students default on what could otherwise be manageable levels of debt because they don't understand the payment options.

The ExCEL Act, which I mentioned earlier and introduced with Representative PETRI, would make simple income-based repayment the default option, which will reduce paperwork and administrative overhead and prevent this unfortunate occurrence and make payments more affordable for students.

The bill will help students understand that they have many options to pay back their loans and help them make the choice that is best for them.

These bills are a step forward, but affording college education requires a lot more progress than a full step. We need to make enormous progress to reverse the trend of the last few decades that have led to five times the cost of college inflation adjusted since 1983.

I wish I could be here before you to say that these bills will fix that. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say that they will help, but they alone will not turn around the alarming trend that is making college harder and harder for middle class families to afford.

So while I support these bills as a step forward, I oppose the rule and call upon this body to allow a full and open debate on the Higher Education Act on ESEA.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON), the prime sponsor on one of these bills.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 3136, the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project of 2014.

I would like to thank Chairman KLINE and the subcommittee Chairwoman FOXX for their support and work on this legislation. I am really appreciative of Representative POLIS and all of his fine work. This truly is a bipartisan bill.

I would also like to state how proud I am to be part of a body that has actually taken its job very, very seriously for the hard times that most Americans have fallen upon, and I am proud that over the course of the last year and a half since I rejoined the Congress, that we passed over 320 bills—40 of them that would create jobs in this economy immediately—that are languishing in the Majority Leader of the Senate's drawer and have no action taken.

A lot of the American public are frustrated, and they have gone to calling this the do-nothing Congress. Well, let me tell you, half the Congress—the House—is actually doing its work.

When it comes to the appropriation bills, which we are required by our rules and our laws to do every year, the House will have done its duty by the end of this year in passing all the appropriation bills. I think we have done 10 of them so far. I believe the Senate hasn't done any.

So I think that when it comes to dealing with the cost of higher education, this is a big step in the right direction. We are aware of the cost of higher education. It has grown by more than 500 percent since 1985 compared to an overall inflation rate of 121 percent.

Federal regulations greatly impede the efforts to reduce the cost of a college degree. As a result, we have got to implement policies to allow institutions to be innovative in developing new models of education, instead of continuing with the status quo because the status quo is not working.

That is why I introduced the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project of 2014 with my colleagues Representative POLIS and Representative BROOKS.

This important bipartisan legislation will set up a pilot project to allow institutions to more easily develop innovative ways to deliver education to their students. H.R. 3136 is the first step in allowing students to earn a degree and enter the job market sooner based on their knowledge and their skill set, rather than seat time in the classroom.

My bill will direct the Secretary of Education to implement a demonstration project and to waive regulatory requirements that impede innovations that might decrease costs to students.

The program would allow colleges to provide college credit to students who can prove competencies through prior work and life experience, rather than a specified amount of time in the classroom.

In our field hearing that we held in Arizona, two of our college presidents from Arizona State University and the University of Arizona said that this will immensely help them to be able to get students through their degree programs quicker, based on their competency.

They all agreed that the group of people that it will probably help more than anybody else in America are our returning veterans because they come with certain skill sets that they don't get credit for.

I would like to just talk 1 minute about how that process works because I had it work in my life. I served a mission for my church to Taiwan when I was a young man, and I came back fluent in Mandarin and Chinese.

It didn't make a lot of sense for me to go through Chinese 101 and learn how to say ''where is the bathroom'' with the other kids when I could already speak fluent Mandarin and Chinese.

I was able to test out of that by demonstrating my competency of already being fluent in the language, and I got just about an entire semester's worth of credit.

That is what we are talking about here. People who have been in the military, people who have been in other jobs that they have had, where they have been able to learn skills that don't necessarily translate into book work, but they are a lot more proficient at those skills than a lot of kids entering the classroom. This is going to cut through a lot of the garbage and allow people to be able to get those degrees earlier and, thereby, reducing their costs.

This legislation passed out of the Education and the Workforce Committee by a voice vote, and it allows higher education institutions to explore more innovative ways to deliver education, measure quality, and disperse financial aid based on actual learning, again, rather than seat time.

It provides flexibility to the schools looking to provide students a more personalized, cost-effective education, and I think that is what we are all here for.

I thank the Speaker for entertaining my ideas, and I thank the gentlewoman for giving me the time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 4582, Mr. TIERNEY's bill, to enable millions of students, graduates, and parents in middle class families to responsibly finance their existing student loans.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY), the ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions.

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

Mr. Speaker, I did file an amendment to this bill that would be considered today. Quite simply, what it does is provide existing student loan borrowers the opportunity to responsibly refinance their high-interest debt to a lower-interest obligation, like homeowners and car owners are able to do all the time.

The amendment is based on legislation that I filed here in the House and my colleague, ELIZABETH WARREN, filed over in the Senate. We have over 130 cosponsors here in the House and dozens of respected educational groups and diverse organizations in support of this measure.

The amendment would help students and parents save some real money. In fact, the Congressional Research Service says that a middle class undergraduate student with an average loan debt would save over $4,000 over the life of the loan and a typical graduate student would save more than $2,500 and the parent who borrowed money to help pay for their child's education would save more than $3,500.

Mr. Speaker, these are real savings, real dollars, and no doubt, they are going to be directly invested back into the community. The Center for American Progress estimated that refinancing just the Federal student loans, not the parents' loans on that, would pump $21 billion back into the economy.

It helps taxpayers too. The Congressional Budget Office—nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office—said that, over 10 years, it would save taxpayers $22 billion.

So the proposal is a good deal for taxpayers, it is a good deal for students and parents, and it is a good deal for the economy. The real question here is: Why isn't there an urgency to move this legislation? Because the benefits to the economy are huge and the savings for taxpayers are real—despite all this, the Republican leadership blocked this amendment from coming to the floor for consideration today.

By blocking that amendment, the Republican leadership has denied every Member in this Chamber the ability to vote on this important measure and show that they are standing with the people—with the students, with the parents, with the economy at large for people who want to take benefit of this legislation.

Worse, by blocking this amendment, the Republican leadership denies relief to tens of millions of college students and parents and middle class families across the country who would benefit from the provisions of the bill that we would offer.

Mr. Speaker, that is unacceptable, but unfortunately, it is becoming more and more common in the House here, as it looks like Republicans refuse to stand with middle class families and those that aspire to the middle class, instead of putting politics before everything.

Instead of debating my amendment and the provisions of it that would help

middle class families, Republicans are finding some way to sue the President of the United States.

If you were to take that measure and ask the public: Would you rather have some relief and allow people to be able to write down and refinance their loans to a more reasonable interest rate as parents, as undergraduate students, graduate students, and parents of students—would you rather do that, or would you rather pursue some suit against the President which doesn't make any sense and isn't going to have any effect and doesn't work to get them real relief in things that matter to them in their lifetime today?

We are not doing what we should be doing this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. We should be putting politics aside. We should be allowing this amendment. We should rely on every Member of this House to vote on it.

I believe that we would get a strong bipartisan vote of support if we did that. I ask my colleagues to not vote on the previous question, to allow us to insert this amendment, and move forward.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts is quite well aware that his amendment was not germane to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Education and the Workforce Committee for bringing up H.R. 4984, the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

Within the past year, I have held two Paying for College Workshops in my district. These district events have attracted hundreds of parents and students. I have noticed that parents take more careful notes during these workshops, but all of them were eager—all who attended were eager to learn about how to finance college tuition, from the free application for Federal student aid, to understanding the multiple grant and loan programs. Many students and parents struggle to understand this very complicated process.

I think that that is why this bill is important, the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act. With total student debt now over $1 trillion, it is critical to equip students and parents with proper interactive counseling, so that they have the knowledge to make responsible and informed decisions when borrowing.

Understanding the terms and conditions for the Pell grants, understanding what an individual's financial obligations are after graduating, these are key to helping students and parents understand and manage financial health well beyond college.

I, again, would like to thank Representative BRETT GUTHRIE and Representative SUZANNE BONAMICI for their joint work on this bill. I would like to express my support, not only for their bipartisan endeavor, but for the other higher education bills before the floor this week. These bills work to strengthen our education policy.

An education is one of the most important investments an individual can make. We must ensure that students and parents are able to make financially responsible choices. We must make sure they understand about Pell grants and other such programs available to them, along with the other higher education bills before this floor.

Let's improve the current system. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), the ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support of H.R. 5134, legislation which would reauthorize two advisory committees within the U.S. Department of Education for 1 year.

The National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity, known as NACIQI, and the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance play vitally important advisory roles to the Secretary of Education and Congress and would not otherwise be extended through the General Education Provisions Act when the Higher Ed Act expires this year.

NACIQI, for example, advises the Secretary of Education on matters related to postsecondary education accreditation and the certification process for higher ed institutions to participate in Federal student aid programs.

The Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance provides advice and counsel on Federal student financial aid policy to both Congress and the Secretary of Education, including the recommendations for increasing college access and persistence to higher ed for low-income and moderate-income students.

As ranking member of the Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training, I want to thank Chairman KLINE, Ranking Member GEORGE MILLER, and Ranking Member FOXX for their leadership on this issue.

Although I will continue to fight for a more comprehensive reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, I believe that this bill, as well as the other three higher education bills being voted on this week, make some key improvements to the Higher Education Act.

So with that, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 5134.

□ 1315

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

Mr. Speaker, the higher education landscape in America is changing to meet the demands of the ever more technologically engaged student population, as well as meeting the needs of adults who are coming back to college after some time in the workforce.

One of the most exciting innovations is competency-based education, which takes traditional degrees and college courses and maps them to specific skill sets or knowledge pieces, known as ''competencies.'' A student progresses through a course by mastering these skill sets and obtaining the knowledge to prove they understand the concept.

Many of these students are individuals returning to college after an interrupted first attempt where they dropped out of college. As Mr. SALMON said, many are veterans with skills that have not yet been equated to coursework. Now they hope to improve their skills and further their careers, but these adults have already been learning skills along the way through their jobs and life experiences. Competency-based education allows students to move quickly through concepts they understand and spend more time focusing on skills that they need.

Additionally, many of these programs apply the skills or concepts to real-world problems that students may have faced in their workplaces or in their families, which helps create a habit of continual learning and application.

While well-intentioned, Federal regulation has often gotten in the way of innovative programs because it cannot account for the rapid change taking place. That is why my colleague, Representative MATT SALMON, has authored H.R. 3136, the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act. This legislation will promote this innovation by directing the Secretary of Education to implement pilot projects for competency-based programs that will deliver greater flexibility to institutions that want to provide students with a more personalized education experience.

The bill will ensure accountability by requiring annual evaluations of each of these projects to determine program quality and ensure student achievement. My hope is that these projects will better inform our reauthorization of the Higher Education Act by giving us proven results of what works and what does not work in the current regulatory framework. Additionally, it will help inform our discussions around financial aid and what learning in the 21st century classroom looks like.

I worked in higher education for many years and thought these changes were imminent long ago, but higher education change in the past has occurred at a leisurely pace. It is exciting today finally to see some of the ideas and concepts that have been around for years being more widely tested and finding success.

In our country, there are 4.6 million jobs going unfilled because employers are not able to find individuals with the right skill sets to meet their needs. As these individuals come back to school to improve their skills, we should find ways to recognize and give credit for what they have already learned to help them move through the

process more quickly. This bill will help students do just that by providing flexibility to institutions to create programs that meet those needs and holding them accountable for the results.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), my esteemed colleague and the ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 4983, the Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act.

The underlying bill strengthens data transparency in higher education by establishing a new college dashboard Web site, which replaces the Network Navigator and ensures the inclusion of nontraditional students and data metrics.

The college dashboard Web site will provide better and more accessible information for students and families. Key information will consist of enrollment and completion data on full-time and part-time students, disaggregated by Pell recipients; by race, ethnicity, and disability; as well as information on net price, average student loan debt, and the college costs.

This bill promotes transparency on the use of adjunct faculty. For the first time, our Nation's colleges will be required to report the ratio of part-time to full-time instructors by degree level.

In addition, this legislation creates a more accessible calculator with clearer and more individualized information on student costs.

Finally, the bill requires that the college dashboard Web site be consumer tested with other agencies and students and institutions and experts to ensure it provides understandable and relevant information.

I am proud to say that Texas has been a leader in this area. The University of Texas system, for example, has developed an impressive college productivity dashboard designed to create transparency and to measure productivity in a more effective way. Above all, the UT dashboard system also provides students, families, and policymakers with robust data and information that they can use to make more informed decisions.

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

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Having better data and information has allowed the University of Texas to identify achievement gaps and to make improvements in areas that need reform. More accurate data on college participation and completion, for instance, can help to improve student outcomes, particularly for low-income students and students of color.

In closing, I applaud Chairman KLINE, Ranking Member MILLER, and Ms. FOXX for working in a bipartisan manner to advance this legislation.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of H.R. 4983.

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

Mr. Speaker, the other bill to be considered under this rule is H.R. 4984, the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act, which will promote financial literacy through enhanced counseling for all recipients of Federal financial aid.

Making the decision to pursue postsecondary education can be challenging, and many students and families find themselves overwhelmed by the choices and new terminology. It is in the best interest of students and taxpayers alike that information about Federal aid be presented in a way that is easily understood.

Additionally, for most students, Federal financial aid provides them with more money than they are used to handling, and they struggle with how to manage properly their debt loads and living expenses. Students want to be treated as independent adults and therefore assume the responsibility that comes with their choices.

As they make the transition to college, or back to the classroom for adult learners, this bill seeks to help students make smart decisions about financing their education so they fully understand the circumstances they may face at the completion of their education.

This legislation ensures that borrowers, both students and parents, who participate in the Federal loan programs receive interactive counseling each year that is personalized to their individual situation, as well as review their loans each year and consent before receiving new Federal student loans.

The bill expands financial counseling to include students who receive a Pell grant, and it also directs the Secretary of Education to maintain and share a consumer-tested, online counseling tool institutions can use to provide annual loan and Pell grant counseling as well as exit counseling.

Mr. Speaker, it may surprise Members in this Chamber that I was the first person in my family to graduate from high school and go 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 with 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.

That is why I am passionate about ensuring that students have the opportunity to get an education but also understand the responsibility they are assuming in taking out a loan and the implications it may have on their family for years to come.

Throughout my career serving low-income, first-generation students, I know how rewarding an education can be, and this bill provides extra tools to help those students fully understand their commitments. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my 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, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress is best characterized by missing opportunities, whether it is balancing our budget, whether it is immigration reform, or, in the context of education, which is the primary issue I work on here on the committee in this institution, the opportunity to reauthorize and replace No Child Left Behind with a Federal education policy that works for our country and to replace the Higher Education Authorization Act with a bill that makes college more affordable for American families.

Today's considerations, while good bills—and I am particularly honored to have my bill with Mr. SALMON on the floor of the House, and I look forward to managing that and discussing its merits later and encourage a strong bipartisan vote of support—the tragedy is that we are nibbling around the edges and not dealing with the core of the issues that the American people demand that Congress deal with.

When we look at congressional approval ratings of 12 percent, we need go no further in explaining that than the hesitancy of this body to solve or address any of the major issues that I hear from my constituents on a daily basis.

If this Congress were serious, we could put H.R. 15, our bipartisan immigration reform bill, on the floor of this House. I am confident it would pass. If this body were serious, we could put the Employment Nondiscrimination Act, a bipartisan bill, on the floor of this House to prevent companies across our country from firing Americans simply because of whom they date or love in their private lives, and it would pass.

We could begin the not easy work but the worthwhile work of working together, Democrats and Republicans, on reauthorizing ESEA, No Child Left Behind, and replacing our broken Federal education policy with a constructive

approach that works for kids across our country in reauthorizing the Higher Education Act.

What would be those principles behind reauthorizing the ESEA? I think there are a lot of good ideas from both sides of the aisle.

When No Child Left Behind was signed into law by George Bush, it was a step forward for transparency and accountability; but even in the immediate aftermath, it was clear that Congress didn't get everything right. Rather than improving it and adjusting it, it has been frozen like a time capsule from 2001. Secretary Duncan has done what he can with the broad authority of waivers.

I hope that my Republican colleagues agree that vesting any administration—not just this President—with that kind of ability should not be the intent of lawmakers. We should address the flaws in the act.

I think any President, Democrat or Republican, is doing what they can with the law such as it is, but the real answer doesn't lie with an administration. It lies with Congress. It lies in Congress altering and changing the AYP formula.

What does real accountability look like? Growth over time and how much students are learning. What should ESEA contain? It should promote innovation and excellence. It should expand and replicate what works in public education. The most promising thing we have is that we have examples of schools that work with at-risk kids from every demographic that outperform their peers and prepare kids for college and the workforce.

Finally, we need to change what doesn't work in public education.

So shining a light isn't enough. Having a broad stroke of AYP and policy levers and penalties that are unconnected to actually improving schools doesn't work. But we need to begin the difficult work of turning around persistently failing schools to ensure that every child across our country has access to a good education.

□ 1330

That is the work we are not doing. It is the work we are not doing in this bill. It is the work we haven't done in committee in any meaningful way, and it joins the litany of issues that I hear about from my constituents on a daily basis.

Has this Congress balanced the budget? No.

Has the Congress resolved our immigration crisis as we have seen the temperature increase with the tens of thousands of young people on our southern border? No, we haven't taken a single step. In fact, this Congress hasn't even passed or brought to the floor or debated a single immigration bill.

For a while, we were hearing that there would be a ''piecemeal approach'' to immigration reform. We are nearing the end of the 113th Congress, and we haven't seen a single piece. I don't know what kind of a meal that is, but it is not one that satisfies one's appetite, and it doesn't satisfy the appetite of the voters not to see Congress deal with immigration reform, secure our border and replace our broken immigration system with one that works for our country.

People in the education world—teachers, students, families, school board members, principals across our country—all know what I hope my colleagues know, which is that ESEA is broken, that No Child Left Behind doesn't work. It has flaws that aren't ideological—they aren't Democrats say this or Republicans say this. It has formulas that don't make sense to anybody. It is the formula, namely, that declares that nearly every public school in our country is a failure.

Now, that can be something that some people might want to say rhetorically, but I don't think you will even find too many Democrats or Republicans saying that every public school in this country is a failure. I shouldn't say ''every.'' It is 99 percent or 95 percent of them. I think there are a few small ones that got through, but AYP sets up this apparatus that is nearly impossible for schools to meet, which is requiring that every student cohort achieve proficiency now. It sounded good. Congress mandated that every student become proficient, but it shouldn't be a great surprise that it didn't happen, so it is time to replace that with something that makes sense. If people rhetorically want to say all public schools are failing on either side of the aisle, they are welcome to it, but I think we all know that the reality is more nuanced in that there are good public schools and there are poorly performing public schools.

The way that you treat and deal with a good public school and public policy is not to say it is a failing one. You can praise it. You can say they are doing a great job. You can pat them on the back. You can certainly challenge them to do more, but that is a very different policy response to a persistently failing high school where six out of 10 kids who go in the door in ninth grade don't even graduate. That school is doing their community a disservice and is only increasing the rampant inequality of opportunity that plagues our country.

Instead of relying on temporary fixes and marginal improvements, I encourage this Congress to take on the real issues—to take on immigration reform, to take on balancing the budget, and, in this context, to take on ESEA: replace our broken education law No Child Left Behind with a bipartisan bill that we can be proud of and that will endure for the next decade; replace the Higher Education Act with a bipartisan bill that actually makes substantive progress around reducing the cost of college.

I want to thank Ranking Member MILLER and Chairman KLINE. I encourage my colleagues to vote against the rule, and I would encourage them to vote ''yes'' on both of these bipartisan bills.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

We have worked in a bipartisan fashion on this legislation that is before us today and on some other legislation. Yesterday, the President signed H.R. 803, which we called the SKILLS Act when it left the House. I am very proud of that, and the President talked about how happy he was to sign that bill and how doing things in a bipartisan fashion felt so good.

But my colleague across the aisle keeps talking about ''the Congress.'' As he well knows, but sometimes does not present accurately to the American people, ''the Congress'' consists of two Chambers: the House of Representatives and the Senate. The House of Representatives, as evidenced by what we are doing here today, is very serious about doing our work.

On average, the House is holding 37 hearings every week, fulfilling our oversight responsibilities. We have passed 321 bills that are sitting in the Senate and are not being taken up by Senator REID, who is responsible for stopping meaningful legislation that will reduce energy costs and help create jobs in this country.

The record of House Republicans on fiscal issues is second to none. We have cut discretionary spending every year since taking control of the House. We have proposed reforms to many of our entitlement programs. If the gentleman is sincere in his desire for a balanced budget, I ask him to work with his ranking member on the Budget Committee to propose such a path. House Republicans have voted to support a pathway to balance, and Democrats have voted to raise taxes on hardworking Americans while never reaching balance.

Mr. Speaker, there is much work that needs to be done in this country, and we are facing lots of challenges. I believe that education is the most important tool Americans at any age can have. It was a privilege to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle on the Education Committee to advance legislation that seeks to meet the needs of today's student population as well as to provide accountability for hardworking taxpayer dollars invested. I think the record of the Education and the Workforce Committee is very clear: when our colleagues across the aisle will work with us, we move legislation.

No legislation is perfect, and that is why I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues to address their concerns and improve this legislation through the amendment process. Additionally, I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate to find common ground on advancing higher education reform that will improve the opportunities and results for students and will provide accountability for taxpayers.

However, these bills provide a good foundation to work from, and as a proud supporter of this legislation, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule and the underlying bills.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule as it does not make in order a bipartisan amendment to H.R. 4984, that I introduced with my friend Congressman RUNYAN.

Under the legislation, institutions are required to provide certain information to borrowers recommending they exhaust their federal loan opportunities before taking out private loans, that federal loans typically offer better terms, and that if they do decide to take out a private loan, an explanation regarding some of the borrower's rights. Our simple, right-to-know amendment would add to the list of information required to be made available an explanation of the differences between private loans and federal loans when it comes to the death or disability of the borrower. Borrowers would be notified that the borrower's estate or any cosigner of a private loan may be obligated to repay the full amount of the loan in the event of the death or disability of the borrower.

This amendment is based on bipartisan legislation I introduced with Mr. RUNYAN, legislation which passed by a voice vote in the House a few years ago. The Bryski family—who live in Mr. RUNYAN's district in South Jersey—fought for six years to discharge a private student loan they cosigned for their son Christopher, a college student who suffered a traumatic brain injury during his third year at Rutgers University and passed away after spending two years in a coma. Upon Christopher's death, his family was told by the bank that they would have to take over the loan and begin making payments on the $50,000 owed.

No family ever expects to lose a child. However, should the unexpected happen during college, it is a terrible fact today that families not only struggle with the loss of their loved one, but are also burdened as they find out they now have the obligation to pay the student's outstanding private loans. In this circumstance, federal loans are forgiven, but private lenders often still require families to pay back loans on behalf of their children. Understandably, the unexpected costs are difficult to absorb, and families are not mentally prepared for these various circumstances.

While no one can prepare for or anticipate the death of a loved one, especially a child entering college, requiring this information to be made available will ensure families can make the most appropriate financial decisions about how they finance higher education. This bill does not add a dime to the deficit, and we are not seeking to change lending rules or requiring banks to discharge debt. We simply want loan cosigners to understand what they could be responsible for.

It is a disappointment that the Majority would rather keep parents in the dark, and would rather allow private banks and some of their most heartless practices remain in the shadows than consider this simple amendment that would simply ensure that students and their families are warned about this possibility.

I urge opposition to the rule.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 677 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, 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. 4582) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill 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. 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. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 4582.

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.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, 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. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions 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.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

STRENGTHENING TRANSPARENCY IN HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4983) to simplify and streamline the information regarding institutions of higher education made publicly available by the Secretary of Education, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4983

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 Transparency in Higher Education Act''.

SEC. 2. COLLEGE DASHBOARD WEBSITE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 132 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1015a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''first-time,'';

(B) in paragraph (3) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''first-time,''; and

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking ''first-time,'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''first-time''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''first-time'';

(3) by striking subsections (c) through (g), (j), and (l);

(4) by redesignating subsections (h), (i), and (k) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively; and

(5) by striking subsection (d) (as so redesignated) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(d) CONSUMER INFORMATION.—

''(1) AVAILABILITY OF TITLE IV INSTITUTION INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall develop and make publicly available a website to be known as the 'College Dashboard website' in accordance with this section and prominently display on such website, in simple, understandable, and unbiased terms for the most recent academic year for which satisfactory data are available, the following information with respect to each institution of higher education that participates in a program under title IV:

''(A) A link to the website of the institution.

''(B) An identification of the type of institution as one of the following:

''(i) A four-year public institution of higher education.

''(ii) A four-year private, nonprofit institution of higher education.

''(iii) A four-year private, for-profit institution of higher education.

''(iv) A two-year public institution of higher education.

''(v) A two-year private, nonprofit institution of higher education.

''(vi) A two-year private, for-profit institution of higher education.

''(vii) A less than two-year public institution of higher education.

''(viii) A less than two-year private, nonprofit institution of higher education.

''(ix) A less than two-year private, for-profit institution of higher education.

''(C) The number of students enrolled at the institution—

''(i) as undergraduate students; and

''(ii) as graduate students, if applicable.

''(D) The student-faculty ratio.

''(E) The percentage of degree-seeking or certificate-seeking undergraduate students enrolled at the institution who obtain a degree or certificate within—

''(i) 100 percent of the normal time for completion of, or graduation from, the program in which the student is enrolled;

''(ii) 150 percent of the normal time for completion of, or graduation from, the program in which the student is enrolled; and

''(iii) 200 percent of the normal time for completion of, or graduation from, the program in which the student is enrolled.

''(F) The average net price per year for undergraduate students receiving Federal student financial aid under title IV based on an income category selected by the user from a list containing the following income categories:

''(i) $0 to $30,000.

''(ii) $30,001 to $48,000.

''(iii) $48,001 to $75,000.

''(iv) $75,001 to $110,000.

''(v) $110, 001 to $150,000.

''(vi) Over $150,000.

''(G) A link to the net price calculator for such institution.

''(H) The percentage of undergraduate students who obtained a certificate or degree from the institution who borrowed Federal student loans and the average Federal student loan debt incurred by an undergraduate student who obtained a certificate or degree from the institution and borrowed Federal student loans in the course of obtaining such certificate or degree.

''(I) A link to national and regional data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics on starting salaries in all major occupations.

''(J) A link to the webpage of the institution containing campus safety data with respect to such institution.

''(2) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall publish on Internet webpages that are linked to through the College Dashboard website for the most recent academic year for which satisfactory data is available the following information with respect to each institution of higher education that participates in a program under title IV:

''(A) ENROLLMENT.—

''(i) The percentages of male and female undergraduate students enrolled at the institution.

''(ii) The percentages of undergraduate students enrolled at the institution—

''(I) full-time; and

''(II) less than full-time.

''(iii) In the case of an institution other than an institution that provides all courses and programs through distance education, of the undergraduate students enrolled at the institution—

''(I) the percentage of such students who are from the State in which the institution is located;

''(II) the percentage of such students who are from other States; and

''(III) the percentage of such students who are international students.

''(iv) The percentages of undergraduate students enrolled at the institution, disaggregated by—

''(I) race and ethnic background;

''(II) classification as a student with a disability;

''(III) recipients of a Federal Pell Grant;

''(IV) recipients of assistance under a tuition assistance program conducted by the Department of Defense under section 1784a or 2007 of title 10, United States Code, or other authorities available to the Department of Defense or veterans' education benefits (as defined in section 480); and

''(V) recipients of a Federal student loan.

''(B) COMPLETION.—The information required under paragraph (1)(E), disaggregated by—

''(i) recipients of a Federal Pell Grant;

''(ii) recipients of a loan made under part D (other than a Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loan) who did not receive a Federal Pell Grant;

''(iii) persons who did not receive a Federal Pell Grant or a loan made under part D (other than a Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loan);

''(iv) race and ethnic background;

''(v) classification as a student with a disability; and

''(vi) recipients of assistance under a tuition assistance program conducted by the Department of Defense under section 1784a or 2007 of title 10, United States Code, or other authorities available to the Department of Defense or veterans' education benefits (as defined in section 480).

''(C) COSTS.—

''(i) The cost of attendance for full-time undergraduate students enrolled in the institution who live on campus.

''(ii) The cost of attendance for full-time undergraduate students enrolled in the institution who live off campus.

''(iii) The cost of tuition and fees for full-time undergraduate students enrolled in the institution.

''(iv) The cost of tuition and fees per credit hour or credit hour equivalency for undergraduate students enrolled in the institution less than full time.

''(v) In the case of a public institution of higher education (other than an institution described in clause (vi)) and notwithstanding subsection (b)(1), the costs described in clauses (i) and (ii) for—

''(I) full-time students enrolled in the institution who are residents of the State in which the institution is located; and

''(II) full-time students enrolled in the institution who are not residents of such State.

''(vi) In the case of a public institution of higher education that offers different tuition rates for students who are residents of a geographic subdivision smaller than a State and students not located in such geographic subdivision and notwithstanding subsection (b)(1), the costs described in clauses (i) and (ii) for—

''(I) full-time students enrolled at the institution who are residents of such geographic subdivision;

''(II) full-time students enrolled at the institution who are residents of the State in which the institution is located but not residents of such geographic subdivision; and

''(III) full-time students enrolled at the institution who are not residents of such State.

''(D) FINANCIAL AID.—

''(i) The average annual grant amount (including Federal, State, and institutional aid) awarded to an undergraduate student enrolled at the institution who receives financial aid.

''(ii) The percentage of undergraduate students enrolled at the institution receiving Federal, State, and institutional grants, student loans, and any other type of student financial assistance known by the institution, provided publicly or through the institution, such as Federal work-study funds.

''(iii) The cohort default rate (as defined in section 435(m)) for such institution.

''(E) FACULTY INFORMATION.—

''(i) The ratio of the number of course sections taught by part-time instructors to the number of course sections taught by full-time faculty, disaggregated by course sections intended primarily for undergraduate students and course sections intended primarily for graduate students.

''(ii) The mean and median years of employment for part-time instructors.

''(3) OTHER DATA MATTERS.—

''(A) COMPLETION DATA.—The Commissioner of Education Statistics shall ensure that the information required under paragraph (1)(E) includes information with respect to all students at an institution, including students other than first-time, full-time students and students who transfer to another institution, in a manner that the Commissioner considers appropriate.

''(B) ADJUSTMENT OF INCOME CATEGORIES.—The Secretary may annually adjust the range of each of the income categories described in paragraph (1)(F) to account for a change in the Consumer Price Index for All

Urban Consumers as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics if the Secretary determines an adjustment is necessary.

''(4) INSTITUTIONAL COMPARISON.—The Secretary shall include on the College Dashboard website a method for users to easily compare the information required under paragraphs (1) and (2) between institutions.

''(5) UPDATES.—

''(A) DATA.—The Secretary shall update the College Dashboard website not less than annually.

''(B) TECHNOLOGY AND FORMAT.—The Secretary shall regularly assess the format and technology of the College Dashboard website and make any changes or updates that the Secretary considers appropriate.

''(6) CONSUMER TESTING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In developing and maintaining the College Dashboard website, the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate departments and agencies of the Federal Government, shall conduct consumer testing with appropriate persons, including current and prospective college students, family members of such students, institutions of higher education, and experts, to ensure that the College Dashboard website is usable and easily understandable and provides useful and relevant information to students and families.

''(B) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGES.—The Secretary shall submit to the authorizing committees any recommendations that the Secretary considers appropriate for changing the information required to be provided on the College Dashboard website under paragraphs (1) and (2) based on the results of the consumer testing conducted under subparagraph (A).

''(7) PROVISION OF APPROPRIATE LINKS TO PROSPECTIVE STUDENTS AFTER SUBMISSION OF FAFSA.—The Secretary shall provide to each student that submits a Free Application for Federal Student Aid described in section 483 a link to the webpage of the College Dashboard website that contains the information required under paragraph (1) for each institution of higher education such student includes on such Application.

''(8) INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.—The Secretary, in consultation with each appropriate head of a department or agency of the Federal Government, shall ensure to the greatest extent practicable that any information related to higher education that is published by such department or agency is consistent with the information published on the College Dashboard website.

''(9) REFERENCES TO COLLEGE NAVIGATOR WEBSITE.—Any reference in this Act to the College Navigator website shall be considered a reference to the College Dashboard website.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), as amended by subsection (a) of this section, is further amended—

(1) in section 131(h) (20 U.S.C. 1015(h)), by striking ''College Navigator'' and inserting ''College Dashboard''; and

(2) in section 132(a) (20 U.S.C. 1015a(a)), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(1) COLLEGE DASHBOARD WEBSITE.—The term 'College Dashboard website' means the College Dashboard website required under subsection (d).''.

(c) DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary of Education shall develop and publish the College Dashboard website required under section 132 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1015a), as amended by subsections (a) and (b) of this section, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) COLLEGE NAVIGATOR WEBSITE MAINTENANCE.—The Secretary shall maintain the College Navigator website required under section 132 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1015a), as in effect the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, in the manner required under the Higher Education Act of 1965, as in effect on such day, until the College Dashboard website referred to in subsection (c) is complete and publicly available on the Internet.

SEC. 3. NET PRICE CALCULATORS.

Subsection (c) of section 132 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1015a), as redesignated by section 2(a)(4) of this Act, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (6); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraphs:

''(4) MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR NET PRICE CALCULATORS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act, a net price calculator for an institution of higher education shall meet the following requirements:

''(A) The link for the calculator shall—

''(i) be clearly labeled as a net price calculator and prominently, clearly, and conspicuously posted in locations on the website of such institution where information on costs and aid is provided and any other location that the institution considers appropriate; and

''(ii) match in size and font to the other prominent links on the webpage where the link for the calculator is displayed.

''(B) The webpage displaying the results for the calculator shall specify at least the following information:

''(i) The net price (as calculated under subsection (a)(2)) for such institution, which shall be the most visually prominent figure on the results screen.

''(ii) Cost of attendance, including—

''(I) tuition and fees;

''(II) average annual cost of room and board for the institution for a full-time undergraduate student enrolled in the institution;

''(III) average annual cost of books and supplies for a full-time undergraduate student enrolled in the institution; and

''(IV) estimated cost of other expenses (including personal expenses and transportation) for a full-time undergraduate student enrolled in the institution.

''(iii) Estimated total need-based grant aid and merit-based grant aid from Federal, State, and institutional sources that may be available to a full-time undergraduate student.

''(iv) Percentage of the full-time undergraduate students enrolled in the institution that received any type of grant aid described in clause (iii).

''(v) The disclaimer described in paragraph (6).

''(vi) In the case of a calculator that—

''(I) includes questions to estimate the eligibility of a student or prospective student for veterans' education benefits (as defined in section 480) or educational benefits for active duty service members, such benefits are displayed on the results screen in a manner that clearly distinguishes such benefits from the grant aid described in clause (iii); or

''(II) does not include questions to estimate eligibility for the benefits described in subclause (I), the results screen indicates that certain students (or prospective students) may qualify for such benefits and includes a link to information about such benefits.

''(C) The institution shall populate the calculator with data from an academic year that is not more than 2 academic years prior to the most recent academic year.

''(5) PROHIBITION ON USE OF DATA COLLECTED BY THE NET PRICE CALCULATOR.—A net price calculator for an institution of higher education shall—

''(A) clearly indicate which questions are required to be completed for an estimate of the net price from the calculator;

''(B) in the case of a calculator that requests contact information from users, clearly mark such requests as optional and provide for an estimate of the net price from the calculator without requiring users to enter such information; and

''(C) prohibit any personally identifiable information provided by users from being sold or made available to third parties.''.

SEC. 4. FUNDING.

(a) USE OF EXISTING FUNDS.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Education to maintain the College Navigator website, $1,000,000 shall be available to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(b) NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.—No funds are authorized by this Act to be appropriated to carry out this Act or the amendments made by this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. 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. 4983.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of the Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act.

The Education and the Workforce Committee has held 14 hearings on higher education, and throughout these hearings, it has become increasingly clear that students and families face a deluge of data that often provides little to no useful information as they try to make the important decisions of where to pursue postsecondary educations.

Despite repeated attempts to enhance transparency in the higher education system, students and families still struggle to access important information that will assist in their searches for the right colleges or universities. To make matters worse, data that is available often ignores a large portion of students enrolled in the postsecondary education system or fails to capture crucial information students and families need to view the entire landscape of higher education.

That is why my colleague, Representative LUKE MESSER, and I authored the bill before us today. The Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act attempts to streamline existing Federal transparency efforts to avoid duplicative information and confusion for students by creating a consumer-tested college dashboard that would display only key information students need when deciding which schools to attend

as well as ensuring that all students are appropriately represented in the data presented.

Taxpayers provide a great deal of money to help students attend the institutions of their choice and to pursue their passions. Therefore, we should make every effort to see that students have the best information available to help them make good decisions for where to continue their educations. The Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act seeks to make that information more accessible and easier to understand.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation, which passed with bipartisan support out of the Education Committee.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise to express my support for H.R. 4983, the Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act.

The underlying bill strengthens the state of transparency in higher education by establishing a new college dashboard Web site, which replaces the Network Navigator and ensures the inclusion of nontraditional students in the data matrix.

The college dashboard Web site will provide better and more accessible information for students and families. Key information will consist of enrollment and completion data on full-time and part-time students as well as those segregated by Pell recipients—or race and ethnicity and disability—as well as information on net price, average student loan debt, and college costs.

The bill promotes transparency on the use of adjunct faculty. For the first time, our Nation's colleges will be required to report the ratio of part-time to full-time instructors by degree level. In addition, this legislation creates a more accessible calculator with clearer, more individualized information on student costs. Finally, the bill requires that the college dashboard Web site be consumer-tested with other agencies and students and institutions and experts to ensure it provides understandable and relevant information.

I am proud to say that Texas has been a leader in this area. The University of Texas' system, for example, has developed an impressive college productivity dashboard designed to increase transparency and to measure productivity in a more effective way. Above all, the UT system's dashboard also provides students, families, and policymakers with robust data and information that they can use to make more informed decisions.

Having better data and information has allowed the University of Texas to identify achievement gaps and to make improvements in areas that need reform. More accurate data on college participation and completion, for instance, can help to improve student outcomes, particularly for low-income students and students of color.

In closing, I applaud Chairman KLINE, Ranking Member MILLER, and Ranking Member Foxx for working in a bipartisan manner to advance this legislation, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of H.R. 4983.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER), my distinguished colleague and cosponsor for this legislation.

□ 1345

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, which will provide prospective students with better information to make more informed choices about pursuing their higher education.

I want to commend Chairman KLINE and subcommittee Chairwoman FOXX for bringing this measure forward. And I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) for his leadership on this topic as well.

In modern life, few decisions are bigger than whether to attend college and which college to attend. The right choice can be a head start towards a strong financial future. The wrong choice can leave a student without a degree and in tens of thousands of dollars of debt.

There is no magic formula for finding the best fit, but having access to clear and relevant data can make the decision easier and less overwhelming. Unfortunately, when making this important choice, students and their families are often faced with a convoluted maze of statistics which don't allow them to make fully informed, cost-conscious decisions.

This legislation will ensure that students have the information they need to make good decisions for their future. Helping students more easily find the schools that are right for them will encourage their academic success, avoid unnecessary student debt, and enhance their professional prospects after graduation.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), a distinguished member of the Education Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4983, the Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act. It is critical that prospective students have access to information on institutions that they may be interested in attending, and the bill before us would provide the platform for these students to gather this information.

This information is essential to ensuring that students will be able to make an informed decision on which institution to attend.

While providing students with additional information on institutions of higher learning is important, none of the bills before us actually will do anything to actually ensure that every student is given every chance possible of receiving an education past high school level.

Studies have consistently shown the value of higher education, and have also shown that two-thirds of the jobs in the future will require some sort of education past the high school level.

Unfortunately, many students today find higher education unaffordable and out of reach due to the increasing cost of attending college and high student loan interest rates. Currently, the Federal Government makes a significant profit on student loans, with the Congressional Budget Office estimating that the Federal Government will profit $135 billion over the next 10 years off of student loans.

We must continue to ensure that college remains affordable and accessible to all that seek it, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Education and the Workforce Committee towards that goal.

On the bill before us today, however, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4983, the Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to our distinguished colleague from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4983, the Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act.

With the cost of a college education increasing, and outstanding student loan debt now at a staggering $1.2 trillion, it is more important than ever for students and their families to have the necessary information to make informed decisions about their educational pursuits.

This legislation empowers students and their families by improving the dissemination of key information about colleges and universities through a consumer-tested college dashboard.

This bill coordinates and streamlines information from multiple Federal agencies to assist students in comparing schools to determine which will best suit their unique needs.

The only college completion rates currently available to students and their families are for the traditional, first-time, full-time student. At East Tennessee State University in my hometown, only about 60 percent of the students fit this description, leaving a significant portion of students not represented by the data.

Completion rates for other groups of students, such as veterans and Pell Grant recipients, are included in the college dashboard to ensure that this information is representative of all students.

Surprisingly, despite spending approximately $32 billion each year to provide Pell Grants to over 9 million students, we have little information about the educational outcomes for these students. By taking a more thorough look at the results this program is producing, we can improve the likelihood of student success.

In addition to providing students and parents with better information, this

bill will give us new tools to help strengthen the Pell Grants program, while ensuring it is a good investment for taxpayers.

To ensure that resource is utilized, students will be provided links to the college dashboard for each prospective school they look at, thus providing this important information to them at the pinnacle of their college search.

I thank the chairwoman and the ranking member on this bipartisan legislation, and I encourage its support.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 3 minutes to my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas.

This bill creates a new Department of Education Web site that includes data allowing prospective students to better understand the cost of specific institutions, and I thank the chairman and the ranking member for working with me to improve this bill before it came to the floor.

The current Department of Education Web site is incomplete and misleading. The current Web site does not include the net price to a student according to that student's income level, which could cause, and does cause, lower and middle class students to reject schools that they, in fact, could afford.

They or their parents would see average net price, calculated for all students, and immediately assume it is unaffordable for them. The changes that I have included in this bill allow a parent or a prospective student to find, upfront, on the home page, the average net price of attending, based on the family's income level. And this information may lead students to consider institutions they would have otherwise excluded.

The difference between the average cost, calculated for all students, and the cost to a student, say, from a $40,000 income level, may be many thousands of dollars.

Now, I should add, in conclusion, that while this bill that we take up today makes some progress, this and the other bills we will be considering fall short of what is really needed: a comprehensive effort to help more students afford college.

We should be considering doubling the Pell Grants, reducing student loan interest rates, and doing all those other things that would be in a comprehensive higher education bill. I am sorry to say we are ignoring those solutions.

Nevertheless, I welcome the modest improvements that we will see in the legislation being considered here, and I hope that soon we will get to the comprehensive higher education legislation that the students of America deserve.

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker I am honored to yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Ranking Member HINOJOSA for the time, and I thank the chairman and Ranking Member MILLER, and Chairwoman FOXX for their hard work on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4983, the Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act. This legislation will help prospective students and their families by providing more accessible information about the costs of attending our Nation's colleges and universities.

The bill before us today includes provisions that I authored that will improve a tool already available to help students and their families assess the cost of attending college, the net price calculator.

Currently, students and families have to guess where the calculators are located on the schools' Web pages, what each school calls the calculator, and whether the information it provides is accurate.

Additionally, veterans and servicemembers must try to determine whether the estimates provided by such calculators accurately reflect the academic benefits they have earned through their service.

As the ranking member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, one of my roles is to help government work more effectively and efficiently.

My bill, the Net Price Calculator Improvement Act, H.R. 3694, addresses the challenges identified with current net price calculators by ensuring that they will provide consistent and comparable price information for colleges and universities based on up-to-date data.

My legislation would also ensure that institutions place the calculators in consistent locations on their Web sites, and it would protect students who use the calculators from data mining.

I applaud my colleagues on the Education and the Workforce Committee for including these critical provisions in H.R. 4983, and urge the passage of this legislation.

As I close, let me note that the bill before us is an important first step in the process of reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, and it contains important reforms. However, our work will not be done by simply passing this bill.

The bills before the House this week ignore the bread and butter of the Federal higher education policy, Federal student aid. We must reauthorize the Higher Education Act in its entirety as quickly as possible.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

Before I close, I want to say that I look forward to working with my friends on the other side of the aisle as soon as possible so that we can complete, in its entirety, the reauthorization of higher education which is greatly needed here in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank our colleagues on both sides of the aisle for working together on what I think is an important piece of legislation that will help families and students in the future.

I want to give particular thanks to the staffs on both sides of the aisle. The Education and the Workforce Committee has been very active this year and last year on presenting excellent legislation to this House, and I want to thank the staff for their good work.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 4983, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4983, 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.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY AND INTEGRITY AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE EXTENSION

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5134) to extend the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity and the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance for one year.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5134

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY AND INTEGRITY.

Section 114(f) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1011c(f)) is amended by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2015''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.

Section 491(k) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1098(k)) is amended by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2015''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

□ 1400

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. 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. 5134.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5134 and yield myself such time as I may consume.

While the majority of the Higher Education Act is extended until the end of FY 2015 by the General Education Provisions Act, the extension does not apply to two committees authorized under the law.

The first committee is the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity, which advises the Secretary of Education on accreditation issues and which accrediting bodies to improve.

The second committee is the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance, which advises both Congress and the Secretary of Education on student financial aid policy. In order to ensure these important advisory committees can continue to serve policymakers, Representative HINOJOSA and I authored H.R. 5134 to extend both of these committees for 1 year.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this simple extension and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HINOJOSA. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 5134, legislation which would reauthorize two advisory committees within the U.S. Department of Education for at least 1 year.

The National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity, known as NACIQI, and the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance play vitally important advisory roles to the Secretary of Education and Congress and would not otherwise be extended through the General Education Provisions Act when the Higher Education Act expires this year.

NACIQI, for example, advises the Secretary of Education on matters related to postsecondary education accreditation and the certification process for higher education institutions to participate in Federal student aid programs.

The Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance provides advice and counsel on Federal student financial aid policy to both Congress and the Secretary of Education, including recommendations for increasing college access and persistence to higher education for low-income and moderate-income students.

As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training, I thank Chairman KLINE, Ranking Member MILLER, and Chairwoman FOXX for their leadership on this issue.

Although I will continue to fight for a more comprehensive reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, I believe that this bill today, as well as the other three higher education bills being voted on this week, make some key improvements to the Higher Education Act.

With that, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the passage of H.R. 5134.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 5134 and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5134.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 677;

Adopting House Resolution 677, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3136, ADVANCING COMPETENCY-BASED EDUCATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECT ACT OF 2013, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4984, EMPOWERING STUDENTS THROUGH ENHANCED FINANCIAL COUNSELING ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 677) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3136) to establish a demonstration program for competency-based education, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4984) to amend the loan counseling requirements under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes, 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 190, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 437]

YEAS—224

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
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
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
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
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
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
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—190

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
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
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
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
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
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
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Becerra
Campbell
DesJarlais
Eshoo
Gingrey (GA)
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Pelosi
Perry
Rogers (MI)
Stewart
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1433

Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. GARCIA changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. KING of New York changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 437 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote 437. If present, I would have voted "no."

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BOEHNER was allowed to speak out of order.)

HONORING DR. JESSICA BIENSTOCK

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity to recognize a special guest who is in our Nation's Capital today. Dr. Jessica Bienstock is the residency program director for the Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics at the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine.

In her career, she has delivered over 1,000 babies, and one of them is well known to all of us, and she is Abigail Rose Beutler, who of course is the daughter of our friend and colleague, the gentlelady from Washington. We are all familiar with Abigail's story and the odds that she overcame. If she is a happy, healthy miracle, then Dr. Bienstock is the miracle worker who helped give the gift of hope and life to this family.

I think the whole House owes a debt of gratitude to her and to all of our doctors, nurses, and medical professionals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 185, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 438]

AYES—230

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
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
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
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
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
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
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)

NOES—185

Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
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
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
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
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
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
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Campbell
DesJarlais
Eshoo
Frelinghuysen
Gingrey (GA)
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Honda
Huffman
Kingston
Latham
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Pelosi
Rogers (MI)
Stewart
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1445

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.

ADVANCING COMPETENCY-BASED EDUCATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECT ACT OF 2013

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 to include extraneous material on H.R. 3136.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 677 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. 3136.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1447

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. 3136) to establish a demonstration program for competency-based education, with Mr. AMODEI 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 Colorado (Mr. POLIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act of 2013.

Mr. Chairman, this week, Congress is moving forward with a bipartisan effort to strengthen our Nation's higher education system.

Across the country, millions of college students are getting ready to start the school year. They will soon say good-bye to family and friends and pursue their dream of a postsecondary education. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, many Americans are struggling to turn that dream into reality.

The higher education system we know today is too costly, too bureaucratic, and outdated. Some are having a hard time fitting the traditional college experience into a busy lifestyle that already includes work, family, or both. Others are graduating with a pile of debt and no job prospects.

A college degree can open the door to a bright and prosperous future, yet too often, obstacles stand in the way. Ultimately, States and institutions must provide the answers students and families need, but Congress has a role to play as well.

First and foremost, we need to continue promoting policies that will get this economy moving again, so every college graduate who wants a job can find a job. We can also adopt commonsense reforms that will improve our higher education system.

Today, the House will begin to do just that. We have an opportunity right now—right now, Mr. Chairman—to advance reforms that will support innovation and empower students to make informed decisions about their college careers. H.R. 3136 is the first step in that effort.

The bipartisan Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act will allow institutions to expand an innovative approach to higher education, known as competency-based education.

This model of education defines a set of skills for a field of work and then measures student progress in acquiring those skills. Once a student demonstrates a level of skill or competency, he or she can move to the next step in the academic program.

Instead of awarding a student credit hours for time spent in class, competency-based education allows a student to learn at a pace tailored to his or her specific needs.

If you are a single mom, you may need more time to complete your degree while juggling the demands of work and kids, or if you are a dad out of a job with a family to support, 4 years sitting in a classroom is time you do not have.

Competency-based education holds tremendous promise. It allows students to earn a degree in less time and even at a lower cost than in a traditional education setting, yet it is difficult for institutions to expand this innovative model under a system that values time over learning.

H.R. 3136 will help us move in a different direction. The legislation directs the Secretary of Education to authorize a number of demonstration projects to test and strengthen competency-based education.

Among other provisions, the legislation requires the Secretary to focus on programs that are designed to reduce costs in the time it takes to earn a degree. The bill requires a thorough evaluation of each demonstration project, so policymakers learn which programs demonstrate success and what specific roadblocks are standing in the way.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill that will help make a difference in the lives of students and families. I want to thank the bipartisan authors of the legislation: Mr. MATT SALMON, Mr. JARED POLIS, and Mrs. SUSAN BROOKS.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today to join my colleague in support of the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act of 2013, a bill that I had the honor to coauthor with Representative SALMON. I greatly appreciate his work, as well as the work of many others on this bill.

This bill will help unleash innovation that promises to improve the quality of a college education and, just as importantly, if not more, reduce the cost. It will allow innovative colleges and universities to shorten the time it takes to earn a degree, reduce college costs through self-paced programs based on learning rather than time spent in the seat—and let's be honest, some of that time is often sleeping.

This innovation, which is called competency-based education, has a lot of promise. There is a lot to learn along the way, pitfalls to avoid. The benefits that we will learn over time promise to help allow students to work at their own pace and progress by mastering the knowledge of a course, which is essentially what the purpose of the course should be.

By demonstrating mastery of the course, regardless of how long it takes, we can, a, ensure employers that there is quality with regard to the outcomes of that course; and, b, reduce costs by allowing a student, if they are capable, to proceed faster.

This growing trend of innovation is very important because it provides a way to increase innovation and decrease costs. Since the last reauthorization in 2007, higher education has become more and more expensive.

Mr. Chairman, the cost of attending a university has risen by almost five times per student since 1983. At the same time that that cost has risen and a higher education has become harder and harder for American families to afford, the returns of a higher education have also increased.

College graduates who are working full time earn almost $17,000 more a year annually than their peers who only have a high school diploma.

While a 4-year university degree isn't always the best option for everyone, some form of postsecondary education, whether it is a community college or whether it is a certification program, has become increasingly imperative to landing a good-paying job in the 21st century workforce.

Competency-based education can increase access to higher education for both nontraditional students, as well as college-age students—oftentimes who have a job—a family, and other commitments.

The National Center for Education Statistics reports that of the 17½ million people enrolled in college, only 15 percent were attending a 4-year college and living on campus.

So when we think about higher education and who is attending college, only 15 percent of those are having the experience I had or perhaps many of our colleagues had, where you go and you live in a dorm and you attend college for 4 years. That is only 15 percent.

The other 85 percent are doing something else. It might mean taking classes at night, it might mean online education, or it might mean taking

courses over a longer period of time. That has been the innovative center around cost reduction and improvements in quality.

H.R. 3136 will help align our higher education system with workforce needs. By providing a framework for measuring and assessing competencies, students are more likely to matriculate with the knowledge they actually need to master to be able to hold a good job.

Likewise, businesses will know what to expect upon hiring these students. That is why I am proud to say this legislation has garnered the support of the Chamber of Commerce, which has applauded competency-based education as an opportunity for employers to work with colleges to help identify skills and competencies for specific courses and programs.

This legislation, just as importantly, if not more, will help combat the rising cost of college. In higher education today, there are very few incentives for institutions to decrease costs.

To fully address this, we would need to do a reauthorization of the Higher Education Act—that is not what we have before us today—but we do have a constructive bill that will allow colleges and universities to adopt new technology, remove some of those barriers to innovation that exist today, and allow universities to look beyond delivering traditional classroom instruction, as they did in the 18th, 19th, and 20th centuries, and look at what a classroom of the 21st century might look like beyond the walls of the physical classroom.

Competency-based education is one of the first innovations in higher education that is specifically designed to help decrease costs and make college more affordable, while also improving quality in terms of what the student has learned.

At its core, what we are talking about here today, competency-based education, flips the traditional campus model on its head, so that learning is the constant, and time and location are the variable and are self-paced.

The result is actually a more uniform and measurable education, ensuring that students actually learn what they are set out to learn versus sitting in a seat for a period of time.

Because competencies are demonstrable skills, schools can potentially form articulation agreements with one another even easier under this bill and under the innovation pilot programs allowed under this bill, saving students and taxpayers money and giving students and families more options, geographically and within a city.

I am thrilled that the Department of Education has done what they could to allow some programs to explore this model through their Experimental Sites Initiative, but there are several advantages to legislation.

First and foremost, we are able to expand the Experimental Sites Initiative from four programs to 20 under this bill, and secondly, we are giving congressional bipartisan approval to this concept, which is far more enduring than the whim of a particular Secretary or a particular administration.

I am proud to say that institutions in my home district, like Colorado State University's Global Campus, are demonstrating that online public universities with competency-based programs can lead the way in attracting, educating, and graduating adult learners and other contemporary students and, at the same time, benefit the physical campus of the public university.

Colorado State University-Global Campus was created by the Colorado State University System Board of Governors in 2007 as the very first 100 percent online State university in the United States.

A longtime leader in academic innovation, CSU-Global already offers alternative credit options, including competency-based exams, which meet or exceed the rigorous academic standards required of a State university. These options help students to manage out-of-pocket expenses and reduce the overall cost of their education, while also rewarding them for their demonstration of knowledge.

However, CSU-Global and programs like it still need to adhere to the overly rigid higher education structure, which inhibits innovation by limiting schedules on which students can enroll and when students can receive financial aid.

□ 1500

In order to continue to be successful and innovate, programs like CSU-Global need the flexibility that this bill enhances to meet their students' needs.

As Congress considers the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, this project is more crucial than ever. That is why I was proud to work with Representative SALMON on this legislation, which would permit institutions chosen by the Secretary to waive certain regulations that stand in the way of adopting competency-based models that reward both students and universities based on what students learn rather than how much time they sat in a seat, regardless of whether they are awake or asleep.

I want to thank Ranking Member MILLER and Chairman KLINE for working with my colleagues and I to craft this bipartisan bill that promises to increase innovation, increase equality, and decrease costs in higher education, and I strongly encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in voting ''yes'' on H.R. 3136 to support competency-based education and allow for laboratories of innovation across our great country as we all seek to reduce the costs and improve the quality of an increasingly important advanced education degree to help middle class families achieve their dreams in our country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON), a key member of the committee and one of the principal authors of this important legislation.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3136, the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project of 2014.

I want to thank Chairman KLINE and Chairwoman FOXX for their support and work on this legislation. I also want to thank Congressman POLIS and Congresswoman BROOKS for working with me on this legislation.

College costs have risen dramatically over the last several years. To be exact, they have risen 500 percent since 1985. The average national tuition for this past school year was just over $30,000, which represents 62 percent of the median annual income for my home State of Arizona. Even so, a college degree is still viewed as essential for success to many students and employers.

Throwing taxpayer dollars at the problem in the form of expanding loan forgiveness does not get at the heart of the problem or the solution of making college more affordable and is not a viable, long-term solution. Federal regulations continue to greatly impede efforts to reduce the cost of a degree. We need to implement policies that allow institutions to be innovative and try developing new models of education instead of continuing with the status quo.

H.R. 3136 will set up a pilot project to allow institutions to more easily develop innovative models of delivering education to students. I have been told before that all teachers don't teach the same and all students don't learn the same. We need to recognize this. This legislation is a step in allowing students to earn a college degree and enter the job market sooner—far sooner, in many cases—based on their knowledge and skill set rather than the amount of time that they spend in the classroom.

All students can benefit from such a program. However, this may be particularly beneficial to our Nation's veterans and nontraditional students. Our veterans return from duty with particular skills, and we should reward them for that by allowing them the ability to earn credits based on those skills and the learning that they have already received.

Similarly, nontraditional students often go back to school to finish their degree to get a better job, and they should be allowed to use the knowledge that they gain from their job to be able to advance their education and their degree.

Additionally, my legislation will incentivize students to work hard to accelerate their degree attainment, potentially cutting their overall education costs and allowing them to begin their careers sooner.

This bipartisan legislation, which passed out of committee by voice vote, allows schools to explore more innovative ways to deliver education, measure quality, and disburse financial aid

based on actual learning rather than seat time.

My bill will direct the Secretary of Education to implement a demonstration project and to waive certain regulatory requirements that impede such innovations that would decrease costs. The program would allow colleges to provide academic credit to students who can prove competencies through their prior work and life experiences and hard work, rather than a specified amount of time in the classroom.

This is a good first step to try to find ways to make a college education more affordable and more attainable for our Nation's students. I strongly encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project of 2014.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, it is my honor to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for all of his work on this legislation and joining Mr. SALMON in an effort to bring this to the floor. I thank both of them for reaching agreement on this. I also thank the chair of the committee, Mrs. BROOKS, and Mr. TIERNEY on our side, for this opportunity to vote on this legislation.

We have made a promise to America's students. We have said that we will make the cost of a college education affordable and accessible. With that comes another promise—the promise that when a student graduates with a college degree in hand, they will have the skills to succeed in the workplace and in the economy.

But the traditional college degree has not changed since the 1800s, as my colleagues have pointed out, despite dramatic changes for businesses and the workforce. We all know that a good middle class job requires some college education and training. And today, as most workers move from job to job more frequently, they need to tap new skills to keep up with the demands of emerging industries.

Despite the changing workforce needs, college credit is earned based upon the hours spent sitting in the classroom, not on the knowledge or the skills earned. Today, the Congress has an opportunity to vote for a new competency-based education model so we can flip the old model on its head.

This model is an opportunity for American students to access a high-quality education in a new way. And through technology and the Internet, this model becomes more user friendly and affordable for families.

I want to thank my colleague, Mr. TIERNEY, for his dedication on this issue. Mr. TIERNEY and I spent many hours with the leaders of this movement to understand how the Federal Government can support these innovative programs—and, in some cases, where we can just get out of the way and let schools innovate.

In particular, I would like to thank the Lumina Foundation, New America, Southern New Hampshire University, Capella University, Cal State University, Open Learning Initiative, and San Jose State for their expertise on these programs.

This demonstration program makes sense because we need to test these innovations before we can make significant commitments of new Federal investments.

Specifically, this bill gives colleges a chance to create competency-based programs to help students succeed by measuring what they know and not solely the number of hours that they spent in the classroom.

Under this legislation, students will still learn the basic academic work, but this model allows them to become proficient at their own pace, potentially shortening the time it takes to earn a degree.

For the returning veteran, this could mean her Army medic skills are more easily transferred to an RN degree or some other medical degree. For a self-taught computer programmer, this could mean a computer science degree in a shorter timeframe and at less cost.

Combined with new technology, competency-based education is one of the most promising new innovations to help make college more affordable and more accessible. This is a very good step forward, and I urge the support of this legislation.

I also urge Members to support H.R. 4984, Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act, a bill that would improve counseling on financial aid and student loans so that students can make more informed choices on how to finance their education.

While I support these bills, they are not enough for students already facing a mountain of college debt. I am disappointed that we are not voting today to help student loan borrowers save thousands of dollars and better manage their debt burden through lower interest rates.

My colleague, Congressman TIERNEY, offered an amendment at the Rules Committee to allow students to refinance student loans and to lock in lower interest rates, just like millions of Americans have been able to do with their mortgages or their car loans.

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership refused to make the Tierney amendment in order, thus blocking a straight up-or-down vote on whether or not to help millions of students and their families reduce their debt.

In closing, I want to thank Chairman KLINE and my Republican colleagues for their cooperation and inclusiveness on all of the higher education bills that we are considering this week. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I will be the last speaker on our side, and will close. I think the other side has completed their speakers as well, so I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 18 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota has 23½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am very excited that, at a time when there are great divisions in this body on so many substantive issues that the American people want us to address, be it immigration reform or addressing our budget deficit, or be it within the realm of education, replacing No Child Left Behind or ESEA with an education law that makes sense for our country, or the Higher Education Act, at least we are able to come together around innovation and removing barriers that currently exist to innovations in higher education that promise to improve the quality and help certify the quality of what students learn, and at the same time reduce costs and allow students more options and choices with regard to how they can pursue an advanced degree or particular content knowledge that can help them achieve the job of their dreams.

While I am pleased that Secretary Duncan and the administration have allowed some programs to explore this model through the Experimental Sites Initiative, this bill is even more important today because we will not only expand to 20 sites the number of sites that will be allowed to experiment with regard to competency-based education, but just as importantly, we will provide a more enduring, bipartisan imprint on this important innovative policy.

We live in a very exciting time, Mr. Chairman, and technology promises to help us reinvent both kindergarten through 12th-grade education, as well as higher education, in ways that benefit American families. But we must adopt our legal framework to ensure that that happens.

Rather than continue to exclusively reward time that sits in seats with a professor up front lecturing, we need to make sure we are inclusive enough and allow innovation that allows students to proceed at their own pace, in their homes, so long as they can demonstrate they can master the knowledge that is the goal of the course.

Employers benefit, which is why the U.S. Chamber of Commerce supports this bill, by knowing that students have achieved content area knowledge of the course. Universities like Colorado State University in Fort Collins benefit because through the auxiliary institution they are able to offer even more varieties of courses to both their on-campus students as well as the surrounding community.

Most importantly, students and families benefit by having more choices and being able to afford a college education

at a time when it is increasingly important in the global economy.

Competency-based education can increase quality and decrease costs, when done right. In allowing innovation and experimentation, we will learn what doesn't work and we will learn what does work. There are good ways to do it, and there are ways that fall short. But to be able to get to that answer that to employers and universities and families and our country offers so much promise, we need to allow this innovation to occur and change the restrictive laws that currently lock the bulk of funding into the seat time requirements of the Carnegie units.

I want to thank Ranking Member MILLER, Chairman KLINE, Representative SALMON, and others for working to craft this bipartisan bill that will increase both access and innovation in higher education.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 3136 to support competency-based education and provide contemporary students with the ability to attain a degree that is based on their knowledge and skills instead of how long they are sitting in a seat.

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

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I want to thank the authors of this bill, with particular emphasis on Mr. SALMON, Mr. POLIS, and Mrs. BROOKS. A lot of people worked on this, though. My colleague, the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. MILLER, and I have talked about the advantages of moving forward with innovation and new ideas, because that is what is happening, Mr. Chairman.

Colleges and universities are changing—or trying to change—the model, the model which, as Mr. POLIS pointed out, is based on how much time you sit in a seat, not what you have learned and not what competency you have.

□ 1515

It has been pointed out by a couple of speakers today that we are now dealing with a different student body than we have in the past. These are contemporary students. I guess that is our way of saying they are not the traditional students of the high school seniors who graduate and go off to 4 or 5 or 6 years of college. These are people, many times, who have come back, looking for a second career, a second chance, a new opportunity, and—yes, Mr. Chairman—looking for lower costs. This bill addresses all of that in order to give more students, more people, more families a chance—an opportunity—and a way to do it at a lower cost.

I know my friend and colleague Mr. POLIS has a couple of times mentioned his concerns about sleep for students. That may have something to do with a new baby in the family, but he makes a good point that these are families and that they have children and that they have jobs, and they need to be able to demonstrate that they have the skills and the knowledge to go forward and get that degree or certificate.

I am very, very pleased with this bill. I will emphasize that it is not the complete reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. We need to continue to move to get that done, but it is an important first step, and I am pleased that this bill was the first step. It has strong bipartisan support and strong recognition in the administration, in Congress, and in colleges and universities that this is the direction we need to go.

As the ranking member pointed out, the demonstration projects part of this is important because, while we are thrilled with enthusiasm about the potential here, we need these projects to demonstrate what works well and what, perhaps, doesn't work as well as we had hoped.

So I am excited about this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it. I would like to see a very big bipartisan vote for this because I know that is where the thought is, and I am enthusiastic about it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 3136, the ''Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act.''

I thank Chairman SESSIONS and Ranking Member SLAUGHTER of the House Rules Committee for their management of the debate on the rule for H.R. 3136.

I thank Congressmen POLIS and SALMON for their bipartisan work to draft this bill that the House is considering.

Chairman KLINE and Congressman POLIS, thank you for managing the debate the debate on H.R. 3136.

I appreciate and thank the bipartisan effort led by Chairman KLINE, Ranking Member MILLER, Ranking Member FOXX, and the sponsors of H.R. 3136.

My appreciation to the Education Committee staff who worked with my staff on the Jackson Lee Amendment and for the Education Committee's support of the Jackson Lee Amendment to H.R. 3136.

As founder and co-chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus I am committed to seeing that every child and young person has the opportunity to grow up in a stable and safe home.

The first step for a safe and healthy childhood is the stability of the lives of adults in the lives of children.

I will speak more on the Jackson Lee Amendment when it is considered by the full House later today. The Jackson Lee Amendment would direct the Secretary of Education to conduct outreach to a number of underrepresented institutions regarding the federal education pilot grant program prior to the deadline for applications to be submitted for consideration for grant funds under the pilot program.

This bill does not do everything that I would hope that a higher education bill would do, but it is a step in the right direction. It would create more opportunities for Americans to have access to more high quality education; flexible higher education opportunities that can meet their education needs—which can open up a world of opportunities for older college students or those who struggle to receive degrees while raising children and working full time jobs.

H.R. 3136, the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act will support federally funded pilot programs at secondary schools for Competency-Based Education programs that work to create certainty when a student progresses through a program that they are ready for the next step in their education.

We know that not everyone learns in the same way or at the same pace, but it is important that learning occurs. Adults have added pressures when they want to pursue education to compete for better paying jobs.

These programs may offer options that are not based on the traditional semester approach to classroom work, but on the steps that must be completed to move from one level of a training or education program to another.

Competence in any subject should be the foundation of education of students. If a student is returning to the classroom after years of work experience, this approach would best prepare them for being job ready upon graduation.

Competence-Based Education plans will aid students to master the lessons learned and enhance the student's educational experience, which will result in the maximum benefit to the student.

The challenge for the United States in the coming years is the STEM challenge—we have far more jobs in the fields of science, technology, engineering and mathematics available than people who are trained or educated to fill them.

The future of the economy is in Science, Technology, Engineering and Math careers.

The growth in STEM jobs is 3 times faster than job growth in non-STEM jobs.

Minority college students who major in STEM higher education make 25% more than minority graduates with non-STEM educations.

Minority students who take STEM jobs make 50% more than minority non-STEM graduates.

Women pursuing STEM higher education drop out of programs with higher grades than males who remain and graduate.

More than two-thirds of all STEM positions are filled by someone with a STEM degree.

Because of the current shortage of STEM workers for STEM positions and the projected need for STEM trained employees, the Federal government is in a race to attract and retain STEM employees.

According to Booze Hamilton's The Biggest Bang Theory, nearly a 25% of federal government employees are people who work STEM positions.

Stem workers earn 26% more than non-STEM graduates.

By 2018 we will need: 710,000 Computing workers, 160,000 Engineers, 70,000 Physical Scientists, 40,000 Life Science workers, and 20,000 Mathematics workers.

Mr. Chair, I ask that my colleagues vote in support of H.R. 3136.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by

the Committee on Education and the Workforce, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–52. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 3136

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 ''Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. COMPETENCY-BASED EDUCATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.

(a) PROJECTS.—Part G of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1088 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 486A the following:

''SEC. 486B. COMPETENCY-BASED EDUCATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.

''(a) DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall select, in accordance with subsection (c), eligible entities to voluntarily carry out competency-based education demonstration projects and receive waivers described in subsection (d) to carry out such projects.

''(b) APPLICATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible entity desiring to carry out a demonstration project under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require.

''(2) AMENDMENTS.—An eligible entity may submit to the Secretary amendments to the eligible entity's application under paragraph (1), at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require, which the Secretary shall approve or deny within 15 days of receipt.

''(3) CONTENTS.—Each application shall include—

''(A) a description of the competency-based education to be offered by the eligible entity under the demonstration project;

''(B) a description of the proposed academic delivery, business, and financial models for the demonstration project, including explanations of how competency-based education offered under the demonstration project would—

''(i) result in the achievement of competencies;

''(ii) differ from standard credit hour approaches, in whole or in part; and

''(iii) result in lower costs or shortened time to degree, certificate, or credential completion;

''(C) a description of how the competency-based education offered under the demonstration project will progress a student toward completion of a degree, certificate, or credential;

''(D) a description of how the eligible entity will articulate the transcript from the competency-based education demonstration project to another program within an institution of higher education that is part of the eligible entity or to another institution of higher education;

''(E) a description of the statutory and regulatory requirements described in subsection (d) for which the eligible entity is seeking a waiver, and why such waiver is necessary to carry out the demonstration project;

''(F) a description of how the eligible entity will develop and evaluate the competencies and assessments of student knowledge (which may include prior-learning assessments) administered as part of the demonstration project, including how such competencies and assessments are aligned with workforce needs;

''(G) a description of the proposal for determining a student's Federal student aid eligibility under this title for participating in the demonstration project, the award and distribution of such aid, and safeguards to ensure that students are making satisfactory progress that warrants disbursement of such aid;

''(H) a description of the students to whom competency-based education will be offered, including an assurance that the demonstration project will enroll a minimum of 50 and a maximum of 3,000 students;

''(I) an assurance that students participating in the demonstration project will not be eligible for more Federal assistance under this title than such students would have been eligible for under a traditional program; and

''(J) an assurance the eligible entity will identify and disseminate best practices with respect to the demonstration project to other eligible entities carrying out a demonstration project under this section.

''(c) SELECTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall select not more than 20 eligible entities to carry out a competency-based education demonstration project under this section.

''(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In selecting eligible entities under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

''(A) prioritize projects which show promise in reducing the time or cost required to complete a degree, certificate, or credential;

''(B) consider the number and quality of applications received;

''(C) consider an eligible entity's—

''(i) ability to successfully execute the demonstration project as described in the eligible entity's application under subsection (b);

''(ii) commitment and ability to effectively finance the demonstration project;

''(iii) ability to provide administrative capability and the expertise to evaluate student progress based on measures other than credit hours or clock hours; and

''(iv) commitment to work with the Secretary to evaluate the demonstration project and the impact of the demonstration project;

''(D) ensure the selection of a diverse group of eligible entities with respect to size, mission, and geographic distribution of the eligible entities;

''(E) not limit the types of programs of study or courses of study approved for participation in a demonstration project; and

''(F) not select an eligible entity that has had, for 1 of the preceding 2 fiscal years—

''(i) a cohort default rate (defined in section 435(m)) that is 30 percent or greater; and

''(ii) a borrowing rate of loans under this title of more than 50 percent of the students enrolled at institutions of higher education of the eligible entity.

''(d) WAIVERS.—The Secretary may waive for any eligible entity selected to carry out a demonstration project under this section any requirements of the following provisions of law (including any regulations promulgated under such provisions) or regulations and for which the eligible entity has provided a reason for waiving under subsection (b)(3)(E):

''(1) Subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 102(a)(3).

''(2) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 481, as such subsections relate to requirements for a minimum number of weeks of instruction.

''(3) Section 484(l)(1).

''(4) Section 668.32(a)(1)(iii) of title 34, Code of Federal Regulations.

''(5) Any of the requirements under provisions in title I, part F of this title, or this part, that inhibit the operation of competency-based education, including requirements with respect to—

''(A) documenting attendance;

''(B) weekly academic activity;

''(C) minimum weeks of instructional time;

''(D) requirements for credit hour or clock hour equivalencies;

''(E) requirements for substantive interaction with faculty; and

''(F) definitions of the terms 'academic year', 'full-time student', 'term' (including 'standard term', 'non-term', and 'non-standard term'), 'satisfactory academic progress', 'educational activity', 'project of study', and 'payment period'.

''(e) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall make available to the authorizing committees and the public a list of eligible entities selected to carry out a demonstration project under this section, which shall include for each such eligible entity—

''(1) the specific statutory and regulatory requirements being waived under subsection (d); and

''(2) a description of the competency-based education programs of study or courses of study to be offered under the project.

''(f) INFORMATION AND EVALUATION.—

''(1) INFORMATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible entity that carries out a demonstration project under this section shall provide to the Director of the Institution of Education Sciences with respect to the students participating in the competency-based education project carried out by the eligible entity the following information:

''(i) The average number of credit hours the students earned prior to enrollment in the demonstration project, if applicable.

''(ii) The number and percentage of students participating in the demonstration project that are also enrolled in programs of study or courses of study offered in credit hours or clock hours, disaggregated by student status as a first-year, second-year, third-year, fourth-year, or other student.

''(iii) The average period of time between the enrollment of a student in the demonstration project and the first assessment of student knowledge of such student.

''(iv) The average time to 25 percent, 50 percent, 75 percent, and 100 percent of the completion of a degree, certificate, or credential by a student who participated in the demonstration project.

''(v) The percentage of assessments of student knowledge that students passed on the first attempt, during the period of the participation in the demonstration project by the students.

''(vi) The percentage of assessments of student knowledge that students passed on the second attempt and the average period of time between the first and second attempts by students, during the period of the participation in the demonstration project by the students.

''(vii) The average number of competencies a student acquired while participating in the demonstration project and the period of time during which the student acquired such competencies.

''(viii) Such other information as the Director may reasonably require.

''(B) DISAGGREGATION.—Each eligible entity shall provide the information required under subparagraph (A) disaggregated by age, race, gender, disability status, and status as a recipient of a Federal Pell Grant, provided that the disaggregation of the information does not identify any individual student participating in the demonstration project.

''(2) EVALUATION.—The Director of the Institute of Education Sciences, in consultation with the Secretary, shall annually evaluate each demonstration project under this section. Each evaluation shall include—

''(A) the extent to which the eligible entity has met the goals set forth in its application to the Secretary;

''(B) the number and types of students participating in the competency-based education offered under the project, including the progress of participating students toward completion of a degree, certificate, or credential, and the extent to which participation and retention in such project increased;

''(C) whether the project led to reduced cost or time to completion of a degree, certificate, or

credential, and the amount of cost or time reduced for such completion;

''(D) obstacles related to student financial assistance for competency-based education;

''(E) the extent to which statutory or regulatory requirements not waived under subsection (d) present difficulties for students or institutions of higher education;

''(F) degree, certificate, or credential completion rates;

''(G) retention rates;

''(H) total cost and net cost to the student of the competency-based education offered under the project;

''(I) a description of the assessments of student knowledge and the corresponding competencies; and

''(J) outcomes of the assessments of student knowledge.

''(3) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Director of the Institute of Education Sciences shall annually provide to the authorizing committees a report on—

''(A) the evaluations of the demonstration projects required under paragraph (2);

''(B) the number and types of students receiving assistance under this title for competency-based education under such projects;

''(C) the retention and completion rates of students participating in such projects;

''(D) any proposed statutory or regulatory changes designed to support and enhance the expansion of competency-based education, which may be independent of or combined with traditional credit hour or clock hour projects;

''(E) the most effective means of delivering competency-based education through demonstration projects; and

''(F) the appropriate level and distribution methodology of Federal assistance under this title for students enrolled in competency-based education.

''(g) OVERSIGHT.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall, on a continuing basis—

''(1) assure compliance of eligible entities with the requirements of this title (other than the provisions of law and regulations that are waived under subsection (d));

''(2) provide technical assistance;

''(3) monitor fluctuations in the student population enrolled in the eligible entities carrying out the demonstration projects under this section; and

''(4) consult with appropriate accrediting agencies or associations and appropriate State regulatory authorities for additional ways of improving the delivery of competency-based education.

''(h) DEFINITIONS.—For the purpose of this section:

''(1) COMPETENCY-BASED EDUCATION.—The term 'competency-based education' means an educational process or program that measures knowledge, skills, and experience through assessments of such knowledge, skills, or experience in place of or in addition to the use of credit hours or clock hours.

''(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term 'eligible entity' means—

''(A) an institution of higher education;

''(B) a system of institutions of higher education; or

''(C) a consortium of institutions of higher education.

''(3) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning given the term in section 102, except that such term does not include institutions described in section 102(a)(1)(C).''.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to alter the authority of the Secretary of Education to establish experimental sites under any other provision of law.

(c) FUNDING.—

(1) USE OF EXISTING FUNDS.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated for salaries and expenses of the Department of Education, $1,000,000 shall be available to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(2) NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.—No funds are authorized to be appropriated by this Act to carry out this Act or the amendments made by this Act.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 113–546. Each such amendment shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. KLINE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 113–546.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 6, insert ''that has been selected to carry out a demonstration project under this section'' after ''eligible entity''.

Page 2, line 8, insert ''approved'' before ''application''.

Page 8, line 15, strike ''Institution'' and insert ''Institute''.

Page 13, line 12, strike ''and'' at the end.

Page 13, line 16, strike the period at the end and insert ''; and''.

Page 13, after line 16, insert the following:

''(5) collect and disseminate to eligible entities carrying out a demonstration project under this section, best practices with respect to demonstration projects under this section.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I offer this amendment in close cooperation with my colleague, the ranking member, Mr. MILLER.

This manager's amendment clarifies that eligible entities that have been selected to carry out demonstration projects may submit amendments to their approved applications. It requires the Secretary of Education to collect and disseminate demonstration project best practices to eligible entities carrying out such projects, and it makes technical corrections.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very straightforward amendment, and we offer it together to improve this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, but I do not oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, this manager's amendment would bolster the Department of Education's ability to help identify and share best practices from experimentation at demonstration project sites.

Really, through this careful review and analysis, lawmakers can be sure that competency-based education is working and can identify any future policy issues that would need to come back to us or others at the State level.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment so we can move one step closer to making colleges more affordable and accessible.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. I thank my colleague for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 113–546.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to consider the Walberg amendment next, out of order, and then to return to the original order as a courtesy to a Member.

The CHAIR. A change in the order of the amendments would have to be accomplished in the House and not in the Committee of the Whole. The gentleman's request cannot be entertained.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 113–546.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentlewoman from Texas, I have an amendment at the desk, the Jackson Lee amendment.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, after line 5, insert the following:

''(2) OUTREACH.—The Secretary shall, prior to any deadline to submit applications under paragraph (1), conduct outreach to historically Black colleges and universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, Native American-serving, nontribal institutions, institutions serving students with special needs, and institutions located in rural areas to provide those institutions with information on the opportunity to apply to carry out a demonstration project under this section.

Page 2, line 6, strike ''(2)'' and insert ''(3)''.

Page 2, line 12, strike ''(3)'' and insert ''(4)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to support this amendment that Ms. JACKSON LEE thoughtfully put together.

This amendment would ensure that the Department of Education is reaching out to colleges and systems that

educate minority, low-income, or students with special needs.

Some of those who stand to benefit the most under this innovation are first-generation college goers for whom cost is a major barrier to success. Minority-serving institutions are a critical thread in the fabric of America, and they should be included when experimenting with promising new education models.

Competency-based education programs are self-paced, helping ensure that students can work while they are in school, helping students who need a little more time to catch up or to learn concepts succeed and achieve at the highest levels.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I don't intend to oppose it.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINE. I see that the author has arrived.

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

Mr. POLIS. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas will control the balance of the time of the gentleman from Colorado.

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, may I determine what time is left, please.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 4½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. First of all, let me thank the managers of this legislation, who have really brought together an important concept, and I just want to call the name of the bill: the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I am a big supporter of pilots because pilots provide information, and information generates a concrete program.

Mr. POLIS, thank you so very much for bringing up my amendment, and thank you both, the chairman and the ranking member, for supporting this amendment.

Let me be very keen on what it is both to Chairman KLINE and to Mr. POLIS. This is to take what you have and to add to it or, I might say, to make it better. The reason is that information is a gift. If you have information, you can do a lot of things.

Mr. Chairman, I work with a lot of Historically Black Colleges, so the Jackson Lee amendment would direct the Secretary of Education, prior to any deadlines for colleges or universities to submit applications for the consideration in the pilot program, to conduct outreach to Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, Native American-serving, nontribal institutions, institutions serving students with special needs, and institutions located in rural areas to provide information to them on the opportunity to apply to carry out a pilot demonstration project under this bill.

It is a whole gamut of individuals and colleges that this bill is directed to engage. Yes, there is general information, but I will tell you, when information is targeted, there are great successes that occur.

In my State alone, Texas ranks 43 out of 50 in State rankings with a 61.3 percent high school graduation rate. This statistic alone shows the need for dramatic improvements in our own system. However, there are great institutions that serve Native Americans, Hispanic-serving and African American, such as Texas Southern University and A&M. This outreach to them would provide these educators with working class residents the opportunity to get the right kind of information in order to develop competency-based education.

Texas Southern University has a technology program that trains young people for the new industries of today. They have a School of Public Affairs named after Barbara Jordan and Mickey Leland, our colleagues here in the United States Congress. They have a transportation department, which is very much geared toward the new opportunities for transportation. Then, of course, they are into science, as I indicated, as well as technology and math.

We have sent out these brilliant graduates, and this pilot program in helping their faculty and helping the university would be a great start. My amendment is to give them the knowledge to be part of the solution.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is information to be part of the solving of the problems. I want more students to graduate from high school, and I want them to have opportunities broad based.

Let me close on this note.

Many people ask about the value of Historically Black Colleges, Hispanic-serving, Native American institutions. Do you know what, Mr. Chairman? There are enough students who are not in college today who will fill all of the universities. All of these universities have a rightful place, and the history of Historically Black Colleges in their traveling through the years of postslavery is a great opportunity to continue to serve. Now, with Native American-serving institutions and Hispanic-serving institutions, I am delighted that this amendment is put before this body.

I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment, which will create more opportunity and more outreach.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I am pleased to offer the Jackson Lee Amendment that adds critical language to this bill.

I would like to thank Chairman KLINE and Congressman POLIS for their work in managing the debate on the rule for H.R. 3136.

I thank my colleague Congressman POLIS for his authorship of the bill and his leadership in working in a bipartisan way with the Education Committee to provide on this legislation that would address the education needs of non-tradition College and university students.

I appreciate and thank the bipartisan work the Education Committee staff who worked with my staff on the Jackson Lee Amendment, and for the Education Committee's support of the Jackson Lee Amendment.

The Jackson Lee amendment is simple, and would further the goals of the bill.

The Jackson Lee Amendment would direct the Secretary of Education prior to any deadlines for colleges or universities to submit applications for consideration in the pilot program to conduct outreach to historically Black colleges and universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, Native American-serving, non-tribal institutions, institutions serving students with special needs, and institutions located in rural areas to provide information to them on the opportunity to apply to carry out a pilot demonstration project under this bill.

Texas ranks 43rd out of the 50 in state rankings with a 61.3 percent high school graduation rate. This statistic alone shows the need for dramatic improvements to Texas' education system.

There will be adults who will benefit from the programs supported by this bill by creating education options that consider that some adults who may want to pursue a degree may need to first receive a GED.

The Texas Southern University located in my Congressional District will benefit from the outreach in making timely information available to the institution regarding the competency-based education demonstration projects Pilot program created by the bill.

TSU is uniquely situated in the heart of a community that it has served the education needs of for decades.

Institutions like TSU provide great educations to working class residents of Houston that is affordable, which means they often do not have Washington, DC based offices and may not receive notice of this opportunity unless efforts are made to conduct outreach to them.

Because of TSU's size it is within their scope and experience to develop a competency-based education pilot program that breaks the learning process down into stages that will attract students who may be unemployed, underemployed or considering a career change from the surrounding residential community where the TSU is located.

The institutions that may benefit from the inclusion of the Jackson Lee Amendment could reach students who are late in life—but still dream of earning a degree, but think that it is far out of reach.

Education programs that support training in a trade would be strengthened through this bill by ensuring that students are job ready upon completion of a certification or education program.

Mr. Chair, I ask that my colleagues support the Jackson Lee Amendment the H.R. 3136, the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentlewoman's amendment will help advance this goal by ensuring that a number of diverse institutions are aware of the opportunity to carry out an innovative, competency-based demonstration project.

I thank the gentlewoman for offering the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it and the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1530

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 113–546.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 6, strike ''An eligible'' and insert the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible''.

Page 2, after line 11, insert the following:

''(B) EXPANDING ENROLLMENT.—Notwithstanding the assurance required with respect to maximum enrollment under paragraph (3)(H)—

''(i) an eligible entity whose demonstration project has been evaluated under subsection (f)(2) not less than twice may submit to the Secretary an amendment to the eligible entity's application under paragraph (1) to increase enrollment in the project to more than 3,000 students, but not more than 5,000 students, and which shall specify—

''(I) the proposed maximum enrollment or annual enrollment growth for the project;

''(II) how the eligible entity will successfully carry out the project with such maximum enrollment or enrollment growth; and

''(III) any other amendments to the eligible entity's application under paragraph (1) that are related to such maximum enrollment or enrollment growth; and

''(ii) the Secretary shall determine whether to approve or deny an amendment submitted under clause (i) for a demonstration project based on the project's evaluations under subsection (f)(2).''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, with the dramatic rise in the cost of obtaining a college degree which we have witnessed over the last decade, it has become even more important to focus on ways to remove Federal roadblocks which prevent efforts to make higher education less costly.

H.R. 3136, the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act, represents one of the innovative steps promoted by the House Education and the Workforce Committee to ensure we actually measure what students are learning, not just the time they have spent sitting in a class.

My amendment builds on this approach and will allow participating entities in the demonstration projects to expand an approved project to a maximum of 5,000 students.

To ensure accountability and program quality, any entity wishing to expand a project must provide the Secretary a new proposed maximum number of students, a description of how the project will successfully carry out the expanded enrollment, and a description of any other amendments to the initial application related to the new enrollment number.

The small-scale expansion allowed by my amendment will help institutions develop techniques for increasing their competency-based education projects so more students can realize the benefits of a self-paced, lower-cost degree.

This approach will also help inform policymakers and the public of what projects are doing the best job at advancing this innovative education delivery model.

I want to thank Representative SALMON and Chairman KLINE for their leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment, but I don't oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, the Walberg amendment would allow institutions that have shown success with their demonstration projects to increase the number of students that can participate in their programs, helping to scale and allow more students to benefit.

By increasing the number of students in successful programs, we can better get a sense of how successful programs can be brought to scale.

Institutions should be rewarded with the ability to run a more robust demonstration project if their programs are reducing costs, improving quality, shortening time to degree. We should make sure that they are allowed to expand and remove any barriers to that.

Therefore, I am proud to join my colleague in support of the Walberg amendment. I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' so that institutions will be able to run more robust and scalable demonstration projects.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 113–546.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of Mr. MCNERNEY, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 17, strike ''and''.

Page 4, line 22, strike the period and insert ''; and''.

Page 4, after line 22, insert the following

''(K) A description of the population of students served by the eligible entity that are veterans or members of the Armed Forces and how such eligible entity will, when appropriate, incorporate the specific needs of such population when carrying out the demonstration project.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the McNerney amendment. This amendment will require participating institutions to show how they are addressing the needs of veterans and members of the Armed Forces in their demonstration project.

Americans with military experience, both present or in their past, stand to benefit tremendously from competency-based education because they leave the military with a wide range of practicable, demonstrable, and marketable skills.

I have talked to so many veterans in my district who felt that they received excellent education within the military around a particular task, but get no credit for that with regard to the demonstrable skills that they have achieved. This amendment will help that occur.

Ensuring that institutions report more on how veterans and members of the Armed Forces are performing in demonstration projects will help highlight those who have served our country to the Department of Education so we can better identify best practices and expand best practices to those who have served.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment, though I do not intend to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I am excited about this amendment. There has been much discussion about things that we can do to help our American heroes, to help those veterans who have served and/or are serving. Many of these veterans and servicemembers are seeking higher educational opportunities, and many of them, while they have limited time due to work and family, they have skills. They have education. They have competency. So this competency-based education is almost tailor-made for them.

I want to urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill to help not only these American heroes, but students across the country.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman KLINE and Ranking Member MILLER, as well as the bill's author, Representative SALMON, for their joint efforts and leadership on this bipartisan piece of legislation, H.R. 3136.

Millions of American families share a common goal of sending their children to college. However, the cost of a college education continues to escalate, making it prohibitive for too many middle class families.

Promoting innovative ideas that provide institutions the flexibility will be essential in an evolving education system and learning environment. H.R. 3136 is a step in the right direction.

The bill seeks to change the ways that institutions have historically used credit hours to measure student progress and the awarding of financial aid, among other things.

The bill incorporates new innovative practices in higher education by allowing students to advance academically by demonstrating competence in a subject rather than by spending a set amount of time in a classroom.

While H.R. 3136 specifies a range of criteria that applications must fulfill to run a competency-based project, it is important that military and veteran populations are also taken into consideration.

That is why I am offering an amendment that requires an applicant, under this program, to provide information on the number of veterans and military students it has, and to include how it incorporates those particular student needs into its demonstration project.

Servicemembers and veterans often require flexibility in the pursuit of their education goals. We owe it to these brave young men and women, upon their returning from service, to help them pursue higher education as seamlessly as possible.

I believe that my amendment will help keep track of these progresses that a veteran and the military student populations are making in any new competency-based program, and to hold these programs accountable for the progress of veterans.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, we have no additional speakers on this side. I reserve the right to close.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KLINE. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIR. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I am a little confused about who has the right to close.

The CHAIR. Where there is no qualifying opponent, the gentleman from Colorado has the right to close on his amendment.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleague, the chair of the committee, and others in encouraging my colleagues to support the McNerney and Polis amendment, so that veterans and members of the Armed Forces today can be better served by these demonstration projects and stand to benefit from the education they receive within the military itself.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. BYRNE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part A of House Report 113–546.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 1, strike ''20'' and insert ''30''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, this is a simple, technical amendment that seeks to increase the maximum number of eligible entities authorized to participate in the competency-based demonstration project established by H.R. 3136 from 20 to 30.

As a former member of the Alabama State Board of Education and chancellor of Alabama's 2-year college system, I commend my colleague and fellow member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, Mr. SALMON of Arizona, for introducing this innovative legislation.

In today's world, we cannot continue to regard higher education as a one-size-fits-all process. As our economy continues to recover, higher education institutions continue to see a large influx of students who are seeking to further their education after years in the workforce.

At the same time, our K–12 school systems are becoming more innovative, incorporating cutting-edge technologies and allowing for dual-enrollment and workforce training opportunities prior to graduation.

For these reasons, many students are arriving at higher education institutions with a variety of different skills in place but must still complete a prerequisite amount of courses before earning a degree, regardless of their competency in certain areas of study.

Unfortunately, the cost of higher education continues to rise, as does student loan debt. The competency-based demonstration project authorized by H.R. 3136 will allow students to gear their financial aid towards actual learning opportunities, versus simply checking off courses that may not be applicable to their needs, and logging seat time.

My basic amendment would simply allow for a more full-bodied and diverse sample of participating institutions to ensure that this demonstration project creates a truly representative sample of higher education opportunities.

This increase should improve the ability to analyze how such an approach could affect flexibility for institutions, while providing a more personalized, cost-effective education for a variety of different students.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment, but I do not oppose this amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, Mr. BYRNE's amendment would increase the number of institutions or consortiums allowed to participate in the demonstration project. Including more high-quality institutions in the demonstration project will yield more information and more innovation on the benefits and risks of competency-based education.

Including more institutions will accelerate the amount of experimentation and, therefore, the amount of learning that we as policymakers have, and also help increase the likelihood of identifying successful best practices to reduce college costs more quickly.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment so that more institutions can experiment with innovative, new, cost-effective education models.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. At this time, with America, we have so many opportunities before us, but we have to make sure that the people in our society, and the people that are coming through some difficult circumstances, have opportunities that didn't exist before.

These sorts of innovations provide opportunities for them and for institutions of higher education to figure out where we need to go in the future so that we deliver the product of higher education in the way it needs to be delivered and received by those that can benefit the most.

□ 1545

So I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania) having assumed the chair, Mr. AMODEI, 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. 3136) to establish a demonstration program for competency-based education, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 105, REMOVING UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM IRAQ

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to consider House Concurrent Resolution 105 in the House, if called up by the Chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or his designee;

that the amendment printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII and numbered 1 be considered as adopted;

that the concurrent resolution, as amended, be considered as read;

and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution, as amended, to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by Representative ROYCE of California and Representative MCGOVERN of Massachusetts or their respective designees.

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

There was no objection.

ADVANCING COMPETENCY-BASED EDUCATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECT ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 677 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3136.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) kindly take the chair.

□ 1547

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3136) to establish a demonstration program for competency-based education, with Mr. WESTMORELAND (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, amendment No. 5 printed in part A of House Report 113–546 offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part A of House Report 113–546.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 10, after line 9 insert the following:

''(B) EMPLOYMENT DATA.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible entity that carries out a demonstration project under this section may provide to the Director of the Institute of Education Sciences with respect to the students participating in the competency-based education project carried out by the eligible entity the number and percentage of students completing a competency-based education program or course of study offered by such eligible entity who find employment in a field related to the program or course of study of such students.

''(ii) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Director of the Institute of Education Sciences shall, at the request of an eligible entity, provide technical assistance to such eligible entity to assist such eligible entity in collecting and reporting accurate information relating to the employment of students participating in a competency-based education project carried out by such eligible entity.

Page 10, line 10, strike ''(B)'' and insert ''(C)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to, first of all, thank the gentleman from Arizona, Congressman SALMON, as well as Chairman KLINE and Ranking Member MILLER for their work in bringing this very important bill to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would allow entities receiving funds under this bill to report the number and percentage of students who are able to find employment in a field relating to their program or course of study and would allow the director of IES to provide technical assistance to such entities upon request.

Basically, my intent is to give situational awareness to both educators and students and also an understanding of how well our dollars being spent in terms of educating both our young people and people who are looking for a second career, looking for other job opportunities, so that they know that their time and effort will be well spent.

I am proud to be joined in offering this amendment by my good friend and colleague, Congressman G.T. THOMPSON from Pennsylvania, as cochairs of the bipartisan Career and Technical Education Caucus.

Representative THOMPSON and I are committed to providing all students with the information necessary to make informed career decisions.

Many of the students who will be served by this bill are nontraditional students, working parents, students with full-time jobs, and many others who are seeking a different education than what a traditional 4-year curriculum affords, so these are the very people who would benefit the most from clear and accessible career market information.

It has become obvious that high school diplomas are really no longer sufficient training for the modern job market, and while not every job will require a college degree, some sort of postsecondary education will be necessary, and students, Mr. Chairman, deserve accurate information to help them find the career pathway that best fits their goals and abilities.

My amendment will help these students by encouraging schools to report on the number of students who are able to use their education to find a relevant career, data that students will be able to use in the coming years to inform their own decisions and choose an academic path that will lead to a well-paying job.

This amendment has been scored by the CBO as budget-neutral and will not result in any additional spending.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, while claiming the time in opposition, I rise as a supporter and cosponsor of this bipartisan amendment with my colleague and fellow cochairman of the House Career and Technical Education Caucus, Congressman LANGEVIN.

Our amendment would allow eligible entities to submit to the Institute of Education Sciences information regarding the number and percentage of students who are able to find employment, jobs in a field relating to their program or course of study.

This will provide for the collection of longitudinal data and will allow policymakers to have a further understanding of course study and career alignment, but more importantly, students will be able to utilize these findings to see what courses of study have a higher prevalence of job placement.

Mr. Chairman, I often say, ''It is not where you start out in life, but it is where you end up,'' and education is the key to that journey.

This amendment will further assist students participating in competency-based programs, many of whom will be nontraditional students and will provide them with another opportunity to attain success in life.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan, no-cost amendment and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his comments and the exceptional work that he does and that we do collaboratively with respect to career and technical education, and I appreciate his cosponsorship of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, again, in closing, this amendment would help to give situational awareness to students, to educators, and to all those who want to understand, is the time and effort, the investment that people are making worth that investment, and is it a clear path forward, particularly for those who are looking for a new career or who are looking to, as we do right now, trying to close the skills gap that we have not only in my home State of Rhode Island, but across the country, as people are trying to get the right skills for the right jobs that are good paying going forward.

This will give them the data to understand the best career paths to follow, where it would be best to invest their time and their energy, as well as their resources.

So with that, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I just want to thank my colleague for his work and leadership on this amendment. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership on the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. DUFFY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part A of House Report 113–546.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 13, line 17, strike ''(h)'' and insert ''(i)''.

Page 13, after line 16, insert the following:

''(h) DISCLOSURE OF AUTHORIZATION TO SELL STUDENT DATA.—An eligible entity carrying out a demonstration project under this section shall ensure that each institution of higher education of the eligible entity provides to each student, or the parents of each minor student, enrolled in the institution of higher education—

''(1) a disclosure letter, which describes the personally identifiable information of the student that may be sold by a person with whom the institution of higher education has an agreement to provide software applications for students; and

''(2) an option to opt-out of such personally identifiable information from being sold.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate all the work that Chairman KLINE and Ranking Member MILLER have put into this bill.

My amendment today has to do with the issue of privacy. Listen, technology has been a great thing for America. It has allowed better communication and connectivity amongst our friends and our family members.

With email, cell phones, text, and pictures, we are able to share very intimate parts of our lives with those who are closest to us, but it is not always used with the purest of hearts. Many Americans, including many young Americans, have been concerned about the data collection that comes from the NSA about Americans' emails, texts, and phone records.

We have just learned recently about the information that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is collecting on the American citizenry. They are collecting information on nearly 600 to 800 million credit cards in America.

They are also teaming up with FHFA to form a database that collects information on Americans about their race, their religion, their sex, their payment history, their credit scores, the number of children that they have, their date of birth, their Social Security number.

They have access to all of this information, and I think most Americans would say that is too much information for the government to have.

It just doesn't happen in government though. It also happens in the private sector, without Americans' permission or consent.

My amendment is narrowly focused on this demonstration project, but it requires those schools, universities, and colleges who participate that when they enter into an agreement with an outside company and that outside company can actually sell the personally identifiable information of students to third parties—whether it is for advertisement or just basic data collection for research—they actually have to give notice to the students that their information is going to be sold, and they have give an opportunity for the students to opt out, that their information not be sold to third-party vendors.

This is about empowering students, giving them the power and control over their personally identifiable information, and if they choose to have it sold, so be it. They give permission, just like when they make a post on Facebook or they send a tweet on Twitter, but if they don't give consent, let's not allow schools to take their information and sell it without their permission.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment in support of our students across the country.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the Duffy amendment, but do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would require institutions participating in the demonstration project to provide a disclosure to students when companies can access and potentially sell students' personally identifiable information.

Students should always know when and how their personal information may be used or sold. This amendment would also allow students to opt out of any arrangement where their information could be sold, allowing them to maintain their privacy.

I have been very active on this issue of privacy in the K–12 space, where I challenged a group of industry leaders to come up with a statement of principles or a promise to parents that delineates clear language about what they are doing and not doing when it comes to housing student data.

I would certainly be pleased to work with the gentleman from Wisconsin on this issue in the higher education space as well, to ensure that we are protecting the privacy of all students.

I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his amendment to ensure the continued protection and safety of students' personally identifiable information, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUFFY. Listen, I would just make the point to my good friend from Colorado, this is common sense.

If you are able to take a poll of university students—college students and say: Listen, there is an amendment on the floor today that would give you power over your personally identifiable information so schools can't sell it and it can't be used for advertisement or data collection, would you support that amendment, to empower you with your personally identifiable information?

□ 1600

I think the answer would be a resounding ''yes.'' And I have worked with the committee to narrowly tailor this amendment specifically for this demonstration project.

Frankly, I am one who believes this should apply to colleges and universities across the board empowering students. I think if you talk to 20-year-olds and 24-year-olds around the country and what they think about the NSA infringing upon their privacy, they are the ones that were outraged by it.

So I think this makes sense. I guess I am disappointed in the opposition. I believe in our youth in America. I believe they should have the right to their data and how their data is used. So I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. GOWDY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part A of House Report 113–546.

Mr. GOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 14, line 1, insert before the semicolon at the end the following: ''including an institution of higher education that offers a dual-enrollment program under which a secondary school student is able simultaneously to earn credit toward a secondary school diploma and a postsecondary degree, certificate, or credential''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. GOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I want to start by recognizing and thanking my friend and chairman, JOHN KLINE from Minnesota, for his leadership not just on this bill, but on the whole jurisdiction of Education and the Workforce. I want to also thank the folks on the staff, Mr. Chairman, of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, Mr. MILLER, and especially my friend PETER WELCH for working with me on this amendment.

The underlying bill, Mr. Chairman, as you know, seeks to support innovation in higher education by reenvisioning how regulators and institutions have measured student progress and student aid. This bill, Mr. Chairman, sets up demonstration projects to study the effect of competency-based education.

Our amendment, Mr. Chairman, simply permits participation of dual enrollment programs to be included in the demonstration projects created. As the chairman knows, many students—in fact, I am reluctant to cite statistics, but I think it is well north of 1 million students across our great country—have benefited in dual enrollment classes.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I live with a student that has benefited back home in Spartanburg, both at Dorman High School and, I know, Spartanburg High School. Probably other high schools have partnered with institutions of higher learning to prepare, Mr. Chairman, our children, number one, to be able to gauge the speed of the pitches in college—the pitchers pitch a little faster in college sometimes than they do in high school—but more significantly, and particularly for my daughter's friends, it enables them to go ahead and start getting college credit and reducing both their caseload and, more importantly, the cost when these children decide to matriculate.

The dual enrollment programs are widespread, and they deserve to be considered as part of the demonstration projects.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although I am in favor of it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. First of all, I do want to thank Mr. KLINE and Mr. MILLER for bringing this bill to the floor, and I want to thank the staffs for working with Mr. GOWDY and me on this amendment and an amendment to follow.

One of the things that brought Mr. GOWDY and me together is the concern about the cost of education, and I know that has been a major concern for the Education and the Workforce Committee. But one of the dilemmas that we have is that, if we put more money in as taxpayers—and I am a strong supporter of more grant and more aid for our colleges—but if every dollar we put in is a dollar increase in tuition, then the students are treading water and the taxpayers are treading water.

So what are some of the things that we can do to try and help give the flexibility to our institutions of higher learning the ability to actually accelerate graduation and, therefore, help potentially lower the cost?

Mr. GOWDY outlined what this competency-based learning amendment would do. It would reward students who have some ambition and get started early. It would allow college administrators to properly give credit for that serious effort on the part of students, and it might help reverse what has been a trend where a lot of students are taking more than 4 years to graduate and allow them the opportunity with their effort and discipline to graduate in less than 4 years. If you graduate in 3½ years, that is a significant savings to that family and that student who is borrowing money as a way of getting ahead in this society.

So I really appreciate the focus that the committee has had on this question and appreciate very much the work that Mr. GOWDY in trying to present to this body this amendment which will help, I think, facilitate the goal of making college more affordable. It is absolutely so essential to the young people of this country.

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

Mr. GOWDY. In summation, Mr. Chairman, I just want to thank, again, the chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota, for his willingness to entertain other peoples' ideas for his hard work and the full book of business that they do on Education and the Workforce, and particularly the women and men who work so hard on the staff, and my friend from Vermont who is always open to areas of consensus and agreement and working across the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I would just say the same to Mr. GOWDY. I appreciate working with him on this and also on our Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part A of House Report 113–546.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk as the designee of Ms. MENG.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 14, beginning line 16, redesignate subsection (c) as subsection (d).

Page 14, after line 15, insert the following:

(c) REPORT.—The Secretary of Education shall report to Congress, every 10 years, on the needs of limited English proficient students using the Free Application for Federal Student Aid.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, today I am proud to rise in support of the Meng amendment.

This amendment would ensure that the Secretary of Education assesses the usability of the Free Application for Federal Student Aid, which we always often call FAFSA, in the business for students with limited English proficiency. Access to student aid should always be free, but the technical form is often hard to understand and complete when a student's, or particularly their parents', first language isn't English. Frankly, I have looked at the form, and it is hard enough to understand in English, Mr. Chairman, as a native speaker.

Assessing the usability of the FAFSA every decade will allow the Department of Education to adapt the changing demographics at colleges across the country. I strongly encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment so students can have better and easier access to Federal student loan aid programs for free.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. GOWDY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part A of House Report 113–546.

Mr. GOWDY. I have an amendment at the desk, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following new section:

SECTION 3. HIGHER EDUCATION REGULATORY REFORM TASK FORCE.

(a) TASK FORCE ESTABLISHED.—Not later than 2 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall establish the Higher Education Regulatory Reform Task Force.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Higher Education Regulatory Reform Task Force shall include—

(1) the Secretary of Education or the Secretary's designee;

(2) a representative of the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance established under section 491 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1098); and

(3) representatives from the higher education community, including—

(A) institutions of higher education, with equal representation of public and private nonprofit institutions, and two-year and four-year institutions, and with not less than 25 percent of such representative institutions carrying out distance education programs; and

(B) nonprofit organizations representing institutions of higher education.

(c) ACTIVITIES.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall submit to Congress and make available on a publicly available website a report (in this section referred to as the ''Higher Education Regulatory Reform Report'') prepared by the Higher Education Regulatory Reform Task Force on Department of Education regulatory requirements for institutions of higher education described in paragraph (2).

(2) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—The Higher Education Regulatory Reform Report shall contain the following with respect to Department of Education regulatory requirements for institutions of higher education:

(A) A list of rules that are determined to be outmoded, duplicative, ineffective, or excessively burdensome.

(B) For each rule listed in accordance with subparagraph (A) and that is in effect at the time of the review under subparagraph (A), an analysis of whether the costs outweigh the benefits for such rule.

(C) Recommendations to consolidate, modify, simplify, or repeal such rules to make such rules more effective or less burdensome.

(D) A description of the justification for and impact of the recommendations described in subparagraph (C), as appropriate and available, including supporting data for such justifications and the financial impact of such recommendations on institutions of higher education of varying sizes and types.

(E) Recommendations on the establishment of a permanent entity to review new Department of Education regulatory requirements affecting institutions of higher education.

(3) NOTICE AND COMMENT.—At least 30 days before submission of the Higher Education Regulatory Reform Report required under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Education shall publish the report in the Federal Register for public notice and comment. The Higher Education Regulatory Reform Task Force may modify the report in response to any comments received before submission of the report to Congress.

(d) DEFINITION OF INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—For the purposes of this section, the term ''institution of higher education'' has the meaning given such term in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002), except that such term does not include institutions described in subsection (a)(1)(C) of such section 102.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. GOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I again want to thank Mr. KLINE and all the hardworking folks on Education and the Workforce, the Members and especially the women and men of the staff.

The Upstate of South Carolina, Mr. Chairman, is home to several higher education institutions, public and private, large and small, and the issue of education affordability is front and center. And, frankly, Mr. Chairman, families are struggling trying to be able to plan for their kids' future.

I know that, both because I have the benefit of representing these families and I hear from them and I also know it anecdotally, Mr. Chairman. I have a 17-year-old daughter, and while she is blessed in many ways compared to her contemporaries, lots and lots of her friends come to the house from time to time. We preach to people that the road to prosperity is paved with hard work and education, but when this road is riddled with potholes called ''unsustainable debt,'' I don't know how we can expect them to get to the end.

You figure out what the cost of education is. In many of these instances, these children are the first ones in their family to try to go to school. And so they are looking at me. They have done well in high school. They have done everything we have asked them to do, and they are staring, in some instances, at massive amounts of debt just so they can do what we promised them that if you work hard and you get an education, the pathway to prosperity will be paved for you.

So against that backdrop, my friend from Vermont and I decided let's look at regulations and what impact they may have on the cost of higher education. Mr. Chairman, as you well know, you may conclude that a regulation is worth it. It may cost money, but it may still be worth it. That is fine. That is a separate analysis. But there really is no reason to not study the regulations themselves to see what impact they are having.

So I give a lot of credit to the gentleman from Vermont who approached me with his idea. I think it is a solid idea. I can't imagine any reason not to form a task force or a working group to study regulations and what impact, whether wittingly or unwittingly, those regulations are having on the cost of higher education.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although I am for the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, this question of college debt that my colleague, Mr. GOWDY, spoke about, that is brutal. It is not a red State-blue State deal, and it is not a Republican-Democratic deal. It is young people getting out of college with a mountain of debt, and they are starting out with the equivalent of a mortgage.

There has been an enormous amount of attention in this body to how to deal with that and a lot of debate about how to deal with it. I know Mr. MILLER has been a champion on this cause along with Mr. TIERNEY on our side and, I know, Mr. GOWDY and Mr. KLINE on the other side.

I have pushed back, to some extent, on our college administrators, because it is not just a matter of what taxpayers can afford to fund by way of grant and aid or what families can afford to put up from their hard-earned savings, it is a question of what will college administrators do to try to keep those tuition increases down. So we need the active participation of our college administrators.

When I talked to Mr. GOWDY, he talked to his folks, I guess the president of Clemson, and I spoke with the president of the University of Vermont and some of our other college leaders in Vermont, and they were somewhat resistant to the notion of our getting involved in what they saw as their job and made some complaints that regulations were causing them to have to spend money.

Now, sometimes that can be an excuse, but I think what Mr. GOWDY said is the right way to go. Let's take a look at them.

I happen to think there are times when you need law and you need regulation. Title IX has been a law that has done an immense amount of good for young women who want the full opportunity to be as athletic as young men, and that was a law that did real good. Sometimes regulations do good—but not always.

Instead of just having a debate about more regulation or no regulation, what Mr. GOWDY and I are saying is, hey, let's get the people who are affected by this from all sides, have them take a look at these things and come up with an analysis of this is working, this isn't working. Because as a person who is in favor of law and regulation in appropriate cases, I am against bad regulations that just get in the way of a good education and affordability.

So this doesn't stack the deck either way, but it does allow parties who are involved in having to deal with regulations to have a way of looking at them, assessing them, and making recommendations about them.

□ 1615

What I see as beneficial on this is that we are going to have this as a tool to get our college administrators more actively involved with us in what is, I think, an enormous challenge of our times, and that is make college affordable and sustainable for the hard-working families in your district, Mr. Chairman, and in my district and Mr. GOWDY's.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOWDY. Mr. Chairman, in summation, reasonable minds can and I am quite certain will differ as to the propriety of certain regulations. I get that. I understand that. That is part of the beauty of our country. What I would think that all reasonable minds can concur on is that we ought to at least look at them and see what the numbers are. That will instruct and inform the debate as to whether or not the benefit is worthy of the cost.

So again, I want to thank Mr. KLINE and the folks on E&W, and I especially want to thank, again, my friend from Vermont for always being willing to listen to other people's ideas. And usually the ones I have he improves and makes them better.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. I thank my cosponsor, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part A of House Report 113–546.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ___. STUDY ON USE OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RETURNS AS PRIMARY APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL STUDENT AID.

Section 483 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C.1090) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i) STUDY ON USE OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RETURNS AS PRIMARY APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL STUDENT AID.—

''(4) STUDY.—The Secretary of Education, in consultation with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, shall conduct a study on the feasibility and advantages and disadvantages of using individual income tax returns as the primary form of application for student aid under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

''(5) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary, in consultation with the Commissioner, shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would require the Secretary of Education, in coordination with the IRS, to conduct a study on the feasibility of using individual income tax returns as the primary form of application for Federal student financial aid applications.

Personally, Mr. Chairman, I see no reason why American families are required to submit two exhaustive overviews of their financial situation to the Federal Government each year if they have a family member who is seeking a student loan. Individual tax returns provide a complete picture of the taxpayer's financial situation. Why should they also be forced to fill out a secondary onerous financial aid form to the Department of Education as well?

In the past few years, the Department of Education has built an IRS data retrieval tool into the financial aid application form in order to reduce the amount of time spent completing the form. It is my hope that we can take this feature a step further.

I support efforts to streamline the financial aid process. I think that using one form already required of all income-earning Americans is the best way to do it.

My amendment today would simply ensure that Congress has all the information it needs in order to accomplish such a transition. I urge my colleagues to support this effort to streamline the student aid process.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment which requires the Secretary of Education to study the advantages and disadvantages of using IRS income data to complete a student's application for Federal aid is an idea that is growing in popularity.

Simplifying the Federal student aid application has been proposed by a number of our colleagues. As part of an effort to reauthorize the Higher Education Act, Representatives LARRY BUCSHON, MIKE KELLY, JOHN TIERNEY, TIM BISHOP, JARED POLIS, and ED ROYCE introduced H.R. 4982, Simplifying the Application For Student Aid Act, which addresses this issue as well. That bipartisan legislation would streamline and improve the student aid application process by allowing students to import into their application IRS income data from 2 years prior to the date of application. The gentleman's amendment today will help inform us how better to simplify this process. I thank him for offering the amendment. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. GOWDY

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 413, noes 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 439]

AYES—413

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.

Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
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
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—19

Bishop (UT)
Brooks (IN)
Campbell
DesJarlais
Eshoo
Gingrey (GA)
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Honda
Huffman
Kingston
Larson (CT)
Nunnelee
Payne
Pelosi
Rogers (MI)
Rush
Stewart
Wasserman Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1649

Messrs. MCCARTHY of California, NEAL, FOSTER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Ms. DELAURO, and Messrs. FATTAH, COTTON, and ISRAEL changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Chair, on roll-call No. 439 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND) having assumed the chair, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Acting 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. 3136) to establish a demonstration program for competency-based education, and, pursuant to House Resolution 677, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, in its current form, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Tierney moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 3136, to the Committee on Education and the Workforce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

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

SEC. ____. PROVIDING STUDENTS WITH REBATES TO LOWER THEIR EDUCATION COSTS.

(a) REBATES AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Education may use funds made available under this section to provide a rebate to a borrower of a loan made under part B or part D of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) equal to the amount of savings the borrower would receive if the loan balance was refinanced at a rate equal to the rate that would be applicable to the loan if it were issued under such part D during the 12-month period beginning on July 1, 2013, and ending June 30, 2014.

(b) APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS REQUIRED FOR REBATE.—The Secretary may only provide a rebate under subsection (a) to the extent that funds are appropriated in advance in an appropriations act for that purpose and shall only provide eligible borrowers a rebate on a first-come, first-served basis.

(c) APPLICATION.—Each borrower who seeks a rebate under subsection (a) shall submit an application to the Secretary not later than June 30, 2015.

(d) BASIS.—The Secretary shall calculate rebates provided to borrowers under this section to approximate the savings to the borrower of a refinanced-loan on a cash basis.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary.

Mr. KLINE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If this amendment is adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, student loan debt is at a crisis level in this country. Outstanding student loans now total more than $1.2 trillion, surpassing total credit card debt, and every year, students are taking on more. An estimated 71 percent of college seniors had debt in 2012, with an average outstanding balance of $29,400 for those who borrowed to get a bachelor's degree.

My constituents—and I am sure the constituents of my colleagues—are calling, emailing, posting on Facebook, and even approaching me on the street to share their stories about how they have been buried in student loan debt.

This debt is causing them to put on hold other life decisions, such as whether or not they can move out of their parents' home, whether or not they can buy a car, purchase their own home, get married, or even consider starting a family.

A young woman from Boxford, Massachusetts, wrote to me and said, ''I pay more than the minimum balance every month. I sacrifice daily for my loans. I live at home, 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 of all my life. I'm 23, and I'm 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's what I live with every day. The anger, depression, and disbelief that I am forever stuck.''

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

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, bills, et cetera. Please do all 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, those are just two examples from my district. I am sure there are untold others throughout this country. Millions are suffering this particular situation all across the Nation. We need to start listening to them. We need to start taking action on their behalf.

This motion is a modified version of the legislation that I filed in the House with Congressman GEORGE MILLER. It has over 130 cosponsors and the support of dozens of respected organizations. Senator ELIZABETH WARREN filed its counterpart in the Senate.

This motion is the functional equivalent of allowing for the responsible refinancing of student loans. We allow homeowners and car owners to refinance their loans to a lower interest rate.

Student loan borrowers should be able to do the same with their high interest loans—converting them into lower interest loans. Particularly right now, when interest rates are so low, they should be able to take advantage of that fact.

When you get right down to it, Mr. Speaker, the real question is: Whose side are we on? Are we on the side of the young woman from Boxford and the others of her generation who feel ''forever stuck''? Are we on the side of the mother from Middleton and the millions of Americans just like her who are concerned about their children's future?

Let's support this motion and show them we are on their side. Let's support this motion and show the tens of millions of students, graduates, parents, and middle class families, who would be able to refinance their loans at a lower interest rate and get their life started, that we are on their side.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to stand up and be counted. I ask Members to support this motion, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

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

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts' passion on this issue.

We have shown in this House, again and again, that we are willing and able and have taken steps to help students pay for their loans. More importantly, we did that in a bipartisan way.

My colleagues may remember that last year, we all agreed it wasn't fair—it wasn't right—to double the rates students were already struggling to afford. We had a bipartisan solution to turn that interest rate determination over to the market, which much more accurately reflects the cost of that money, rather than politicians sitting around and making a decision.

□ 1700

We are taking action right now in the underlying bill to make it less costly for students to go to school to get their educations, to get their degrees, to get their certificates by advancing the competency-based education bill. We are open to discussing ways to help student borrowers manage the amount of debt they are taking on to finance their college degrees, but today, Mr. Speaker, is not the time, and this is not the place to have that discussion. This motion is, as is, frankly, always the case, a partisan move to score political points with a procedural vote.

I urge my colleagues to support the underlying bill and vote ''no'' on the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 221, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 440]

AYES—194

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
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
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
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
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
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
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—221

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
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
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
McAllister
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)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
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)
Southerland
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)

NOT VOTING—17

Barton
Bishop (UT)
Campbell
DesJarlais
Eshoo
Gingrey (GA)
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Honda
Huffman
Kingston
Nunnelee
Pelosi
Rogers (MI)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Wasserman Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1707

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KLINE. Can we get a recorded vote?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A timely request was not made. Is the gentleman prepared to ask for unanimous consent?

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a recorded vote.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, this will be a 5-minute vote.

There was no objection.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 414, noes 0, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 441]

AYES—414

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
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
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—18

Bishop (UT)
Campbell
Conyers
DesJarlais
Eshoo
Garcia
Gingrey (GA)
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Honda
Huffman
Kingston
Nunnelee
Pelosi
Rogers (MI)
Smith (WA)
Stewart
Wasserman Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1717

Mr. WESTMORELAND changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON H.R. 5171, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

Mr. CALVERT, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–551) on the bill (H.R. 5171) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3393, STUDENT AND FAMILY TAX SIMPLIFICATION ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4935, CHILD TAX CREDIT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2014

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–552) on the resolution (H. Res. 680) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3393) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to consolidate certain tax benefits for educational expenses, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4935) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements to the child tax credit, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule

XXII, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 3230, the conference report on Veterans Access and Accountability.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Ms. Brownley of California moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 3230 (an Act to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes) be instructed to—

(1) recede from disagreement with title V of the Senate amendment (relating to health care related to sexual trauma); and

(2) recede from the House amendment and concur in the Senate amendment in all other instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's notice will appear in the RECORD.

ENHANCING SERVICES FOR RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS VICTIMS OF YOUTH TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2014

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5076) to amend the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act to increase knowledge concerning, and improve services for, runaway and homeless youth who are victims of trafficking.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5076

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 ''Enhancing Services for Runaway and Homeless Victims of Youth Trafficking Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS.

The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 343(b)(5)—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by inserting '', severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9))), and sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)))'' before the semicolon at the end,

(B) in subparagraph (B) by inserting '', severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9))), and sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)))'' after ''assault'', and

(C) in subparagraph (C) by inserting '', including such youth who are victims of trafficking (as defined in section 103(15) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(15)))'' before the semicolon at the end, and

(2) in section 351(a) by striking ''or sexual exploitation'' and inserting ''sexual exploitation, severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9))), or sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)))''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HECK of Nevada. 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. 5076.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 5076, the Enhancing Services for Runaway And Homeless Victims of Youth Trafficking Act, legislation I introduced to help better serve our most vulnerable youth who are the victims of extreme trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, trafficking is an issue that hits close to home for me. I represent parts of the city of Las Vegas and the surrounding suburbs. When people think of Las Vegas, they think of the lights, the magnificent hotels, shopping, fine dining, and nightlife. But the city's reputation as a national and international tourist destination, combined with the transient nature of the population, has made Las Vegas a prime target for human traffickers.

In fact, between 1994 and 2014, the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department recovered 2,229 victims of sex trafficking. Just last year, Metro recovered 107 children victims of human trafficking.

All of us, Federal and State officials, law enforcement, the courts, all of us have a moral obligation to eradicate trafficking and support its victims. And it will take close coordination between all stakeholders to achieve the dual goals of ending the human trafficking epidemic and assisting the victims.

To help facilitate that coordination, I hosted representatives from Nevada's State government, law enforcement, the judiciary, and victims' rights groups for a roundtable discussion on ways to combat trafficking, and also offer more support to victims or potential victims.

At that roundtable I met Annie. She came to Las Vegas to make a better life for herself, and was, instead, ensnared in the sex industry. Thankfully, Annie got out.

This is how she described her life as a victim of human trafficking: ''I felt like a dirty, cheated, disrespected, violated, and worthless individual to society. I didn't know who Annie was anymore. I often wanted to end my own life.''

Now she is an advocate devoted to helping other victims of trafficking. One of the things that she and others at the roundtable talked about was the need for improved resources for victims' advocacy and support, especially for youth victims and at-risk youth.

To that end, I introduced H.R. 5076, the Enhancing Services for Runaway and Homeless Victims of Youth Trafficking Act. My bill amends the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act to enable the Secretary of Health and Human Services to apply existing grant resources to train staff on the effects of human trafficking on runaway and homeless youth victims, and for developing statewide strategies to reach such youth.

It also allows the Secretary to utilize the Street Outreach Program to provide street-based services for runaway and homeless youth who are victims of trafficking.

Our Nation's runaway and homeless youth deserve access to services that will help them escape a life of crime, abuse, and neglect. By passing this simple fix to the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, we can help ensure that those suffering from the trauma of these deplorable acts will have access to the care and support they need.

I would like to thank Chairman KLINE of the Education and the Workforce Committee, as well as my colleague from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for working with me on this important piece of legislation.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Enhancing Services for Runaway and Homeless Victims of Youth Trafficking Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5076, the Enhancing Services for Runaway and Homeless Victims of Youth Trafficking Act of 2014. I am honored to have joined my colleagues, Mr. HECK and Mr. KLINE, and appreciate their leadership on this important issue.

Our bill makes an important change in the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act so that victims of trafficking can be better served. We know that trafficking and youth homelessness often affect similar populations. Young people that have run away or are homeless are particularly vulnerable to sexual exploitation and trafficking, and programs targeted towards runaway and homeless youth should be simultaneously equipped to support victims of trafficking when there is such an overlap.

Research consistently confirms the correlation between running away and becoming exploited through prostitution. For example, according to a 2006 FBI Uniform Crime Report, girls who run away from their homes, group homes, foster homes, or treatment centers are at high risk of being targeted by a trafficker and becoming exploited.

Street Outreach Programs were created to provide services to ''runaway, homeless, and street youth who have been subjected to or are at risk of being subjected to sexual abuse.'' Every year, 25,000 of these young people find shelter as a result of these programs.

The legislation being considered today ensures that Street Outreach Programs can rely on funding already available through the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act.

This allows the Department of Health and Human Services to provide street-based services such as individual assessments, treatment, counseling, or access to emergency shelter for runaway and homeless youth who are also victims of trafficking. Because of the overlap that often occurs with homelessness and trafficking, this just makes good sense.

Additionally, it is important that we provide the necessary resources to States, organizations, and other entities to train staff working with these victims. This additional training, authorized by this bill under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act research grants, will allow service providers to successfully address and respond to the behavioral and emotional effects of abuse and assault.

Our bill ensures that staff training will also include ways to recognize and respond to the unique needs and circumstances of trafficking victims. This is a simple change but an important one necessary to improve services available.

It is my hope that we can continue to work in this spirit of bipartisanship and work together to improve and strengthen programs that support our Nation's children, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and for his dedicated and hard work in combating sex trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, each year an estimated 300,000 innocent children fall victim to sex trafficking right here in the United States. The victims can be homeless or runaway youth. Others are simply taken from their parents in the blink of an eye. The victims' families are our neighbors, our friends, and our loved ones.

As a father of two and a grandfather of four, for me it is impossible to fathom the pain and suffering they must feel knowing their son or daughter is trapped in a modern-day slave trade filled with darkness and hopelessness. While we will never fully comprehend the grief these families are forced to bear, we can, as a Nation, fight this heinous crime with every tool available.

□ 1730

There are heroic efforts underway right now to locate victims of youth sex trafficking and return them to their families. Last week, the Education and Workforce Committee had an opportunity to hear from John Ryan, who is the head of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

The center plays a vital role in a national effort to protect vulnerable youth, leading a partnership among law enforcement, government agencies, and private ventures like Honeywell, Google, and Lifetouch.

In my home State of Minnesota, the center has helped resolve cases involving 1,699 endangered runaways and 373 family abductions. The center's 24-hour CyberTipline has provided law enforcement more than 2 million leads of child sexual exploitation.

The center and its staff provide an invaluable service to families. They stand on the front lines of this critical battle each and every day. Despite these and other achievements, we know more can be done to protect our most vulnerable youth.

Right now, many kids are falling through the cracks of child welfare systems. Often, they are not properly identified as sex trafficking victims when they enter the system and are then lost in the shuffle once they are in State custody, and too often, runaway and homeless youth who are victims of sex trafficking do not receive the special help they need.

That is why I strongly support this legislation, which will enhance existing services for runaway and homeless youth. I am also proud to support legislation we will consider in just a few moments that will improve how State child welfare systems identify and respond to victims of youth sex trafficking.

Finally, we will also consider legislation that ensures victims are properly identified when reported to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children CyberTipline.

Mr. Speaker, we have to do more to address this national crisis. The bills the House is considering today move our country in the right direction. I am humbled to help lead this bipartisan effort and urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

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

Mr. HECK of Nevada. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5076.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STRENGTHENING CHILD WELFARE RESPONSE TO TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2014

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5081) to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to enable State child protective services systems to improve the identification and assessment of child victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5081

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 Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. CAPTA AMENDMENTS.

Section 106 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(i) by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (xxii); and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

''(xxiv) provisions and procedures to identify and assess reports involving children who are sex trafficking victims, and which may include provisions and procedures to identify and assess reports involving children who are victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons described in section of 103(9)(B) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9)(B));

''(xxv) provisions and procedures for training representatives of the State child protective services systems about identifying and assessing children who are sex trafficking victims, and which may include provisions and procedures for such training with respect to children who are victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons described in section of 103(9)(B) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9)(B)); and

''(xxvi) provisions and procedures for identifying services (including the services provided by State law enforcement officials, the State juvenile justice system, and social service agencies, such as runaway and homeless youth shelters) and procedures for appropriate referral to address the needs of children who are sex trafficking victims, and which may include provisions and procedures for the identification of such services and procedures with respect to children who are victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons described in section of 103(9)(B) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9)(B));'';

(B) in paragraph (2)(D)—

(i) by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (v);

(ii) by inserting ''and'' at the end of clause (vi); and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(vii) the provisions and procedures described in clauses (xxiv) and (xxvi) of subparagraph (B);''; and

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (A);

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

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) SEX TRAFFICKING VICTIM.—The term 'sex trafficking victim' means a victim of—

''(i) sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(10))); or

''(ii) a severe form of trafficking in persons described in section 103(9)(A) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7102(9)(A)).''; and

(2) in subsection (d), by adding at the end the following:

''(17) The number of children identified under clause (xxiv) of subsection (b)(2)(B), and of such children—

''(A) the number identified as sex trafficking victims (as defined in subsection (b)(4)(C)); and

''(B) in the case of a State that has provisions and procedures to identify children who are victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons described in section 103(9)(B) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9)(B)), the number so identified.''.

SEC. 3. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pension of the Senate, a report that—

(1) describes the specific type and prevalence of severe form of trafficking in persons to which children who are identified for services or intervention under the placement, care, or supervision of State, Indian tribe, or tribal organization child welfare agencies have been subjected as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) summarizes the practices and protocols utilized by States to identify and serve—

(A) under section 106(b)(2)(B) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a(b)(2)(B)), children who are victims of trafficking; and

(B) children who are at risk of becoming victims of trafficking; and

(3) specifies any barriers in Federal laws or regulations that may prevent identification and assessment of children who are victims of trafficking, including an evaluation of the extent to which States are able to address the needs of such trafficked children without altering the definition of child abuse and neglect under section 3 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5101 note).

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) SEVERE FORM OF TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.—The term ''severe form of trafficking in persons'' has the meaning given the term in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9)).

(2) VICTIM OF TRAFFICKING.—The term ''victim of trafficking'' has the meaning given the term in section 103(15) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(15)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HECK of Nevada. 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. 5081.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 5081, the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2014. Mr. Speaker, human trafficking has reached epidemic proportions in the United States. Young people are being forced into manual labor or commercial sexual activity in what has become a $32 billion a year industry.

While we are fighting trafficking with every tool available, there is more that can be done. The fact remains that domestic child trafficking is a serious problem in the United States. Around 300,000 American youth are at risk of sexual commercial exploitation and trafficking per year.

Through my involvement with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, I have seen the exploitation and horrific abuses trafficking victims have to endure. As an emergency room physician, I have seen the physical, emotional, and psychological trauma inflicted on victims, and as a father, it sickens me to think that one of my children could become a victim.

As a Member of Congress, I have worked on legislation to help address this problem and held a local roundtable in Nevada with victims, advocacy, and law enforcement groups.

H.R. 5081, the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2014, will help protect child victims by improving practices within State child welfare systems to identify, assess, and document sex trafficking victims.

This legislation amends the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to direct States to implement and maintain procedures to identify and assess reports involving children who are victims of sex trafficking.

Additionally, this bill requires that States train child protective services workers on how to identify these children and the services necessary to meet their needs, and it would improve reporting on the number of children identified as sex trafficking victims.

The bill also requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to report on the type of prevalence of youth trafficking victims in the welfare system, provide a summit of State practices for serving youth trafficking victims, and report on any barriers in Federal law that prevents the identification and assessment of youth victims of trafficking.

Instead of properly identifying and assisting trafficked and exploited children, these children are often sent to the juvenile justice system, where they are labeled and treated as criminals. These innocent victims are victimized again by the very system that was designed to protect them.

This bill works towards a positive solution that ensures child welfare agencies have the appropriate systems in place to properly identify, assess, and document child victims of sex trafficking, instead of treating them as criminals.

It is imperative that we continue to pass legislation that helps victims of both labor and sex trafficking to ensure that victims receive the services they need to escape a life of abuse.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman KLINE of the Education and the Workforce Committee, as well as the other original cosponsors of this legislation—Representatives KAREN BASS, MICHELE BACHMANN, TOM MARINO, JIM MCDERMOTT, and LOUISE SLAUGHTER—for their hard work on this bill.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2014 and reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BASS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5081, the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2014, and I would like to thank Chairman KLINE and Ranking Member MILLER for their support and collaboration on creating momentum for this policy that will be a critical step towards preventing child sex trafficking. I appreciate both their insight and assistance in bringing this bill to the floor today.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative MARINO. He has been a tireless advocate for children in the foster care system. Mr. MARINO, along with the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth cochairs, Representatives MCDERMOTT and BACHMANN, all served as original cosponsors of the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act, and their continuing commitment to transforming the child welfare system has brought national attention to the intersection between child sex trafficking and the child welfare system.

The U.S. Department of Justice reports that more than 300,000 children in the country are at risk of sexual commercial exploitation and trafficking each year. These are 300,000 too many, and tragically, this number shows that a comprehensive and aggressive response is needed in order to combat child trafficking throughout the country.

In my city, the Los Angeles County Probation Department reports that 61 percent of identified trafficking victims are foster youth. The Los Angeles STAR court is a specialized collaborative courthouse designed to serve commercially exploited youth and reports that 80 percent of these girls have been previously involved in the child welfare system.

As cochair of the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth, I have had the opportunity to travel throughout the country as part of our nationwide listening tour. Unfortunately, the stories I have heard from advocates and youth is that children in the child welfare system continue to be preyed upon by traffickers who use their vulnerability as an opportunity to exploit them.

The stories that emerge are those like Caroline's, a young girl who grew up in a household where she was physically, sexually, and emotionally

abused. When Caroline was just 13 years old, a 35-year-old man attended a sporting event at her school and deceived her into believing that he loved her and would give her the attention she craved.

Instead, this man began to sell Caroline to numerous men for sex. Throughout this time, she had many encounters with the child welfare system, but no one picked up that she was a victim of trafficking. The social workers did not have the training or the proper tools to assess that she needed specialized services.

Our bill would ensure that children like Caroline do not slip through the cracks, as State and county child welfare departments have protection plans that will outline provisions and procedures to identify and assess all reports of children known or suspected to be victims of sex trafficking.

State systems do not currently have the proper protections, services, or protocols to adequately serve those in the system who have been victims of trafficking. States also lack such support for victims who enter the child welfare system.

In fact, during a site visit recently on the Foster Youth Caucus listening tour to Missouri, a law enforcement officer told us that he had no other option but to arrest the girls, to ensure that they receive the proper services.

In Los Angeles, the child sex trafficking unit of the county probation department specifically addresses the needs of child victims, and it is the only such division in the country. I commend their critical work and commitment to ensure the trafficking victims receive the resources they need.

We must not continue to arrest these children in order to provide them with these services. Our bill will be a first step toward ensuring that there are policies and procedures in place to connect child sex trafficking victims to public or private specialized services.

Last year, in a meeting with children in the child sex trafficking unit of the Los Angeles County Probation Department, the girls all echoed the same sentiment. While they were grateful to have the resources they needed to begin to deal with their trauma, they felt stigmatized by having to be arrested in order to receive these services.

Our bill would ensure that each State has a training plan for child protective service workers to appropriately respond to reports of trafficking, so that trafficked children would be provided the same resources as youth in the child welfare system and be classified as victims of crime, not as criminals.

We have story after story across the country of children being raped and sold as if they were little more than objects, but we do not have the concrete data to help them find the appropriate services. H.R. 5081 requires that, within 1 year, the Department of Health and Human Services report to Congress on the prevalence and types of trafficking they have encountered.

Many advocates believe that labor trafficking is also a critical issue with children in the child welfare system. The reality is we need hard data to evaluate what is happening to the children, so that proper resources can be allocated in the future. Our bill also allows States to establish the same policy and procedures for children if they are victims of labor trafficking.

The report will also assess State practices used to identify and serve trafficking victims and Federal laws and policies that may prevent States from supporting these victims, including the absence of trafficking in the Federal definition of child abuse and neglect under CAPTA, the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act.

These critical steps to reforming our child welfare system will help ensure that victims are provided with the same resources and access as other children. I strongly urge my colleagues to support our bill and continue to build momentum to combat domestic child sex trafficking.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Nevada for yielding. I also want to thank my friend from California (Ms. BASS) for introducing this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, you are going to find tonight that there are eight bills dealing with sex trafficking in the United States. You will also find that these are bipartisan bills, and a lot of different Members are involved in this legislation, which goes to say that on this issue of modern-day slavery—the human sex trafficking that is taking place—Members of Congress are working together in many different ways to come to the same conclusion to present legislation to the House floor.

I would just encourage the Speaker in his role to get the Senate to bring up this legislation as soon as it all passes, either tonight or tomorrow.

We have already had some good pieces of legislation pass, a piece of legislation called the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, sponsored by CAROLYN MALONEY from New York, a Democrat, and myself, a Republican from Texas. That is about as bipartisan as you can get, Mr. Speaker. We don't even speak the same language, but it passed the House 2 weeks ago, 409–0.

The House of Representatives is moving as fast as we can and as carefully as we can to deal with this scourge of modern-day slavery. You don't get much talk about it in the national media. It is just not one of those controversial issues, but it is being done, and that is a good thing.

□ 1745

Mr. Speaker, there are two types of minor sex trafficking that are taking place. There are children from foreign countries that are being sold and delivered to the United States for sex trafficking, and then there are Americans, kids that live in the United States, that are being sold and delivered throughout the United States for domestic sex trafficking. It is increasing for a lot of reasons, but awareness is one of those reasons—or lack of awareness is a reason that we want to hopefully stop—and the awareness needs to go to parents and children about what can take place.

Also, when sex trafficking with minor children takes place, as my friend Ms. BASS from California has said, when that child is rescued by law enforcement, they don't have anyplace to take them. There is no housing for those individuals, so they put them in the juvenile justice system for their safety. But, yes, they are labeled. They are given that stigma of a criminal. Even though it is juvenile criminal, they are still a criminal.

They are not a criminal, Mr. Speaker. They are victims of crime, victims of slavery.

For example, in the United States, there are 5,000 animal shelters, and they are great. I have got three dalmatians—I call them the weapons of mass destruction—and two of them came from dalmatian rescue. But, Mr. Speaker, there are only 300 beds for minor sex-trafficked children in the United States. That is it. There aren't any more.

So we need to have the ability to take those children when rescued by law enforcement or by child protective services or whoever to a shelter where they have a place that they can stay other than the jailhouse. That is one of the most important things that we can do.

As the gentleman from Nevada has said, this scourge is a multimillion dollar business. It is second only to the illicit drug trade. The reason is because children can be sold more than once each day—some up to 20 times. Drugs are sold one time. Plus, the risk of apprehension and the consequences for drugs is a whole lot more than that of sex trafficking, and therefore that is why it is the second, will soon be the highest, income for illicit activity, criminal activity, because there is no risk involved.

So those are some things that are being addressed by these eight pieces of legislation tonight. They are all good, and they are all bipartisan. They are supported by most Members. There are a lot of cosponsors on all of that legislation. Hopefully, we can get all eight of those pieces of legislation passed and sent down the hallway to the Senate and get their attention and vote on these.

And that is just the way it is.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington State, Mr. MCDERMOTT.

(Mr. MCDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Strengthening

Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2014.

Today, more than 293,000 American youth are at risk of sexual commercial exploitation and trafficking each year. Far too often, State child welfare systems fail to properly identify and assist trafficked and exploited children. The protective services and protocols established for abused and neglected children within the child welfare system are rarely extended to trafficked children and youth. In many States, such children are often not even categorized as victims.

I would point out that we have on our borders today 57,000 youngsters who have come in whatever way they have come to our attention. One of the real dangers in sort of sending people back into whatever is that you may well be sending them back into sexual trafficking. This is one of the issues that should be looked at in every case where you find a youngster roaming the streets. States have got to look at this issue and figure out a way to deal with it.

We know that youngsters when they age out of foster care have no skills, they have no job, and they have very little to keep themselves alive, and, therefore, they easily become victims of sexual trafficking. This is an issue that this country, if we really care about children, we are going to look carefully at every kid and what are the risks to which they are being exposed.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO), the cochair of the Foster Care Adoption Caucus.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5081.

It is an absolute outrage that between 100,000 and 300,000 American youth are currently at risk for becoming victims of commercial sexual exploitation and trafficking right here in the United States.

Although we know there are many factors that make youth particularly vulnerable to traffickers and exploiters, such as age range, history of abuse, living in an impoverished community, and many others, the most astounding indicator a child will be trafficked is whether or not he or she is in foster care—in the foster care system at all.

In 2013, 60 percent of the child sex trafficking victims recovered as part of an FBI nationwide raid from over 70 cities were children from foster care or group homes. Make no mistake about it. Our foster care system provides an essential service to our communities and our children. In fact, my wife and I have housed children from this system. However, we are simply not doing enough to protect these children from being preyed upon.

This is why I have worked with my colleague, Congresswoman KAREN BASS, to introduce H.R. 5081, the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2014. This bill would make much-needed reforms to the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to ensure States increase their child protection service plans and that we increase the data being reported to Congress.

To enact good law in Congress, we simply need as many facts at our fingertips as possible. Sadly, criminals in the child trafficking industry have become adept at lurking in the shadows and evading law enforcement, leaving us with very poor records and data on the activity.

This is why Congresswoman BASS and I are calling on States to work with us to strengthen our records and data logs so that we can more effectively craft laws to stop these criminals moving forward.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important bipartisan bill, because when it comes to those who are the most innocent among us, they deserve as much protection as possible.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York, Ms. YVETTE CLARKE.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS) for her tireless commitment to the children of our Nation's child welfare system and for extending time to speak on this timely and important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the House's legislative efforts to combat human trafficking, a very cruel form of modern-day slavery. I urge all my colleagues to support the legislation before us, including H.R. 5081, the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act, a bill that seeks to improve the child welfare response to trafficking by requiring States to have procedures for identifying, assessing, and documenting child victims of trafficking. H.R. 5081 would also help identify, assess, and document child victims of sex trafficking throughout the United States.

Unfortunately, human trafficking is a big, booming business, and I cannot—and I will not—stand idly by and watch as our country becomes the center for smuggling human beings and human sexual exploitation.

We have a major crisis on the border of our Nation and in big cities like New York and others across the Nation that have been exacerbated and enabled by highly organized crime syndicates. If we understand the methods these groups use and begin by eliminating their sources of revenue, we can save people from human rights abuses and exploitation. Young girls are sold as sexual property, and boys and men are forced to work for cheap labor after they are convinced to sign unfair labor contracts. Their government documents are taken from them, and they are left with no one and nothing.

The people who want to do harm to our most vulnerable are likely to get more money from trafficking a child for sex than from the illicit drug trade. Awareness concerning human trafficking has increased significantly in recent years, but awareness is not enough.

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

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. The United States is now considered a destination country according to the United States Department of State. Yes, Mr. Speaker, you heard it correctly. Human trafficking isn't something that is just occurring in other countries or other continents. It is happening right here in America.

In the United States, human trafficking rakes in $9.8 billion for the use and abuse of victims, many of whom are children. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children estimates that each year 100,000 children are falling victim to the industry within our own borders.

I am proud to join my colleagues and the ever-growing number of Americans who are standing up to the objectionable practice of human trafficking. Congress is taking the additional steps to protect our children with this legislation. Again, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5081 and all of the legislation concerning human trafficking before the House. The time is now to protect children from being victims of human trafficking.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to support H.R. 5081, the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2014.

It has been estimated that more than 293,000 children in the United States are at risk of sexual exploitation, many of whom are imported into this country along the routes used by the drug traders across the Rio Grande and moved through Texas. This form of modern-day slavery is absolutely unacceptable. No one, especially children, should have to endure this kind of cruelty. We cannot ignore that child trafficking is a serious problem taking place right here in our own backyard in the United States of America.

Unfortunately, many State child welfare systems do not identify and assist these exploited children appropriately. This bill strengthens the response to child trafficking by conditioning grants to States on their creating plans to protect children from these abuses and atrocities.

We had a hearing of the Homeland Security Committee in Houston and learned that often the trafficked children are not considered victims. They are considered the perpetrators. We have got to educate the police departments. We have got to educate the officers on the street. We have got to educate all of America that these children are victims. They need help. They don't need to end up in the juvenile justice system being treated like criminals.

This legislation would help identify children who were forced into sex trafficking and require States receiving grants to train their child protective services workers to appropriately respond to these activities.

Ideally, the child sex trafficking industry would not even exist. Unfortunately, the monetary motivations and God knows what else keep it going. It is happening right here, and we have got to stop it. This bill and the other bills on the floor of the House tonight take very important steps to combat this scourge.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support it and thank Representatives BASS and KLINE for moving us forward in this important endeavor.

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

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to speak today in support of the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2014. I would like to thank my good friend and colleague, Congresswoman KAREN BASS, for introducing this bill and for all she does on behalf of foster youth.

Foster youth are some of the most at-risk children in our society. They are often victims of abuse or neglect, and too many face trials and tribulations beyond their years. So much that we take for granted—a stable home, living with our siblings, or returning to the same school year after year—are constant obstacles for these children.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation before us today will specifically address the link between girls in foster care and sex trafficking, and it will require States to develop a child protection plan to identify and assess all reports involving children known or suspected to be victims of trafficking.

□ 1800

Additionally, States must provide training plans for child protective services workers to appropriately respond to reports to child trafficking and have procedures in place that will connect child victims to public or private specialized services.

So I want to echo the comments of so many of my colleagues who have spoken here today. I commend Congresswoman BASS and Congressman KLINE, and all those who have had a hand in this legislation and who are looking out for the welfare of our children. I am proud to support this bipartisan legislation. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this day and the opportunity to be on the floor to have the Nation recognize the value of our children and the importance of protecting them. In particular, I thank Ms. BASS and Mr. MARINO for their leadership of the Foster Care Caucus, work that has been so important across America, and I thank the Education Committee with Mr. MILLER and Mr. KLINE for aspects of this legislation.

But I remember, Mr. Speaker, walking the streets of Houston with Covenant House and finding in cubbyholes homeless children, homeless teens. Many of them had aged out, and many of them during that time when the language wasn't clear had been prostituted, they were being sex-trafficked. No one was helping. So I am excited about legislation that recognizes that this act of ignoring them is child abuse, and that we need to ensure that they are not criminals and that the child welfare system understands their needs.

I was the first to bring to Houston a Homeland Security hearing on human and sex trafficking. It was an emotional hearing. The stories that were being told through law enforcement and those who had been victimized as children and how their lives were ruined would raise the hairs on your head. So I support all of these human trafficking initiatives, particularly as they take children away from the criminal justice system, and I look forward to Homeland Security moving more toward understanding this through the international process, and our Nation recognizing that, as has been said before, that the unaccompanied children are themselves victims of sex trafficking and need due process protection.

But we start at home. Therefore, I look forward to introducing legislation dealing with the homeland security human trafficking component in that Department, but the legislation offered by Ms. BASS and Mr. MARINO, again, is a program that is long overdue. And I am grateful that we will now have a system where these children will be recognized not as criminals but will be recognized through the State child welfare system to identify and help these children that have been taken by this terrible industry, Mr. Speaker, and save their lives. The bills on the floor today will save the lives of our children. I ask support for all of the bills on human trafficking today.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5081, the "Strengthening Our Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2014," which strengthens the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (Pub. L. 93–247) by requiring that state plans for federal grants for child abuse or neglect prevention and treatment programs include elements focused on human trafficking.

Trafficking in humans is a major problem across the globe and in our own country. As lawmakers, we have a moral responsibility to combat this scourge and protect our children, especially those without parents to care for them, from being exploited and falling through the cracks.

As the Founder and Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I understand how important it is to defend those who are too young to defend themselves.

This problem is personal for me because according to the U.S. Department of Justice, my home city of Houston, Texas is the epicenter of human trafficking in the United States with over 200 active brothels in Houston and two new ones opening each month.

Houston has also surpassed Las Vegas for the dubious distinction of having the most strip clubs and illicit spas serving as fronts for sex trafficking.

Human trafficking in Texas is not limited to Houston. During the 2011 Dallas Super Bowl, 133 underage arrests for prostitution were made and during this year's massive effort "Operation Cross Country" led by the FBI, several pimps were arrested.

Between 1998 and 2003 more than 500 people from 18 countries were ensnared in 57 forced labor operations in almost a dozen cities throughout the State of Texas.

Currently, our state child welfare systems do not properly identify and help the children that have been taken by this horrible industry. Even more disturbing is that the protections provided by our child welfare systems often do not extend to young victims of trafficking.

Hard as it is to believe, in some states trafficked youths are not even regarded or classified as victims. Rather, they are treated as youthful offenders and consigned to the criminal justice system.

These kids are not criminals. They are victims, robbed of their innocence by adult criminals. They are boys and girls who have been taken advantage of and are unable to escape an ugly system.

I support H.R. 5081 because it is focused on helping at-risk and vulnerable children and treat them as victims rather than treating them as criminals.

Specifically, the bill requires that state plans for Federal grants for child abuse or neglect prevention and treatment:

1. provide procedures to identify and assess all reports involving children known or suspected to be victims of sex trafficking;

2. provide training for child protection service workers to appropriately respond to reports of child sex trafficking; and

3. develop and implement policies and procedures to connect child victims to public or private specialized services.

Additionally, the bill requires States to report annually the numbers of children identified as victims of sex trafficking within the already existing National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System.

H.R. 5081 also requires the Department of Health and Human Services to submit a report to Congress outlining the prevalence and type of child trafficking nationwide as well as the current barriers to serving child victims comprehensively.

I strongly support H.R. 5081 and urge my colleague to join me in voting for its passage which will help bring an end to the evil practice that is child sex trafficking.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

The fight against child sex trafficking is a bipartisan issue, and I appreciate that both parties have come

together today to support the development of legislation that would make a significant impact on one of the most vulnerable populations in our Nation.

The Strengthening Our Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act is an important step in ensuring that child welfare agencies have the proper systems in place to identify, assess, and document child victims of trafficking.

Stories like those of Caroline and the other young girls in the child sex trafficking unit of the Los Angeles County Probation Department are critical to understanding exactly the effect our bill would have in laying the foundation of transforming the way our Nation responds to child sex trafficking.

However, it is also important to recognize that this bill and the other bills on the floor today are steps on that journey, and there is still an enormous amount of work that needs to be done.

Again, I would like to thank members of the Education and Workforce Committee and the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth for their continued commitment to advancing policies that help change the lives of children.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank my staff, Adriane Alicea, and especially my former deputy chief of staff, Jenny Wood, who did the lion's share of work to make this legislation happen, and without her hard work and dedication, this legislation would not be on the floor today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have heard some compelling and moving stories this evening that underscore our moral obligation as a society to do all we can to combat this epidemic of child and human trafficking. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5081 and all of the related legislation that we will consider this evening.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act.

We all know that our nation's children are our most precious resource, and we wish that every child had the opportunity to grow up in a family that loved and protected them, but unfortunately that is not the case.

As a result, about 400,000 children are in the foster care system as we speak. In the last few years, there have been great improvements in how we care for foster children, particularly the focus on supporting youth as they age out of the system.

But there is a stain on the American foster care system that we have not adequately addressed: child sex trafficking. Child sex trafficking is truly one of the most deplorable and disgusting crimes any adult can commit, and it's our job to do all that we can to end it—especially when so many victims are children for whom we have taken responsibility in the foster care system.

The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children tells us that 60% of runaways who are victims of sex trafficking were at one time in the custody of social services or in foster care. In my home state of New York, 85% of trafficking victims have prior child welfare involvement. While state-specific numbers vary throughout the country, they all tell us that something more needs to be done.

To add insult to injury, far too often, state child welfare systems fail to properly identify and assist trafficked and exploited children. Instead of being cared for and supported, these children are often sent to the juvenile justice system and criminalized for, at no fault of their own, being raped and trafficked! These children are victims, and we have a moral obligation to protect them.

I'm a proud original co-sponsor of the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act, which would help identify exploited children, train child protective services workers to appropriately respond to them, and connect child victims to specialized services so that they can begin the process of recovery. I am particularly pleased that this legislation includes a directive for HHS to report on any barriers in Federal laws or regulations that may be preventing States from properly identifying, assessing, and serving children who are victims of trafficking. I believe one such barrier is that currently, under the Child Abuse Protection and Treatment Act, young victims of trafficking are not automatically defined as victims of abuse and neglect. Making a definitional change would ensure that these children, who are clearly victims, are supported and protected, not sent to the juvenile justice system for prosecution. I look forward to receiving this report next year and working with my colleagues to make that change for the sake of these young people who deserve our protection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5081.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

MISSING CHILDREN'S ASSISTANCE ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5111) to improve the response to victims of child sex trafficking, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5111

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

SECTION 1. RESPONSE TO VICTIMS OF CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING.

Section 404(b)(1)(P)(iii) of the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5773(b)(1)(P)(iii)) is amended by striking ''child prostitution'' and inserting ''child sex trafficking, including child prostitution''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALBERG. 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. 5111.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and rise in support of H.R. 5111.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives continues its commitment to providing the necessary tools and policies to help reduce child sex trafficking and better serve these victims in the United States. I want to thank Congresswoman JOYCE BEATTY for her leadership on this issue and for introducing H.R. 5111, which will improve the ability of law enforcement officials and others to respond to and assist these victims.

For too long these victims have been viewed as willing participants and have been treated as actors in the criminal scheme. However, we now know that oftentimes individuals are trapped as victims by human trafficking organizations, and sadly, many of these victims are children.

As previous House efforts have done, the bills today attempt to change for the better how we view these victims. Congresswoman BEATTY's legislation will ensure that we view victims of sex trafficking not as participants but as victims, and ensure that child sex trafficking crimes are reported.

Under current law, the National Center For Missing and Exploited Children, NCMEC, operates a CyberTipline to provide online users and electronic service providers a means of reporting Internet-related child sexual exploitation in many areas, including child prostitution. However, children who are sex-trafficked or sexually exploited should be treated as victims, not criminals. In fact, approximately one out of seven runaway youth are likely victims of sex trafficking, and roughly one out of three youths are lured into prostitution within 48 hours of running away from home.

For this reason, H.R. 5111 would replace the term ''child prostitution'' with ''child sex trafficking'' in the CyberTipline reporting categories to reinforce that children who are sex-trafficked or sexually exploited are victims whose situation should be taken seriously when reported. It would also ensure the public recognizes that child prostitution is included in how NCMEC uses the term ''child sex trafficking,'' and thus should still be reported to the tip line.

Again, I want to thank Congresswoman BEATTY, along with the Education and Workforce Committee and

House leadership, for recognizing the need to steadfastly address this dreadful practice. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5111.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 5111, a bill I introduced which would help victims of child sex trafficking by decriminalizing their behavior.

I thank Chairman KLINE from Minnesota and Ranking Member MILLER from California of the Education and the Workforce Committee for bringing this important bill to the floor for consideration. I also thank Representative WALBERG from Michigan, who is managing the bill today for the Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank Senator PORTMAN, whom I partnered with on this legislation earlier this year. Together we introduced bipartisan, bicameral legislation in order to assist victims of child sex trafficking and ensure that they are viewed and treated as victims and not criminals. We participated in a roundtable discussion with the Dominican Sisters of Peace in my district with diverse stakeholders who shared stories of victims and ideas of what we could do to further help these children who are trafficked.

We heard story after story, just like on the House floor today: the story of Caroline, in my district; the story of Teresa, who was a victim herself at a very young age and now is a national advocate against child sex trafficking.

As we know, human trafficking is one of the fastest-growing crimes in the world. In fact, according to the United States State Department, human trafficking is the world's second-largest criminal enterprise after the illegal drug trade.

□ 1815

In the United States, some 300,000 children are at risk each year for commercial sexual exploitation. Many of them come from family and social backgrounds that render them particularly at risk. These are children who fall through the cracks in our society.

Mr. Speaker, many are runaways, homeless, and in and out of foster care. These children deserve better. The average age of a traffic victim in the United States is 12 years of age.

Mr. Speaker, this is shameful. At 12 years of age, girls and boys should be playing youth sports, participating in their school science fair, learning a new language, or just being able to be a child.

In my home State of Ohio, each year, an estimated 1,078 Ohio children become victims of human trafficking, and over 3,000 more are at risk. Ohio is the fifth leading State for human trafficking because of its proximity to a waterway that leads to an international border and a system of interstate highways that allows an individual to exit the State within 2 hours to almost anywhere.

The I–75 corridor—which runs through Toledo, Dayton, and Cincinnati—is infamous for subjecting children to the horrors of sex trafficking, with reports of victims being repeatedly abused.

Just last week, my hometown paper, The Columbus Dispatch, reported that Ohio children younger than 6 years old have been sexually trafficked by their parents in exchange for drugs, for rent, or cash.

Mr. Speaker, I will enter a copy of this article into the RECORD.

[From the Columbus Dispatch, July 11, 2014.]

OHIOANS SELLING SEX WITH THEIR OWN KIDS

(By Alan Johnson)

Ohio children younger than 6 have been sexually trafficked by their own parents in exchange for drugs, rent and cash, a new report indicates.

Information from the Ohio Network of Children's Advocacy Centers shows that 51 minors from across the state were potential human-trafficking victims—five of them age 6 or younger—over a nine-month period. The network has a state contract to screen children referred by law enforcement, children's services agencies and others, to determine whether they may have been trafficked.

Statistics from July 2013 to March 2014 showed all but five of the 51 minors reported were 13 to 18 years old. Only one case involved a male. They came from both urban and rural areas of the state.

''I'm most shocked that families are doing this to their own children,'' said the director of the advocacy center that originally detected three of the cases involving the youngest children. She asked not to be identified for this story to avoid pinpointing specific details about the cases that might cause problems for the children, or jeopardize legal proceedings.

''We think it happens to young girls who are runaways. But with these youngest kids, it's their actual families who are trafficking them.''

She said more information about what happened to very young children gradually comes out over time as they are in counseling and other therapeutic programs.

Information on at least three of the five youngest victims indicated they were trafficked sexually by one or both of their parents in ''exchange for drugs, rent, goods or money,'' said Amy Deverson Roberts of the children's advocacy network.

She said some cases have been referred for prosecution and others are pending. She could not release specifics about any cases.

The suspected victims were referred for help to law enforcement, children's services, mental-health providers and other agencies as needed, Roberts said.

''It's all about collaboration to provide the best services for victims,'' Roberts said.

The network last year received a $523,000, two-year grant from the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services to provide training to detect signs of trafficking, to put on education programs, and to handle child referrals. The grant came from a trafficking task force created in an executive order by Gov. John Kasich.

Officials estimate that 1,100 children are forced into the sex trade each year in Ohio; 13 is the most common age for children to be victimized.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, more must be done to assist these children, these children who are victims, not criminals, and need our help.

We know that no single system can successfully combat trafficking. Preventing, identifying, and serving victims of trafficking requires a multi-coordinated approach across all levels of government. We need to encourage all people, when they see something, say something.

Currently, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children operates a CyberTipline, which receives leads and tips regarding suspected crimes of sexual exploitation committed against children. More than 2.3 million reports of suspected child sexual exploitation have been made to the CyberTipline between 1998 and March of this year.

In identifying the types of sexual exploitation that should be reported to the CyberTipline, current law does not specifically mention ''child sex trafficking'' as one of its reporting categories, even though the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children encounters child victims of sex trafficking and currently uses this term on its Web site in order to encourage the public's reporting of these types of crimes.

Instead, the statute uses the term ''child prostitution,'' which we know does not fully and accurately capture these types of crimes against children.

My bill would add the phrase ''child sex trafficking,'' including ''child prostitution'' to the section b(1)(p) of the Missing Children's Assistance Act.

Working with my colleagues on the Education and the Workforce Committee and Congressman CHRIS SMITH from New Jersey, we have crafted legislation in order to improve and update the law in order to reflect the current state of Federal law and to reinforce that children who are sex-trafficked or sexually exploited are victims and not criminals.

Mr. Speaker, children in sex trafficking situations are often misidentified as ''willing'' participants. We know there is widespread lack of awareness and understanding of trafficking.

By adding the term ''child sex trafficking,'' including ''child prostitution,'' the Missing Children's Assistance Act will continue to fight the perception that sex trafficking is a voluntary, victimless crime.

Child sex trafficking is an issue of abuse and exploitation of children.

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

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS).

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5111, a bill to improve the response to victims of child trafficking.

First, I would like to commend my colleague, Representative JOYCE BEATTY, for her commitment to transforming the language that we use to discuss child victims of sex trafficking and for taking the lead on this important legislation.

While antitrafficking advocates and organizations have worked tirelessly over the years to ensure that the framework and language that we use to describe child victims of trafficking recognize that they are, in fact, victims, we still have a long way to go.

For example, men who exploit the children, we call them ''johns.'' We arrest the traffickers, we arrest the victims, but the men are seldom arrested, and when they are, it is for soliciting.

As we change the way we speak about the girls, we must change the way we speak about the men, the men who are not johns, but child molesters.

Representative BEATTY's bill is another critical building block to transforming the framework and dialogue around child victims of sex trafficking. I look forward to continuing to change the conversation and urge my colleagues in the House to support this important legislation.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me conclude by saying that I urge all of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to support H.R. 5111.

This is a very important piece of legislation that will help the victims of child sex trafficking. It will decriminalize their behavior. It will help rescue them from the horrible situations that we have heard tonight.

Let me also share that it is not only about H.R. 5111, but it is about all of the bills that we are hearing tonight that I ask this House to support.

I would certainly be remiss if I did not thank the House leadership on both sides of the aisle for allowing us to bring these important bills forward and also my entire staff, but specifically my legislative director for all of her hard work.

Lastly, to Congresswoman BASS, let me say thank you for being someone who has led this charge and has been willing to work with me and others on helping bring all of our bills forward.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

The passage of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, shows the House's commitment to not only bolstering enforcement efforts against human traffickers, but also ensuring that we properly identify victims.

I urge all Members to lead efforts in their districts, to continue the conversation, as I have done in mine, about human trafficking, to learn what more we can do in our communities to curtail this hideous crime.

During the human trafficking roundtables I have held in my district, law enforcement officials have consistently raised the need to make community members aware of the real and present threat of human trafficking. We must work to not only educate children, but also families and the general public about the safety risks.

H.R. 5111 is another step to educating our communities about human trafficking victims, and it continues our work to ensure that we are doing what we can to help reduce this horrible crime.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 5111, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5111, "An Act to Improve the Response To victims Of Child Sex Trafficking." I would like to congratulate Representative BEATTY for her work.

Youth sexual exploitation and trafficking is a major issue in this country that affects more than 293,000 young Americans.

As a Representative of Texas, this issue is close to my heart as my state is plagued by this problem. For example, multiple sporting events, conventions, and other large festivities make Houston a prime location for trafficking.

Another metric demonstrating the high level of trafficking in Houston is the high volume of calls to National Trafficking Hotline coming from Houston.

I have worked on this issue for a very long time as a member of the Anti-Human Trafficking Caucus and recognize the enormous damage that human trafficking does to its victim and to society.

There have been many efforts made to improve how our system addresses the issue of sex trafficking. However, there is still a great deal of work to be done to reframe the issue as one of abuse and exploitation of children rather than one of teenage prostitution.

The legal definition of sex trafficking states that "any individual induced or caused to engage in commercial sex activity who is under 18 is a victim of trafficking,"

But what about those who are teenagers and voluntarily engage in this sort of activity?

We need to update the Missing Children's Assistance Act so that it better recognizes these young people as victims of a serious crime and reports the information accordingly.

Under current law, (42 U.S.C. 5773 (b)(1)(P)), the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children operates a cyber tipline to provide online users and electronic service providers a means of reporting Internet-related child sexual exploitation in many areas, including child prostitution.

Children, who are sex trafficked or sexually exploited, even if they are in their teens, are victims. They are not criminals and should not be categorized as such.

H.R. 5111 would replace the term "child prostitution" with "child sex trafficking" in order to reinforce that children who are sex trafficked or sexually exploited are victims whose situation should be taken seriously when reported on the online tipline.

I believe that this bill is a step in the right direction for recognizing the broad impact of sex trafficking in the United States and assisting those who are exploited by it.

I urge all members to join me in supporting H.R. 5111 so we can all work towards a society where we no longer have to worry about our children being exploited by the sex trade.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5111, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PREVENTING SEX TRAFFICKING AND STRENGTHENING FAMILIES ACT

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4980) to prevent and address sex trafficking of children in foster care, to extend and improve adoption incentives, and to improve international child support recovery.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4980

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 ''Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.
Sec. 3. References.

TITLE I—PROTECTING CHILDREN AND YOUTH AT RISK OF SEX TRAFFICKING

Subtitle A—Identifying and Protecting Children and Youth at Risk of Sex Trafficking

Sec. 101. Identifying, documenting, and determining services for children and youth at risk of sex trafficking.
Sec. 102. Reporting instances of sex trafficking.
Sec. 103. Including sex trafficking data in the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System.
Sec. 104. Locating and responding to children who run away from foster care.
Sec. 105. Increasing information on children in foster care to prevent sex trafficking.

Subtitle B—Improving Opportunities for Children in Foster Care and Supporting Permanency

Sec. 111. Supporting normalcy for children in foster care.
Sec. 112. Improving another planned permanent living arrangement as a permanency option.
Sec. 113. Empowering foster children age 14 and older in the development of their own case plan and transition planning for a successful adulthood.
Sec. 114. Ensuring foster children have a birth certificate, Social Security card, health insurance information, medical records, and a driver's license or equivalent State-issued identification card.
Sec. 115. Information on children in foster care in annual reports using AFCARS data; consultation.

Subtitle C—National Advisory Committee
Sec. 121. Establishment of a national advisory committee on the sex trafficking of children and youth in the United States.
TITLE II—IMPROVING ADOPTION INCENTIVES AND EXTENDING FAMILY CONNECTION GRANTS
Subtitle A—Improving Adoption Incentive Payments
Sec. 201. Extension of program through fiscal year 2016.
Sec. 202. Improvements to award structure.
Sec. 203. Renaming of program.
Sec. 204. Limitation on use of incentive payments.
Sec. 205. Increase in period for which incentive payments are available for expenditure.
Sec. 206. State report on calculation and use of savings resulting from the phase-out of eligibility requirements for adoption assistance; requirement to spend 30 percent of savings on certain services.
Sec. 207. Preservation of eligibility for kinship guardianship assistance payments with a successor guardian.
Sec. 208. Data collection on adoption and legal guardianship disruption and dissolution.
Sec. 209. Encouraging the placement of children in foster care with siblings.
Sec. 210. Effective dates.
Subtitle B—Extending the Family Connection Grant Program
Sec. 221. Extension of family connection grant program.
TITLE III—IMPROVING INTERNATIONAL CHILD SUPPORT RECOVERY
Sec. 301. Amendments to ensure access to child support services for international child support cases.
Sec. 302. Child support enforcement programs for Indian tribes.
Sec. 303. Sense of the Congress regarding offering of voluntary parenting time arrangements.
Sec. 304. Data exchange standardization for improved interoperability.
Sec. 305. Report to Congress.
Sec. 306. Required electronic processing of income withholding.
TITLE IV—BUDGETARY EFFECTS
Sec. 401. Determination of budgetary effects.

SEC. 3. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise expressly provided in this Act, wherever in this Act an amendment is expressed in terms of an amendment to a section or other provision, the amendment shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Social Security Act.

TITLE I—PROTECTING CHILDREN AND YOUTH AT RISK OF SEX TRAFFICKING

Subtitle A—Identifying and Protecting Children and Youth at Risk of Sex Trafficking

SEC. 101. IDENTIFYING, DOCUMENTING, AND DETERMINING SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH AT RISK OF SEX TRAFFICKING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 471(a)(9) (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(9)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'';

(2) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) not later than—

''(i) 1 year after the date of enactment of this subparagraph, demonstrate to the Secretary that the State agency has developed, in consultation with State and local law enforcement, juvenile justice systems, health care providers, education agencies, and organizations with experience in dealing with at-risk children and youth, policies and procedures (including relevant training for caseworkers) for identifying, documenting in agency records, and determining appropriate services with respect to—

''(I) any child or youth over whom the State agency has responsibility for placement, care, or supervision and who the State has reasonable cause to believe is, or is at risk of being, a sex trafficking victim (including children for whom a State child welfare agency has an open case file but who have not been removed from the home, children who have run away from foster care and who have not attained 18 years of age or such older age as the State has elected under section 475(8) of this Act, and youth who are not in foster care but are receiving services under section 477 of this Act); and

''(II) at the option of the State, any individual who has not attained 26 years of age, without regard to whether the individual is or was in foster care under the responsibility of the State; and

''(ii) 2 years after such date of enactment, demonstrate to the Secretary that the State agency is implementing the policies and procedures referred to in clause (i).''.

(b) DEFINITION OF SEX TRAFFICKING VICTIM.—Section 475 (42 U.S.C. 675) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(9) The term 'sex trafficking victim' means a victim of—

''(A) sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000); or

''(B) a severe form of trafficking in persons described in section 103(9)(A) of such Act.''.

SEC. 102. REPORTING INSTANCES OF SEX TRAFFICKING.

(a) STATE PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—Section 471(a) (42 U.S.C. 671(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (32);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (33) and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(34) provides that, for each child or youth described in paragraph (9)(C)(i)(I), the State agency shall—

''(A) not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, report immediately, and in no case later than 24 hours after receiving information on children or youth who have been identified as being a sex trafficking victim, to the law enforcement authorities; and

''(B) not later than 3 years after such date of enactment and annually thereafter, report to the Secretary the total number of children and youth who are sex trafficking victims.''.

(b) DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY.—Section 471 (42 U.S.C. 671) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) ANNUAL REPORTS BY THE SECRETARY ON NUMBER OF CHILDREN AND YOUTH REPORTED BY STATES TO BE SEX TRAFFICKING VICTIMS.—Not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of this subsection and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall report to the Congress and make available to the public on the Internet website of the Department of Health and Human Services the number of children and youth reported in accordance with subsection (a)(34)(B) of this section to be sex trafficking victims (as defined in section 475(9)(A)).''.

SEC. 103. INCLUDING SEX TRAFFICKING DATA IN THE ADOPTION AND FOSTER CARE ANALYSIS AND REPORTING SYSTEM.

Section 479(c)(3) (42 U.S.C. 679(c)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C)(iii), by striking ''and'' after the comma; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(E) the annual number of children in foster care who are identified as sex trafficking victims—

''(i) who were such victims before entering foster care; and

''(ii) who were such victims while in foster care; and''.

SEC. 104. LOCATING AND RESPONDING TO CHILDREN WHO RUN AWAY FROM FOSTER CARE.

Section 471(a) (42 U.S.C. 671(a)), as amended by section 102(a) of this Act, is amended—

(1) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (34) and inserting ''; and''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(35) provides that—

''(A) not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the State shall develop and implement specific protocols for—

''(i) expeditiously locating any child missing from foster care;

''(ii) determining the primary factors that contributed to the child's running away or otherwise being absent from care, and to the extent possible and appropriate, responding to those factors in current and subsequent placements;

''(iii) determining the child's experiences while absent from care, including screening the child to determine if the child is a possible sex trafficking victim (as defined in section 475(9)(A)); and

''(iv) reporting such related information as required by the Secretary; and

''(B) not later than 2 years after such date of enactment, for each child and youth described in paragraph (9)(C)(i)(I) of this subsection, the State agency shall report immediately, and in no case later than 24 hours after receiving, information on missing or abducted children or youth to the law enforcement authorities for entry into the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) database of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, established pursuant to section 534 of title 28, United States Code, and to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.''.

SEC. 105. INCREASING INFORMATION ON CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE TO PREVENT SEX TRAFFICKING.

Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to the Congress a written report which summarizes the following:

(1) Information on children who run away from foster care and their risk of becoming sex trafficking victims, using data reported by States under section 479 of the Social Security Act and information collected by States related to section 471(a)(35) of such Act, including—

(A) characteristics of children who run away from foster care;

(B) potential factors associated with children running away from foster care (such as reason for entry into care, length of stay in care, type of placement, and other factors that contributed to the child's running away);

(C) information on children's experiences while absent from care; and

(D) trends in the number of children reported as runaways in each fiscal year (including factors that may have contributed to changes in such trends).

(2) Information on State efforts to provide specialized services, foster family homes, child care institutions, or other forms of placement for children who are sex trafficking victims.

(3) Information on State efforts to ensure children in foster care form and maintain long-lasting connections to caring adults, even when a child in foster care must move

to another foster family home or when the child is placed under the supervision of a new caseworker.

Subtitle B—Improving Opportunities for Children in Foster Care and Supporting Permanency

SEC. 111. SUPPORTING NORMALCY FOR CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE.

(a) REASONABLE AND PRUDENT PARENT STANDARD.—

(1) DEFINITIONS RELATING TO THE STANDARD.—Section 475 (42 U.S.C. 675), as amended by section 101(b) of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(10)(A) The term 'reasonable and prudent parent standard' means the standard characterized by careful and sensible parental decisions that maintain the health, safety, and best interests of a child while at the same time encouraging the emotional and developmental growth of the child, that a caregiver shall use when determining whether to allow a child in foster care under the responsibility of the State to participate in extracurricular, enrichment, cultural, and social activities.

''(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'caregiver' means a foster parent with whom a child in foster care has been placed or a designated official for a child care institution in which a child in foster care has been placed.

''(11)(A) The term 'age or developmentally-appropriate' means—

''(i) activities or items that are generally accepted as suitable for children of the same chronological age or level of maturity or that are determined to be developmentally-appropriate for a child, based on the development of cognitive, emotional, physical, and behavioral capacities that are typical for an age or age group; and

''(ii) in the case of a specific child, activities or items that are suitable for the child based on the developmental stages attained by the child with respect to the cognitive, emotional, physical, and behavioral capacities of the child.

''(B) In the event that any age-related activities have implications relative to the academic curriculum of a child, nothing in this part or part B shall be construed to authorize an officer or employee of the Federal Government to mandate, direct, or control a State or local educational agency, or the specific instructional content, academic achievement standards and assessments, curriculum, or program of instruction of a school.''.

(2) STATE PLAN REQUIREMENT.—Section 471(a)(24) (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(24)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''include'' and inserting ''includes'';

(B) by striking ''and that such preparation'' and inserting ''that the preparation''; and

(C) by inserting '', and that the preparation shall include knowledge and skills relating to the reasonable and prudent parent standard for the participation of the child in age or developmentally-appropriate activities, including knowledge and skills relating to the developmental stages of the cognitive, emotional, physical, and behavioral capacities of a child, and knowledge and skills relating to applying the standard to decisions such as whether to allow the child to engage in social, extracurricular, enrichment, cultural, and social activities, including sports, field trips, and overnight activities lasting 1 or more days, and to decisions involving the signing of permission slips and arranging of transportation for the child to and from extracurricular, enrichment, and social activities'' before the semicolon.

(3) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall provide assistance to the States on best practices for devising strategies to assist foster parents in applying a reasonable and prudent parent standard in a manner that protects child safety, while also allowing children to experience normal and beneficial activities, including methods for appropriately considering the concerns of the biological parents of a child in decisions related to participation of the child in activities (with the understanding that those concerns should not necessarily determine the participation of the child in any activity).

(b) NORMALCY FOR CHILDREN IN CHILD CARE INSTITUTIONS.—Section 471(a)(10) (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(10)) is amended to read as follows:

''(10) provides—

''(A) for the establishment or designation of a State authority or authorities that shall be responsible for establishing and maintaining standards for foster family homes and child care institutions which are reasonably in accord with recommended standards of national organizations concerned with standards for the institutions or homes, including standards related to admission policies, safety, sanitation, and protection of civil rights, and which shall permit use of the reasonable and prudent parenting standard;

''(B) that the standards established pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be applied by the State to any foster family home or child care institution receiving funds under this part or part B and shall require, as a condition of each contract entered into by a child care institution to provide foster care, the presence on-site of at least 1 official who, with respect to any child placed at the child care institution, is designated to be the caregiver who is authorized to apply the reasonable and prudent parent standard to decisions involving the participation of the child in age or developmentally-appropriate activities, and who is provided with training in how to use and apply the reasonable and prudent parent standard in the same manner as prospective foster parents are provided the training pursuant to paragraph (24);

''(C) that the standards established pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall include policies related to the liability of foster parents and private entities under contract by the State involving the application of the reasonable and prudent parent standard, to ensure appropriate liability for caregivers when a child participates in an approved activity and the caregiver approving the activity acts in accordance with the reasonable and prudent parent standard; and

''(D) that a waiver of any standards established pursuant to subparagraph (A) may be made only on a case-by-case basis for non-safety standards (as determined by the State) in relative foster family homes for specific children in care;''.

(c) SUPPORTING PARTICIPATION IN AGE-APPROPRIATE ACTIVITIES.—

(1) Section 477(a) (42 U.S.C. 677(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (6);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) to ensure children who are likely to remain in foster care until 18 years of age have regular, ongoing opportunities to engage in age or developmentally-appropriate activities as defined in section 475(11).''.

(2) Section 477(h)(1) (42 U.S.C. 677(h)(1)) is amended by inserting ''or, beginning in fiscal year 2020, $143,000,000'' after ''$140,000,000''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) DELAY PERMITTED IF STATE LEGISLATION REQUIRED.—If the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines that State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) is required in order for a State plan developed pursuant to part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this section, the plan shall not be regarded as failing to meet any of the additional requirements before the 1st day of the 1st calendar quarter beginning after the 1st regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act. If the State has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session is deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

SEC. 112. IMPROVING ANOTHER PLANNED PERMANENT LIVING ARRANGEMENT AS A PERMANENCY OPTION.

(a) ELIMINATION OF ANOTHER PLANNED PERMANENT LIVING ARRANGEMENT FOR CHILDREN UNDER AGE 16.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 475(5)(C)(i) (42 U.S.C. 675(5)(C)(i)) is amended by inserting ''only in the case of a child who has attained 16 years of age'' before ''(in cases where''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 422(b)(8)(A)(iii)(II) (42 U.S.C. 622(b)(8)(A)(iii)(II)) is amended by inserting '', subject to the requirements of sections 475(5)(C) and 475A(a)'' after ''arrangement''.

(3) DELAYED APPLICABILITY WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN CHILDREN.—In the case of children in foster care under the responsibility of an Indian tribe, tribal organization, or tribal consortium (either directly or under supervision of a State), the amendments made by this subsection shall not apply until the date that is 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Part E of title IV (42 U.S.C. 670 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 475 the following:

''SEC. 475A. ADDITIONAL CASE PLAN AND CASE REVIEW SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS.

''(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR ANOTHER PLANNED PERMANENT LIVING ARRANGEMENT.—In the case of any child for whom another planned permanent living arrangement is the permanency plan determined for the child under section 475(5)(C), the following requirements shall apply for purposes of approving the case plan for the child and the case system review procedure for the child:

''(1) DOCUMENTATION OF INTENSIVE, ONGOING, UNSUCCESSFUL EFFORTS FOR FAMILY PLACEMENT.—At each permanency hearing held with respect to the child, the State agency documents the intensive, ongoing, and, as of the date of the hearing, unsuccessful efforts made by the State agency to return the child home or secure a placement for the child with a fit and willing relative (including adult siblings), a legal guardian, or an adoptive parent, including through efforts that utilize search technology (including social media) to find biological family members for the children.

''(2) REDETERMINATION OF APPROPRIATENESS OF PLACEMENT AT EACH PERMANENCY HEARING.—The State agency shall implement procedures to ensure that, at each permanency hearing held with respect to the child, the court or administrative body appointed or approved by the court conducting the hearing on the permanency plan for the child does the following:

''(A) Ask the child about the desired permanency outcome for the child.

''(B) Make a judicial determination explaining why, as of the date of the hearing, another planned permanent living arrangement is the best permanency plan for the child and provide compelling reasons why it

continues to not be in the best interests of the child to—

''(i) return home;

''(ii) be placed for adoption;

''(iii) be placed with a legal guardian; or

''(iv) be placed with a fit and willing relative.

''(3) DEMONSTRATION OF SUPPORT FOR ENGAGING IN AGE OR DEVELOPMENTALLY-APPROPRIATE ACTIVITIES AND SOCIAL EVENTS.—At each permanency hearing held with respect to the child, the State agency shall document the steps the State agency is taking to ensure that—

''(A) the child's foster family home or child care institution is following the reasonable and prudent parent standard; and

''(B) the child has regular, ongoing opportunities to engage in age or developmentally appropriate activities (including by consulting with the child in an age-appropriate manner about the opportunities of the child to participate in the activities).''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) STATE PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—

(i) PART B.—Section 422(b)(8)(A)(ii) (42 U.S.C. 622(b)(8)(A)(ii)) is amended by inserting ''and in accordance with the requirements of section 475A'' after ''section 475(5)''.

(ii) PART E.—Section 471(a)(16) (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(16)) is amended—

(I) by inserting ''and in accordance with the requirements of section 475A'' after ''section 475(1)''; and

(II) by striking ''section 475(5)(B)'' and inserting ''sections 475(5) and 475A''.

(B) DEFINITIONS.—Section 475 (42 U.S.C. 675) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting ''meets the requirements of section 475A and'' after ''written document which''; and

(ii) in paragraph (5)—

(I) in subparagraph (B), by adding at the end the following ''and, for a child for whom another planned permanent living arrangement has been determined as the permanency plan, the steps the State agency is taking to ensure the child's foster family home or child care institution is following the reasonable and prudent parent standard and to ascertain whether the child has regular, ongoing opportunities to engage in age or developmentally appropriate activities (including by consulting with the child in an age-appropriate manner about the opportunities of the child to participate in the activities);''; and

(II) in subparagraph (C)—

(aa) by inserting '', as of the date of the hearing,'' after ''compelling reason for determining''; and

(bb) by inserting ''subject to section 475A(a),'' after ''another planned permanent living arrangement,''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) DELAY PERMITTED IF STATE LEGISLATION REQUIRED.—If the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines that State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) is required in order for a State plan developed pursuant to part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this section, the plan shall not be regarded as failing to meet any of the additional requirements before the 1st day of the 1st calendar quarter beginning after the 1st regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act. If the State has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session is deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

SEC. 113. EMPOWERING FOSTER CHILDREN AGE 14 AND OLDER IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THEIR OWN CASE PLAN AND TRANSITION PLANNING FOR A SUCCESSFUL ADULTHOOD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 475(1)(B) (42 U.S.C. 675(1)(B)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''With respect to a child who has attained 14 years of age, the plan developed for the child in accordance with this paragraph, and any revision or addition to the plan, shall be developed in consultation with the child and, at the option of the child, with up to 2 members of the case planning team who are chosen by the child and who are not a foster parent of, or caseworker for, the child. A State may reject an individual selected by a child to be a member of the case planning team at any time if the State has good cause to believe that the individual would not act in the best interests of the child. One individual selected by a child to be a member of the child's case planning team may be designated to be the child's advisor and, as necessary, advocate, with respect to the application of the reasonable and prudent parent standard to the child.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO INCLUDE CHILDREN 14 AND OLDER IN TRANSITION PLANNING.—Section 475 (42 U.S.C. 675) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(D), by striking ''Where appropriate, for a child age 16'' and inserting ''For a child who has attained 14 years of age''; and

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking ''16'' and inserting ''14'';

(ii) by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (ii); and

(iii) by adding at the end the following: ''and (iv) if a child has attained 14 years of age, the permanency plan developed for the child, and any revision or addition to the plan, shall be developed in consultation with the child and, at the option of the child, with not more than 2 members of the permanency planning team who are selected by the child and who are not a foster parent of, or caseworker for, the child, except that the State may reject an individual so selected by the child if the State has good cause to believe that the individual would not act in the best interests of the child, and 1 individual so selected by the child may be designated to be the child's advisor and, as necessary, advocate, with respect to the application of the reasonable and prudent standard to the child;''; and

(B) in subparagraph (I), by striking ''16'' and inserting ''14''.

(c) TRANSITION PLANNING FOR A SUCCESSFUL ADULTHOOD.—Paragraphs (1)(D), (5)(C)(i), and (5)(C)(iii) of section 475 (42 U.S.C. 675) are each amended by striking ''independent living'' and inserting ''a successful adulthood''.

(d) LIST OF RIGHTS.—Section 475A, as added by section 112(b)(1) of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(b) LIST OF RIGHTS.—The case plan for any child in foster care under the responsibility of the State who has attained 14 years of age shall include—

''(1) a document that describes the rights of the child with respect to education, health, visitation, and court participation, the right to be provided with the documents specified in section 475(5)(I) in accordance with that section, and the right to stay safe and avoid exploitation; and

''(2) a signed acknowledgment by the child that the child has been provided with a copy of the document and that the rights contained in the document have been explained to the child in an age-appropriate way.''.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit a report to Congress regarding the implementation of the amendments made by this section. The report shall include—

(1) an analysis of how States are administering the requirements of paragraphs (1)(B) and (5)(C) of section 475 of the Social Security Act, as amended by subsections (a) and (b) of this section, that a child in foster care who has attained 14 years of age be permitted to select up to 2 members of the case planning team or permanency planning team for the child from individuals who are not a foster parent of, or caseworker for, the child; and

(2) a description of best practices of States with respect to the administration of the requirements.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) DELAY PERMITTED IF STATE LEGISLATION REQUIRED.—If the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines that State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) is required in order for a State plan developed pursuant to part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this section, the plan shall not be regarded as failing to meet any of the additional requirements before the 1st day of the 1st calendar quarter beginning after the 1st regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act. If the State has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session is deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

SEC. 114. ENSURING FOSTER CHILDREN HAVE A BIRTH CERTIFICATE, SOCIAL SECURITY CARD, HEALTH INSURANCE INFORMATION, MEDICAL RECORDS, AND A DRIVER'S LICENSE OR EQUIVALENT STATE-ISSUED IDENTIFICATION CARD.

(a) CASE REVIEW SYSTEM REQUIREMENT.—Section 475(5)(I) (42 U.S.C. 675(5)(I)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and receives assistance'' and inserting ''receives assistance''; and

(2) by inserting '', and, if the child is leaving foster care by reason of having attained 18 years of age or such greater age as the State has elected under paragraph (8), unless the child has been in foster care for less than 6 months, is not discharged from care without being provided with (if the child is eligible to receive such document) an official or certified copy of the United States birth certificate of the child, a social security card issued by the Commissioner of Social Security, health insurance information, a copy of the child's medical records, and a driver's license or identification card issued by a State in accordance with the requirements of section 202 of the REAL ID Act of 2005'' before the period.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) DELAY PERMITTED IF STATE LEGISLATION REQUIRED.—If the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines that State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) is required in order for a State plan developed pursuant to part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this section, the plan shall not be regarded as failing to meet any of the additional requirements before the 1st day of the 1st calendar quarter beginning after the 1st regular session of the State legislature

that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act. If the State has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session is deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

SEC. 115. INFORMATION ON CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE IN ANNUAL REPORTS USING AFCARS DATA; CONSULTATION.

Section 479A (42 U.S.C. 679b) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary'';

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(3) in paragraph (6)(C), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) include in the report submitted pursuant to paragraph (5) for fiscal year 2016 or any succeeding fiscal year, State-by-State data on—

''(A) children in foster care who have been placed in a child care institution or other setting that is not a foster family home, including—

''(i) the number of children in the placements and their ages, including separately, the number and ages of children who have a permanency plan of another planned permanent living arrangement;

''(ii) the duration of the placement in the settings (including for children who have a permanency plan of another planned permanent living arrangement);

''(iii) the types of child care institutions used (including group homes, residential treatment, shelters, or other congregate care settings);

''(iv) with respect to each child care institution or other setting that is not a foster family home, the number of children in foster care residing in each such institution or non-foster family home;

''(v) any clinically diagnosed special need of such children; and

''(vi) the extent of any specialized education, treatment, counseling, or other services provided in the settings; and

''(B) children in foster care who are pregnant or parenting.

''(b) CONSULTATION ON OTHER ISSUES.—The Secretary shall consult with States and organizations with an interest in child welfare, including organizations that provide adoption and foster care services, and shall take into account requests from Members of Congress, in selecting other issues to be analyzed and reported on under this section using data available to the Secretary, including data reported by States through the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System and to the National Youth in Transition Database.''.

Subtitle C—National Advisory Committee

SEC. 121. ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE SEX TRAFFICKING OF CHILDREN AND YOUTH IN THE UNITED STATES.

Title XI (42 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 1114 the following:

''NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE SEX TRAFFICKING OF CHIILDREN AND YOUTH IN THE UNITED STATES

''SEC. 1114A. (a) OFFICIAL DESIGNATION.—This section relates to the National Advisory Committee on the Sex Trafficking of Children and Youth in the United States (in this section referred to as the 'Committee').

''(b) AUTHORITY.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish and appoint all members of the Committee.

''(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

''(1) COMPOSITION.—The Committee shall be composed of not more than 21 members whose diverse experience and background enable them to provide balanced points of view with regard to carrying out the duties of the Committee.

''(2) SELECTION.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Attorney General and National Governors Association, shall appoint the members to the Committee. At least 1 Committee member shall be a former sex trafficking victim. 2 Committee members shall be a Governor of a State, 1 of whom shall be a member of the Democratic Party and 1 of whom shall be a member of the Republican Party.

''(3) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT; VACANCIES.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the Committee. A vacancy in the Committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made and shall not affect the powers or duties of the Committee.

''(4) COMPENSATION.—Committee members shall serve without compensation or per diem in lieu of subsistence.

''(d) DUTIES.—

''(1) NATIONAL RESPONSE.—The Committee shall advise the Secretary and the Attorney General on practical and general policies concerning improvements to the Nation's response to the sex trafficking of children and youth in the United States.

''(2) POLICIES FOR COOPERATION.—The Committee shall advise the Secretary and the Attorney General on practical and general policies concerning the cooperation of Federal, State, local, and tribal governments, child welfare agencies, social service providers, physical health and mental health providers, victim service providers, State or local courts with responsibility for conducting or supervising proceedings relating to child welfare or social services for children and their families, Federal, State, and local police, juvenile detention centers, and runaway and homeless youth programs, schools, the gaming and entertainment industry, and businesses and organizations that provide services to youth, on responding to sex trafficking, including the development and implementation of—

''(A) successful interventions with children and youth who are exposed to conditions that make them vulnerable to, or victims of, sex trafficking; and

''(B) recommendations for administrative or legislative changes necessary to use programs, properties, or other resources owned, operated, or funded by the Federal Government to provide safe housing for children and youth who are sex trafficking victims and provide support to entities that provide housing or other assistance to the victims.

''(3) BEST PRACTICES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STATES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Within 2 years after the establishment of the Committee, the Committee shall develop 2 tiers (referred to in this subparagraph as 'Tier I' and 'Tier II') of recommended best practices for States to follow in combating the sex trafficking of children and youth. Tier I shall provide States that have not yet substantively addressed the sex trafficking of children and youth with an idea of where to begin and what steps to take. Tier II shall provide States that are already working to address the sex trafficking of children and youth with examples of policies that are already being used effectively by other States to address sex trafficking.

''(B) DEVELOPMENT.—The best practices shall be based on multidisciplinary research and promising, evidence-based models and programs as reflected in State efforts to meet the requirements of sections 101 and 102 of the Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act.

''(C) CONTENT.—The best practices shall be user-friendly, incorporate the most up-to-date technology, and include the following:

''(i) Sample training materials, protocols, and screening tools that, to the extent possible, accommodate for regional differences among the States, to prepare individuals who administer social services to identify and serve children and youth who are sex trafficking victims or at-risk of sex trafficking.

''(ii) Multidisciplinary strategies to identify victims, manage cases, and improve services for all children and youth who are at risk of sex trafficking, or are sex trafficking victims, in the United States.

''(iii) Sample protocols and recommendations based on current States' efforts, accounting for regional differences between States that provide for effective, cross-system collaboration between Federal, State, local, and tribal governments, child welfare agencies, social service providers, physical health and mental health providers, victim service providers, State or local courts with responsibility for conducting or supervising proceedings relating to child welfare or social services for children and their families, the gaming and entertainment industry, Federal, State, and local police, juvenile detention centers and runaway and homeless youth programs, housing resources that are appropriate for housing child and youth victims of trafficking, schools, and businesses and organizations that provide services to children and youth. These protocols and recommendations should include strategies to identify victims and collect, document, and share data across systems and agencies, and should be designed to help agencies better understand the type of sex trafficking involved, the scope of the problem, the needs of the population to be served, ways to address the demand for trafficked children and youth and increase prosecutions of traffickers and purchasers of children and youth, and the degree of victim interaction with multiple systems.

''(iv) Developing the criteria and guidelines necessary for establishing safe residential placements for foster children who have been sex trafficked as well as victims of trafficking identified through interaction with law enforcement.

''(v) Developing training guidelines for caregivers that serve children and youth being cared for outside the home.

''(D) INFORMING STATES OF BEST PRACTICES.—The Committee, in coordination with the National Governors Association, Secretary and Attorney General, shall ensure that State Governors and child welfare agencies are notified and informed on a quarterly basis of the best practices and recommendations for States, and notified 6 months in advance that the Committee will be evaluating the extent to which States adopt the Committee's recommendations.

''(E) REPORT ON STATE IMPLEMENTATION.—Within 3 years after the establishment of the Committee, the Committee shall submit to the Secretary and the Attorney General, as part of its final report as well as for online and publicly available publication, a description of what each State has done to implement the recommendations of the Committee.

''(e) REPORTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall submit an interim and a final report on the work of the Committee to—

''(A) the Secretary;

''(B) the Attorney General;

''(C) the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

''(D) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

''(2) REPORTING DATES.—The interim report shall be submitted not later than 3 years after the establishment of the Committee. The final report shall be submitted not later

than 4 years after the establishment of the Committee.

''(f) ADMINISTRATION.—

''(1) AGENCY SUPPORT.—The Secretary shall direct the head of the Administration for Children and Families of the Department of Health and Human Services to provide all necessary support for the Committee.

''(2) MEETINGS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Committee will meet at the call of the Secretary at least twice each year to carry out this section, and more often as otherwise required.

''(B) ACCOMMODATION FOR COMMITTEE MEMBERS UNABLE TO ATTEND IN PERSON.—The Secretary shall create a process through which Committee members who are unable to travel to a Committee meeting in person may participate remotely through the use of video conference, teleconference, online, or other means.

''(3) SUBCOMMITTEES.—The Committee may establish subcommittees or working groups, as necessary and consistent with the mission of the Committee. The subcommittees or working groups shall have no authority to make decisions on behalf of the Committee, nor shall they report directly to any official or entity listed in subsection (d).

''(4) RECORDKEEPING.—The records of the Committee and any subcommittees and working groups shall be maintained in accordance with appropriate Department of Health and Human Services policies and procedures and shall be available for public inspection and copying, subject to the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552).

''(g) TERMINATION.—The Committee shall terminate 5 years after the date of its establishment, but the Secretary shall continue to operate and update, as necessary, an Internet website displaying the State best practices, recommendations, and evaluation of State-by-State implementation of the Secretary's recommendations.

''(h) DEFINITION.—For the purpose of this section, the term 'sex trafficking' includes the definition set forth in section 103(10) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)) and 'severe form of trafficking in persons' described in section 103(9)(A) of such Act.''.

TITLE II—IMPROVING ADOPTION INCENTIVES AND EXTENDING FAMILY CONNECTION GRANTS

Subtitle A—Improving Adoption Incentive Payments

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF PROGRAM THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 2016.

Section 473A (42 U.S.C. 673b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(5), by striking ''2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''2013 through 2015''; and

(2) in each of paragraphs (1)(D) and (2) of subsection (h), by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2016''.

SEC. 202. IMPROVEMENTS TO AWARD STRUCTURE.

(a) ELIGIBILITY FOR AWARD.—Section 473A(b) (42 U.S.C. 673b(b)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraphs (3) through (5) as paragraphs (2) through (4), respectively.

(b) DATA REQUIREMENTS.—Section 473A(c)(2) (42 U.S.C. 673b(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''NUMBERS OF ADOPTIONS'' and inserting ''RATES OF ADOPTIONS AND GUARDIANSHIPS'';

(2) by striking ''the numbers'' and all that follows through ''section,'' and inserting ''each of the rates required to be determined under this section with respect to a State and a fiscal year,''; and

(3) by inserting before the period the following: '', and, with respect to the determination of the rates related to foster child guardianships, on the basis of information reported to the Secretary under paragraph (12) of subsection (g)''.

(c) AWARD AMOUNT.—Section 473A(d) (42 U.S.C. 673b(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraphs (A) through (C) and inserting the following:

''(A) $5,000, multiplied by the amount (if any) by which—

''(i) the number of foster child adoptions in the State during the fiscal year; exceeds

''(ii) the product (rounded to the nearest whole number) of—

''(I) the base rate of foster child adoptions for the State for the fiscal year; and

''(II) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year;

''(B) $7,500, multiplied by the amount (if any) by which—

''(i) the number of pre-adolescent child adoptions and pre-adolescent foster child guardianships in the State during the fiscal year; exceeds

''(ii) the product (rounded to the nearest whole number) of—

''(I) the base rate of pre-adolescent child adoptions and pre-adolescent foster child guardianships for the State for the fiscal year; and

''(II) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year who have attained 9 years of age but not 14 years of age; and

''(C) $10,000, multiplied by the amount (if any) by which—

''(i) the number of older child adoptions and older foster child guardianships in the State during the fiscal year; exceeds

''(ii) the product (rounded to the nearest whole number) of—

''(I) the base rate of older child adoptions and older foster child guardianships for the State for the fiscal year; and

''(II) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year who have attained 14 years of age; and

''(D) $4,000, multiplied by the amount (if any) by which—

''(i) the number of foster child guardianships in the State during the fiscal year; exceeds

''(ii) the product (rounded to the nearest whole number) of—

''(I) the base rate of foster child guardianships for the State for the fiscal year; and

''(II) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year.''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) INCREASED ADOPTION AND LEGAL GUARDIANSHIP INCENTIVE PAYMENT FOR TIMELY ADOPTIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If for any of fiscal years 2013 through 2015, the total amount of adoption and legal guardianship incentive payments payable under paragraph (1) of this subsection are less than the amount appropriated under subsection (h) for the fiscal year, then, from the remainder of the amount appropriated for the fiscal year that is not required for such payments (in this paragraph referred to as the 'timely adoption award pool'), the Secretary shall increase the adoption incentive payment determined under paragraph (1) for each State that the Secretary determines is a timely adoption award State for the fiscal year by the award amount determined for the fiscal year under subparagraph (C).

''(B) TIMELY ADOPTION AWARD STATE DEFINED.—A State is a timely adoption award State for a fiscal year if the Secretary determines that, for children who were in foster care under the supervision of the State at the time of adoptive placement, the average number of months from removal of children from their home to the placement of children in finalized adoptions is less than 24 months.

''(C) AWARD AMOUNT.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the award amount determined under this subparagraph with respect to a fiscal year is the amount equal to the timely adoption award pool for the fiscal year divided by the number of timely adoption award States for the fiscal year.''.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—Section 473A(g) (42 U.S.C. 673b(g)) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) through (8) and inserting the following:

''(1) FOSTER CHILD ADOPTION RATE.—The term 'foster child adoption rate' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the percentage determined by dividing—

''(A) the number of foster child adoptions finalized in the State during the fiscal year; by

''(B) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year.

''(2) BASE RATE OF FOSTER CHILD ADOPTIONS.—The term 'base rate of foster child adoptions' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the lesser of—

''(A) the foster child adoption rate for the State for the then immediately preceding fiscal year; or

''(B) the foster child adoption rate for the State for the average of the then immediately preceding 3 fiscal years.

''(3) FOSTER CHILD ADOPTION.—The term 'foster child adoption' means the final adoption of a child who, at the time of adoptive placement, was in foster care under the supervision of the State.

''(4) PRE-ADOLESCENT CHILD ADOPTION AND PRE-ADOLESCENT FOSTER CHILD GUARDIANSHIP RATE.—The term 'pre-adolescent child adoption and pre-adolescent foster child guardianship rate' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the percentage determined by dividing—

''(A) the number of pre-adolescent child adoptions and pre-adolescent foster child guardianships finalized in the State during the fiscal year; by

''(B) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year, who have attained 9 years of age but not 14 years of age.

''(5) BASE RATE OF PRE-ADOLESCENT CHILD ADOPTIONS AND PRE-ADOLESCENT FOSTER CHILD GUARDIANSHIPS.—The term 'base rate of pre-adolescent child adoptions and pre-adolescent foster child guardianships' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the lesser of—

''(A) the pre-adolescent child adoption and pre-adolescent foster child guardianship rate for the State for the then immediately preceding fiscal year; or

''(B) the pre-adolescent child adoption and pre-adolescent foster child guardianship rate for the State for the average of the then immediately preceding 3 fiscal years.

''(6) PRE-ADOLESCENT CHILD ADOPTION AND PRE-ADOLESCENT FOSTER CHILD GUARDIANSHIP.—The term 'pre-adolescent child adoption and pre-adolescent foster child guardianship' means the final adoption, or the placement into foster child guardianship (as defined in paragraph (12)) of a child who has attained 9 years of age but not 14 years of age if—

''(A) at the time of the adoptive or foster child guardianship placement, the child was in foster care under the supervision of the State; or

''(B) an adoption assistance agreement was in effect under section 473(a) with respect to the child.

''(7) OLDER CHILD ADOPTION AND OLDER FOSTER CHILD GUARDIANSHIP RATE.—The term 'older child adoption and older foster child guardianship rate' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the percentage determined by dividing—

''(A) the number of older child adoptions and older foster child guardianships finalized in the State during the fiscal year; by

''(B) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year, who have attained 14 years of age.

''(8) BASE RATE OF OLDER CHILD ADOPTIONS AND OLDER FOSTER CHILD GUARDIANSHIPS.—The term 'base rate of older child adoptions and older foster child guardianships' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the lesser of—

''(A) the older child adoption and older foster child guardianship rate for the State for the then immediately preceding fiscal year; or

''(B) the older child adoption and older foster child guardianship rate for the State for the average of the then immediately preceding 3 fiscal years.

''(9) OLDER CHILD ADOPTION AND OLDER FOSTER CHILD GUARDIANSHIP.—The term 'older child adoption and older foster child guardianship' means the final adoption, or the placement into foster child guardianship (as defined in paragraph (12)) of a child who has attained 14 years of age if—

''(A) at the time of the adoptive or foster child guardianship placement, the child was in foster care under the supervision of the State; or

''(B) an adoption assistance agreement was in effect under section 473(a) with respect to the child.

''(10) FOSTER CHILD GUARDIANSHIP RATE.—The term 'foster child guardianship rate' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the percentage determined by dividing—

''(A) the number of foster child guardianships occurring in the State during the fiscal year; by

''(B) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year.

''(11) BASE RATE OF FOSTER CHILD GUARDIANSHIPS.—The term 'base rate of foster child guardianships' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the lesser of—

''(A) the foster child guardianship rate for the State for the then immediately preceding fiscal year; or

''(B) the foster child guardianship rate for the State for the average of the then immediately preceding 3 fiscal years.

''(12) FOSTER CHILD GUARDIANSHIP.—The term 'foster child guardianship' means, with respect to a State, the exit of a child from foster care under the responsibility of the State to live with a legal guardian, if the State has reported to the Secretary—

''(A) that the State agency has determined that—

''(i) the child has been removed from his or her home pursuant to a voluntary placement agreement or as a result of a judicial determination to the effect that continuation in the home would be contrary to the welfare of the child;

''(ii) being returned home or adopted are not appropriate permanency options for the child;

''(iii) the child demonstrates a strong attachment to the prospective legal guardian, and the prospective legal guardian has a strong commitment to caring permanently for the child; and

''(iv) if the child has attained 14 years of age, the child has been consulted regarding the legal guardianship arrangement; or

''(B) the alternative procedures used by the State to determine that legal guardianship is the appropriate option for the child.''.

SEC. 203. RENAMING OF PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The section heading of section 473A (42 U.S.C. 673b) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 473A. ADOPTION AND LEGAL GUARDIANSHIP INCENTIVE PAYMENTS.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 473A is amended in each of subsections (a), (d)(1), (d)(2)(A), and (d)(2)(B) (42 U.S.C. 673b(a), (d)(1), (d)(2)(A), and (d)(2)(B)) by inserting ''and legal guardianship'' after ''adoption'' each place it appears.

(2) The heading of section 473A(d) (42 U.S.C. 673b(d)) is amended by inserting ''AND LEGAL GUARDIANSHIP'' after ''ADOPTION''.

SEC. 204. LIMITATION ON USE OF INCENTIVE PAYMENTS.

Section 473A(f) (42 U.S.C. 673b(f)) is amended in the 1st sentence by inserting '', and shall use the amount to supplement, and not supplant, any Federal or non-Federal funds used to provide any service under part B or E'' before the period.

SEC. 205. INCREASE IN PERIOD FOR WHICH INCENTIVE PAYMENTS ARE AVAILABLE FOR EXPENDITURE.

Section 473A(e) (42 U.S.C. 673b(e)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking ''24-MONTH'' and inserting ''36-MONTH''; and

(2) by striking ''24-month'' and inserting ''36-month''.

SEC. 206. STATE REPORT ON CALCULATION AND USE OF SAVINGS RESULTING FROM THE PHASE-OUT OF ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR ADOPTION ASSISTANCE; REQUIREMENT TO SPEND 30 PERCENT OF SAVINGS ON CERTAIN SERVICES.

Section 473(a)(8) (42 U.S.C. 673(a)(8)) is amended to read as follows:

''(8)(A) A State shall calculate the savings (if any) resulting from the application of paragraph (2)(A)(ii) to all applicable children for a fiscal year, using a methodology specified by the Secretary or an alternate methodology proposed by the State and approved by the Secretary.

''(B) A State shall annually report to the Secretary—

''(i) the methodology used to make the calculation described in subparagraph (A), without regard to whether any savings are found;

''(ii) the amount of any savings referred to in subparagraph (A); and

''(iii) how any such savings are spent, accounting for and reporting the spending separately from any other spending reported to the Secretary under part B or this part.

''(C) The Secretary shall make all information reported pursuant to subparagraph (B) available on the website of the Department of Health and Human Services in a location easily accessible to the public.

''(D)(i) A State shall spend an amount equal to the amount of the savings (if any) in State expenditures under this part resulting from the application of paragraph (2)(A)(ii) to all applicable children for a fiscal year, to provide to children of families any service that may be provided under part B or this part. A State shall spend not less than 30 percent of any such savings on post-adoption services, post-guardianship services, and services to support and sustain positive permanent outcomes for children who otherwise might enter into foster care under the responsibility of the State, with at least ⅔ of the spending by the State to comply with such 30 percent requirement being spent on post-adoption and post-guardianship services.

''(ii) Any State spending required under clause (i) shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, any Federal or non-Federal funds used to provide any service under part B or this part.''.

SEC. 207. PRESERVATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR KINSHIP GUARDIANSHIP ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS WITH A SUCCESSOR GUARDIAN.

Section 473(d)(3) (42 U.S.C. 673(d)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) ELIGIBILITY NOT AFFECTED BY REPLACEMENT OF GUARDIAN WITH A SUCCESSOR GUARDIAN.—In the event of the death or incapacity of the relative guardian, the eligibility of a child for a kinship guardianship assistance payment under this subsection shall not be affected by reason of the replacement of the relative guardian with a successor legal guardian named in the kinship guardianship assistance agreement referred to in paragraph (1) (including in any amendment to the agreement), notwithstanding subparagraph (A) of this paragraph and section 471(a)(28).''.

SEC. 208. DATA COLLECTION ON ADOPTION AND LEGAL GUARDIANSHIP DISRUPTION AND DISSOLUTION.

Section 479 (42 U.S.C. 679) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) To promote improved knowledge on how best to ensure strong, permanent families for children, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations providing for the collection and analysis of information regarding children who enter into foster care under the supervision of a State after prior finalization of an adoption or legal guardianship. The regulations shall require each State with a State plan approved under this part to collect and report as part of such data collection system the number of children who enter foster care under supervision of the State after finalization of an adoption or legal guardianship and may include information concerning the length of the prior adoption or guardianship, the age of the child at the time of the prior adoption or guardianship, the age at which the child subsequently entered foster care under supervision of the State, the type of agency involved in making the prior adoptive or guardianship placement, and any other factors determined necessary to better understand factors associated with the child's post-adoption or post-guardianship entry to foster care.''.

SEC. 209. ENCOURAGING THE PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE WITH SIBLINGS.

(a) STATE PLAN AMENDMENT.—

(1) NOTIFICATION OF PARENTS OF SIBLINGS.—Section 471(a)(29) (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(29)) is amended by striking ''all adult grandparents'' and inserting ''the following relatives: all adult grandparents, all parents of a sibling of the child, where such parent has legal custody of such sibling,''.

(2) SIBLING DEFINED.—Section 475 (42 U.S.C. 675), as amended by sections 101(b) and 111(a)(1) of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(12) The term 'sibling' means an individual who satisfies at least one of the following conditions with respect to a child:

''(A) The individual is considered by State law to be a sibling of the child.

''(B) The individual would have been considered a sibling of the child under State law but for a termination or other disruption of parental rights, such as the death of a parent.''.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as subordinating the rights of foster or adoptive parents of a child to the rights of the parents of a sibling of that child.

SEC. 210. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the amendments made by this subtitle shall take effect as if enacted on October 1, 2013.

(b) RESTRUCTURING AND RENAMING OF PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by sections 202 and 203 shall take effect on October 1, 2014, subject to paragraph (2).

(2) TRANSITION RULE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the total amount payable to a State under section 473A of the Social Security Act for fiscal year 2014 shall be an amount equal to ½ of the sum of—

(i) the total amount that would be payable to the State under such section for fiscal year 2014 if the amendments made by section 202 of this Act had not taken effect; and

(ii) the total amount that would be payable to the State under such section for fiscal year 2014 in the absence of this paragraph.

(B) PRO RATA ADJUSTMENT IF INSUFFICIENT FUNDS AVAILABLE.—If the total amount otherwise payable under subparagraph (A) for fiscal year 2014 exceeds the amount appropriated pursuant to section 473A(h) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673b(h)) for that fiscal year, the amount payable to each State under subparagraph (A) for fiscal year 2014 shall be—

(i) the amount that would otherwise be payable to the State under subparagraph (A) for fiscal year 2014; multiplied by

(ii) the percentage represented by the amount so appropriated for fiscal year 2014, divided by the total amount otherwise payable under subparagraph (A) to all States for that fiscal year.

(c) USE OF INCENTIVE PAYMENTS; ELIGIBILITY FOR KINSHIP GUARDIANSHIP ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS WITH A SUCCESSOR GUARDIAN; DATA COLLECTION.—The amendments made by sections 204, 207, and 208 shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) CALCULATION AND USE OF SAVINGS RESULTING FROM THE PHASE-OUT OF ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR ADOPTION ASSISTANCE.—The amendment made by section 206 shall take effect on October 1, 2014.

(e) NOTIFICATION OF PARENTS OF SIBLINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by section 209 shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act, subject to paragraph (2).

(2) DELAY PERMITTED IF STATE LEGISLATION REQUIRED.—In the case of a State plan approved under part E of title IV of the Social Security Act which the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines requires State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) in order for the plan to meet the additional requirements imposed by section 209, the State plan shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of such part solely on the basis of the failure of the plan to meet such additional requirements before the 1st day of the 1st calendar quarter beginning after the close of the 1st regular session of the State legislature that ends after the 1-year period beginning with the date of enactment of this Act. For purposes of the preceding sentence, in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session is deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

Subtitle B—Extending the Family Connection Grant Program

SEC. 221. EXTENSION OF FAMILY CONNECTION GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 427(h) (42 U.S.C. 627(h)) is amended by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2014''.

(b) ELIGIBILITY OF UNIVERSITIES FOR MATCHING GRANTS.—Section 427(a) (42 U.S.C. 627(a)) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(1) by striking ''and'' before ''private''; and

(2) by inserting ''and institutions of higher education (as defined under section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)),'' after ''arrangements,''.

(c) FINDING FAMILIES FOR FOSTER CHILDREN WHO ARE PARENTS.—Section 427(a)(1)(E) (42 U.S.C. 627(a)(1)(E)) is amended by inserting ''and other individuals who are willing and able to be foster parents for children in foster care under the responsibility of the State who are themselves parents'' after ''kinship care families''.

(d) RESERVATION OF FUNDS.—Section 427(g) (42 U.S.C. 627(g)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1); and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if enacted on October 1, 2013.

TITLE III—IMPROVING INTERNATIONAL CHILD SUPPORT RECOVERY

SEC. 301. AMENDMENTS TO ENSURE ACCESS TO CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES FOR INTERNATIONAL CHILD SUPPORT CASES.

(a) AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF HHS TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH MULTILATERAL CHILD SUPPORT CONVENTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 452 (42 U.S.C. 652) is amended—

(A) by redesignating the second subsection (l) (as added by section 7306 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005) as subsection (m); and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(n) The Secretary shall use the authorities otherwise provided by law to ensure the compliance of the United States with any multilateral child support convention to which the United States is a party.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 453(k)(3) (42 U.S.C. 653(k)(3)) is amended by striking ''452(l)'' and inserting ''452(m)''.

(b) ACCESS TO THE FEDERAL PARENT LOCATOR SERVICE.—Section 453(c) (42 U.S.C. 653(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (3);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) an entity designated as a Central Authority for child support enforcement in a foreign reciprocating country or a foreign treaty country for purposes specified in section 459A(c)(2).''.

(c) STATE OPTION TO REQUIRE INDIVIDUALS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES TO APPLY THROUGH THEIR COUNTRY'S APPROPRIATE CENTRAL AUTHORITY.—Section 454 (42 U.S.C. 654) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)(A)(ii), by inserting before the semicolon ''(except that, if the individual applying for the services resides in a foreign reciprocating country or foreign treaty country, the State may opt to require the individual to request the services through the Central Authority for child support enforcement in the foreign reciprocating country or the foreign treaty country, and if the individual resides in a foreign country that is not a foreign reciprocating country or a foreign treaty country, a State may accept or reject the application)''; and

(2) in paragraph (32)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting '', a foreign treaty country,'' after ''a foreign reciprocating country''; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''or foreign obligee'' and inserting '', foreign treaty country, or foreign individual''.

(d) AMENDMENTS TO INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS.—Section 459A (42 U.S.C. 659a) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following:

''(e) REFERENCES.—In this part:

''(1) FOREIGN RECIPROCATING COUNTRY.—The term 'foreign reciprocating country' means a foreign country (or political subdivision thereof) with respect to which the Secretary has made a declaration pursuant to subsection (a).

''(2) FOREIGN TREATY COUNTRY.—The term 'foreign treaty country' means a foreign country for which the 2007 Family Maintenance Convention is in force.

''(3) 2007 FAMILY MAINTENANCE CONVENTION.—The term '2007 Family Maintenance Convention' means the Hague Convention of 23 November 2007 on the International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance.'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''foreign countries that are the subject of a declaration under this section'' and inserting ''foreign reciprocating countries or foreign treaty countries''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''and foreign treaty countries'' after ''foreign reciprocating countries''; and

(3) in subsection (d), by striking ''the subject of a declaration pursuant to subsection (a)'' and inserting ''foreign reciprocating countries or foreign treaty countries''.

(e) COLLECTION OF PAST-DUE SUPPORT FROM FEDERAL TAX REFUNDS.—Section 464(a)(2)(A) (42 U.S.C. 664(a)(2)(A)) is amended by striking ''under section 454(4)(A)(ii)'' and inserting ''under paragraph (4)(A)(ii) or (32) of section 454''.

(f) STATE LAW REQUIREMENT CONCERNING THE UNIFORM INTERSTATE FAMILY SUPPORT ACT (UIFSA).—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 466(f) (42 U.S.C. 666(f)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''on and after January 1, 1998,'';

(B) by striking ''and as in effect on August 22, 1996,''; and

(C) by striking ''adopted as of such date'' and inserting ''adopted as of September 30, 2008''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 1738B of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (d), by striking ''individual contestant'' and inserting ''individual contestant or the parties have consented in a record or open court that the tribunal of the State may continue to exercise jurisdiction to modify its order,'';

(B) in subsection (e)(2)(A), by striking ''individual contestant'' and inserting ''individual contestant and the parties have not consented in a record or open court that the tribunal of the other State may continue to exercise jurisdiction to modify its order''; and

(C) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking '' 'child' means'' and inserting ''(1) The term 'child' means'';

(ii) by striking '' 'child's State' means'' and inserting ''(2) The term 'child's State' means'';

(iii) by striking '' 'child's home State' means'' and inserting ''(3) The term 'child's home State' means'';

(iv) by striking '' 'child support' means'' and inserting ''(4) The term 'child support' means'';

(v) by striking '' 'child support order' '' and inserting ''(5) The term 'child support order' '';

(vi) by striking '' 'contestant' means'' and inserting ''(6) The term 'contestant' means'';

(vii) by striking '' 'court' means'' and inserting ''(7) The term 'court' means'';

(viii) by striking '' 'modification' means'' and inserting ''(8) The term 'modification' means''; and

(ix) by striking '' 'State' means'' and inserting ''(9) The term 'State' means''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE; GRACE PERIOD FOR STATE LAW CHANGES.—

(A) PARAGRAPH (1).—(i) The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect with

respect to a State no later than the effective date of laws enacted by the legislature of the State implementing such paragraph, but in no event later than the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the close of the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(ii) For purposes of clause (i), in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session shall be deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

(B) PARAGRAPH (2).—(i) The amendments made by subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2) shall take effect on the date on which the Hague Convention of 23 November 2007 on the International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance enters into force for the United States.

(ii) The amendments made by subparagraph (C) of paragraph (2) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 302. CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS FOR INDIAN TRIBES.

(a) TRIBAL ACCESS TO THE FEDERAL PARENT LOCATOR SERVICE.—Section 453(c)(1) (42 U.S.C. 653(c)(1)) is amended by inserting ''or Indian tribe or tribal organization (as defined in subsections (e) and (l) of section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)),'' after ''any State''.

(b) WAIVER AUTHORITY FOR INDIAN TRIBES OR TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS.—Section 1115(b) (42 U.S.C. 1315(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (3) as subparagraphs (A) through (C), respectively, and realigning the left margin of subparagraph (C) so as to align with subparagraphs (A) and (B) (as so redesignated);

(2) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(b)''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) An Indian tribe or tribal organization operating a program under section 455(f) shall be considered a State for purposes of authority to conduct an experimental, pilot, or demonstration project under subsection (a) to assist in promoting the objectives of part D of title IV and receiving payments under the second sentence of that subsection. The Secretary may waive compliance with any requirements of section 455(f) or regulations promulgated under that section to the extent and for the period the Secretary finds necessary for an Indian tribe or tribal organization to carry out such project. Costs of the project which would not otherwise be included as expenditures of a program operating under section 455(f) and which are not included as part of the costs of projects under section 1110, shall, to the extent and for the period prescribed by the Secretary, be regarded as expenditures under a tribal plan or plans approved under such section, or for the administration of such tribal plan or plans, as may be appropriate. An Indian tribe or tribal organization applying for or receiving start-up program development funding pursuant to section 309.16 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, shall not be considered to be an Indian tribe or tribal organization operating a program under section 455(f) for purposes of this paragraph.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 453(f) (42 U.S.C. 653(f)) is amended by inserting ''and tribal'' after ''State'' each place it appears.

SEC. 303. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING OFFERING OF VOLUNTARY PARENTING TIME ARRANGEMENTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds as follows:

(1) The separation of a child from a parent does not end the financial or other responsibilities of the parent toward the child.

(2) Increased parental access and visitation not only improve parent-child relationships and outcomes for children, but also have been demonstrated to result in improved child support collections, which creates a double win for children—a more engaged parent and improved financial security.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) establishing parenting time arrangements when obtaining child support orders is an important goal which should be accompanied by strong family violence safeguards; and

(2) States should use existing funding sources to support the establishment of parenting time arrangements, including child support incentives, Access and Visitation Grants, and Healthy Marriage Promotion and Responsible Fatherhood Grants.

SEC. 304. DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDIZATION FOR IMPROVED INTEROPERABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 452 (42 U.S.C. 652), as amended by section 301(a)(1) of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(o) DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDS FOR IMPROVED INTEROPERABILITY.—

''(1) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with an interagency work group established by the Office of Management and Budget and considering State government perspectives, by rule, designate data exchange standards to govern, under this part—

''(A) necessary categories of information that State agencies operating programs under State plans approved under this part are required under applicable Federal law to electronically exchange with another State agency; and

''(B) Federal reporting and data exchange required under applicable Federal law.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The data exchange standards required by paragraph (1) shall, to the extent practicable—

''(A) incorporate a widely accepted, nonproprietary, searchable, computer-readable format, such as the eXtensible Markup Language;

''(B) contain interoperable standards developed and maintained by intergovernmental partnerships, such as the National Information Exchange Model;

''(C) incorporate interoperable standards developed and maintained by Federal entities with authority over contracting and financial assistance;

''(D) be consistent with and implement applicable accounting principles;

''(E) be implemented in a manner that is cost-effective and improves program efficiency and effectiveness; and

''(F) be capable of being continually upgraded as necessary.

''(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require a change to existing data exchange standards found to be effective and efficient.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall issue a proposed rule within 24 months after the date of the enactment of this section. The rule shall identify federally required data exchanges, include specification and timing of exchanges to be standardized, and address the factors used in determining whether and when to standardize data exchanges. It should also specify State implementation options and describe future milestones.

SEC. 305. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

(1) in conjunction with the strategic plan, review and provide recommendations for cost-effective improvements to the child support enforcement program under part D of title IV of the Social Security Act, and ensure that the plan addresses the effectiveness and performance of the program, analyzes program practices, identifies possible new collection tools and approaches, and identifies strategies for holding parents accountable for supporting their children and for building the capacity of parents to pay child support, with specific attention given to matters including front-end services, ongoing case management, collections, Tribal-State partnerships, interstate and intergovernmental interactions, program performance, data analytics, and information technology;

(2) in carrying out paragraph (1), consult with and include input from—

(A) State, tribal, and county child support directors;

(B) judges who preside over family courts or other State or local courts with responsibility for conducting or supervising proceedings relating to child support enforcement, child welfare, or social services for children and their families, and organizations that represent the judges;

(C) custodial parents and organizations that represent them;

(D) noncustodial parents and organizations that represent them; and

(E) organizations that represent fiduciary entities that are affected by child support enforcement policies; and

(3) in developing the report required by paragraph (4), solicit public comment;

(4) not later than June 30, 2015, submit to the Congress a report that sets forth policy options for improvements in child support enforcement, which report shall include the following:

(A) A review of the effectiveness of State child support enforcement programs, and the collection practices employed by State agencies administering programs under such part, and an analysis of the extent to which the practices result in unintended consequences or performance issues associated with the programs and practices.

(B) Recommendations for methods to enhance the effectiveness of child support enforcement programs and collection practices.

(C) A review of State best practices in regards to establishing and operating State and multistate lien registries.

(D) A compilation of State recovery and distribution policies.

(E) Options, with analysis, for methods to engage noncustodial parents in the lives of their children through consideration of parental time and visitation with children.

(F) An analysis of the role of alternative dispute resolution in making child support determinations.

(G) Identification of best practices for—

(i) determining which services and support programs available to custodial and noncustodial parents are non-duplicative, evidence-based, and produce quality outcomes, and connecting custodial and noncustodial parents to those services and support programs;

(ii) providing employment support, job training, and job placement for custodial and noncustodial parents; and

(iii) establishing services, supports, and child support payment tracking for noncustodial parents, including options for the prevention of, and intervention on, uncollectible arrearages, such as retroactive obligations.

(H) Options, with analysis, for methods for States to use to collect child support payments from individuals who owe excessive arrearages as determined under section 454(31) of such Act.

(I) A review of State practices under 454(31) of such Act used to determine which individuals are excluded from the requirements of

section 452(k) of such Act, including the extent to which individuals are able to successfully contest or appeal decisions.

(J) Options, with analysis, for actions as are determined to be appropriate for improvement in child support enforcement.

SEC. 306. REQUIRED ELECTRONIC PROCESSING OF INCOME WITHHOLDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 454A(g)(1) (42 U.S.C. 654a(g)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking '', to the maximum extent feasible,''; and

(2) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (i);

(B) by adding ''and'' at the end of clause (ii); and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) at the option of the employer, using the electronic transmission methods prescribed by the Secretary;''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 2015.

TITLE IV—BUDGETARY EFFECTS

SEC. 401. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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.

I rise in support of this legislation, which is designed to prevent sex trafficking of youth in foster care, encourage the adoption of more children from foster care, and increase child support collected to support children, among other important purposes.

I will focus my comments on the important adoption provisions in the legislation and then recognize subcommittee Chairman REICHERT to discuss the provisions designed to prevent sex trafficking.

I have spent much of my professional career promoting adoption of children by loving parents. As an attorney in private practice, I worked with parents and children in the foster care system. Those sorts of experiences provided much of the background for changes in landmark adoption legislation Congress has approved in recent years.

In 1997, my colleagues and I on the Ways and Means Committee crafted the Adoption and Safe Families Act. That legislation streamlined the adoption process to help more children in foster care quickly move into permanent adoptive homes. It also, for the first time, offered incentives to States to safely increase the number of children from foster care. It worked.

In the decade following that legislation, the number of U.S. children adopted from foster care increased by 71 percent. In the years since, adoptions have continued to remain higher, even as the foster care caseload started to decline.

Overall, almost 300,000 children have been adopted as a result of the increase in adoptions starting in 1997. While placing children in permanent loving homes is the most important benefit of the legislation, one study estimated the Federal Government saved $1 billion over 8 years by ensuring people were adopted, instead of remaining in foster care.

That is the successful incentive program this legislation extends and updates. With this bill today, we add a new award for States that increase adoptions of older children, who are the hardest to adopt and have the worst outcomes if they ''age out'' of foster care without a family to call their own.

We also add a new award for increases in guardianship when family members step up to care for their nieces and nephews, grandsons and granddaughters. This bill ensures that States maintain their commitment to post-adoption and related services, so children truly have a forever family.

Finding a forever family is the goal of this legislation, and forever homes are possible. Just last year, I met with the Johns family of Midland, Michigan. The Johns family has adopted three children and was honored during their visit to Washington as an Angels in Adoption family, but before they adopted, they were foster parents to Austin and Katie, their first two children.

They adopted them and later adopted their third child, Aliyah. The Johns family made a safe, permanent, and loving home a reality for three children, and with this legislation, we can continue to build on that success.

I note that this legislation is fully paid for by expecting all States to use electronic methods that will do a better job collecting child support, increasing family incomes, and reducing the amount of welfare benefits taxpayers pay.

Those savings not only cover the cost of this legislation, but reduce the deficit by $19 million over the next 10 years. That is a win-win for children, families, and hardworking taxpayers alike.

This legislation reflects bipartisan, bicameral agreements on all these policy areas, and I thank my colleagues who joined me in introducing this legislation: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. REICHERT of Washington, and Mr. DOGGETT of Texas, as well as the chairman and ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, Senators WYDEN and HATCH.

They are all leaders on these issues, and I value their help in developing and advancing this legislation.

□ 1830

This bill was crafted the way legislation is supposed to be: through hearings, markups, public comments, and negotiations with our colleagues in the Senate. The bill we are considering today incorporates many suggestions from experts in the child welfare field, as well as just interested citizens and adoptive parents. We are grateful for the public's comments and their participation in this process.

The bottom line is this: children in foster care deserve a place to call home not just for a few months or years, but for good. We have already seen great progress in increasing adoptions since the Adoption Incentives program was created in 1997, and it is our hope that we can continue this progress once this bill is signed into law.

I encourage all of my colleagues to join us in supporting this bill in the House, and I hope and expect the Senate to also act soon on this bill so we can continue to move more foster children into permanent, loving homes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control the time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have a special responsibility to protect vulnerable children. This is bipartisan legislation that takes some important, though modest, steps toward meeting that responsibility by addressing three issues: combating the exploitation of at-risk children, promoting permanent homes for foster children, and strengthening international enforcement of child support obligations.

With a bipartisan, bicameral agreement between the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and the ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, this legislation combines modified versions of three bills that we previously passed here in the House earlier in the session. This measure has been endorsed by a number of important child advocacy groups, including the Children's Defense Fund, the Child Welfare League of America, and Voice for Adoptions.

I was pleased to work with Chairman CAMP, Ranking Member LEVIN, and certainly Human Resources Subcommittee Chairman REICHERT, as well as our colleagues in the Senate, as we came together with bipartisan agreement on this legislation.

There are still provisions in the bill that I think could use improvement,

including the fact that an important program that helps link children in foster care to relatives, called Family Connection Grants, is extended only for a single year; but I think that even with some of its limitations, this legislation does make a positive difference in the lives of many children, particularly those who are vulnerable to sex trafficking.

When children come into foster care, they already have issues. They have suffered abuse or neglect. They have been exploited. They have suffered. They have a sense of isolation, and they often feel that they have been removed from one home and put out in a place with which they are not familiar. They are especially at prey for sex traffickers and are targets in that condition.

This bipartisan legislation attempts to combat trafficking in the foster care system by screening at-risk children and providing services, when necessary; by reporting the incidence of trafficking so we will have a clear indication of that among foster children; and by expediting the location of children who run away from foster care.

Additionally, this bill attempts to help children live more normal lives while in foster care by allowing them to more fully participate in the activities that most children enjoy, such as playing sports and an occasional sleepover at a friend's house.

This legislation also extends and adopts changes in the Adoption Incentives program to encourage States to find permanent homes for children in foster care, which is certainly the best approach. The bill increases the program's focus on promoting the adoption of older children in foster care.

It also, for the first time, provides an incentive for States to increase the number of children leaving foster care to live with a legal guardian. It includes a provision that I authored ensuring children won't lose their eligibility for Federal guardianship assistance if the guardian dies or becomes incapacitated.

Finally, the legislation would take necessary steps to implement a very important international treaty on enforcing child support obligations abroad so that leaving this country doesn't allow individuals to leave behind their responsibility for the children that they parented that are here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we still have much to do to ensure that the well-being of vulnerable children is receiving the attention that it deserves, but I think this is a good start with this bill. I urge its passage and swift action by the Senate in accord with our agreement to see that it gets to the President's desk soon for signature.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the majority leader.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington.

I rise today in strong support of the Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act and the other antitrafficking bills we have on the floor today in furtherance of our efforts to bring an end to this abhorrent crime.

Mr. Speaker, human trafficking continues to be one of the world's great dangers, threatening millions of innocent lives, including right here at home in the United States. Our very own Department of Homeland Security describes human trafficking as ''a modern-day form of slavery involving the illegal trade of people for exploitation or commercial gain.''

The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children estimates that between 100,000 and 300,000 children in America may be trafficked for commercial sex every year. These children represent the most vulnerable among us, and it is our responsibility to act now and do what we can to stop these heinous crimes. Ending human trafficking is a goal that both parties share, and today we can take one step closer to achieving that goal.

Some of the most vulnerable to this crime are America's foster children, as the gentleman from Texas just discussed. All too frequently, they fall through the cracks and become victims in these criminal schemes. The legislation before us today takes this problem head-on, encouraging States to tackle the issue of trafficking foster children and to ensure their placement into loving adoptive homes.

This is a great opportunity for us in the House to stand together to show the people that sent us here and the rest of this country and the world that our House is united to bringing an end to human trafficking.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Washington, Chairman REICHERT, Ranking Members LEVIN and DOGGETT, and the rest of the members of the Ways and Means Committee for their hard work on this issue, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take a minute to thank the gentleman from Michigan, Chairman DAVE CAMP, one of our great leaders in Congress, who has not only led on this issue, but has been a tireless champion for families and children throughout his career.

Over the years, Chairman CAMP has advocated and succeeded in bringing much-needed reforms to our foster care system. The Adoption and Safe Families Act, which Chairman CAMP introduced in the House and President Clinton then signed, streamlined the adoption process, making it easier for kids to move out of foster care and into more permanent homes. In 2003, President Bush signed then-Congressman, now-Chairman, CAMP'S Adoption Promotion Act, which provides financial incentives for States that increase adoption among older children. These are just a few of Chairman CAMP's many great accomplishments, and today's bill is just another example of his heartfelt dedication to putting America's kids first.

Few have had the impact on creating a better future for our children than DAVE CAMP. Because of Chairman CAMP, children all over America have the opportunity to live in safe homes and to pursue their dreams. I have been very proud to call him my colleague and honored to call him a dear friend.

Though I know we have still got several months before the end of this Congress, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate DAVE CAMP on a terrific and wonderful career. I want to thank the gentleman for his service and wish him the very best in his retirement. The Congress will certainly miss the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS), who cochairs the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth. I don't know another Member of this Congress who has expressed more concern in going all over the country to work and seek improvements in the lives of our foster children.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4980, the Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act.

First, I would like to commend Chairmen CAMP and REICHERT and Ranking Members LEVIN and DOGGETT for their work on this important legislation and for their ongoing commitment to our Nation's foster youth.

As cochair of the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth, I have had the opportunity to hear stories from youth across the country during our listening tour. Many of the young people I have heard from share similar stories—from Washington State to Missouri—that they just want to be a part of loving families and have the ability to participate in sports, hang out with their friends, and have the same experiences as their peers. I strongly believe this legislation will help bring a greater sense of stability to foster youth and give kids a chance to be just like their friends.

Since 1997, when the adoption incentives legislation became law, we have seen a significant reduction in the number of kids in foster care. By improving adoption incentives, we help children find their forever families. This is why it is so critical to highlight this legislation's investment in legal guardianship and relative caregivers.

More than half of the youth in the child welfare system are placed with a relative caregiver: a grandmother, an aunt, uncle, or older sibling. Guardianship is often the preferred type of family permanence for relative caregivers.

In addition, parts of H.R. 4980 include the funding for Family Connection Grants, which provide critical resources to ensure children find permanent homes, oftentimes with relatives.

In my Los Angeles district, relative caregivers are the largest group of foster care providers. Research shows that

foster placement with relatives are good for children. They allow children to stay in their schools, receive continued support from their community and culture, and feel connected to families that continue to love them.

Despite the importance of relative caregivers, they face unique obstacles. Becoming a caregiver changes lives in every way: physically, emotionally, and financially. Stable middle class families or seniors who live on their life savings are often pushed to the brink of poverty because they have accepted the unexpected financial burden of caring for a child.

I am greatly encouraged by the critical work this legislation before us encourages—children having forever families through both adoption and guardianship throughout the country—and hope to continue this work with my colleagues in the House.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to also add my compliments to Chairman CAMP.

Not to be repetitive, I think it is important to mention some of the fine work that Chairman CAMP has done in his time here in Congress, which has inspired all of us, I think, to move the legislation that we are discussing today. He has left an indelible stamp on our Nation's child welfare policy during the years he has served in Congress, and especially throughout his service on the Ways and Means Committee. He has a whole list of bills and initiatives and amendments that he has been associated with to champion this cause, but I think, suffice it to say, Mr. CAMP has probably done more than most in the last 20 years of his service here for the people of America to help children, and especially focused on foster care and adoption.

Again, I want to join in praising and thanking the chairman for his service and dedication to the children of this country and families in general.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge support of H.R. 4980, the Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act.

□ 1845

This bill, as the chairman said, reflects bipartisan agreement and bicameral agreement. So, after we pass this bill tonight, it goes back to the Senate, and this will go to the President's desk, I am sure, and be signed within, I hope, the next month or so.

This bill is designed to prevent sex trafficking involving youth in foster care. It is designed to strengthen families by increasing adoptions from foster care, and it is designed to improve child support collections.

This issue is a very personal issue for me. I have listened to the speeches tonight, and I appreciate the enthusiasm and the dedication and the focus that Members of Congress have put on this issue over the last year especially. This is our second week this month, I think, that we have focused on human trafficking in foster care.

Mr. Speaker, some people know that my previous career was in law enforcement. I spent 33 years in the sheriff's office. Many of those years were spent investigating a case that has been entitled the Green River murder case. We finally arrested that person. He says that he killed somewhere between 60 and 70 young girls in Seattle—60 to 70 children's lives taken. I collected a lot of those bodies, Mr. Speaker. I remember them, where they lay, 15-year-old girls.

We are not talking about a bill today, ladies and gentlemen and Mr. Speaker. We are not talking about a bill—legislation—that is just a piece of fluff, that is just a piece of legislation, that is just words. We are talking about the lives of children and the monsters who are out there—and they have been discussed tonight—who are ready to prey on them, who are ready to take their lives, even if it is just to take a piece of their lives away from them for a moment, or maybe 20 times a night they take a piece of their lives. They survive physically, but mentally and emotionally, their lives have been ripped apart and so have the families'.

If you were to just drive down this street and see 10 young ladies standing on a street corner, Mr. Speaker, who were involved in human trafficking, six out of those 10 would be foster kids. These are kids we have responsibility for, whom we as a nation have the responsibility for—all of us in each one of our States who take care of foster children. We place them in foster homes, and they run away, and we don't find them, and we don't search for them, and they go on the streets, and they get scooped up by somebody who says: I love you. Stay with me. I will buy you clothes. I will buy you jewelry. I will put you on the street, too, and that is how you are going to make the money to buy those things—and guess what. You are going to provide me with some of those things, too.

It just makes me sick. It should make every American sick to his stomach. We need to stop this.

I have seen it with my own eyes for 19 years in having been involved in this case, trying to bring this monster, who not only took away their souls, but who also eventually ended up taking away their lives. He ripped those lives out of the families' hands—gone. My 15-year-old daughter—gone. Can you imagine?

That is why we need to help folks. This is such an important piece of legislation. One of the young ladies who was one of the first victims in this case was Wendy Coffield. She was a foster kid. She ran away from her foster home, and she ended up on the street, but nobody looked for Wendy Coffield until we found her one day, floating in the river just south of Seattle—dead.

One of the things that I wanted to do as the chair of the Human Resources Subcommittee was to help educate this country and other Members about this issue. We held hearings, and we had experts from DSHS and the State of Washington and human resources all across the country who were directors of DSHS, and we had social workers. They all provided great information.

But do you know? One of the most powerful witnesses and speakers we had was a young lady named Miss Ortiz Walker Pettigrew. She goes by the name of ''T.'' She was recently named by Time magazine as one of the 100 most influential people in the world. She is a young lady who spent the first 18 years of her life in foster care, and 7 of those years were in human trafficking. She is now one of the most 100 most influential people in the world. She was trafficked on the streets. She was trafficked on the Internet. She was trafficked on the back pages of newspapers. Now she is speaking out, and she is the one—and people like her are the ones—who provides us with that information.

I think that we can all agree that our Nation's children deserve better, because her statement was and her comment was: I felt like I was part of a family. I identified with my pimp and with the other young ladies who were out working the street. That was my family—versus having a family that could hold them and love them.

This bill requires States to identify victims of sex trafficking and provide them with the services they need to heal. It will also improve data on instances of child sex trafficking so better policies can be developed to prevent it.

Also, on the prevention front, this bill makes sure that kids can be kids, that foster kids can participate in after-school events, which would, I think, make them less vulnerable, anyway, to getting involved in street activity and getting sucked into the life of human trafficking. It encourages States to move children out of the foster care system and into loving families more quickly.

The approach we are taking is practical. It is bipartisan. It is based on experiences from States around the country. It is evidence-based, and it is also real life experience-based. This bill incorporates a wide range of ideas gleaned from bills introduced by members of the Ways and Means Committee—like from Mr. PAULSEN, who will speak soon—and by other Members of the House and from over 150 pages of public comments received on our December 2013 discussion draft.

I want to thank the subcommittee's ranking member, Mr. DOGGETT, who joins me on the floor today, as well as to thank the chairman, Mr. CAMP, and the ranking member, Mr. LEVIN, for their support of this legislation and for their help throughout its development.

I also want to thank the many outside groups that offered their feedback and their support. As of today, we have received support for this bill from 48 child welfare groups, which is an indication of the high importance of this legislation. I can't think of a more important or a more bipartisan topic than

protecting vulnerable children in foster care and working to find loving homes for each of them.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to join in the accolades for our chairman, DAVE CAMP of Michigan, and to particularly recognize the key role he played in helping to create our child abuse commission, which is currently holding hearings. They had the first one down in San Antonio, in my district. They will be going to Michigan, and they have been in Florida. I think they are collecting data that will provide us another opportunity to act, to deal with some of the same issues that we are concerned with today. I appreciate the leadership that he has shown and, certainly, that Mr. REICHERT has shown.

I am pleased that among those groups that we have heard from is the American Academy of Pediatrics, which plays such a leading role. They say that this legislation is an essential step in improving the health and well-being of foster youths and in expanding their access to appropriate permanency options. The Children's Defense Fund was important in this legislation. It emphasized the importance of permanent placements for children as they leave care and of empowering our older youth. I believe that this bipartisan legislation is a good step forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN).

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker and Members, while there are many issues that divide Washington, this is absolutely an area where there is agreement and bipartisan and bicameral work being done. We already passed five separate antitrafficking bills just a few months ago, in May, and I am very pleased we are taking additional action on these pieces of legislation tonight.

More than 100,000 children are at risk of being trafficked for commercial sex in the United States. Those most at risk of victimization are the vulnerable, including children from our foster care system. Many of these children face barriers to a real childhood, and they are unable to participate in school activities, to play after-school sports, or to even spend time with friends. Youths that have been involved in the foster care system are much more likely to become runaways or homeless at an early age. The preventative measures in this legislation will make a difference.

On any given night, 2,500 youths in Minnesota—my home State—will experience homelessness, and a majority of those homeless youths is solicited for sex within 48 hours of becoming homeless. In fact, law enforcement will say—and tells me—that the overwhelming majority of trafficking victims is part of that homeless population and that 60 percent of those victims were in foster care or group homes when they ran away.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that trafficking is a very complex problem that requires many different solutions. It is going after the demand by punishing the johns. It is shutting off access to trafficking victims through Web sites like backpage.com. It is increasing international cooperation and passing safe harbor laws that ensure children are treated as victims of these heinous crimes and not as criminals.

Most importantly, as we have in this legislation, we need to prevent children from becoming potential victims in the first place. This bill takes important steps to improve the sharing of information as to what is happening, where and to whom. By identifying trends and filling in the gaps, we can help these children in foster care before they become victims in the first place.

I really want to thank not only Chairman CAMP, Ranking Member LEVIN and Ranking Member DOGGETT, but I want to thank Subcommittee Chairman REICHERT for his passion, his advocacy, and his hard work on this legislation. We brought this together in a bipartisan manner.

I also want to thank them in particular for including provisions from the legislation, which I authored with Congresswoman SLAUGHTER, that address the lack of reliable data and reporting to law enforcement as it relates to runaway youth from the child welfare system. I look forward to its passage and to the passage of all of these bipartisan bills this evening because, together, we can end trafficking.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, would you report on the time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 12½ minutes remaining.

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

I am so pleased tonight to hear one colleague after another indicate that they are ready to act in a bipartisan way on this issue and that it should be a bipartisan commitment to addressing the vulnerability of our children. I think that needs to apply to all children. This legislation that we are considering at the moment is one of seven bills that we are going to approve here in the House today that deal with trafficking because trafficking remains a serious problem here and around the world.

Several of the bills that we are considering recognize that there is an international dimension to this problem. Therefore, I would particularly urge my Republican colleagues and all of our colleagues tonight to remember next week the statements that are being made this evening and to be as concerned about the vulnerability and the exposure to the trafficking of those children who have recently sought refuge in our country as we are about foster children or any other children in our country.

While the sex trafficking prevention in this bill addresses, specifically, problems within the foster care system, the scourge of youth sex trafficking extends far beyond this population. As we are all well aware, we have had a recent influx of children come across our southern border, many of whom have been abused at home, abused along the 1,000-plus-mile track, and could be subject to abuse or to being involved again in sex trafficking.

□ 1900

Polaris, a group that works to help end modern-day slavery, notes that undocumented immigrants are ''highly vulnerable'' to sex trafficking due to their ''lack of legal status and protections, language barriers, limited employment options, immigration-related debts, and social isolation.'' Most of these vulnerabilities are amplified when the immigrants are children. We have an obligation in this Congress to take their unique situation into account and provide them with the protection and the care that they deserve.

The steady drumbeat to remove the very protections that help vulnerable children from becoming sex slaves or remaining in slavery is wrong, and that is why 37 Latino organizations, including MALDEF, the National Council of La Raza, and the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, among them, all have urged this Congress to assure due process for these kids rather than stripping away rights that this Congress provided in current United States law.

A diverse group of faith leaders, including the Southern Baptist Convention, the Sojourners, and the National Association of Evangelicals have joined with these Latino groups in calling to assure that these children are not denied their due process rights, and that they do not have rights guaranteed by American law today taken away next week.

Over 50 child development experts from around the country, many of the same people that supported our effort in today's legislation, wrote this Congress yesterday and urged that we change course before we put thousands of traumatized children into danger. They describe an expedited screening process that would leave children in danger. It is the expedited screening process that applies today to Mexican children, and it is flawed.

Children who fear trafficking, or were previously trafficked, can be returned to Mexico to reenter that trafficking trade and come back again. We shouldn't subject the Central American children to the same process, yet, that is what has been recommended today.

I am concerned about what happens to children along the Green River,

about what happens along the Potomac River, about what happens along the Colorado River, but I am also concerned about what is happening to the many who have just crossed the Rio Grande River.

When children are asked about whether they have been trafficked by a police officer, who may not speak their native language, in a rushed interview in what may be a chaotic situation in a detention center that is much like a police station, where someone who just abused them or who may actually have been involved in the trafficking and smuggling process is nearby and can perhaps overhear these tales, they will be reluctant to articulate the sexual trauma, the very private trauma to which they have been subjected.

These children who have been traumatized, in some cases, multiple times, who may well have left their native country because of abuse, deserve to be interviewed and evaluated in an environment that takes into consideration their youth, their vulnerability, all of the factors that we have been talking about on this piece of legislation, and the other six pieces of legislation that the House is about to approve.

These children deserve the same type of protections, not an intimidating environment that is made all the more unfamiliar to them by virtue of the fact that they are in a land that they have never been to before.

This special treatment does not occur and happen if you have an expedited screening process. That is why we unanimously passed the guarantees that are in the 2008 law. If we want to protect these children, we should abandon a plan to throw out these children by the wayside by abandoning those protections.

I believe that we shouldn't let our desire, the fears of some, perhaps the hate of others, to result in the quick deportation of children and return them to a live of sex slavery. They are vulnerable children. We don't assure them amnesty. Certainly, we cannot accept every child that wants to enter this country.

I am not in favor of amnesty, but I do think we need a little humanity, a little human decency, and that those children deserve the same respect and due process as any child that we are talking about tonight.

So I am pleased that we are making progress on this piece of legislation and another six bills. I think they are an important step forward in dealing with a serious international problem. But it is critical that this interest in bipartisan concern for the vulnerability of children extend to those children who are now in my home State, and about whom we will be talking in the few days that remain in this Congress, and that we apply the same kind of standard then as we are applying tonight.

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

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I will insert in the RECORD a list of the organizations in support of this legislation.

ORGANIZATIONS IN SUPPORT OF THE PREVENTING SEX TRAFFICKING AND STRENGTHENING FAMILIES ACT (H.R. 4980)

1. American Academy of Pediatrics (letter)
2. American Psychological Association (letter)
3. Association on American Indian Affairs (email)
4. Central Council Tlingit & Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska (letter)
5. Cherokee Nation (letter)
6. Children Awaiting Parents (Senate)
7. Children's Defense Fund (letter)
8. Dave Thomas Foundation for Adoption (letter)
9. Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians (letter)
10. Eastern Shashone Tribe (letter)
11. First Focus Campaign for Children (letter)
12. Fort Belknap Child Support Program (letter)
13. Foster Club (letter)
14. Foster Family-Based Treatment Association (letter)
15. Generations United (letter)
16. Holt International (letter)
17. Keweenaw Bay Indian Community (letter)
18. Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa
19. Love 146 (letter)
20. Menominee Tribal Child Support Agency (letter)
21. Mescalero Apache Tribe (letter)
22. Meskwaki Nation Child Support Services (letter)
23. National Adoption Center (letter)
24. National Child Support Enforcement Association (letter with concerns)
25. National Children's Alliance (letter)
26. National Foster Parent Association (letter)
27. National Indian Child Welfare Association (email)
28. Nebraska Families Collaborative (letter)
29. Nez Perce Tribe (letter)
30. North American Council on Adoptable Children (letter)
31. NYS Citizens' Coalition for Children (letter)
32. Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin (letter)
33. Oregon Post Adoption Resource Center (letter)
34. Penobscot Nation Child Support Agency (letter)
35. Red Cliff Tribal Child Support Services Agency (letter)
36. Rights4Girls (letter)
37. Stockbridge-Munsee Community (letter)
38. Suquamish Tribe (letter)
39. The Adoption Exchange (email)
40. The Attachment and Trauma Network (Senate)
41. The California Alliance of Child and Family Services (Senate)
42. The Child Welfare League of America (letter)
43. The Donaldson Adoption Institute (letter)
44. The National Crittenton Foundation (email)
45. Tribal Child Support Enforcement, Modoc Tribe of Oklahoma (letter)
46. Voice for Adoption (letter)
47. You Gotta Believe (letter)
48. Yurok Tribe (letter).

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, this legislation, as I said earlier, represents bipartisan, bicameral progress in protecting our Nation's most vulnerable children.

So, in plain language, the House of Representatives cooperated together and developed a bill. The Senate cooperated together, Senators HATCH and WYDEN worked together to develop a bill on the Senate side. They agreed and passed a bill, we agreed and passed a bill.

This bill that we are talking about today is one of those rare moments in history where not only did Democrats and Republicans agree, but the Senate and the House agreed this was a good bill, and here it is today.

After we pass this bill tonight, it will move to the Senate, and we already know we have agreement there. It will be passed in the Senate, hopefully, some time early next week, and move on to the President's desk for signing.

We are focused tonight on this bill, with foster kids, because this is the jurisdiction that I have, as the chairman of the Human Resources Subcommittee, and that Mr. DOGGETT, as the ranking member, has too. We are focused on foster kids and human trafficking, and helping them find loving homes so they can have a productive life, so they can have hope, hope for the future.

We need to pass this bill tonight.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4980.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING PREVENTION, INTERVENTION, AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2014

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5135) to direct the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to identify strategies to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking and review trafficking prevention efforts, to protect and assist in the recovery of victims of trafficking, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5135

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 ''Human Trafficking Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE REPORT ON CHILD TRAFFICKING PRIMARY PREVENTION.

(a) REVIEW.—The Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking, established under section 105 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103), shall conduct a review that, with regard to trafficking in persons in the United States—

(1) in consultation with nongovernmental organizations that the Task Force determines appropriate, surveys and catalogues

the activities of the Federal Government and State governments to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses and to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking;

(2) surveys academic literature on deterring individuals from committing trafficking offenses, preventing children from becoming victims of trafficking, the commercial sexual exploitation of children, and other similar topics that the Task Force determines appropriate;

(3) identifies best practices and effective strategies to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses and to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking; and

(4) identifies current gaps in research and data that would be helpful in formulating effective strategies to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses and to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking shall provide to Congress, and make publicly available in electronic format, a report on the review conducted pursuant to subparagraph (a).

SEC. 3. GAO REPORT ON INTERVENTION.

On the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report, which shall include—

(1) information on the efforts of Federal and select State law enforcement agencies to combat human trafficking in the United States; and

(2) information on each Federal grant program, a purpose of which is to combat human trafficking or assist victims of trafficking, as specified in an authorizing statute or in a guidance document issued by the agency carrying out the grant program.

SEC. 4. PROVISION OF HOUSING PERMITTED TO PROTECT AND ASSIST IN THE RECOVERY OF VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING.

Section 107(b)(2)(A) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(2)(A)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', including programs that provide housing to victims of trafficking''.

SEC. 5. VICTIM OF TRAFFICKING DEFINED.

In this Act, the term and ''victim of trafficking'' has the meaning given such term in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 5135, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today to speak in favor of H.R. 5135, the Human Trafficking Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Act of 2014, introduced by Representative KRISTI NOEM.

The crisis of human trafficking is ruinous to the lives of its victims, many of whom are drawn from the ranks of the most vulnerable in our society. This crisis has touched nearly every corner of the globe, and even exists here in the United States.

The Justice Department, and its many State and local partners, have made great strides to rescue children and other victims from the terrible crime of sex trafficking. Last month, the FBI announced a successful nationwide sting that led to the rescue of 168 children and the arrest of 281 pimps in more than 100 cities.

Also last month, the Justice Department seized a major Web site known for promoting illegal sex trafficking and indicted its owner. Both of these cases, and the many other trafficking cases that have been brought in recent years, show that law enforcement is making progress in the fight against child exploitation. But sadly, there remains more work to be done.

Studies suggest that over 290,000 youth are at risk of commercial sexual exploitation in the United States. To effectively combat human trafficking, we must cut it off at its root by trying to prevent the trafficking before it can occur.

H.R. 5135 requires the existing Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to survey and catalog the methods being employed by our Federal and State governments to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses and children from being victimized.

The bill also directs the task force to identify best practices and what gaps might exist, if any, in research and data so that we can place new and valuable tools in the hands of law enforcement.

One challenge that victims of sex trafficking often face is a lack of financial independence that keeps them trapped in a life of prostitution. H.R. 5135 helps to address that by clarifying that existing Federal trafficking grants may be used for programs that provide housing for victims of sex trafficking.

As I have said before, sex traffickers, and the buyers who enable them to stay in business, dehumanize their victims, treating them as objects to be used for the profit and pleasure of others, instead of human beings creating in the image of God.

In May of this year, the House passed a number of antitrafficking bills that originated in the House Judiciary Committee, which are all awaiting consideration by the Senate. I encourage my colleagues on the other side of the Capitol Hill to move swiftly to pass those bills.

I am pleased that we can consider another set of bipartisan antitrafficking bills here today. It is important that we do everything that we can to bring an end to this illicit industry. H.R. 5135 will help us to do just that. I hope that this body will join with me and Congresswoman NOEM in supporting this legislation.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5135, the Human Trafficking Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Act of 2014. This bill is vital to identifying best practices and effective strategies to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses and to prevent children from becoming victims, and it, therefore, enjoys bipartisan support in the House.

This bill will encourage Federal, State, and local governments to work together as an Interagency Task Force to investigate and enforce the existing laws. This task force will emphasize prosecution of the purchasers of sex with children as child rapists. These purchasers are usually referred to as ''johns'' who pay for sex with children, but insofar as children cannot consent to sex, the johns are legally committing rape and should be prosecuted as rapists.

The bill encourages law enforcement coordination with intergovernment organizations and academics who will put into practice what research and data demonstrate will work to prevent these crimes.

The GAO will submit a report on how the Federal grant programs' funds have been used to combat human trafficking or to assist victims of trafficking. An Interagency Task Force will submit a report to Congress on its findings.

The bill will also provide housing to protect and assist children in recovering victims of trafficking. To date, the number of victims, especially child victims, greatly exceeds the number of available shelter beds.

Without a safe place to stay, many rescued victims will end up running away and returning to their abusers due to the unique trauma bond that occurs in these cases.

□ 1915

Along those lines, we must do more to rescue child victims and expand the services they need. Our country has a moral imperative to protect and help these children who are vulnerable, warrant special protection, and need these services, even in the best of circumstances.

This vulnerability is compounded amongst children who have been victims of sexual exploitation, physical violence, trauma, and extreme poverty. With our protection, support, and assistance, we can help them survive.

I commend my colleague from Virginia, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, for working to bring the bill to the floor, and I commend our colleague from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM) for introducing the legislation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in prosecuting those who rape children, protecting and rescuing child victims, and providing the victims with the support that they need.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM), the chief sponsor of the legislation.

Mrs. NOEM. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, over the past several years, my eyes have really been opened to the disturbing type of slavery that we have seen across the world and here at home.

I have heard about human trafficking before and young children being sold for sex overseas, but I guess I didn't really realize how much it was happening here in the United States and even in my home State of South Dakota. The more I learned about human trafficking and the risk that it posed to our kids, the more I became convicted that I needed to do something about it.

The average age of a child that is trafficked is just 11 to 14 years old. Many times, the trafficker will lure these children in, pretending to be their friend or their boyfriend, control them through the use of drugs or alcohol, and give them the comfort and stability that they may be lacking at home. After they have them isolated and dependent, they sell them for sex.

It is heartbreaking for me as a mom, as an aunt of many nieces and nephews, as a 4–H leader, and as a person who works with our youth every single day to think about the innocent children that are being forced into this disgusting industry and becoming slaves to these predators.

Every year, hundreds of thousands of children are at risk to being trafficked here in the United States, so this isn't a problem that is far away. It is a problem that is right here in our backyards.

Back in South Dakota, I held a lot of roundtables and a Justice Against Slavery Summit. I heard from local shelters, from law enforcement officers, tribal leaders, from victims and advocate groups and learned from their expertise.

I learned a lot about what was being done to stop human trafficking and what additional tools they needed from Congress and what we should pursue. While we talked about the problem, I wanted them to focus on what they needed for solutions. With the insight of all these community leaders, we identified ways we could rout out the disgusting industry and help victims recover.

That is why I am so proud to be here today to introduce H.R. 5135, the Human Trafficking Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Act. This bipartisan bill was based on those conversations that I had during those roundtables and the summit that I held in South Dakota on how best to prevent and combat human trafficking. The best way to stop human trafficking in its tracks is to prevent it.

My bill launches a task force review to look into Federal and State trafficking-prevention activities. The review will be in done in consultation with nongovernmental organizations, like those I heard from in South Dakota, and will work to identify and develop best practices to prevent trafficking.

Next, it requires an inventory to be done of existing antitrafficking efforts by the Federal Government. It is important to take a hard look at all of these programs across the Federal Government to ensure that Federal resources are targeted and that they are used where they are needed.

We can also identify any gaps in Federal programs that need to be filled, and finally, my bill improves existing Department of Justice grants and allows them to be used for shelters for survivors.

Did you know, nationwide, there is only about 200 beds available for underage victims of sex trafficking? Many of these kids, once they are rescued from their trafficker, have nowhere safe to go. They don't have any other option, and so often, what they are forced to do is to return to their trafficker.

Many who are in the foster care system don't have the family support that is necessary to be safe and to recover. Sadly, without a place to recover from the trauma that has happened in their lives, kids return back to those traffickers, and that is why it is important that we use Federal resources wisely to promote more facilities to help these recovering children.

I am proud to be standing here with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to take action on this bill today and the other bills that were brought to deal with sex trafficking. It is an issue that we can and we should all stand together on. Together, these bills will do more to prevent trafficking, give law enforcement more tools to deal with it, and help our victims recover.

I am grateful for my colleagues and to the leadership for making this a priority in the House. I urge my colleagues to support this package and continue our fight to end human trafficking.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), who has also been a leader on this issue of combating sex trafficking.

Mrs. BLACK. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government reports that as many as 17,500 people are trafficked into our country annually. With the rise of the Internet, the number of sex trafficking incidents in particular has exploded. We must do what we can to combat this rising epidemic by identifying best practices in combating trafficking, so that others can duplicate these successful models.

I am proud that in my home State of Tennessee, the Tennessee Bureau of Investigation has developed a card that would identify an algorithm of how law enforcement would interview those who potentially have been sex-trafficked, as well as on the back of the card, those kinds of resources that can be used to help those who are in this situation.

Systems like this must be identified, studied, and duplicated to combat trafficking, and I am proud to support this bill from Congresswoman NOEM, which would help to make this very important work successful.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that my home State of North Dakota is enjoying the blessing of an energy boom, an economic boom, which is driven largely by an oil and gas renaissance that has us contributing now over 1 million barrels of oil per day toward America's energy security, but with the blessing of this energy boom comes some unwanted consequences, and chief among them is a growing demand for the product of human trafficking. It has caused the citizens of our clean and beautiful State to be somewhat alarmed and rightfully so.

Our local and State law enforcement agencies are stressed to the max. Our nonprofit and faith-based communities are doing all that they can to assist, and they are doing it with great effort, but they need some additional help and encouragement.

So this and the many other House bills that will be passed in the next couple of days dealing with this plague of human trafficking will provide the tools that, frankly, only the Federal Government can provide to assist—not replace, but assist local, State, and nonprofit agencies in this fight against the plague of human trafficking in our society.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this and the other bills before us.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, having no further requests for time, I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say to all that, as the chair of the Judiciary Committee, I appreciate the bipartisan work that has been done on many of these sex trafficking bills.

I appreciate especially the work of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr.

SCOTT), who is the ranking member on the Crime Subcommittee, and the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. CONYERS, as well. I commend the chairman of that subcommittee, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, as well as Congresswoman NOEM for their leadership on this issue.

Sex trafficking is a serious problem, and while we see it around the world, we should not overlook the fact that it is a serious problem right here in the United States.

This bill joins several others that we have already passed through the House of Representatives to address this serious problem, and it deserves the same bipartisan support that the others received, and it also deserves the consideration of the other side of the Capitol, by the other body which needs to take these bills up and pass them as well, so they can go to the President's desk and be signed into law.

This is truly a bipartisan effort to address a serious national problem, and we all need to join into the solution.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5135.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING DETECTION ACT OF 2014

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5116) to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to train Department of Homeland Security personnel how to effectively deter, detect, disrupt, and prevent human trafficking during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5116

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 ''Human Trafficking Detection Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) DEPARTMENT.—The term ''Department'' means the Department of Homeland Security.

(2) HUMAN TRAFFICKING.—The term ''human trafficking'' means an act or practice described in paragraph (9) or (10) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

SEC. 3. TRAINING FOR DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL TO IDENTIFY HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall implement a program to—

(1) train and periodically retrain relevant Transportation Security Administration, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and other Department personnel that the Secretary considers appropriate, how to effectively deter, detect, and disrupt human trafficking, and, where appropriate, interdict a suspected perpetrator of human trafficking, during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities; and

(2) ensure that the personnel referred to in paragraph (1) regularly receive current information on matters related to the detection of human trafficking, including information that becomes available outside of the Department's initial or periodic retraining schedule, to the extent relevant to their official duties and consistent with applicable information and privacy laws.

(b) TRAINING DESCRIBED.—The training referred to in subsection (a) may be conducted through in-class or virtual learning capabilities, and shall include—

(1) methods for identifying suspected victims of human trafficking and, where appropriate, perpetrators of human trafficking;

(2) for appropriate personnel, methods to approach a suspected victim of human trafficking, where appropriate, in a manner that is sensitive to the suspected victim and is not likely to alert a suspected perpetrator of human trafficking;

(3) training that is most appropriate for a particular location or environment in which the personnel receiving such training perform their official duties;

(4) other topics determined by the Secretary to be appropriate; and

(5) a post-training evaluation for personnel receiving the training.

(c) TRAINING CURRICULUM REVIEW.—The Secretary shall annually reassess the training program established under subsection (a) to ensure it is consistent with current techniques, patterns, and trends associated with human trafficking.

SEC. 4. CERTIFICATION AND REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) CERTIFICATION.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall certify to the appropriate congressional committees that all personnel referred to in section 3(a) have successfully completed the training required under that section.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall report to the appropriate congressional committees the overall effectiveness of the program required by this Act, the number of cases reported by Department personnel in which human trafficking was suspected and, of those cases, the number of cases that were confirmed cases of such trafficking.

SEC. 5. ASSISTANCE TO NON-FEDERAL ENTITIES.

The Secretary may provide training curricula to any State, local, or tribal government or private organization to assist such entity in establishing its program of training to identify human trafficking, upon request from such entity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Indiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5116, the Human Trafficking Detection Act of 2014, sponsored by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

This bill requires the Department of Homeland Security to implement a human trafficking awareness training program for Customs and Border Protection, Transportation Security Administration, and other DHS personnel which is tailored to their professional roles and responsibilities.

Additionally, it directs the Secretary of Homeland Security to annually assess and update training, as needed, based on current human trafficking trends and then report to Congress on the number of suspected and confirmed trafficking cases reported by DHS officials.

Lastly, it authorizes DHS to provide training curricula to non-Federal entities that request assistance in setting up their own programs. The Committee on Homeland Security expects that this bill will primarily codify already existing training programs within the Department, thereby having little or no implementation costs.

Mr. Speaker, DHS plays a critical role in combating human trafficking which has, unfortunately, become one of the most profitable forms of transnational crime in the world, amounting to a $32 billion per year industry.

Trafficked individuals are often forced into prostitution and labor, and an estimated 100,000 U.S. children are victims of trafficking each year. This modern-day form of slavery is a heinous stain on our society.

Moreover, CBP personnel are often the first to come into contact with unaccompanied minors crossing the border, which we are seeing on a daily basis now. It has become a significant humanitarian crisis that must be addressed.

While these children are crossing under a variety of circumstances, it is imperative that DHS personnel encountering them are adequately trained to detect potential victims of trafficking and respond most appropriately.

As a member of the Committee on Homeland Security and chair of the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications, I believe it is critical that we continue to equip Department of Homeland Security personnel with up-to-date training and the tools to detect and counter this growing challenge, including Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, employees and others who often are working on the front lines with local communities, and

we know they are working on the front lines of the southern border as we speak.

□ 1930

H.R. 5116 would not only strengthen and codify training requirements for DHS, but it would also provide Congress with a clearer picture of the effectiveness of the training, as well as the number of suspected and confirmed instances of human trafficking reported by DHS officials.

Finally, this bill will encourage partnerships between DHS, State, local, and tribal governments, as well as private organizations, to set up additional training programs, raise broader awareness, and further enable these entities to become a force multiplier in human trafficking detection and prevention efforts.

I commend Congressman MEADOWS for introducing this bill, as well as the chairman of the full committee, Mr. MCCALL, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security, Mr. HUDSON, and the ranking member of the subcommittee and the ranking member, who is here in the Chamber today, for the fact that we are working on this in a bipartisan way. I appreciate their continued attention to this critical issue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5116, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5116, the Human Trafficking Detection Act of 2014, and I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

This whole issue of human trafficking is one, in my 18 years in the Congress, that I have been working significantly on. I sit on the Homeland Security Committee, and one of the things that we were able to do many years ago was to direct funds actually into my area, into Orange County, California, to work on a collaboration of State agencies, police officers, and the Federal Government, and we funded this to make one of the first task forces on human trafficking in our Nation. Originally, there were six, and we were one of six. Now they are, I think, in the double digits.

So we have learned a lot. We have learned a lot about human trafficking. We have learned that there are some countries that are initiation or supply countries. There are some that just transit these young people, these children, these women. We have also learned that there are destination countries or demand countries, and, of course, the United States is one of the largest demand countries. We are also a transit country because we take our own children from one State and put them in the other States. We are also a supply country because we use our own children in this human trafficking process, these terrible people who do this. They are really just, most of the time, about making money any way they can.

So what we know is that there are many children being trafficked across our State lines, but also across our borders. They come in through our airports. They come in through boats in Miami and my State of California, and, yes, they pour across our borders just as we see the humanitarian crisis that my colleague mentioned earlier.

So some of the people who first see these young children, for example, or these women who are being trafficked are going to be our Customs people. They are going to be our Border Patrol. As you can imagine, depending on the circumstance, they have got a lot of other things going on in their mind. They are trying to stem people from coming across. They are trying to figure out whether these people have drugs in their stuff, and so they may not notice what you can notice, and that is the trafficking of people, because in order to traffic that person, you have got to have the trafficker coming along with them.

So, if we train them, if we give them the tools, our Department of Homeland Security, our Customs, our Border Patrol people, our transport people will have a better idea and will be able to see almost immediately, which is what I have learned to do through this task force that we have. The signs are always there. It is do we know, do we have something in our mind that can show us what is happening?

Now, the Department of Homeland Security has obviously tried, but they have got a lot of things that they have got to work with. So by actually doing and increasing the awareness and increasing the training of our frontline employees, we will do a better job. We will do a better job of stopping this trafficking.

I thank the other side for working with us to ensure that this bill moves forward and becomes law to give that additional training that I believe our Department of Homeland Security employees need and want.

With that, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Indiana for her leadership on this particular issue and for her time and her eloquent remarks in introducing this particular piece of legislation.

I would also like to thank the gentlewoman from California who is leading from the other side of the aisle. Much is made of headlines where the dysfunction of Washington, D.C., is in every newspaper on how things do not work, and yet a few hundred feet away from me is a gentlewoman from California representing a constituency many, many miles away from my home State of North Carolina. So today we are not only reaching across the aisle, but we are reaching across the country from California to North Carolina, because human trafficking affects us all.

I was first made aware of this by my daughter who was 15 years old when she did a report on human trafficking. I thought it was one of those things that was not a big deal until she informed me that it was in our backyard. It was in our neighborhoods. It was in our communities. Right now, some estimated 23 million people are trafficked, are caught up in human trafficking. And to give you a perspective of that, that equals a number that is very close to another slavery that we know as a horrific blight on our Nation and our world—the African slave trade. Today we have more people caught up in modern-day slavery than at the height of that particular time, yet somehow we continue to not address it. So hopefully on our watch, Mr. Speaker, we will address that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to provide a little bit of the context of this particular bill. The genesis of it came from a hearing. Many times we have hearings over and over, Mr. Speaker. Some people say, well, why do you continue to have those hearings?

We had some Delta Airline flight attendants who came in to a hearing. They were talking about the effort that they went through, on a voluntary basis, to set up a program to train their flight attendants and, ultimately, now all of their customer service representatives who see people on a day-by-day basis, they trained them to recognize those that are being trafficked. Yet they did this on their own. So from that, we felt like it would be a good idea to not only partner with them, but to provide that same type of training for the Federal workers that get to see these people at our borders, in our airports, and places across our Nation.

I want to thank Chairman MCCAUL, Chairman HUDSON, Mr. O'ROURKE, and the entire Homeland Security Committee staff for their hard work on working on this bill to make it not only one that hopefully will be a useful tool, but also one that will make a difference. It is estimated that there is no additional cost for providing this training, and yet the benefits will be great.

Tens of thousands of people are trafficked through the United States every year, 80 percent of whom are exploited sexually, two-thirds of them women, but more accurately, most of them little girls.

We must stand together in a bipartisan way, and I thank my colleague across the aisle for working with us and her leadership on this. But if we are successful—well, the word should not be ''if.'' When we are successful, Mr. Speaker, we will have saved thousands of lives, and we will have changed thousands of lives. So it is with great humility that I ask my colleagues to come together and support this piece of legislation.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no more

speakers. If the gentlewoman from Indiana has no more speakers, then I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to applaud Representative MEADOWS for introducing what I think is a very important piece of legislation in a bipartisan manner, and I am thankful that he cares enough and that he has a daughter who wrote a report.

These people who are trafficked live amongst us. In particular, they live in areas where there is lots of diversity, where there are lots of people going about doing their business, in crowded areas a lot. Trafficked, you are right, they are exploited for sexual purposes, about 70 percent of them; but the other 30 percent are used in homes in domestic servitude not even getting, sometimes, to sleep in a bed of the very house where they are worked as a slave, sleeping on the floor and getting the crumbs off the table. We have seen that. We have seen that in Orange County, California, in one of the richest areas of the Nation. In one of the nicest homes this was happening with a little Egyptian girl who was there who had been trafficked in by a family.

If it is not domestic and it is not sexual, then it is sweatshops where people literally have their passports and their papers taken away and they are working 18 or 19 hours a day, not being paid and barely being fed. So they are all around us.

Americans have to open up their eyes. We have to see it in our neighborhoods, and, of course, we have to stop them as they bring them from other countries. That is why I believe that our Nation's screeners and our Customs officers serve as the eyes and the ears on the front line of our ports of entry and exit from the United States. If they are properly trained, then they will see it, and they can help stop it.

Lastly, I am very grateful that tonight we have had a series of bills with respect to human trafficking. I just want to remind my colleagues that this humanitarian crisis we see on our southern border, that many of those children also have faced what we are talking about tonight; and, in order to stop it, we have to be as generous as possible with those young people to restart their lives.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to say ''yes'' to this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, as I close, this bill, which will ensure that valuable human trafficking awareness training is provided to DHS employees, and that is so very important, the gentlewoman from California reminded me that when I was United States attorney between 2001 and 2007, we started one of the human trafficking task forces in Indianapolis.

At that time, human trafficking was not really a concept that law enforcement really understood, and so trafficking task forces did start up in this country. They have grown, and we have put a lot of resources at the local and State level educating law enforcement, nonprofit groups, and neighborhood groups to understand what human trafficking is.

□ 1845

I think what this bill does is it strengthens for the Federal employees, the Department of Homeland Security employees, their training so that they, as the gentlewoman from California mentioned, they who have so many responsibilities, whether they are coming through our ports, whether they are coming through our airports, whether they are coming through our borders, they need the same type of training, if not enhanced training, than what they already have. And providing DHS employees with the tools to identify and appropriately respond to the potential victims of human trafficking will only serve as a force multiplier as we work to combat this terrible crime. I urge all Members to join me in supporting this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5116, ''Human Trafficking Detection Act of 2014.''

I support this bipartisan legislation which ensures that Transportation Security Administration (TSA), Customs and Border Protection (CBP), and other Department of Homeland Security (DHS) personnel the Secretary deems appropriate are trained to effectively detect, intercept, and disrupt human trafficking in a manner relevant to their professional roles and responsibilities.

As the ranking member on the House Committee on Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the men and women of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection agency who do yeoman work on the front lines in combating human trafficking and rescuing its victims.

Mr. Speaker, worldwide there are at least 20.9 million adults and children human trafficking victims living as forced low-wage workers and exploited as objects of sexual pleasure; and 1.4 million persons are victims of national and transnational sex trafficking.

I have long advocated declaring unconditional war on human trafficking and I am pleased that the Homeland Security Committee is taking a leading role in this effort.

The legislation before us will result in a significant enhancement of DHS's capability to combat human trafficking and does so in a way that allows the department necessary flexibility in providing training.

Departmental personnel may be trained in-class or through virtual, computer-based learning programs. In either case, the training provided will include methods for:

1. identifying specific indicators of human trafficking victims and perpetrators; and

2. where appropriate, approaching victims of trafficking in a manner that is sensitive to the potential victim and includes steps to avoid alerting potential perpetrators of human trafficking.

The legislation requires the Secretary to certify to the relevant committees that all described personnel have received the training, as well as submit a report to the committees on the overall effectiveness of the program, as well as the number of reported cases by DHS personnel and which of those cases were confirmed cases of human trafficking no later than one year after enactment.

Mr. Speaker, trafficking in humans, and especially domestic child trafficking, has no place in a civilized society. Those who engage in this illicit trade should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

Approximately 600,000 and 800,000 victims are moved across international borders every year and subjected to compelled service and millions more are enslaved domestically within their own countries.

Mr. Speaker, Texas has one of the longest international borders in the world, a 1254 mile border it shares with Mexico, our good neighbor to the South.

Texas also has a major federal highway Interstate I–10 which traverses the Southern United States from the state of Florida to the state of California.

Human trafficking is a problem for the United States because the U.S. State Department estimates that approximately 17,500 foreign nationals are trafficked into the United States, the largest number of people trafficked into the United States come from East Asia and the Pacific and the next highest numbers coming from Latin America and Europe.

I support H.R. 5116 because it is another important tool in the national arsenal to combat and eradicate the scourge of human trafficking.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of H.R. 5116.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 5116, The Human Trafficking Detection Act of 2014.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this important, bipartisan legislation, which will ensure that DHS personnel continue to receive the training they need to detect and disrupt human trafficking.

As Chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, I recently convened a field hearing in Houston to examine the issue of human trafficking. At the hearing, the Committee heard compelling and disturbing testimony on how human trafficking is destroying the lives of vulnerable populations across the globe, including here in the United States.

Simply put, human trafficking is a despicable crime, and it must be stopped. I believe this bill is an excellent step towards that goal.

The Human Trafficking Detecting Act of 2014 would ensure that U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Transportation Security Administration, and other Department of Homeland Security personnel are trained to effectively detect, and to the extent appropriate, intercept and disrupt trafficking in persons during the course of their normal roles and responsibilities. Not only would this legislation require effective training, it would also ensure that these employees are regularly provided with the most current trends and information on human trafficking and are adequately equipped to counter this growing problem.

While the men and women at DHS carry out their everyday work, many of them are well-positioned to spot traffickers who may try to exploit our nation's transportation systems to move their victims, both from overseas and within our borders.

H.R. 5116 also ensures that Congress has insight into the level of success of the training being provided, and that the Department's State and local partners have full access to training curricula to establish their own trafficking awareness programs.

I applaud Mr. MEADOWS for introducing this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote yes on this common-sense measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5116.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING PRIORITIZATION ACT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2283) to prioritize the fight against human trafficking within the Department of State according to congressional intent in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 without increasing the size of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2283

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 ''Human Trafficking Prioritization Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The International Labor Organization estimates that nearly 21,000,000 people are subjected to modern slavery around the world at any given time and that the majority of the enslaved are women and girls.

(2) Congress authorized the creation of a Department of State Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (division A of Public Law 106–386) in order to directly assist the Secretary of State in his or her effort to coordinate a United States Government interagency response to domestic and international trafficking in persons.

(3) The Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons monitors trafficking worldwide and produces the online and printed versions of the annual Trafficking in Persons Report, which is Congress' primary resource for human trafficking reporting, analysis, and recommendations on the United States and 186 countries around the world.

(4) The annual Trafficking in Persons Report contains tier rankings of each country on which it reports, and these tier rankings have become an essential diplomatic tool for promoting protection for victims, prevention of trafficking, and prosecution of perpetrators.

(5) Some countries have openly stated, and many others have confided, that dramatic improvements in the country's human trafficking record were directly related to avoidance of a low tier ranking in the annual Trafficking in Persons Report.

(6) Ambassador Mark Lagon, former Ambassador-at-Large to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons (2007–2009), testified before the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives on April 18, 2013, that ''[T]he State Department does a tremendous job in producing a report which tells it like it is, offering objective rankings. Yet at times it pulls punches, typically due to the urging of regional specialists rather than the TIP Office's dedicated experts on trafficking.''.

(7) Ambassador John Miller, former Ambassador-at-Large to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons (2002–2006), recently stated that, ''Upgrading the status of the Office to a Bureau will not create additional bureaucracy—it will simply give JTIP and the Ambassador-at-large who heads it equal standing with regional and functional bureaus at the State Department. That standing is absolutely essential for the issue to remain a priority, especially when multiple U.S. interests are engaged.''.

(8) The tier ranking process authorized by Congress in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 has been in some instances compromised by the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking subordinate stature within the Department of State.

(9) It is essential for Congress and the Secretary of State to be accurately informed regarding United States and foreign country successes and failures in the fight against human trafficking.

(10) The diplomatic power and credibility of the Trafficking in Persons Report is based on rigorous scholarship and scrupulous application of the minimum standards for the elimination of human trafficking and is undermined by political, rather than factual, tier rankings.

(11) Strong and effective anti-slavery policy requires that officials from the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking have equal hierarchical standing with State Department regional bureaus and direct access to the Secretary of State.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking of the Department of State will be more effective in carrying out duties mandated by Congress in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 if the Office status is changed to that of a Bureau within the Department hierarchy;

(2) the change in status from Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to a Bureau can be accomplished without increasing the number of personnel or the budget of the current Office;

(3) a Bureau to Monitor and Combat Trafficking would be more effective in carrying out duties mandated by Congress in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 if the Bureau were headed by an Assistant Secretary with direct access to the Secretary of State, rather than an Ambassador-at-Large; and

(4) the Secretary of State should review the current use of the 24 Assistant Secretary positions authorized by section 1(c)(1) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a(c)(1)) and make appropriate revisions, consolidations, and eliminations, to ensure that those positions reflect the highest Departmental needs and foreign policy priorities of the United States, including efforts to combat trafficking in persons.

SEC. 4. BUREAU TO COMBAT TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 105(e) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(e)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking ''OFFICE TO MONITOR AND COMBAT TRAFFICKING'' and inserting ''BUREAU TO COMBAT TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS'';

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking ''Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking'' and inserting ''Bureau to Combat Trafficking in Persons'';

(B) in the second sentence, by striking ''Office'' and inserting ''Bureau''; and

(C) in the sixth sentence, by striking ''Office'' and inserting ''Bureau''; and

(3) in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2), by striking ''Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking'' and inserting ''Bureau to Combat Trafficking in Persons''.

(b) REFERENCE.—Any reference in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 or in any other Act to the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking shall be deemed to be a reference to the Bureau to Combat Trafficking in Persons.

SEC. 5. REPORT REGARDING DESIGNATION OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE TO COMBAT TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report detailing—

(1) for each current Assistant Secretary of State position—

(A) the title of that Assistant Secretary of State;

(B) how long that particular Assistant Secretary designation has been in existence; and

(C) whether that particular Assistant Secretary designation was legislatively mandated or authorized and, if so, the relevant statutory citation for such mandate or authorization; and

(2) whether the Secretary intends to designate one of the Assistant Secretary of State positions authorized by section 1(c)(1) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a(c)(1)) as the Assistant Secretary of State to Combat Trafficking in Persons, and the reasons for that decision.

SEC. 6. COUNTRIES ON SPECIAL WATCH LIST FOR 4 CONSECUTIVE YEARS THAT ARE DOWNGRADED AND REINSTATED ON SPECIAL WATCH LIST.

Section 110(b)(2) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7107(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(F) COUNTRIES ON SPECIAL WATCH LIST FOR 4 CONSECUTIVE YEARS THAT ARE DOWNGRADED AND REINSTATED ON SPECIAL WATCH LIST.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (D) and (E), a country that—

''(i) was included on the special watch list described in subparagraph (A) for 4 consecutive years after the date of the enactment of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008, and

''(ii) was subsequently included on the list of countries described in paragraph (1)(C),

may not thereafter be included on the special watch list described in subparagraph (A) for more than 1 consecutive year.''.

SEC. 7. COST LIMITATION.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated for ''Diplomatic and Consular Programs'' to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

Mr. Speaker, today is an historic day for the House of Representatives, so I would like to begin by offering my profound appreciation for the extraordinary leadership of Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR for encouraging and moving through this House this very comprehensive package of antitrafficking legislation. I have been in Congress now 34 years, and I have never seen so many bills that are mutually reinforcing, that send a clear, unambiguous message to the world, as well as to our fellow Americans, that we care and we care deeply about the victims, and we want to put the perpetrators behind bars for a very, very long time. Again, I want to thank ERIC CANTOR for his leadership.

I am very proud to say that the United States continues to lead the world in our trafficking responses at home and abroad. The bills we debate today not only bring relief to trafficking victims, but light the way for the rest of the world to do likewise.

One of the greatest and most successful efforts to transmit our best practices to the rest of the world and to ensure accountability for minimum standards that we created in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act is the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons housed in the U.S. Department of State, created by the legislation I authored known as the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000.

Over the last 15 years, this office has been led by several incredibly talented and dedicated ambassadors who, through their persistence and grit, have turned out the annual Trafficking in Persons Report, laying bare the record of each country for the world to see, and summarizing the country's progress in an annual tier ranking.

Tier 1 countries, for the record, are countries that fully meet the minimum standards prescribed by the act. Tier 2 countries do not meet the minimum standards but are making significant efforts to do so. Tier 3 countries do not meet the standards and are not making significant efforts to do so, and those countries can be held liable through a series of sanctions that are imposed by our government.

Along with Tier 1, 2 and 3, we also have what we call a watch list. Since the TIP report's inception, Mr. Speaker, more than 100 countries have enacted antitrafficking laws, and many countries have taken other steps required to significantly raise their tier rankings, many citing the TIP Report as a key factor in their increased antitrafficking response.

The importance of accurate tier rankings cannot be overstated. Over the years, we have seen countries begin in earnest the hard work of reaching the minimum standards after the TIP Report accurately exposed—with a Tier 3 ranking—each country's failure to take significant action against human trafficking. Whether that country be a close ally or foe, the TIP Report is designed to speak truth to power. And even some of our greatest friends and allies, like South Korea and Israel, have found themselves on Tier 3, only to engage in Herculean efforts to get off Tier 3 and to protect victims and to prosecute the traffickers.

The tier rankings were meant to be and in large part have become a very powerful tool in the fight against trafficking. We have found a system that works. But tragically, it is sometimes muffled, misguided, and marginalized by unrelated bilateral concerns and by the internal structure of the State Department itself.

In the words of Ambassador Mark Lagon, who from 2007 to 2009 was our Ambassador-at-Large to combat human trafficking:

> The State Department does a tremendous job in producing a report which tells it like it is, offering objective rankings. Yet at times it pulls punches, typically due to the urging of regional specialists rather than the TIP Office's dedicated experts on trafficking.

This problem is what my bill, the Human Trafficking Prioritization Act, H.R. 2283, seeks to remedy. The Human Trafficking Prioritization Act will keep the fight against human trafficking from being lost in the politics of other U.S. interests by raising the status of the J/TIP ''office'' to that of a ''bureau'' within the U.S. Department of State.

In the words of Ambassador John Miller, who served from 2002 to 2006 as Ambassador-at-Large:

> Upgrading the status of the office to a bureau will not create additional bureaucracy, it will simply give J/TIP and the Ambassador-at-Large who heads it equal standing with regional and functional bureaus at the Department of State. That standing is absolutely essential for the issue to remain a priority, especially when multiple U.S. interests are engaged.

H.R. 2283 encourages the Secretary of State to upgrade the ''ambassador-at-large'' position to that of ''Assistant Secretary,'' to lead the bureau without adding to the number of Assistant Secretaries the State Department is permitted by law.

In addition, H.R. 2283 will make it more difficult for countries and some State Department bureaus to game the tier-ranking system by limiting the time period countries can use promises of action to avoid tier downgrading. Currently, a country can sit on the Tier 2 watch list for up to 4 years with Presidential waivers, effectively stringing the U.S. along with promises to take action without ever actually taking action. After 4 years, by law, the country must be automatically downgraded to Tier 3 and, therefore, subject to sanctions.

The law worked very well upon its first implementation in the 2013 reporting cycle. But we discovered a problem this year when China was wrongly and foolishly upgraded from Tier 3 to Tier 2 Watch List. As the law is currently written, China and its enablers at the U.S. Department of State can again game the system for 4 more years. H.R. 2283 will hold countries like China accountable by limiting to 1 year the amount of time a country can stay on the Tier 2 Watch List after the country was previously ordered downgraded to Tier 3.

H.R. 2283 builds on the success of the TIP Office for the sake of the 21 million people still living in modern day slavery, and does so without increasing the cost of government. H.R. 2283 will give the TIP Office the integration and voice it deserves within the State Department and ensure accurate accountability for countries failing to meet the minimum standards for the eliminate of human trafficking.

I respectfully ask my colleagues to support the bill. I would also like to offer special thanks to Gary Haugen, Holly Burkhalter, Tim Gehring, and the grassroots efforts of the International Justice Mission, which has worked so tirelessly to educate Members of Congress on the importance of this bill. I would note parenthetically that at least two of those people, Holly and Gary, especially Gary when we were first writing the Trafficking Victims Protection Act, was a frequent contributor to hearings as we crafted the bill, and then when we did the oversight as to how well or poorly the U.S. Department of State was implementing the law. You could always count on Gary Haugen to be there to give a very incisive look at the work that was being done or not being done. So a very special thanks to them for their work on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and ask unanimous consent that he may control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and rise in strong support of H.R. 2283, the Human Trafficking Prioritization Act.

First, let me thank my friend and colleague, Representative CHRIS SMITH, for introducing this important piece of legislation which elevates the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to the status of a bureau within the State Department.

Put simply, as we have heard this evening, human trafficking is modern day slavery. It represents a brutal violation of individual freedom and human dignity. Unfortunately, this practice is all too common around the world and in our own neighborhoods. But, fortunately, the United States is committed to responding to this crime here at home and around the world. Since this Congress passed the Trafficking Victims Protection Act in 2000, leaders on both sides of the aisle have

rallied around this issue. Indeed, three administrations have made this effort a priority. Our coordination across government through the President's Interagency Task Force on Human Trafficking has never been stronger.

Mr. Speaker, today we can take another step forward by making the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons a full bureau within the State Department. This office is already doing critical work. Its annual Trafficking in Persons Report has become the global gold standard in assessing how well governments around the world are meeting this important challenge.

Elevating the trafficking office to a State Department bureau would send a strong message to the world that combating modern day slavery remains a top priority to the United States. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEADOWS. 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 materials on H.R. 2283, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

I want to rise in support of this particular legislation and follow-up on what the gentleman from New Jersey shared regarding the importance of not only the TIP Report but to remain vigilant with a number of the countries abroad where trafficking has become very commonplace.

Just in the last week, we had an ambassador from one of those countries come to us and share the fact that they are a Tier 3 country. They were very concerned and wanted to outline the things that they were doing to try to combat human trafficking.

It was very obvious to me that with the emphasis we have placed on that, not only here in Congress but with the State Department, that making human trafficking a priority for them to correct and combat was certainly something that has drawn great attention. To strengthen the efforts there, to continue to strengthen the State Department, to raise and elevate this position to bureau status, certainly will send a message not only to our country, not only to countries abroad, but hopefully will give hope to the young girls and young men that are being trafficked in so many of these foreign countries that the United States is serious about this, and that it is not just a few words that perhaps are shared by myself and the gentleman from New York here on the House floor today but that it goes to the very core of who we are, that we must stand up and be a voice for those who have no voice.

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

□ 2000

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from North Carolina. I listened with great interest to his words earlier. I would like to thank him and acknowledge him for his leadership on this issue. It is so great to see him reaching across the aisle to do so, and I want to acknowledge his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN).

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation and many other bills we are considering that deal with human and sex trafficking—an important issue, a critical issue, that especially relates to protecting children who are too often victims of abuse and violence. I commend the Speaker for bringing these bills up for a vote.

Mr. Speaker, as I was watching the debate this evening, I couldn't help but come back to the floor. I hope all of my colleagues that are speaking tonight on the importance of passing these human trafficking bills will join us next week to talk about the importance of protecting children.

It was with alarm, Mr. Speaker, that I read a letter that Speaker BOEHNER penned to President Barack Obama that appears that my Republican colleagues, when they left a meeting earlier this afternoon, are asking to take away the very protections from children during a law that was passed in 2008 that we are asking to protect these children tonight.

So I come today to ask my colleagues to read the transcripts, to hear the debate this evening, and to think about it, to go home this weekend and, whatever faith that we may be, that we pray about it and we talk to our pastors and our religious leaders about it because these kids that we are going to be talking about next week are the very children that need protections as well.

The motivation to pass these bills today is the same motivation that moved this body to pass legislation that became law in 2008, to protect children. This law has since become the subject of much condemnation for many of my Republican colleagues as we discuss the humanitarian crisis on the border.

We are here on this floor debating legislation to protect children, yet many of my colleagues want to take away due process from children who are trying to escape unimaginable violence in Central America. In Honduras, the murder capital of the world, the violence was captured in a story recently—and I apologize for the graphic nature of this story.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COTTON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. This is a story from The New York Times:

> During a recent late-night visit to the San Pedro Sula morgue, more than 60 bodies, all victims of violence, were seen piled in a heap, each wrapped in a brown plastic bag. While picking bullets out of a 15-year-old boy shot 15 times, technicians discussed how they regularly received corpses of children under 10 and sometimes as young as 2. Last week, in nearby Santa Barbara, an 11-year-old had his throat slit by other children because he did not pay a 50-cent extortion fee.

The doctor at the morgue said: before, we saw children being killed because they were at the scene when gangs were coming to prey on families and they just happened to be there; now, we are seeing kids kill kids.

There are hundreds of other stories like this.

Mr. Speaker, I beg and I plead of my colleagues, each and every one of us that may or may not have been here when the law passed, but those of us that are here now, these are kids. I know that you and I, Mr. Speaker, that we love children, and we want to make sure that they are not victims of these horrific crimes.

Please, please, take this weekend and ask the Speaker to remove the provisions that will take away the due process from these children. As we pass these bills together, let us not forget what brought this Congress together in 2008, to protect these children.

Let us show the same compassion that is a driving force of these bills tonight.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New Mexico for his eloquent and passionate remarks, a concern so many of us share.

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, we have no more speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Human Trafficking Prioritization Act, H.R. 2283, and commend my friend and colleague Rep. CHRIS SMITH for introducing it. Congressman SMITH is a leader in the global fight against sex slavery and I thank him for all he has done and the leadership he continues to provide.

The State Department's Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons (J/TIP) does a fantastic job of maintaining U.S. leadership and accountability in the worldwide effort to combat human trafficking.

Today, human trafficking represents a modern form of slavery. It is a crisis that victimizes 21 million people worldwide.

In my home state of Illinois, the National Human Trafficking Resource Center estimates 25,000 women and girls are exploited each year by sex traffickers.

More than 130 countries have created or strengthened their anti-trafficking laws largely due to the work carried out by the J/TIP. It's important, therefore, to provide the J/TIP with the standing it needs to maintain the momentum that has resulted in increased prosecution of traffickers, protection of victims, and prevention of human trafficking.

The Human Trafficking Prioritization Act does just that. By raising the status of the J/TIP ''office'' to that of a ''bureau'' and encouraging the Secretary of State to upgrade the ''ambassador-at-large'' position to that of an ''assistant secretary,'' H.R 2283 builds upon the acknowledged accomplishments of the J/TIP.

It will give the J/TIP and the Ambassador-at-Large who leads it level standing with regional and functional bureaus within the State Department and prevent countries and other bureaus at the agency from gaming the tier ranking system. It achieves this without creating additional bureaucracy or additional cost to the government.

As a member of the Congressional Human Trafficking Task Force working with the congressional leadership, J/TIP, and international anti-trafficking groups to end sex slavery, I know it is critical to keep the fight against human trafficking from being consumed in a bureaucratic shuffle. I am convinced that the Human Trafficking Prioritization Act will only serve to enhance the vital work undertaken by the J/TIP.

Human trafficking targets the most vulnerable in a society. The Human Trafficking Prioritization Act will give the J/TIP the integration and voice it deserves within the Department of State to ensure nations are diligent in their efforts to protect the victims and punish the perpetrators of human trafficking.

Again, I thank Mr. SMITH for introducing this bill and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2283, ''Human Trafficking Prioritization Act of 2014.''

I support this bipartisan legislation which modifies the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 to elevate the status of the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to that of the Bureau to Combat Trafficking in Persons, which shall be headed by an Assistant Secretary of State.

The office produces the annual Trafficking in Persons Report (TIP Report), which is Congress' primary resource for human trafficking reporting, analysis and recommendations for the United States and 186 countries around the world. The TIP Report also contains tier rankings of each country on which it reports, which are used to help protect victims, prevent trafficking and prosecute traffickers.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with many thoughtful observers that the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking would be even more effective in carrying out the duties mandated by Congress in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 if its status was elevated from that of ''Office'' to a ''Bureau'' within the department hierarchy and the title of its chief administrator elevated from ''director'' to Assistant Secretary of State.''

Human trafficking is a problem for the United States because the U.S. State Department estimates that approximately 17,500 foreign nationals are trafficked into the United States, the largest number of people trafficked into the United States come from East Asia and the Pacific and the next highest numbers coming from Latin America and Europe.

It is estimated 2.8 million children living on the streets of this nation are at risk for trafficking into the sex industry. Children who are abused or victims of molestation are most vulnerable.

If they are lured into human trafficking they are isolated from the rest of the world and start living lives controlled by pimps, escort and massage services, private dancing clubs, pornographic clubs and much worse.

Mr. Speaker, this bill requires the Secretary of State to report to Congress within 90 days of enactment on how long each assistant secretary designation has been in existence, and whether the designation was legislatively mandated or authorized.

According to a Northwestern Journal of International Human Rights Report Mexican authorities are working to address the problem of trans-border human trafficking, but the country's ''legal framework remains largely untouched and hence limited in its crime-fighting scope and effectiveness.''

According to the U.S. Department of Justice, Houston, Texas is one of the nation's largest hubs for human trafficking, with over 200 active brothels in Houston and two new ones opening each month.

Houston has also surpassed Las Vegas for the dubious distinction of having the most strip clubs and illicit spas serving as fronts for sex trafficking.

Human trafficking in Texas is not limited to Houston. During the 2011 Dallas Super Bowl, 133 underage arrests for prostitution were made and during this year's massive effort ''Operation Cross Country'' led by the FBI, several pimps were arrested.

In 2006, the Department of Justice National Conference on Human Trafficking identified the I–10 corridor as one of the main routes for traffickers. Interstate I–10 links the major Texas urban areas Houston, San Antonio and El Paso and dozens of mid- and small sized towns in between.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important things that can and must continue to be done is to raise public awareness of the continuing prevalence of modern day slavery and human trafficking.

Raising the visibility and status of the governmental entity charged with the responsibility of documenting the problems, successes, and remaining challenges confronting the United States and the international community in eradicating the scourge of human trafficking is a positive step forward in achieving this goal.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of H.R. 2283.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2283, 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.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING PREVENTION ACT

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4449) to amend the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 to expand the training for Federal Government personnel related to trafficking in persons, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4449

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 ''Human Trafficking Prevention Act''.

SEC. 2. EXPANDED TRAINING RELATING TO TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.

Section 105(c)(4) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(c)(4)) is amended—

(1) by inserting '', including members of the Service (as such term is defined in section 103 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3903))'' after ''Department of State''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: ''Training under this paragraph shall include, at a minimum, the following:

''(A) A distance learning course on trafficking-in-persons issues and the Department of State's obligations under this Act, targeted for embassy reporting officers, regional bureaus' trafficking-in-persons coordinators, and their superiors.

''(B) Specific trafficking-in-persons briefings for all ambassadors and deputy chiefs of mission before such individuals depart for their posts.

''(C) At least annual reminders to all such personnel, including appropriate personnel from other Federal departments and agencies, at each diplomatic or consular post of the Department of State located outside the United States of key problems, threats, methods, and warning signs of trafficking in persons specific to the country or jurisdiction in which each such post is located, and appropriate procedures to report information that any such personnel may acquire about possible cases of trafficking in persons.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the bill, H.R. 4449, to amend the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 to expand the training for Federal Government personnel related to trafficking in persons, and for other purposes.

I thank the gentleman from New York for his leadership in addressing this issue.

As we look at this, this particular bill would require appropriate personnel of the Department of State, that they would be trained in identifying victims of severe forms of trafficking and provide for the protection of those victims.

H.R. 4449 would specify three minimum training requirements in that underlying statute: one, a distance learning course for Embassy and bureau personnel dealing with trafficking issues; two, trafficking briefings for all ambassadors and DCMs before they head to their postings; and, three, annual reminders to appropriate personnel regarding key trafficking problems and issues related to their countries.

The State Department believes that these specified forms of training largely track their current activities; thus, while adding these examples to the statute will ensure that these types of training will continue, it will not result in a substantial and additional cost.

Again, I thank the leadership, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY) as the primary sponsor of this, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of my bill, H.R. 4449, the Human Trafficking Prevention Act.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to also thank my colleague, Mr. MEADOWS, for his leadership on this bill. I would like to thank the Democratic whip—my friend, the gentleman from Maryland, STENY HOYER—and his staff for the work they dedicated to this piece of legislation and to my own staff.

Worldwide, less than 1 percent of an estimated 27 million victims of human trafficking have been reported, and in the past year, only about 44,000 survivors have been identified.

Millions—literally millions of children, women, and men are trafficked each year and forced into modern-day slavery as part of the world's most evil and fastest growing industry. It may seem like it only happens on the other side of the world, but it is happening here in quiet neighborhoods across our country.

Some of those survivors are from neighborhoods I represent in the Hudson Valley of New York. In New Windsor and Newburgh, for nearly 4 years, one man would troll the streets, coercing at least 10 women to work for him as sex workers in local motels.

Last year, law enforcement authorities uncovered an international sex trafficking ring operating brothels in Yonkers, Poughkeepsie, and Newburgh, where women were brutalized and forced to have sex 10, 20, 30 times a day.

It is a hard truth, but it is a truth nonetheless. This disgusting, this horrifying practice of modern-day slavery happens here, right here in our own neighborhoods, in our own backyards, in our own country.

Even with the assistance of law enforcement and dedicated organizations like My Sister's Place in Westchester and Safe Homes of Orange County, groups which help survivors rebuild their lives, New York continues to be one of the top hubs of human trafficking where sex trafficking, child labor, child sex trafficking, and indentured servitude happen all too frequently.

In another community in Hudson Valley about an hour away from New York City, a man tricked teenage girls to travel to the United States on tourist visas from countries like Brazil, Hungary, and France. He instructed these women to lie to both Immigration and State Department officials in order to gain access to our country.

It is precisely this kind of situation that my legislation seeks to stop. We must ensure that our men and women on the front lines of our borders have the resources and training they need in order to identify and stop human trafficking at its source before these women and children and men become victims.

As part of our goal to end human trafficking, we can make sure that our foreign service officers and other government personnel have the tools and training they need to spot, to identify these victims and stop this trafficking across international borders.

In the past, the State Department estimated that between 14,500 and 17,000 foreign nationals were trafficked into the United States every single year. Although the Federal Government has a zero tolerance policy on human trafficking, our foreign service officers, who often have face-to-face contact with these victims when they are obtaining U.S. visas, currently undergo minimal training to define, identify, and recognize the indicators of human trafficking or smuggling.

My legislation would expand new minimum training procedures for foreign service officers and other government personnel in order to identify and stop human trafficking at its source and take action before people are trafficked across international borders before it becomes too late, when they are already in the United States and already victimized.

Since we know criminals will do just about anything to adapt and to avoid being caught, this legislation also requires annual updates on key problems, threats, methods, and warning signs of trafficking.

I want to thank my colleagues across the aisle because, by working across the aisle, we have a new opportunity to come together to combat this absolutely monstrous practice of trafficking in children, women, and men.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support my legislation, H.R. 4449, the Human Trafficking Prevention Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to close by saying that anything we can do, certainly, to continue to highlight this particular issue, whether it is with the State Department or laws within our Nation, gives us a rare opportunity to affect lives not only here in the United States, but across the world.

I would like to thank the committee work for those on the Foreign Affairs Committee, their diligence and hard work here at a late hour—certainly our own personal staffs, congressional staffs, for their work too. So many times, they don't get mentioned.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4449, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4449, the "Human Trafficking Prevention Act."

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their stewardship in bringing this legislation to the floor and for their commitment to expanding the training and capability of Federal government personnel in detecting and combating human trafficking and assisting its victims.

Throughout my tenure in Congress and a founder and Co-Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I have advocated on behalf of victims of human trafficking, especially children, who are the most vulnerable and innocent victims.

I am also committed to ensure that law enforcement agencies have the tools, resources, and training necessary to identify, apprehend, and prosecute criminals who ruthlessly traffic in people.

H.R. 4449 strengthens the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 by amending it to require training related to trafficking in persons for all State Department personnel. Specifically, the bill requires the following:

1. A distance learning course on trafficking in persons issues and the Department of State's obligations under the Act to be completed by embassy reporting officers, regional bureaus' trafficking in persons coordinators, and their supervisors;

2. Specific trafficking-in-persons briefings for all ambassadors and deputy chiefs of mission before they depart for their posts; and

3. Annual reminders to all such personnel and other federal personnel at each diplomatic or consular post of the Department of State located outside the United States of key human trafficking problems, threats, methods, and warning signs.

This legislation does for the State Department what the Jackson Lee to H.R. 4660, "Commerce, Justice, and Science Appropriations Act for 2015," does for the Justice Department.

That amendment, adopted earlier this year by the House, provides another tool in law enforcement's arsenal to tip the balance in favor of victims by ensuring funding for the Attorney General to provide training for State and local law enforcement agencies on immigration law that may be useful for the investigation and prosecution of crimes related to trafficking in persons.

Mr. Speaker, trafficking in humans, and especially child trafficking, has no place in a civilized society and those who engage in this illicit trade should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

To effectively combat human trafficking, we need to provide resources and training to government personnel to assist victims and apprehend criminals.

By providing the necessary training and support, we will catch more human trafficking criminals and save lives, and prevent many other persons, including children, from becoming human trafficking victims.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4449, the Human Trafficking Prevention Act of 2014.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4449.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Peters of California moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 3230 (an Act to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes) be instructed to—

(1) recede from disagreement with section 702 of the Senate amendment (relating to the approval of courses of education provided by public institutions of higher learning for purposes of the All-Volunteer Force Educational Assistance Program and the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program conditional on in-State tuition rate for veterans); and

(2) recede from the House amendment and concur in the Senate amendment in all other instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 2015

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of the Veterans' Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014, which the Senate passed on a bipartisan 93–3 vote last month.

It is no secret that the Department of Veterans Affairs is failing to keep our Nation's promise to our veterans and their families.

Ensuring that our veterans have access to the medical care and benefits that they have earned is one of the most important jobs of Congress and a top priority of mine, given the more than 200,000 veterans who live in San Diego County.

In recent months, failures at the Phoenix VA and other facilities across the country demonstrated a culture of complacency and ineptitude that is unacceptable and must change.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Phoenix, KYRSTEN SINEMA.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California (Mr. PETERS) for offering this motion to instruct and for his leadership and work on behalf of veteran and military families.

This motion urges House conferees to accept language in the Senate bill that ensures post-9/11 veterans receive instate tuition at colleges and universities, regardless of their home State. This concept was overwhelmingly supported by the House of Representatives when it passed the GI Bill Tuition Fairness Act in February.

I am a cosponsor of the GI Bill Tuition Fairness Act, authored by Chairman MILLER, and I appreciate his bipartisan leadership and dedication to improving opportunities for veterans. Tuition fairness gives our veterans a better chance to achieve the American Dream.

In April of 2011, as a State senator, I authored and led the effort to pass this same law in Arizona. I am proud to now be a part of the national effort to make college more affordable for our veterans.

As David Lucier, president of the Arizona Veterans and Military Leadership Alliance, said:

This is an opportunity to create the 'next greatest generation' by investing in our veterans as they move out of uniform—to being scholars—to becoming national and global leaders.

I couldn't agree more. Acting on tuition fairness is the right thing to do. Acting on a VA reform bill is also the right thing for Congress to do. But in Arizona, we are not waiting for Congress to act. We are making sure that veterans receive the care they need right now.

In Phoenix, we recently cohosted the Veterans First Clinic, which brought together community providers, the Phoenix VA, and over 20 veteran-serving organizations to help veterans access services. We are leveraging community-based providers to make sure veterans receive timely access to care, and we are holding the VA accountable through monthly reporting meetings. We are moving forward while Washington drags its feet, because in Arizona we believe that veterans and their families should come first. But more action is required.

I appreciate the bipartisan work to advance a VA reform bill, especially from Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MICHAUD. I call on the conferees to move quickly to produce commonsense reforms that can be signed into law. By working together, we can address this crisis and create a VA system that our veterans deserve.

Again, I thank my colleague from California for offering this motion.

Mr. PETERS of California. I thank my colleague, Ms. SINEMA.

While San Diego's VA centers have performed better than most, and the backlog of benefits claims has been reduced significantly in my region, we can't ignore the larger structural reforms that the entire VA system clearly needs.

In San Diego, my district office staff has been working to help veterans and their families who have experienced the bureaucratic red tape at the VA firsthand. Since coming to Congress last year, we have handled more than 400 veterans' cases and have recovered more than $750,000 in benefits to which these veterans were entitled.

I have also focused on ways to make the transition from Active Duty service back to civilian life an easier one for veterans and their families. Last year, I engaged with military commanders, nonprofits, and veterans' advocacy organizations to launch the Military Transition Support Project. This collaborative community effort will provide a central hub of information for servicemembers as they become veterans and search for housing, employment, and benefits. It is on its way to being a national model and doesn't cost the Federal Government or taxpayers a dime.

The experience of Dr. Howard and Jean Somers, constituents of mine from Coronado, has only added to my urgency in addressing reform at the VA. The Somers' son Daniel served our country in Operation Iraqi Freedom. As the Somers testified in the House Veterans Affairs Committee 2 weeks ago, their son made several attempts after returning home from combat to seek help and counseling for posttraumatic stress but was ultimately unsuccessful, and eventually he took his own life. The VA system failed Daniel Somers; it failed his parents; and that is unacceptable.

Both the Senate and the House have taken action to make real, substantive changes at the VA. I voted for many of these measures in the House, but the Senate's plan is comprehensive, bipartisan, and is the best opportunity for the quick action that our veterans deserve.

It will benefit thousands of veterans by increasing their access to care by allowing the VA to lease more facilities, hire doctors and nurses to fill their most pressing staff shortages, and by allowing veterans to see non-VA providers if they have been forced to wait for an appointment or live too far from the closest facility.

It would increase accountability on those responsibile for the recent failures by allowing the VA Secretary to fire complacent employees, and through changes to the scheduling, staffing, and administrative processes in each facility.

Part of my motion also has to do with ensuring that our veterans and their spouses are able to access a high-quality education after their time of Active Duty has ended.

Veterans are advancing themselves at colleges and universities across my

district, across San Diego, and across the country. Expanding instate tuition to our veterans, regardless of where they live, would expand their educational opportunities significantly and potentially reduce the financial burden that many of them face.

As of today, only 24 States offer instate tuition benefits for veterans who have not yet met the standard residency requirements of that State. My home State of California is one of those that does not offer it.

In the University of California system, one of the premier public university systems in the entire world, more than 1,600 veterans are currently enrolled. The instate tuition at a UC school averages $13,200 per year. For nonresidents, it is $36,000. That is a difference of $23,000 that veterans must pay out of pocket.

UC San Diego, part of which is in my district, enrolls 324 veterans, and nearby San Diego State has 1,127 veterans. In the California State University system, being a non-California resident costs nearly double the tuition, to the tune of more than $4,000 per year.

By forcing veterans who fought not just for one State or for their home State but for the entire United States, to fit into the standard residency requirements, in many instances we are forcing them to delay their education or vocational training they need for career advancement. Instead of making it more difficult to use their earned GI Bill benefits, we should be making it easier and more financially feasible.

A recent national investigation called ''Back Home: The Enduring Battle Facing Post-9/11 Veterans,'' noted the example of Marine Corps Corporal veteran Brian Oller, a student at UC San Diego's Scripps Institution of Oceanography, who is paying out of pocket to cover part of the $22,000 tuition, which his GI benefits don't fully pay.

Fifteen thousand veterans are discharged in the San Diego region each year, and about half decide to stay in the area to restart their civilian lives. Many of them are not from California, but they should have access immediately to the instate tuition rate.

Giving veterans the instate tuition rate is a bipartisan idea that I know our chairman, Mr. MILLER, supports. The House passed a bill 390–0 to provide this benefit. The comprehensive Senate bill I want us to vote on also includes that language.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we can pass the Veterans Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act in its entirety and provide the necessary relief and support to our veterans and show the American people that Congress is capable of passing comprehensive reforms to what is clearly a broken system.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this motion to instruct. Let's actually get the needed reforms in place and expand educational opportunities and our support for our veterans.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, as I said during the debate last week on other motions to instruct that were brought to the floor, improving timely access to quality health care and imposing true accountability for senior managers are the keys to beginning the long process of restoring trust at the Department of Veterans Affairs. This was the central charge to the conferees that are currently meeting at the beginning of our conference, and it remains the same charge tonight.

As I said last week, now is not the time to tie the hands of the conferees with an unnecessary motion on the floor.

I know my colleague, Mr. PETERS, has the best of intentions. They are rooted in his desire to serve veterans of this country, but unfortunately, somebody somewhere has different ideas.

Veterans expect us to do what is best to improve the quality of care that they receive and the delivery of the benefits that they have earned. I certainly expect that none of these votes that have been taken—in fact, I believe we have done four, and another was noticed today—will be used by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in 30-second political ads.

By adopting the motion to instruct, we would be telling our conferees to recede to the Senate's position on all provisions of the Senate bill.

While I am still hopeful that a deal is possible, Senator SANDERS and I and our staffs and other conferees continue to work each day and into the night. It is becoming more difficult, though, because the Senate has once again changed the goalposts, and I don't know what the Senate's real position is today. In fact, I said last week I don't know if the Senate could vote for their own bill now.

Senator SANDERS has recently indicated his desire to expand the scope of our conference committee's work by adding VA's request—and I say ''request,'' but I really don't know. Is it an emergency request? Is it a supplemental request? Nobody seems to be sure exactly what it is. Most importantly, the VA doesn't know what it is. Senator SANDERS is asking for the inclusion of an additional $17.6 billion into our conversation.

As I said last week, both the VA Office of Inspector General and the General Accountability Office have said on numerous occasions that they do not have any confidence in the numbers that VA provides right now. Moreover, at every budget hearing before our committee in recent years, the Secretary has sat at the witness table and clearly said—when asked by members: Do you have the funds necessary?—the Secretary says: We have the funds necessary to meet the needs of our veterans.

So why all of a sudden would we believe that VA sees this need for an additional $10 billion to hire 10,000 more health care staff and $6 billion in new construction without thoroughly vetting the numbers—also, add an additional $1.5 billion for IT—when we already know that VA has squandered hundreds of millions of dollars in IT money over the years?

But what I want to do for the Members here tonight is to show you a typical budget submission, a request from the administration on behalf of the Department of Veterans Affairs. It is over 1,300 pages in four volumes to justify the money that is spent at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

□ 2030

Mr. Speaker, here is the explanation that was given to us for the $17.6 billion ask by the Department. I have in recent days called it a three-page document—$17.6 billion justified by a three-page document—but actually, if you take the cover letter off and if you take the closing page off, you have one page to justify $17.6 billion.

Now, in talking with Senator SANDERS and Acting Secretary Sloan Gibson on the phone a couple of days ago, I expressed that this was not the way to justify this type of expenditure to this Congress. I believe people on both sides of the aisle will clearly admit that this is not what we would call ''regular order,'' but the Acting Secretary said, by noon yesterday, I would receive much more detailed information on this ask. So noon came and it rolled by, and it was at 9 o'clock last night when, finally, we got this deep dive—additional information—and they doubled the pages to two pages of information for a $17.6 billion ask—two pages. The Acting Secretary will be before our committee tomorrow morning. I hope he brings three pages with him to justify this request.

This is not enough information for such a huge ask by the VA. It is not some unsubstantiated guess put together in the back room of a massive bureaucracy. In fact, interestingly enough, it is titled, ''A Working Estimate,'' as of July 22. This isn't even the number that they are sure that they want to ask for.

What is really disappointing is that I actually believe that we could have already come to an agreement if Senator SANDERS had not insisted on moving the goalpost and adding this $17.6 billion ask into a clearly defined conference committee.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I am prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in closing, the House has almost a dozen bills that sit, languishing in the Senate right now, including the authorization of 27 VA clinics that passed in December—important changes to

the processing of disability claims that has been so backlogged over the last few years, education benefits, including the instate tuition bill that passed unanimously out of this House, that has sat, languishing with the other 11 bills in the Senate that are waiting to be brought up for a vote. The Senate could pass these bills and send them straight to the President, and they would become law right away.

Again, to my colleague from California, I would remind you that H.R. 357, the GI Bill Tuition Fairness Act, did pass this House unanimously, and you were a cosponsor of the bill that passed by 390–0 in February. It gives States the incentive to provide all veterans instate tuition rates. It is very similar to the provision in the Senate bill that Mr. PETERS wants our conferees to recede to in conference. Once again, this bipartisan bill could be sent to the President if the Senate would just bring it up for a vote.

We are trying to work out a deal with the Senate, but I submit to this body today that these motions to instruct are clearly becoming unproductive, are slowing down our process, and unfortunately, I think they are being used as nothing more than a political ploy. I find it very interesting that not one member of the minority side on our VA Committee has offered over the last four times a motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the motion to instruct, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, first, I lament the notion that this is motivated entirely by politics; although, I understand that would not be entirely unusual in this body. It was 80 degrees in San Diego today—a beautiful day. I don't fly all the way over here to the 91-degree heat that feels like 100 not to do something, and veterans are a top priority for me.

The point of this motion is that we have something right before us that would deal with the culture of complacency that has failed our veterans, and we could pass the bill supported both by Senator BERNIE SANDERS and Senator JOHN MCCAIN, which was passed by a vote of 93–3—I don't think you could get more bipartisan than that—and it would not raise the issues that Chairman MILLER has discussed because, if we wanted to add more money, as Senator SANDERS may want, we could take that up later.

There are very, very many points of agreement in the Senate bill, and it would incorporate many of the things we did here in the House if we would pass it just like this. So it makes all the sense in the world to go ahead and have that bill before us so that we could pass it. It could be on the President's desk tomorrow, and at least many of the points of agreement, like the instate tuition, for example, would be on their way to helping veterans right away.

Last week, I attended part of the stand down for homeless veterans in San Diego. The Veterans Village of San Diego organized the first stand down in 1988, and there are more than 200 similar programs nationwide that help provide a hand up, not a hand out for homeless vets. No one at the event asked me whether I thought the House or the Senate or the President had the best plan for keeping our promise to America's veterans. They want action, and they want it now. They don't want to hear about how the procedural rules of this place are some way to hide behind our lack of action.

They fought for our country in the jungles of Vietnam, in the deserts of Iraq, and in the mountains of Afghanistan. The fact that this House can't put aside partisan politics to do the right thing for our veterans is even more messed up than anyone can imagine.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERS of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, surely, the gentleman did not insinuate that I, as the chairman of the most bipartisan committee in this Congress, was being partisan in any anything that I have said or done.

Mr. PETERS of California. Absolutely not, Mr. Chairman. What I am suggesting is that the effect of our inability to vote on this Senate bill, which passed 93–3, sends the message that we just can't get it together.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERS of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that I do know one bill that is much more bipartisan than the Senate's 93–3 vote, and that was the House's bill that passed 430–0.

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. MILLER, I could not argue with you. The only other point I would make is that the provisions of that bill are contained within the Senate bill that I hope we are able to vote on. That is why we could kill two birds with one stone.

Mr. Speaker, frankly, if we can't get this kind of thing done, it is no wonder that the approval rating of the body is at 9 percent. It is a shame.

I do urge my colleagues to adopt the motion to instruct so that we can get this effort moving and provide our veterans with the educational opportunities that they deserve, with the support they deserve, and with the opportunities that they deserve because they fought so hard and so bravely for us.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

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

Mr. PETERS of California. 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.

RECOGNIZING HELEN MADDOX ON HER 100TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, it is very rare that you have a constituent who reaches the century mark, but I have one, a young lady named Helen Maddox in Arlington, Texas, who will be celebrating her 100th birthday later this week.

Helen was not born a native Texan, but she got there as soon as she could. She and her husband moved to Arlington, Texas, over half a century ago, and she has lived there ever since. Her husband is now deceased.

Helen has been very active in the Republican Women, in numerous civic clubs, and has been a very strong personal friend of mine and also a political supporter. She will be celebrating her 100th birthday this week.

On behalf of the United States Congress, I want to wish her the absolute very best birthday and hope that the next 100 are as happy and positive as her first 100 have been.

Happy birthday, Helen Maddox, of Arlington, Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add to what I just said.

HONORING HELEN MADDOX ON HER 100TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a very special woman on a very special day—her 100th birthday. Helen Maddox was born on her family's small family farm in Romulus, Michigan on July 28, 1914.

She was the youngest of three and admits that while she was surrounded by love, life back then wasn't always easy. There was always a long list of chores that included taking care of the animals and helping with the crops.

Helen worked at a roadside stand selling fruits and vegetables and says her curly hair was a great marketing tool. People would stop because of her cute curls, and then buy something.

Her parents were community leaders and that is a trait that rubbed off on Helen.

Like many people who weren't lucky enough to be born in Texas, she moved there as an adult. She immediately became involved in the small, but growing community of Arlington, Texas. Back then it was a town of just 15,000, now it is close to 400,000. Helen Maddox played a role in making it a big city with a small town feel.

She started attending city council meetings so she could keep up with what was going on

and support city leaders. Helen founded the Arlington Women's Club in 1957 and it is still going strong. She also worked with longtime Mayor Tom Vandergriff to organize the YMCA.

She and her late husband loved to travel, many times hitting the road in their Winnebago.

Helen slowly got more involved in Republican politics. In 1986 she got an invitation to have tea at the White House with Nancy Reagan.

When Arlington became part of my district 20 years ago, Helen was one of the first people to welcome me. She was 80 at the time, but still full of life and her love of Arlington and America was infectious.

As she hits 100 she is still active in the community. I am proud today to say Happy 100th Birthday to my friend—Helen Maddox!

CHRISTIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to yield to a friend, a colleague, a guy I came in with in the class of 2004, my friend, Mr. FORTENBERRY.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank the gentleman from Texas, my good friend, Congressman GOHMERT. I appreciate your yielding, and I appreciate your willingness to engage in the most important dialogues facing our Nation night after night. Thank you again for allowing me to intrude a bit on your time.

I wanted to raise something of the utmost urgency, Mr. Speaker.

Mosul is Iraq's second largest city. For 1600 years, Mosul has been a center of Christian life, and, today, not a single Christian remains.

Now, who could have imagined that 1 month ago—just a month ago—large swaths of the country of Iraq would be invaded—conquered—by an army of religious fanatics who would fly a flag that is a black banner of death.

After capturing Mosul, this group, known as the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, commonly called ISIS, issued an ultimatum to the Christians who lived in this city. They said three things: you must depart; you must convert to Islam—or you will die by the sword.

They did more than that.

Mr. Speaker, they did this: this is the Arabic letter for ''N,'' and it is pronounced ''none.'' It is a symbol that stands for the word ''Nazarene,'' which is a denigrating term used to describe Christians in the area by some. In their brutal campaign against Christians and other religious minorities, ISIS spray-painted this letter on the doors of the remaining Christians' homes, their businesses and their churches, except they didn't do it in gold. They did it in red—blood red.

Leave, convert, or die.

Mr. Speaker, Iraq's Christians have just as much right as anybody else to be there. That community has traditionally served—even in a minority status—as a leavening influence, oftentimes trying to build bridges where there were ethnic or religious tensions.

People all around the world, fortunately, are recognizing the grotesque injustice that is happening. Even though we are busy here, debating all types of other concerns, nonetheless, in a land very, very far away, people are being told that they must leave their homes—their ancestral homelands—and go to who knows where or they will die.

Fortunately, there is a movement that is now happening. Many people around the world are taking that red symbol of death that was painted on those Christians' homes, and they are turning it into this gold symbol of solidarity, saying that, if we are going to find peace in the world—if we are ever at least going to find a bit of stability—we are going to have to come to some deeper awareness of understanding of the nature and dignity of all human persons and of that most sacred right of religious liberty: to be able to express one's faith tradition, particularly an ancient faith tradition which has existed in this area for 1600 years.

□ 2045

We must find a way to elevate that value. So, in the midst of this chaos, this horror, this grotesque injustice, there is a little bit of glimmering light, in that people all around the world are starting to use this symbol on Facebook and social media.

Mr. Speaker, all I wanted to do tonight is say I stand with them in solidarity.

I yield back to my good friend from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend. I am immensely grateful to my friend, Mr. FORTENBERRY, for bringing this point home. It is a point that has been brought home repeatedly to me in different places in the world.

In Afghanistan, where this country helped with a constitution that would be shari'a law-based, my country, my country, where Americans have fought and died for freedom, my country, where the most valuable commodity we have, human life, has been sacrificed on the altar of freedom because we believed where there was a threat like Afghanistan to us as Americans, we could repel the Taliban, and the world would benefit and certainly America would benefit, and Christians around the world would benefit, who were being so persecuted by the Taliban in control in Afghanistan.

But we weren't alone. Moderate Muslims in Afghanistan were being persecuted. That is why there were plenty, there were plenty of groups willing to rise and fight with America, for America, against the radical Islamists of the Taliban.

The moderate Muslims didn't want radical Islamists running their country. They were perfectly willing to allow Christians or Buddhists or secularists, Jews, to live and worship or not worship as they saw fit in their country.

So the people that some in this administration call war criminals, the Northern Alliance, fought for us, and they defeated the Taliban in a matter of months.

It was in October of 2001, a month or so after the worst attack on the United States in our history killed over 3,000 people here in our homeland. We finally figured out that planning and preparation occurred in Afghanistan.

And there did have to be some diplomatic negotiations to get some of the tribes to be willing to fight together because they didn't like each other sufficiently, at least, to work together and be under each others' control and command.

Diplomatically, there may have been some money that changed hands, we are told, to get one tribal leader to subjugate to another.

General Dostum, legendary in the region, in the whole continent, for courage, led. We had less than 500, around 300 or so, embedded military, special ops guys, as well as intelligence. And within about 4 or 5 months, the Taliban were totally routed, totally defeated.

Then the administration, under the leadership of the State Department, decided the best thing for Afghanistan would be to have a stove-piped, centralized, top-heavy government, even though this was a regional, tribal country, had been for millennia.

That was a mistake that was not the Obama administration's; that happened before President Obama took office.

But, from those I talked with, they could see problems, and I believe, if there had been a President Bush clone he would have been willing to admit we needed a change.

But the new President accepted Afghanistan, with its top-heavy government, where the President can appoint the governors, appoint the mayors, appoint the police chief, appoint the highest level teachers, appoint a slate of a big portion of the legislature. Incredible powers.

If you were looking for a formula that would help you create corruption, we helped provide it to the Afghans. If you were looking for an environment that could be created that would encourage corruption, we helped provide it to the Afghans.

Well, everybody makes mistakes. But the important thing is, after you have made them, recognize them and correct them.

Instead, this administration came in and really doubled down and bet on the top-heavy, corrupt Karzai administration. As a result, synagogues really can't be found in Afghanistan. Christian churches—you would be hard-pressed to find a church in Afghanistan, not that they are not there somewhere.

But the Taliban, one of whose leaders has been on national television in Afghanistan, on behalf of the Taliban,

citing shari'a law and, basically, announcing if you have been an opposing the Taliban, if you have not actually supported us, then everyone knows when the Americans leave, which will be this year, then we, the Taliban will be back in charge here in Afghanistan.

So under shari'a law, you must come to us, admit your mistakes, ask forgiveness, and ask for our protection, swear allegiance to the Taliban. We will forgive you and we will provide you protection. But if you fail to do so, then you will be fodder for death.

So, we have helped create a situation in Afghanistan, under this administration, where now, if you are not going to be a radical Islamist, your life is going to be miserable, which were the conditions in Afghanistan before we went in.

We have set up a situation in Afghanistan that will be ripe for further Taliban development, further Taliban training, and planning for a more glorious 9/11 attack that can and would kill more Americans.

And although that would most likely occur after this President leaves office, it would only be the mainstream media who would not recognize that it was this administration that made this possible.

Yes, the Bush administration would have contributed some by the government so centralized that was set up. But all but the most deaf and blind to the mistakes of the current administration would say the Bush administration would have allowed it to get to this point in Afghanistan, where Christians and Jews have to fear for their lives, where moderate Muslims have to fear for their lives, and where those who fought for and with America will likely be killed.

Now, knowing some of these people, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you they are not going to go down without a fight. So most likely, our President, here in the United States, by siding with the bullies, is likely to contribute to a massive, ugly, destructive civil war in Afghanistan.

But it is one of the situations that has led our allies around the world to say, wait a minute. The Northern Alliance in Afghanistan fought for America. They fought for you. They defeated radical Islamic Taliban in Afghanistan. They were defeated. They were overrun.

That last incredible battle where General Dostum—and I have talked with him personally about it in Afghanistan, how he knew that they couldn't send tanks up to this last fortification of the Taliban because they could get blown up and they would block the way up.

He knew that he couldn't send massive numbers of infantry until, eventually, they prevailed because they are fighting uphill against artillery, rocket propelled grenades, and gunfire, and they wouldn't have a chance, no matter how many they sent.

He felt the only chance was if they put the 1,000 fastest, most courageous, best horseback riders they had on horses and sent them uphill into this Taliban stronghold. And they did, and these 1,000 courageous freedom fighters, Muslims who wanted freedom from these cruel, uncivilized, brutal beasts called the Taliban, they wanted them defeated, and they went after them.

Riding as fast as they can, they head up the hill, rocket propelled grenades, artillery, gunfire coming their way, and they lost 30 percent of the 1,000 riders.

They didn't slow down, they didn't stop, they didn't watch and see as someone fell. They knew their only chance of victory was to keep heading up that hill to the fortification. Around 700 got there and wiped out the Taliban, destroyed the last fortification, the last stronghold of the Taliban, and there was victory in Afghanistan.

Now, all these years later, 12 years later, with an administration that keeps helping the bullies of the world and hurting those who are oppressed in the world, the Taliban is poised to take back over.

Our allies are wondering, why did we trust you? Why did we fight with you?

You said when we defeated the Taliban for you that we could trust you, we could give you our weapons because we had nothing to fear; the United States would always stand with us and make sure the Taliban would never take back over.

Now, 12 years after we trusted you, we put our lives in your hands, we gave these weapons to you, you are turning your back on us in Afghanistan who fought for you and with you, lost family, lost limbs, fighting for you and with you, and now you are going to walk away and leave this country to fall back in the hands of the Taliban.

We are not going to let it happen without a fight. But we can't believe you would do this to someone to whom you said, hey, trust us, you can trust us, and we did, and now the current administration is turning its back on us, calling us war criminals.

□ 2100

Other allies around the world see this, and they say, wow. You know, we can't say this to Secretary of State Kerry. We couldn't say it to Secretary of State Clinton. We couldn't say this to President Obama, but we can say this to you. We trust you, but we are wondering if we are going to be the next allies to be thrown under the bus.

People around the world are saying—it seems to be pretty clear—you can't trust the United States, or you will pay with your life. That is not the America that gained the trust and respect around the world from everyone except the radical Islamists and some of the mainstream media.

The America that became the most free, the most affluent nation in world history has also been the most generous nation in world history, and what we have done and given and lost on behalf of other people—not to create an empire, not to build an empire, not to force people to speak English and to follow American ways—but so they could be free to choose the way in which they should go.

Countries historically have not done that, and we have, and now, that generous nature has been used by this administration until it has become a vice, a vice that would allow our allies to be killed, to be oppressed and persecuted because we are going to let the bullies take over.

Not only did we watch and let bullies take over in other parts of the world, but we saw the Arab Spring that, in the not-so-distant future, would become a Christian and Jewish winter—a bleak, miserable winter for Jews and Christians and secularists.

We demanded that the leader of Egypt be ousted—never mind that this administration had agreements with the Egyptian leader—the President. We turned our back on them—and how about after the Soviet Union fell and the United States, particularly the Clinton administration, as I understand it, were the ones that guaranteed Ukraine that if you will give up the nuclear weapons that you hold and allow us to provide them to Russia—we know you don't want to give these weapons to Russia, we know you don't trust the Russians, but you can trust us, the United States.

President Clinton, as I understand it, worked this great deal with Ukraine: trust us, you can trust us—yes, let the Russians have the nuclear weapons that you possess, Ukraine; and we, the United States, will have your back, we will protect you. Russia wouldn't dare come against you because we will protect you. We will fight for you. We have got your back.

What this administration has done with the Ukrainians' back is to put a knife in it.

Well, you know, there were a lot of Russians in Crimea. Well, yes, there were. The Russians forced them in there and forced the Ukrainians out at one time. Gee, what a great way to claim this land is yours, by forcing the people out of there.

If you want to talk about earlier possession being the right to currently possess, you are going to be hard-pressed to find any Muslim that was a practicing Muslim 1,000 years before Christ, although you will find the Jews under King David, and you would find King David in the first 7 years of his reign in Hebron, leading Israel from Hebron.

This administration wants to say: oh, that is not Israel's land—the people that came along and worshiped Mohammed 1,600 years after King David ruled in this land, they are the ones that should have the land.

Really—that is this administration's position—seriously? What about the prophecies in the Old Testament that, in the mountains of Sumeria, there would be fruit, there would be grapes, there would be fine wine?

For decades, since Israel came back into the land, it was promised over 3,000 years ago. People are saying, well, you can't grow grapes there in those mountains. We don't know. The prophets really blew that one. You can't grow grapes in that area of Sumeria, except that I have been in that area of Sumeria where the prophet said that Israeli grapes would grow and provide great wine. I don't drink alcohol, but the grapes were amazing, and they are growing where the prophet said they would.

So how could land that was in Israel's possession, that was prophesied would be lost by the children of Israel, but God would return them to the area, and there would be fine grapes and fruit grown in that area, how could that be somebody else's prior claim when they were longer there than anybody still, any tribes in existence today?

Perhaps that is Israel's land, but not according to this administration. This administration is anxious to help those who are the most brutal in all of Israel.

So even though we have gotten used to seeing this administration turn its back on an ally in Egypt in favor of a radical Islamist Muslim brother, Morsi, who was in charge—and who, by the way, sent his wife to have a baby in America, who could be brought up and taught to hate America, just like Alamoudi, who is doing over 20 years in prison for supporting terrorism. His wife came to America and had a baby. They have got an American citizen.

Actually, it was rather interesting. I found out today that Osama bin Laden told his wife to come to America to have her baby. He wanted her to have an American citizen that they could raise up and teach to hate America who, because of their citizenship, would be able to come in and out. Fortunately, she ended up in Saudi Arabia, as I understand, before the child was born.

These radical Islamists may be crazy, but they are not stupid. They know as long as we have open borders and welcome people who are pregnant that hate us, they can get in and have baby American citizens and take them back to their country and, over their life, teach them to hate America.

I have talked about it for a number of years. There have been the naysayers, and at some point, they will wise up and see, wow, this has been happening for many years.

Well, the same administration that has condemned Israel at different times for not being willing to step up and do what we told them to do, the same administration that has left the leader of Israel sitting, waiting for the President for long periods of time while he went and ate and yet chastised him, well, you stay here and think about it, like a child, and when you come to the agreement I told you to, basically then I will get back together with you.

Like a child—really? We treat our allies like that?

Well, Prime Minister Netanyahu should be thankful because the way this administration treated the ally leader in Egypt was to have him destroyed—his position, get him out of office, out of power, subject him to torture by the locals.

Look at the ally that this administration had in Libya. Qadhafi was not a good man, but he was scared so badly after we entered Iraq that he opened his doors: okay, guys—America, you tell me what I can keep, what I have to get rid of. I don't want you to invade me, so I would rather be your friend. You tell me what I can have in the way of weapons.

He really and truly did give up whatever we told him to, and he became an ally. I have even met Qadhafi's son here at the Capitol before—while President Obama has been President. Apparently, he had meetings here in Washington with the administration, with people on Capitol Hill, and yet this administration not only turned on their ally that they had in Qadhafi—who had supposedly given up his terrorist-supporting ways—and this administration supplied weapons into Libya to al Qaeda, to other rebels who were not al Qaeda, but to al Qaeda, to al-Shari'a, to other radical Islamists to take out Qadhafi.

Some have contended, if we had not gone in and bombed Qadhafi's caravan as he was trying to get away, they would not have caught him, and he would have gotten out, so it would appear that the United States contributed mightily to the torturous death of Qadhafi.

I am not saying he didn't deserve a rough death after what he had done to so many, Mr. Speaker. I am just pointing out that this administration had made agreements and discussions with him as an ally, and they turned on him, threw him away—and not only that, but they helped bring about his personal death and destruction.

When you deal with al Qaeda, when you deal with radical Islam, the Taliban, it is like handling a snake, a poisonous snake. Eventually, it will bite because it is a snake. That is what it does.

Now, in areas where this administration helped rebels, being a Christian or a Jew is the quickest route to death. This administration, sadly, has helped contribute to situations in the world where there is now more terror if you are a Christian or a Jew than there has been in centuries.

So I guess I shouldn't be surprised, but I am a little bit surprised that as Hamas—who does get some of our money. Money is fungible, and we are sending it to the Palestinians, and every dime of it ought to be cut off as long as they have a relationship with Hamas; but yet, because we are sending money that is being used for textbooks and things like street signs that are named for people who have killed innocent Jews, Israelis, Christians, we are contributing to what they are doing.

Then this administration, through the FAA, stuck a knife in Israel once again by having the administration, through the FAA, ban U.S. flights to and from Israel's main airport for a second day.

As even CNN reported, ''The FAA's ban on U.S. flights to and from Israel's main airport for a second day marks another blow to that country's economy and a success for Hamas militants, experts said Wednesday.''

□ 2115

As one said, quoted in the CNN story:

> It is a big hit to the Israeli economy and to our pride, the director of the Civil Aviation Authority of Israel said. But he and other Israeli officials insisted their country's sophisticated antimissile system makes Ben Gurion Airport a safe place, even though a Hamas rocket from Gaza fell 1 mile away from the airfield, prompting the FAA temporary ban on U.S. flights.
>
> ''We knew about that rocket,'' said Israeli Government spokesman Mark Regev. ''We were tracking it for about 3 minutes, our air force. We could have taken it down, but because we saw that it wasn't going to hit inside the airport, we let it through.''
>
> For some Americans, Gaza conflict strikes close to home. The FAA ban marks something of a victory for Hamas—as well as prudent decision to protect commercial airlines, one expert said.
>
> But his quote included, ''What is the objective of terrorists? To incite terror in people.''

That was Tim Clemente, a retired FBI counterterrorism agent talking about Hamas.

Clemente said:

> I think because they probably got lucky with this one rocket that came close enough to Ben Gurion to make it seem like the threat was legitimate.

Well, the truth is, maybe Mr. Clemente didn't know the Israelis were tracking it. They could have shot it down, but there have been so many. What? A couple thousand of these rockets have been sent in the last 15 days into Israel, they cannot afford to knock down ones that are not going to harm people or do damage, so they didn't take it down. They could see the trajectory. They knew where it was going to hit.

Yet the Obama administration decides to inflict even more damage on Israel by harming them economically. Oh, we are lifting bans. We are working with Iran, even though Iran said they want to wipe out the Little Satan, Israel, and the Great Satan, the United States. They made it clear, and they have never, ever ceased to pursue that dream of wiping out Israel and the United States.

Oh, we will give them some money. We will let them have proceeds, but when it comes to Israel, we are going to slap them around like a little kid again even though they have the sophisticated weaponry to knock down rockets and they let one go because it is not going to hurt anybody. This administration seizes on that to declare a ban on U.S. flights to and from Tel Aviv.

Fawzi Barhoum, a Hamas spokesman, described the missile landing near the airport as one victory in the ongoing war between Hamas and Israel in Gaza. The resistance success in stopping the air traffic and isolating Israel from the world is a great victory for the resistance, Barhoum told Al-Aqsa Television.

Great victory for Hamas. Great victory for radical Islam. They have gotten the United States administration under President Obama to ban air traffic into Tel Aviv, so we are sticking a knife in our friend.

It is not bad enough that Hamas is launching rockets nonstop into Israel, that they have made clear no matter how badly Israel wants a cease-fire, they are not going to stop the rockets, they are hoping they will kill innocent people because they have made clear before that to them, to these terrorists, they don't think there is an innocent child in all of Israel because ultimately they will be in the military, so they are doing the world a favor, they say, or they think, by killing every Israeli they can.

And what does this administration do? It says let's help Hamas by sticking, taking a stab into the heart of Israel's economy.

Here is an article from haaretz.com:

Will the threat to Israel's only international airport be a game-changer?

Whether or not flights in and out of Israel are suspended for any length of time, the suspension of flights by several major air carriers is Hamas' first major achievement of this conflict.

Mr. Speaker, it is tragic that the United States is the one who gave Hamas, the radical Islamists, their first big victory. It wasn't Israel that gave them a victory. Israel has defended itself, and that is all they are doing.

The article says:

With a single rocket, which evaded the Iron Dome missile defense system and exploded between two houses in the Tel Aviv suburb of Yehud, Hamas might just have achieved what it failed to do with nearly 2,000 rockets fired at Israel since the beginning of this round of warfare 15 days ago.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it should be clear that Israel tracked the missile, saw it wasn't going to hit anybody, and they let it go. It was not a mistake. It was something they saw would be harmless, and they let it go, the Israelis did.

But the article says:

The decision of the United States' Federal Aviation Administration to advise the three U.S. carriers flying to Israel, Delta, United, and US Airways, to suspend their flights to Israel for 24 hours, could just be just a temporary blip, another inconvenience caused by the current security situation. If the suspension is extended indefinitely, for as long as the rockets are flying, and if it spreads to the airlines of other countries—a number of European carriers have already followed suit and Korean Air suspended flights already last week—it would create an intolerable situation for the government of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu.

Further in the article it says:

The rocket falling on Yehud did not change that situation. One factor that could have changed the FAA assessment was probably the downing of the Malaysian Airlines Boeing 777 over eastern Ukraine on Thursday, with the deaths of all 298 crew and passengers on board.

Tens of thousands of Israelis planning to fly abroad, tourists who were to leave, and those who were scheduled to arrive here in the next few days will have had their plans disrupted. The national carrier, El Al, however, will continue to fly, and since there have been many cancelations already, it will carry many of those who were set to fly on foreign airlines.

But the psychological effect on Israelis will be significant, and this could have a longer term implication for Israel's economy.

The last time there was a wide-scale suspension of flights to Israel by foreign airlines was not in 2001 after 9/11 when there were continued threats against Israel or 2002 with continued threats against Israel or 2003 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8. No. There were no flights suspended from the United States under the President George W. Bush administration, even though the threats at that time were probably more severe than now that they have such an effective Iron Dome. There were days before the effective Iron Dome that Israel was probably more at risk than they are with the Iron Dome, but Bush didn't call a suspension. But this administration has.

The last time there was a wide-scale suspension of flights to Israel by foreign airlines was in early 1991, when Iraqi scud missiles were falling on Israel during the first gulf war. Israelis then did not travel abroad as often as they do now, and that conflict did not happen during the summer vacation period. More significantly, the local economy was not integrated into the global markets as it is today, with hundreds of international companies having research centers in the Israeli high-tech hubs and thousands of companies here totally reliant on export markets. It took Israel's economy many years to break down the reluctance of foreign corporations to invest and work in Israel—a few days or a couple of weeks with limited air travel probably won't change that, but it may well create a temporary feeling of siege.

This may prove to be a game-changer in a conflict which is now entering its third week. It could provide further impetus for the government in seeking a speedy cease-fire with Hamas, but that seems doubtful.

It is much more likely that, faced with the prospect of more rockets cutting off Israel off from the international air routes, the government will be inclined to order a much more devastating blow, a wider ground operation to occupy the rocket-launching sites or even directed at Hamas' underground headquarters, with dreadful implications for the people of Gaza living above.

And that will be the fault of this administration by failing to put pressure on Hamas but instead putting pressure on the more reasonable people who have just tried to defend themselves and have made clear if you stop the rockets, we stop attacking.

All we are seeking is peace. Hamas holds the peace in its own hands, and with that hand, it keeps trying to murder Israelis. And then you end up having discussions in mainstream media—not that hardly anybody is watching. But on CNN when one commentator asked another, I think it was Wolf Blitzer, in effect, gee, these Hamas, they don't have near the weapons that Israel has, so are you seeing any let-up of Israel since they clearly have more fighting power than Hamas?

I am sorry. That is just really a stupid question. If somebody is coming at you with a rock with the intent to murder you and you have a gun, are you supposed to stand aside and say: Yeah, beat me as long as you want to until you kill me. I can't use a gun because it is more powerful than your rock?

Of course not. You can use self-defense when someone has murderous intent.

Israel does have the ability to go in and clean out the weapons in Gaza. I have pointed out to Prime Minister Netanyahu and other leaders of Israel that going back to the very inception of Israel—the very inception—before there was a king, even before there were judges, there has never been a time in Israel's history when Israel gave away its land trying to buy peace. Not only did they not get peace, that land they gave away was used as a staging area from which to attack it. Southern Lebanon and Gaza Strip are just more modern examples.

Mr. Speaker, I didn't understand until I went to Israel for the first time why in the world Israel would be willing to give away more land. But when you are there, you see it among the people. They were tired of suicide bombers, and they were tired of rockets. Look, if you will just leave us alone, we will give you land. But hopefully Israel has learned a lesson that even though you are tired of the rockets, you are as tired of the destruction from Hamas and from radical Islamists as you were from the PLO, you can't buy peace by giving away your country, not part of it, not all of it.

As long as you exist, they will want to kill you, eradicate you, and wipe you out. They have said they will create a worse holocaust than World War II, and I think they are quite serious.

What this administration ought to do for the good of mankind is to recognize that in Hamas are some of the most heinous war crimes in current days because Hamas is willing to take schoolchildren, the sick, the afflicted, and families and put weapons in their homes, their schools, and their hospitals, hiding them under, hiding them in, and then when Israel defends itself by taking out the weapons, they get to claim: Oh, gee, look. You killed innocent civilians. Shame on you.

The Hamas leaders ought to be tried for war crimes, convicted and killed.

□ 2130

They ought to be put to death in a war crimes system of justice for using children and innocent people as shields. And this administration ought to be leading the cry against Hamas' exposure of its children and its people. But unfortunately, because some of the

American money we have spent is capable of being used to fund schoolbooks that teach the children to hate Israelis and hate Americans, hate Jews, hate Christians, you actually have families that say sure, you want to hide your weapons in here, gee, if we are taken out by the Israelis, then we are martyred and we will be heroes. What kind of sick thinking have we contributed to in the region?

It is time to cut off every dime that America is giving to the Palestinians, to Hamas, anybody working with Hamas, anybody having any relationship with Hamas. It is time to take President Bush's words that you are either with us or you are against us. If you are doing business with Hamas, if you are helping Hamas, if you are friendly with Hamas, then you are our enemy, and then we ought to enforce that.

Israel is standing in defense not only of itself but of the United States of America because the radical Islamists represented in Hamas don't just want an end to Israel. Anyone who wants the destruction and end of Israel wants the destruction and the end of the United States of America, and it is time that somebody in this administration recognized that. I think there are military leaders that recognize that, and some day they are going to grow a pair and tell the President of the United States that he is helping the wrong side, and God bless him when they do.

We even have Jewish self-loathers in this country and in the media—which there have always been—who want to beat up and vilify Israel when the country just wants to defend itself. But we know this has happened as long as there have been the Jewish people. I mean, going back to World War II, there were actually Jews who went and identified where other Jews lived for the Germans. So is it any surprise that you would have some Jewish people, self-loathing Jews, who would ridicule Israel when it is just trying to defend itself?

Here is another article, ''World suspension of Israel flights a 'great victory': Hamas'':

> The success of Hamas in closing Israeli airspace is a great victory for the resistance, and is the crown of Israel's failure.

That is Hamas spokesman Sami Abu Zuhri. Well, he should give credit to this administration. This administration is the one who gave it to him.

And then here is an article from Reuters. Netanyahu asks Kerry to help resume flights to Israel. Well, good luck with that. As long as they think they are hurting Israel, they will probably keep it.

Sure, the President has already got his Nobel Peace Prize, he got that before he really got started. But Secretary Kerry doesn't have his yet, and the only chance he will have of bringing any peace to the Middle East from his perspective is if you put pressure on the only reasonable group over there, and that is the Israelis, because they are the only ones that recognize that human life is valuable and we ought to try to save as much as we can. They have shown great restraint in the Gaza Strip. They shouldn't have to. We should clean it up for them.

Another article by Andrew McCarthy, ''Palestinians Chose Hamas and the Mass Murder of Civilians, Including Their Own.'' He posted this July 22:

> Today, we are yet again being inundated with tales of Palestinian woe after Hamas's familiar barbarism has provoked an Israeli military response. It thus bears remembering that the Palestinian people chose Hamas. Whatever happened to all of those Democracy Project paeans to self-determination? Hamas is Palestinian self-determination. Hamas was not forced on Palestinians. Hamas did not militarily conquer Gaza. No, Hamas swept parliamentary elections freely held in the Palestinian territories in 2006—thrashing its rival, Fatah, which is only marginally less committed to the destruction of Israel.

Anyway, Andrew McCarthy quotes from The Wall Street Journal:

> The people of Gaza overwhelmingly elected Hamas, a terrorist outfit dedicated to the destruction of Israel as their designated representatives. Almost instantly Hamas began stockpiling weapons and using them against a more powerful foe with a solid track record of retaliation. What did Gazans think was going to happen? Surely they must have understood on election night that their lives would now be suspended in a state of utter chaos. Life expectancy would be miserably low. Children would be without a future. Staying alive would be a challenge, if staying alive even mattered anymore. To make matters worse, Gazans sheltered terrorists and their weapons in their homes, right beside ottoman sofas and dirty diapers. When Israel warned them of impending attacks, the inhabitants defiantly refused to leave.
>
> On some basic level you forfeit your right to be called civilians when you freely elect members of a terrorist organization as statesmen, invite them to dinner with blood on their hands, and allow them to set up shop in your living room as their base of operations. At that point you begin to look a lot more like conscripted soldiers than innocent civilians. And you have wittingly made yourself targets.
>
> It also calls your parenting skills into serious question. In the U.S. if a parent is found to have locked his or her child in a parked car on a summer day with the windows closed, a social worker takes the children away from the demonstrably unfit parent. In Gaza, parents who place their children in the direct line of fire are rewarded with an interview on MSNBC, where they can call Israel a genocidal murderer.

He says it is just a warmup for Jew hatred that pervades the Charter's Article 7, and then he quotes:

> Hamas is one of the links in the Chain of Jihad in the confrontation with the Zionist invasion. It links up with the setting out of Martyr Izz-a-din al-Qassam and his brothers in the Muslim Brotherhood who fought the Holy War in 1936; it further relates to another link of the Palestinian Jihad and the Jihad and efforts of the Muslim Brothers during the 1948 war, and to the Jihad operations of the Muslim Brothers in 1968 and thereafter. But even if the links have become distant from each other, and even if the obstacles erected by those who revolved in the Zionist orbit, aiming at obstructing the road before the Jihad fighters, have rendered the pursuance of Jihad impossible, nevertheless, the Hamas has been looking forward to implement Allah's promise, whatever time it takes. The prophet, prayer and peace be upon him, said: The time will not come until Muslims will fight the Jews (and kill them); until the Jews hide behind rocks and trees, which will cry: O Muslim! there is a Jew hiding behind me, come on and kill him. This will not apply to the Gharqad, which is a Jewish tree.

Anyway, Andrew McCarthy said:

> This is what Palestinians voted for. The highlighted section of Article 7 comes straight from Islamic scripture, from the authoritative Bukhari and Muslim collections of hadith (the sayings and doings of the prophet Mohammed). It foretells an eternal struggle until the end of time, when, with Allah's intercession, the rocks and trees will help Muslims battalions find and kill every remaining Jew.

Mr. Speaker, this is a dangerous time. Prime Minister Netanyahu seeks the help of his former ally, the United States, not the stabbing in the back by the ally, the United States. I have asked my office to try to set up an appointment with Prime Minister Netanyahu if he would see me this weekend. I know the Sabbath is coming up, but I would find a commercial way to fly in there because I believe in the Israeli people and their ability to keep me safe despite the efforts of the United States in consoling their enemy.

Just as my friend DANA ROHRABACHER came to me several years ago and said, look, the U.S. State Department is saying we cannot go into northern Iraq, the Kurdish area, for more than just maybe a meal because if we do, they won't protect us. They say it is too dangerous. Well, it was the safest area in Iraq, and the Kurdish people were begging for our help. Well, we went in. We were protected 3 days, and I know and I would put my life in the hands of the Israelis. I trust them and I wish the rest of the United States would trust them despite this administration.

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. GINGREY of Georgia (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 609. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land in San Juan County, New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 24, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6535. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Poultry Improvement Plan and Auxiliary Provisions [Docket No.: APHIS-2011-0101] (RIN: 0579-AD83) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6536. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, GSA, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-74; Small Entity Compliance Guide [Docket No.: FAR 2014-0052, Sequence No. 2] received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6537. A letter from the Attorney Advisor/Federal Register Liaison, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Government Securities Act Regulations; Replacements of Reference to Credit Ratings and Technical Amendments [Docket No.: BPD GSRS 11-01] (RIN: 1535-AA02) received July 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6538. A letter from the Deputy Director, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — CLIA Program and HIPAA Privacy Rule; Patients' Access to Test Reports [CMS-2319-F] (RIN: 0938-AQ38) received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6539. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Heath and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — New Animal Drug Applications; Confidentiality of Data and Information in a New Animal Drug Application File; Confirmation of Effective Date [Docket No.: FDA-2014-N-0108] received July 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6540. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Policies Regarding Mobile Spectrum Holdings; Expanding the Economic and Innovation Opportunities of Spectrum Through Incentive Auctions [WT Docket No.: 12-269] [Docket No.: 12-268] received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6541. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition of Certain Persons to the Entity List; and Removal of Person from the Entity List Based on Removal Request [Docket No.: 140522446-4446-01] (RIN: 0694-AG19) received July 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6542. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations (EAR): Control of Military Electronic Equipment and Other Items the President Determines No Longer Warrant Control Under the United States Munitions List (USML) [Docket No.: 120330233-4307-03] (RIN: 0694-AF64) received July 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6543. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; 2014 Recreational Accountability Measure for Greater Amberjack in the Gulf of Mexico [Docket No.: 1206013412-2517-02] (RIN: 0648-XD230) received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6544. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 130214139-3542-02] (RIN: 0648-XD251) received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6545. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; 2014 Recreational Accountability Measures for Red Grouper in the Gulf of Mexico [Docket No.: 120717247-3029-02] (RIN: 0648-XD231) received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6546. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, National Ocean Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — U.S. Integrated Ocean Observing System; Regulations to Certify and Integrate Regional Information Coordination Entities [Docket No.: 120813326-4163-02] (RIN: 0648-BC18) received July 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6547. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Closure [Docket No.: 121210694-3514-02] (RIN: 048-XD238) received July 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6548. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2014 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for Blueline Tilefish in the South Atlantic Region [Docket No.: 131231999-4319-01] (RIN: 0648-XD331) received July 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6549. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office National Marine Sanctuaries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Department's final rule — Re-Establishing the Sanctuary Nomination Process [Docket No.: 130405334-3717-02] (RIN: 0648-BD20) received July 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6550. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopters Textron Canada (Bell) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0574; Directorate Identifier 2008-SW-22-AD; Amendment 39-17766; AD 2014-04-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6551. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; I-90 Inner-belt Bridge Demolition, Cuyahoga River, Cleveland, OH [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0425] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6552. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Cape Fear River; Wilmington, NC [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0413] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6553. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Urbanna Creek; Saluda, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0372] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6554. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Chesapeake Bay; Cape Charles, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0298] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6555. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Tennessee River mile 4.8 to 5.8; Ledbetter, KY [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0301] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6556. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Hackensack River, Jersey City, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2013-1005] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6557. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (previously Eurocopter France) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0334; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-021-AD; Amendment 39-17858; AD 2014-0-52] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6558. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Previously Eurocopter France) (Airbus Helicopters) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0938; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-057-AD; Amendment 39-17852; AD 2014-11-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6559. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Albion, NE [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0595; Airspace Docket No. 13-ACE-10] received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6560. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0141; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-024-AD; Amendment 39-17871; AD 2014-12-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64)

received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6561. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dornier Luftfahrt GmbH Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1056; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-046-AD; Amendment 39-17849; AD 2014-10-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6562. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. (BHTI) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0415; Directorate Identifier 2008-SW-065-AD; Amendment 39-17865; AD 2014-12-04] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6563. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0378; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-050-AD; Amendment 39-17868; AD 2014-12-07] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6564. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. (Agusta) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0379; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-067-AD; Amendment 39-17870; AD 2014-12-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6565. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Przedsiebiorstwo Doswiadczalno-Produkcyjne Szybownictwa ''PZL-Bielsko'' Model SZD-50-3 ''Puchacz'' Sailplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0180; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-004-AD; Amendment 39-17869; AD 2014-12-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6566. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0340; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-084-AD; Amendment 39-17867; AD 2014-12-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6567. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0882; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-29-AD; Amendment 39-17864; AD 2014-12-03] (RIN: 2120-AA 4) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6568. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; AgustaWestland S.p.A.(Type Certificate Previously Held by Agusta S.p.A) (Agusta) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0943; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-001-AD; Amendment 39-17836; AD 2014-09-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6569. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Grants for Adaptive Sports Programs for Disabled Veterans and Disabled Members of the Armed Forces (RIN: 2900-AP07) received July 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

6570. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Annual Price Inflation Adjustments for Contribution Limitations Made to a Health Savings Account Pursuant to Section 223 of the Internal Revenue Code (Rev. Proc. 2014-30) received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6571. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Applicable Federal Rates — May 2014 (Rev. Rul. 2014-13) received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6572. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Revenue Procedure: Purchase Price Safe Harbors for Sections 143 and 25 (Rev. Proc. 2014-31) received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6573. A letter from the SSA Regulations Officer, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Electronic Substitutions for SSA-538 [Docket No.: SSA-2009-0027] (RIN: 0960-AH02) received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6574. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Maritime Administration, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Retrospective Review Under E.O. 13563: War Risk Insurance (RIN: 2133-AB82) received May 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 103. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run (Rept. 113–549). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 3696. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements regarding cybersecurity and critical infrastructure protection, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–550, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CALVERT: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 5171. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–551). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 680. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3393) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to consolidate certain tax benefits for educational expenses, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4935) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements to the child tax credit (Rept. 113–552). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology and Oversight and Government Reform discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3696 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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 Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. VELA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ENYART, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 5168. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants for the support of full-service community schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 5169. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to enhance accountability within the Senior Executive Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 5170. A bill to improve Federal employee compliance with the Federal and Presidential recordkeeping requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio (for himself, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 5172. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to review the list of veterans designated as former prisoners of war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 5173. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit to employers who provide paid family and medical leave; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 5174. A bill to allow additional appointing authorities to select individuals from competitive service certificates; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

H.R. 5175. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal the risk corridor program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself and Mrs. LUMMIS):

H.R. 5176. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to retire coal preference right lease applications for which the Secretary

has made an affirmative commercial quantities determination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MAFFEI (for himself, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. BARROW of Georgia):

H.R. 5177. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to eliminate benefits under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program for Members of Congress so they are treated the same way as other taxpayers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, 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. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 5178. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an offset against income tax refunds to pay for restitution and other State judicial debts that are past-due; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California):

H.R. 5179. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide that the United States Postal Service may provide certain basic financial services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER):

H.R. 5180. A bill to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to improve the transparency of the Financial Stability Oversight Council, to improve the SIFI designation process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself and Mr. CHAFFETZ):

H.R. 5181. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to require the retention of records of high level officials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. HIMES):

H.R. 5182. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for equal treatment of individuals in same-sex marriages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 5183. A bill to establish a demonstration program requiring the utilization of Value-Based Insurance Design to demonstrate that reducing the copayments or coinsurance charged to Medicare beneficiaries for selected high-value prescription medications and clinical services can increase their utilization and ultimately improve clinical outcomes and lower health care expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. BUTTERFIELD:

H.J. Res. 120. A joint resolution approving the location of a memorial to commemorate the more than 5,000 slaves and free Black persons who fought for independence in the American Revolution; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress relating to extending the interim agreement with the Government of Iran regarding its nuclear program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself and Mr. LAMBORN):

H. Res. 681. A resolution recognizing the National Museum of World War II Aviation in Colorado Springs, Colorado, as America's National World War II Aviation Museum; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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 Mr. HOYER:

H.R. 5168.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 5169.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

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. MEADOWS:

H.R. 5170.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

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. CALVERT:

H.R. 5171.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 5172.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clauses 14 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 5173.

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. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 5174.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 5175.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have the power to . . . regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 5176.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. MAFFEI:

H.R. 5177.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 5178.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 5179.

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 7 and from Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 5180.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (The Congress shall have the Power ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States and with the Indian Tribes'') and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 (The Congress shall have the 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 Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 5181.

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 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 5182.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 5183.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution which states, ''(t)he 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.''

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.J. Res. 120.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 32: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 36: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 259: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 333: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 401: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 445: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 494: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 543: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 594: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 721: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 851: Mr. DINGELL and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 1020: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 1024: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 1070: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1094: Mr. MAFFEI.
H.R. 1125: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 1201: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1313: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 1318: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 1389: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 1507: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 1563: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 1652: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 1666: Ms. NORTON and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1698: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 1699: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska and Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 1812: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 1914: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. LEWIS, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2084: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 2283: Ms. KUSTER, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 2433: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 2453: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2457: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2480: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2529: Mr. BARBER, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 2536: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2607: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 2664: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 2673: Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 2745: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 2780: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 2831: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2856: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SIRES, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2957: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2996: Mr. BOUSTANY and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 3024: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3121: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
H.R. 3153: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3333: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 3465: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 3490: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 3505: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 3611: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 3680: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HALL, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. PETRI, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. YODER, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 3708: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 3717: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 3747: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3761: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 3775: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 3850: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 3857: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 3958: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 3991: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 3992: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 4016: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 4023: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4041: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. STIVERS, and Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 4060: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. COTTON.
H.R. 4156: Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 4190: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 4276: Mr. JOLLY and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 4319: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LONG, and Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 4364: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4365: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 4385: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 4423: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 4426: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 4432: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 4449: Ms. KUSTER and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 4510: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. FARR, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 4511: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 4576: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 4577: Mr. OLSON and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 4578: Mr. WELCH, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 4582: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 4589: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 4592: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 4629: Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 4664: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 4709: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 4740: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 4748: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 4750: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 4765: Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 4772: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H.R. 4778: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 4792: Mr. AMASH.
H.R. 4793: Ms. MENG and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 4818: Ms. MENG and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 4833: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 4837: Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 4851: Mr. NEAL, Ms. CLARK OF MASSACHUSETTS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 4857: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 4872: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 4878: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 4906: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 4917: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4930: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 4960: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 4962: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 4969: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 4978: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 4979: Mr. LANKFORD and Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 4980: Mr. PITTENGER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 4988: Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 4995: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 5007: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 5011: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 5014: Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 5023: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 5049: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 5050: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 5053: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 5059: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. UPTON, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 5062: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 5071: Mr. ENYART, Mr. COBLE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 5076: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 5078: Mr. KLINE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. HURT, Mr. ROSS, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. ROONEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. UPTON, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 5081: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 5088: Ms. MENG, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 5089: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 5094: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 5104: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 5110: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. JONES, and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 5111: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 5116: Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 5118: Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 5122: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 5135: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 5139: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 5143: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 5160: Mr. SALMON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.J. Res. 68: Mr. DELANEY.
H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. LEWIS.
H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. HALL, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H. Res. 109: Mr. RUIZ.
H. Res. 440: Mr. SHERMAN.
H. Res. 596: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H. Res. 614: Mr. LATHAM.
H. Res. 621: Mr. PEARCE.
H. Res. 622: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H. Res. 623: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H. Res. 652: Mr. BYRNE and Mrs. BACHMANN.
H. Res. 665: Mr. STOCKMAN, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. CAMP

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 4980, the Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H. CON. RES. 105

OFFERED BY: MR. MCGOVERN

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. PROHIBITION REGARDING UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN IRAQ.

The President shall not deploy or maintain United States Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific statutory authorization for such use enacted after

the date of the adoption of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 2. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this concurrent resolution supersedes the requirements of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).