

Ratcliffe	Scott, David	Van Hollen
Reed	Sensenbrenner	Vargas
Reichert	Serrano	Veasey
Renacci	Sessions	Vela
Ribble	Sewell (AL)	Velázquez
Rice (SC)	Sherman	Wagner
Rigell	Shimkus	Walberg
Roby	Shuster	Walden
Rogers (AL)	Simpson	Walker
Rogers (KY)	Sinema	Walorski
Rohrabacher	Sires	Walters, Mimi
Rokita	Slaughter	Walz
Rooney (FL)	Smith (MO)	Wasserman
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NE)	Schultz
Roskam	Smith (NJ)	Weber (TX)
Ross	Smith (TX)	Webster (FL)
Rothfus	Smith (WA)	Welch
Rouzer	Stefanik	Westrup
Roybal-Allard	Stewart	Westerman
Royce	Stivers	Westmoreland
Ruiz	Stutzman	Whitfield
Ruppersberger	Swalwell (CA)	Williams
Russell	Takai	Wilson (SC)
Ryan (OH)	Takano	Wittman
Ryan (WI)	Thompson (PA)	Womack
Salmon	Thornberry	Woodall
Sanchez, Loretta	Tiberi	Yarmuth
Sanford	Tipton	Yoder
Sarbanes	Titus	Yoho
Scalise	Tonko	Young (AK)
Schakowsky	Torres	Young (IA)
Schiff	Trott	Young (IN)
Schock	Tsongas	Zeldin
Schweikert	Turner	Zinke
Scott (VA)	Upton	
Scott, Austin	Valadao	

NOES—20

Clarke (NY)	Jones	Schrader
Ellison	Kaptur	Thompson (CA)
Fudge	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Grijalva	Napolitano	Visclosky
Hastings	Pocan	Waters, Maxine
Hoyer	Richmond	Watson Coleman
Johnson, E. B.	Rush	

NOT VOTING—11

Byrne	Long	Sánchez, Linda
Costa	McNerney	T.
Hinojosa	Rice (NY)	Speier
Lee	Roe (TN)	Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1552

Ms. BASS changed her 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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote today because of a serious illness in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 84, “yea” on rollcall No. 85, “yea” on rollcall No. 86, “yea” on rollcall No. 87, “yea” on rollcall No. 88, “no” on rollcall No. 89, and “yea” on rollcall No. 90.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

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

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 124

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—Mrs. Capps and Mr. Polis.

(2) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY.—Mr. Takano and Mr. Foster.

(3) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—Ms. Clarke of New York.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 121 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. 5.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from New York (Mr. COLLINS) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1558

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. 5) to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children’s schools, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of New York 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 Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5, the Student Success Act. This week, we have an opportunity to advance bold reforms that will strengthen K–12 education for children across America.

A great education can be the great equalizer. It can open doors to unlimited possibilities and provide students

the tools they need to succeed in life. Every child in every school deserves an excellent education, yet, Mr. Chairman, we are failing to provide every child that opportunity.

Today, approximately one out of five students drops out of high school, and many who do graduate are going to college or entering the workforce with a subpar education. The number of students proficient in reading and math is abysmal. The achievement gap separating minority students from their peers is appalling. Parents have little to no options to rescue their children from failing schools.

A broken education system has plagued families for decades. Year after year, policymakers lament the problems and talk about solutions, and once in a while, a law is enacted that promises to improve our education system.

Unfortunately, past efforts have largely failed because they are based on the idea that Washington knows what is best for children. We have doubled down on this approach repeatedly, and it is not working.

Federal mandates dictate how to gauge student achievement, how to define qualified teachers, how to spend money at the State and local levels, and how to improve underperforming schools. And now, thanks to the unprecedented overreach of the current administration, the Department of Education is dictating policies concerning teacher evaluations, academic standards, and more.

No one questions whether parents, teachers, and local education leaders are committed to their students, yet there are some who question whether they are capable of making the best decisions for their students.

Success in school should be determined by those who teach inside our classrooms, by administrators who understand the challenges facing their communities, by parents who know better than anyone the needs of their children. If every child is going to receive a quality education, then we need to place less faith—less faith—in the Secretary of Education and more faith in parents, teachers, and State and local leaders. That is why I am a proud sponsor of the Student Success Act.

By reducing the Federal footprint, restoring local control, and empowering parents and education leaders, this commonsense bill will move our country in a better direction.

□ 1600

The Student Success Act provides States and school districts more flexibility to fund local priorities, not Washington’s priorities. The legislation eliminates dozens of ineffective or duplicative programs so that each dollar makes a direct, meaningful, and lasting impact in classrooms. The bill strengthens accountability by replacing the current national scheme with State-led accountability systems, returning to States the responsibility to

measure student performance and improve struggling schools. The Student Success Act also ensures parents have the information they need to hold their schools accountable. It is their tax money, but more importantly, it is their children, and they deserve to know how their schools are performing.

Mr. Chairman, the bill reaffirms that choice is a powerful lifeline for families with children in failing schools by extending the magnet school program, expanding access to high quality charter schools, and allowing Federal funds to follow low-income students to the traditional, public, or public charter school of the parents' choice.

Finally, the Student Success Act reins in the authority of the Secretary of Education. We must stop the Secretary from unilaterally imposing his will on schools, and this bill will do just that. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, that is why the White House and powerful special interests are teaming up to defeat this legislation. They fear the bill will lead to less control in Washington and more control in States and school districts. Let me assure the American people: that is precisely what this bill will do.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to help all children, regardless of background, income, or ZIP Code, to receive an excellent education by supporting the Student Success Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5, a bill to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, a landmark civil rights law enacted under President Lyndon B. Johnson. As we approach the 50-year anniversary of its enactment, we cannot take lightly ESEA's mission, goals, and achievements over the course of five decades. It is by that yardstick of history that we must judge H.R. 5 today and determine if it will move our education system closer to meeting the challenges of the 21st century and prepare our students for the global economy.

We all know too well that quality education is even more vital today than it was generations ago. In our rapidly changing economy, our Nation's continued success depends on a well-educated workforce. A competitive and educated workforce strengthens the very social fabric of America: people with higher levels of education are less likely to be unemployed, less likely to need public assistance, less likely to become a teen parent, and less likely to get caught up in the criminal justice system. Over the course of ESEA's history, we have recognized that for many politically disconnected populations, equitable access to an education has not been a reality. It was necessary for the Federal Government to fill in the gaps of funding our public school systems.

Inequality was inevitable when most school systems are funded by real es-

tate taxes, and further by virtue of the fact that in our democratic society, we respond to political pressure. For 50 years, Congress has recognized that low-income students were not getting their fair share of the pie and that supplemental resources were absolutely necessary to ensure that all children had access to quality public education. As a result, Congress has a long-standing policy to target our limited Federal funding to schools and students who get left behind in an unequal system.

Mr. Chairman, one of this bill's most troubling provisions, which strikes at the heart of ESEA's long history of targeting resources to our neediest students, is the so-called portability provision. Now, present law gives greater weight to funding in areas of high concentration of poverty. Under H.R. 5, portability, a State agency could use all of its title I funds to districts based solely on the percentage of poor children, regardless of the concentration of poor people in a district.

As a result, much of the title I support intended towards those areas of concentration of poverty would be re-allocated to those wealthier areas. In other words, the low-income areas would get less, and the wealthy areas would get more. I ask: If that is the solution, then I wonder what you think the problem was? Analysis from a number of organizations, including the Department of Education, demonstrates title I portability will take money from the poorer schools and school districts and give more to affluent districts. This disproportionately affects students of color, and this is just simply wrong.

Data shows that H.R. 5 would provide the largest 33 school districts with the highest concentration of Black and Hispanic students over \$3 billion less in Federal funding than the President's budget over the next 6 years. Furthermore, the Center for American Progress found in its review of portability that districts with high concentrations of poverty could lose an average of \$85 per student, while the more affluent areas would gain more than \$290 per student.

There is an overwhelming body of research that shows that targeting resources to schools and districts with the highest concentrations of poverty is an effective way to mitigate the effects of poverty. Current law reflects this evidence and targets funding to schools where there are greater concentrations of poverty, and this bill rolls the clock back and reverses that.

To add insult to injury, H.R. 5 eliminates what is called maintenance of effort, a requirement of ESEA that States maintain their effort and that the Federal money will supplement what they are doing. As a result of this bill, States could use their education funds to fund tax cuts or other noneducation initiatives, thus turning ESEA into a glorified slush fund where politics would drive funding allocations.

And we know who is going to lose when politics are at play—our children.

There are other flaws with H.R. 5. This bill sets no standards for college or career readiness and allows students with disabilities to be taught with lesser standards. It limits our investment in education over the next 6 years because there are no adjustments for inflation. It block grants important programs, diluting the purpose and the outcome. Taken as a whole, these policies will have a disproportionate impact on students of color, students with disabilities, and our English language learners. It is no wonder that business groups, labor groups, civil rights, disabilities, and education groups have all expressed deep concerns about this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong opposition to H.R. 5, as it will turn the clock back on American public education. In its current form, the bill abandons the fundamental principles of equity and accountability in our education system, it eviscerates education funding, it fails to support our educators, and it leaves our children ill-prepared for success in the classroom and beyond. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, it is now my great pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his great leadership on this bill and in the committee generally.

I rise in strong support this afternoon because every student, Mr. Chairman, every student deserves an effective teacher, an engaging classroom, and a quality education that paves the path for a bright and prosperous future. That is what we all want. Unfortunately, despite the best of intentions, the Nation's current K-12 education law has failed to provide students this fundamental right. In fact, the law has only gotten in the way.

Far from taking us back to the past, this bill will take us to the future, where we should have been for a while now in terms of education, so that we can maintain competitiveness with the rest of the world and win in the 21st century.

No Child Left Behind's onerous requirements and the Obama administration's waiver scheme and pet projects have created a one-size-fits-all system that hinders innovation and stymies local efforts to improve student learning. As a result, too many young adults leave high school today without basic knowledge in reading, math, and science. They are ill-equipped to complete college and compete in the workforce, and consequently they are deprived of one of the best opportunities they have to earn a lifetime of success. We shouldn't shackle any student to that kind of future.

Americans have settled for the status quo for far too long, and today we have an opportunity to chart the new course. The Student Success Act departs from the top-down approach that has inefficiently and ineffectively governed elementary and secondary education and restores that responsibility to its rightful stewards: parents, teachers, State and local education leaders, and the local taxpayers.

First, the bill gets the Federal government out of the business of running our schools. It eliminates the dizzying maze of Federal mandates that has dictated local decisions and downsizes the bloated bureaucracy at the Department of Education that has focused on what Washington wants rather than what students need. The whole theme of this bill is that we trust teachers, parents, local education officials, and our local taxpayers much more than we would ever trust a Federal bureaucrat.

Mr. Chairman, I find it funny that the other side, those who are against this bill, actually cite the Department of Education in arguing what a bad bill this is. Imagine a Federal bureaucrat actually arguing to devolve its power back to its rightful owners. Of course they are going to be for the status quo. They benefit from the status quo. The students do not.

Second, the bill empowers parents and education leaders with choice, transparency, and flexibility. It ensures parents continue to have the information they need to hold schools accountable and helps more families escape underperforming schools by expanding alternative education options such as quality charter schools. It also provides States the flexibility to develop their own systems for addressing school performance and the autonomy to use Federal funds in the most efficient way.

This bill respects, Mr. Chairman, that it is the people's property. It is their tax dollars. We shouldn't be forcing any kind of maintenance of effort requirement on States or local jurisdictions. It is their decision to decide what to do with their money.

With the Student Success Act, we have an opportunity to overcome the failed status quo of high stakes testing and Federal waivers. We have an opportunity to reduce the Federal footprint in our Nation's classrooms. We also have an opportunity to signal to moms, dads, teachers, administrators, and State officials that we trust them to hold schools accountable for delivering a quality education to every child.

As my good friend, former colleague and fellow Hoosier Governor Mike Pence, said before the House Education and the Workforce Committee earlier this month:

There is nothing that ails education that can't be fixed by giving parents more choices and teachers more freedom to teach.

That is exactly what this bill does. This bill fosters an environment to accomplish that very thing. So I urge my colleagues to join me in replacing a

broken law with much-needed, commonsense education reforms and ask you to vote "yes"—"yes"—on the Student Success Act.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Ms. BONAMICI. Thank you, Mr. Ranking Member, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, there is overwhelming bipartisan consensus that we need to replace No Child Left Behind. And there is overwhelming bipartisan consensus that a rewrite of No Child Left Behind should promote local flexibility and support schools, not punish them. So I am deeply disappointed that the House has not come together to produce a bipartisan bill.

Despite a common goal and a long history of setting aside differences to work together on this important legislation, this bill does not adequately support America's students. Unfortunately, the Student Success Act shifts resources away from communities where poverty is most concentrated and freezes funding for America's most needy students at a time when public school enrollment is on the rise and more than half the students come from low-income families.

H.R. 5 does not support a well-rounded education for all students, it does not ensure college- and career-ready standards for all students, it does not promote quality afterschool programs, and it does not do enough to reduce emphasis on high-stakes tests.

The original goal of ESEA was laudable—equity. ESEA deserves a full review by the House so we can implement thoughtful solutions that reflect the current needs in our schools. But this bill does not protect historically underserved students.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this act, and I ask my colleagues to do the same. We need a law that is serious about addressing the challenges educators and students face today.

□ 1615

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), who has been active in this bill.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask, if I could, for the chairman of the Education and the Workforce Committee to engage in a colloquy with me concerning the importance of ensuring the Federal Government does not interfere with States' rights over public education.

Mr. KLINE. I, as the chairman of the full committee, would be happy to engage in that colloquy.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I believe there is no constitutional role for the Federal Government in education.

However, I understand that the funds under this act are accepted voluntarily by each State, but I am concerned that State bureaucrats often simply accept

these funds and all the strings without any input from our constituents or locally elected officials. I saw this in the Texas House.

I very much appreciate that the gentleman from Indiana and Chairman KLINE worked with me to protect the 10th Amendment and to ensure that States knowingly accept the strings attached to these programs before they receive any funding under this bill.

I want to be clear that this provision simply ensures that locally elected officials, parents, and other interested stakeholders have the opportunity to stand up and voice concern or support for accepting Federal funding at their State capital before any unelected, unaccountable bureaucrat can accept that money and all the strings that come with them.

I want to ask if the chairman concurs that this is the intent and the result of the language that you have included in the Student Success Act?

Mr. KLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me thank my colleague from Texas for his leadership on this important issue. I understand and appreciate your concern about this Federal role in education policy.

That is why we were happy to include your amendment in the underlying bill. It made the bill stronger and gave another tool to parents and local officials to protect their rights when it comes to educating our children.

This amendment, in combination with other strong provisions to rein in the Secretary, including an absolute ban on his ability to force any State to adopt the Common Core State Standards or any other particular standards, ensures the Federal Government cannot dictate what is taught in schools, what assessments are given, or what standards are used.

In fact, this amendment ensures States willfully accept the limited requirements that will come with these funds and reaffirms what decisions should be left to the States.

I thank the gentleman for offering this provision and his commitment to a limited Federal role in education, and I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart for protecting the 10th Amendment rights of the States to control their public school system and affirming a parents' right to control their child's education.

I appreciate you confirming the intent of this amendment. It will mean a far greater role for States and parents in their child's education.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I hate to throw cold water on the last colloquy, but I think it is important to note as we debate this bill, which never had the benefit of a public hearing or a

single subcommittee hearing, is that the Federal mandate for annual testing does not change as a result of this law.

What does change regarding that testing requirement is that the dedicated funding stream, which Congress at least had the decency to pass back in 2002, that is eliminated.

What you are doing is you are maintaining a mandate and you are eliminating the funding to pay for that mandate for testing. What we are ending up with, for all the talk about reducing the Federal footprint, is that we are doubling down on the Federal requirement that States have to have annual testing in schools, which every Member in this Chamber has heard about in loud protest over the last 13 years.

What this shows is that when the process is broken—and it was broken in this case, no committee-subcommittee meetings, no hearings, rushing it to the floor on a hyperpartisan basis, not one single Democratic amendment was accepted at the committee during markup, that is what you end up with, is a deformed bill, which should be defeated.

I urge in the strongest terms possible a “no” vote. Let’s go back and do this the right way.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Just to address a notion of what is done in secret and what is not done in secret and whether or not people have had a chance to weigh in on this legislation, as my friend knows—and I do thank him for not mentioning basketball, by the way—as my friend knows, this bill has had multiple hearings over several years.

It has been debated in committee. It has been debated on the floor of the House. It has been debated in the media. It is much discussed and much known—in contrast to the bill, the amendment, a substitute that my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle brought forward in committee, 851 pages, that nobody had seen outside the Democrat Caucus, so I believe this bill is well known, and it is the right direction to move us forward into the future to make sure that all of our children receive the quality education they deserve.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just to respond to the idea that our substitute was produced.

I would apologize to the gentleman for having sprung the substitute on him.

However, 2 legislative days after his bill was introduced, he scheduled a markup on the bill, so we produced a response to his bill in 2 legislative days. That is all the time we were allowed.

We would have allowed hearings. We would have liked hearings on his bill and our bill, but that just wasn’t to take place because of the rush to judgment.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE), the ranking member of the Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education Subcommittee.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose H.R. 5, the Student Success Act.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act reaffirmed the Supreme Court’s decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* that every child has the right to an equal educational opportunity. H.R. 5 undermines the law’s original intent, turning back the clock on equity and accountability in American public education.

As we commemorate the 50th anniversary of ESEA, Republicans have chosen to honor the anniversary by bringing a partisan bill to the House floor that tears apart the historic Federal role in education.

H.R. 5 should be known as the “Ensure Students Don’t Succeed Act.” The bill is a backward leap in our country’s education system, not a forward one.

Every student in America has a right to a quality education. It is our job as Members of Congress to make sure that right is protected, something that H.R. 5 does not do.

I refuse to fail our children and their families because our children deserve so much more than this legislation provides.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I am very, very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the chair of the Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, the current K–12 education system is failing our students, and State and local attempts to make it better have been hampered by an enormous Federal footprint.

Parents and education leaders have lost much of their decisionmaking authority to Washington bureaucrats, and the Secretary of Education has bullied States into adopting the Obama administration’s pet projects.

Unsurprisingly, student achievement levels remain worrisome. Just 36 percent of eighth grade students read at grade level, and only 35 percent are proficient in math.

For far too long, our schools have been governed by a top-down approach that stymies State and local efforts to meet the unique needs of their student populations. We can’t continue to make the same mistakes and expect better results. America’s students deserve change.

Fortunately, this week, the House of Representatives has an opportunity to chart a new course with the Student Success Act, legislation that reduces the Federal footprint in the Nation’s classrooms and restores control to the people who know their students best: parents, teachers, and local leaders.

The Student Success Act gets Washington out of the business of running

schools. It protects State and local autonomy by prohibiting the Secretary of Education from coercing States into adopting Common Core or other standards or assessments and by preventing the Secretary from creating additional burdens on States and school districts.

The bill reduces the size of the Federal education bureaucracy. Currently, the Department of Education oversees more than 80 programs geared towards primary and secondary education, most of which are duplicative and fail to deliver adequate results for students. The bill eliminates over 65 of these programs and requires the Secretary of Education to reduce the Department’s workforce accordingly.

The Student Success Act repeals onerous, one-size-fits-all mandates that dictate accountability, teacher quality, and local spending that have done more to tie up States and school districts in red tape than to support education efforts. It returns responsibility for classroom decisions to parents, teachers, administrators, and education officials.

The bill also provides States and school districts the funding flexibility to efficiently and effectively invest limited taxpayer dollars to boost student achievement by creating a local academic flexible grant. It provides the public with greater transparency and accountability over the development of new rules affecting K–12 schools.

Education is a deeply personal issue. After years of the Secretary of Education running schools through executive fiat, we understand that people are concerned about what a new K–12 education law will do.

That is why a number of key principles have guided our efforts to replace the law since we began the process more than 4 years ago: reducing the Federal footprint, restoring local control, and empowering parents and education leaders.

Those principles are reflected throughout the legislation, including specific safeguards that protect the right of States to opt out of the law, as well as the autonomy of home schools, religious schools, and private schools.

Organizations such as the Council for American Private Education, the Home School Legal Defense Association, and Committee on Catholic Education of U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops have expressed support for the Student Success Act because they know it will keep the Federal Government out of their business and preserve their cherished rights.

A host of administration bureaucrats is attempting to defeat these much-needed changes. They know each reform that returns flexibility and choice to parents and school boards represent a loss of power in D.C.

It is time we put the interests of America’s students above the desires of Washington politicians.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. KLINE. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. FOXX. By reversing the top-down policies of recent decades, the Student Success Act offers conservative solutions to repair a broken education system.

It would finally get Washington out of the way and allow parents, teachers, and State and local education leaders the flexibility to provide every child in every school a high-quality education.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member SCOTT.

I have to ask the majority: When did local control come to mean spend Federal dollars but ditch the Federal oversight?

During our markup last week—and I certainly heard today Member after Member arguing how removing Federal standards would help local leaders make tough decisions. This is absolutely backwards.

For 9 years, I served on the second largest school board in California, the sixth in the Nation, and I distinctly remember every school in the district making a compelling case for extra resources.

Which is why, frankly, we should be debating how to increase the size of the pie that goes to education, rather than only arguing on how to cut it up.

I still remember particularly one board meeting agonizing over the decision to move money from one needy school to another. We had to cut our budget, and we had to make a decision. In the end, the law and the safeguards around title I helped direct us to make sure the money went to the students that needed it most.

Ultimately, the direction in the law helps us balance competing needs, and I urge opposition to the bill.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

□ 1630

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 5, also known as the Student Success Act. Having spent 24 years as a classroom teacher, I am especially concerned about the title I funding mechanism in this legislation. We have seen time and time again that block grants often redirect funding away from intended populations and are a prelude to further cuts.

I also oppose the Republican bill's portability provision, which betrays the original intent of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. ESEA is meant to promote equitable opportunity and education for all and to help raise the academic achievement of low-income children. This legislation will do the opposite.

Finally, I object to the utter lack of Federal accountability in H.R. 5. While I oppose the current test-driven, high-stakes accountability system, I want the right accountability system, not no accountability system.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation goes too far. It cuts too deep and takes too many steps backward. I oppose H.R. 5. I call on my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to address this issue of grants and block grants and so forth we are starting to hear a little bit about.

I have been hearing for years, as I talk to superintendents in Minnesota and around the country, their frustration with the maze of Federal programs, 80-some Federal programs, each with its soda straw of funding and requirements for action and reporting. They have told me again and again: I have got money here, and I don't need it there. I need money here, and I can't move that money. I don't have the flexibility to move that money. I need to be able to put the resources where my students need it.

So, by eliminating 65 of those soda straws of individual controls and giving that flexibility to superintendents, we allow the money to be spent where it is needed the most. I think that is one of the great strengths of this bill, and it is one of the reasons why the American Association of School Superintendents does support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member SCOTT.

Mr. Chairman, this bill breaks the promise made 50 years ago to help all kids get a good, quality public education and to recognize the challenges faced by kids living in poverty.

When talking about the problems with this Republican bill, one wonders where to start. Is it the tearing apart of public education that comes in the form of dismantling title I funding? or the fact that the portability scheme is a slippery slope to turning our public school system into one big taxpayer-funded voucher program with public dollars sent to private schools? or the fact that Republicans have failed to address the need for early education or the maintenance of efforts of education? or that this bill diminishes the focus on professional development for teachers or the clear protections for collective bargaining agreements that are already part of State laws? or, ultimately, that this bill provides insufficient funding lower than what the title I authorization for last year authorized under the current law?

This bill doesn't provide real student success, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KLINE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), a member of the committee.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was passed 50 years ago to embody the promise that education is a right, not a privilege. We are supposed to be guardians of that promise, not the architects of its demise.

This reauthorization was an opportunity for Congress to delve in and debate the most pressing issues facing our schools. Sadly, the Republican majority chose to introduce a partisan bill behind closed doors without a single public hearing. Now we have a bill that reflects that lack of inclusion, takes hundreds of millions of dollars from our most vulnerable children, and weakens the safeguards that govern taxpayer money.

When I served on my local school committee, a tough economy meant some really difficult decisions. Not everyone was happy, but we listened. We listened to teachers, administrators, parents, students, experts, and fiscal watchdogs, and we were guided by one simple principle: what is best for our students. It is a shame Congress couldn't find the will to do the same.

I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 5.

Mr. KLINE. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), a former college professor and now a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member SCOTT.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5.

Two weeks ago, our committee came together expecting to seriously consider this bill, but instead Republicans said "no": "no" to moving beyond the status quo, "no" to investing in the futures of our kids, "no" to supporting our teachers and principals, and "no" to ensuring the success of our neediest students.

Guess what. You said "yes" to taking money from our poorest students like Robin Hood in reverse, "yes" to erasing the gains we have made over the past 50 years, and "yes" to denying students success. This bill ignores the obvious needs of our students and turns its back on some of our most vulnerable.

I hope we are not fooled by the name of the bill. Student Success is a failure. It clearly sets up our students to fail. H.R. 5 fails on all accounts. It fails our neediest students. It fails to invest in our teachers and our principals. It fails to prepare students for college and careers. This bill deserves an F.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. KLINE. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, could you advise how much time is available to both parties?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 15 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a former mayor.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is our responsibility to provide America's young people with every opportunity to obtain a world-class education in the best possible environment so they can compete in an increasingly global economy. That is why it is critical that we reauthorize ESEA the right way. Schools and educators deserve certainty, continuity, and direction based on new research and informed by our experience from the last decade, and students deserve the best education we can provide. H.R. 5 is not the right way to do it.

H.R. 5 would freeze funding at current levels for 6 years, representing over \$800 million in cuts compared to pre-sequester funding. By funding programs with block grants and introducing title I portability, this fails to support greater achievement of low-income students, students of color, students with disabilities, and English language learners. This fails students in so many ways.

We should be working together to ensure that a reauthorized ESEA improves student achievement, supports teachers and principals, and provides high-quality education for all students. This bill does not accomplish this.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. KLINE. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies.

Ms. DELAURO. Upon signing the original Elementary and Secondary Education Act, President Johnson described education as "the only valid passport from poverty." This bill threatens to tear up that passport. It caps Federal education funding at 2015 levels, levels which are already woefully inadequate after years of drastic cuts, and makes no provision for inflation, let alone the growing need for Federal education programs.

The bill allows States to direct Federal dollars away from schools in districts with the greatest poverty. It permits States to reduce education funding with no accountability. It allows schools in wealthier neighborhoods to use title I funding without having to target funds to the students with the greatest needs. It is a blatant betrayal of the ESEA's fundamental purpose, which is to level the playing field for low-income kids.

It weakens or eliminates many successful programs, including 21st Century Community Learning Centers initiative, which provides quality after school, summer school programs for disadvantaged children.

Mr. Chairman, it used to be that hard work in schools and on the job was the surest ticket to the middle class. Today, that compact is broken. Millions of hardworking families do not earn enough to make ends meet, let alone move up in the world. The cuts proposed in this bill would make matters even worse. Kids from poor neighborhoods are already being neglected, while those from wealthy areas get an ever-increasing slice of the pie. These disparities reverberate throughout their lives to create an increasingly divided, unequal society.

Let me put it simply: Without broad access to quality education, there is no future for the middle class. With this legislation, the majority is saying to America's low-income kids: You are on your own.

Mr. Chairman, that is not who we are. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP), a new member of the committee.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 5, the Student Success Act, because our system, education system, is failing. Where I come from, we call trying to do things over and over again and expecting a different outcome insanity. I believe our system is broken to the extent that it is a moral imperative for Congress, at this point, to step up and act. Our students, our parents, our teachers should not have to settle for a failing system.

Before Congress, I worked in the private sector, and I also had an opportunity to work in State government, including the opportunity to serve as the majority leader of the Michigan Senate. At that time, I saw firsthand how much more effective we can be at the State level to use State resources and control where they are going than to have the Federal Government come in, step in and use, and expect the State to spend it in a certain way.

This system of top-down does not help the States; it puts us in a bad position. As a State legislator, had I the opportunity, I would have come here and supported the cause as well because it is the right thing to do. I do believe it is high time that we defend the 10th Amendment and rein back the Federal Government's role, especially in our children's education. Local teachers and parents know our children better than the Department of Education in Washington, D.C., ever could; and the result is that our system is broken, and that becomes clearer and clearer every day.

I just want to mention a couple statistics that I find alarming but instruc-

tive. First of all, 35 percent of our fourth graders are reading at a proficient level. Only 26 percent of our high school seniors are proficient in math. Just a couple examples that I mention. Those examples are unacceptable.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KLINE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. The Student Success Act gives authority back to our States and expands opportunities so our children can get the best education opportunity possible. That is what they deserve, and that is what I was sent to Washington, D.C., to support.

This bill is also critical in ensuring the Federal Government cannot force a failed program like Common Core on the States. When looking at education reform, it is also important to make sure that we continue to protect the rights of our home schoolers and our private schools. That is exactly what this bill does.

Mr. Chairman, we must reduce the Federal Government's footprint in our children's classrooms because it is making a mess of the education system. We are long overdue for change, and I believe the Student Success Act will move our Nation in the right direction.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, because this bill limits the amount of funding available, it moves money from low-income areas to wealthy areas, eliminates targeted funds for English learners and those with disabilities; it fails to set meaningful standards.

A lot of organizations oppose the legislation, including business organizations, child advocacy groups, civil rights groups, the organizations supporting those with disabilities and health groups, including the Congressional Tri-Caucus; the Advocacy Institute; the Afterschool Alliance; the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee; the American Association of People With Disabilities; the American Association of University Women; the American Federation of Teachers; the American Foundation for the Blind; the Association of University Centers on Disabilities; Autism National Committee; Autistic Self Advocacy Network; the Center for American Progress; the Center for Law and Social Policy; the Children's Defense Fund; the Committee for Education Funding; the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities; the Council of the Great City Schools; the Council of Parent Attorneys and Advocates, Inc.; Democrats for Education Reform; Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund; Easter Seals; Education Post; Education Law Center; First Focus Campaign for Children; Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network; Human Rights Campaign; the Bazelon Center

for Mental Health Law; Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law; Leading Educators; the League of United Latin American Citizens; the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund; the NAACP; the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund; the National Association of School Psychologists; the National Center for Learning Disabilities; the National Council on Independent Living; the National Council on Teacher Quality; the National Center on Time & Learning; the National Congress of American Indians; the National Council of La Raza; the National Coalition for Public Education; the National Disability Rights Network; the National Down Syndrome Congress; the National Education Association; the National Urban League; the National Women's Law Center; Partners for Each and Every Child; the Poverty & Race Research Action Council; Public Advocates Inc.; Stand for Children; Southeast Asia Resource Action Center; TASH; Teach Plus; TNTP; the Education Trust; the United Negro College Fund; the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. They are all in opposition to this legislation.

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

□ 1645

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I often don't come to the floor to speak, but I felt compelled on this particular bill, H.R. 5, to talk about it. Why? Because I represent a district that has 90 percent of the public schoolchildren who live and receive reduced or free lunches and it is important for me to just state for the record that I think that a bill that takes away funding from public schools—targeted funding for low-income and poverty students—would be an abomination.

This bill is here because of the work of Lyndon Johnson 50 years ago. It was a civil rights bill, frankly. Why? It was an acknowledgment that socially disadvantaged children needed additional help. Somewhere along the line, Mr. Chairman, we have lost as a nation the notion of "our children."

It is always "my child," not "our children."

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Until the parents of more affluent children see that their lives are intrinsically linked to children who are poor, we as a nation will never be the beloved community that so many civil rights leaders fought and died for.

I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia for the opportunity to speak on this underlying bill, and I want to

urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 5.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), a member of the committee.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his work on this bill. It is a very important bill, and it is certainly very applicable to what is going on in our country right now.

Mr. Chairman, Federal intervention in our Nation's classrooms is at an all-time high, and the Obama administration continues to believe that they think they know what is best for our children. However, despite the continued intrusion into our children's classrooms, student achievement remains stagnant.

Out of 34 countries, students in the U.S. rank 20th and 27th in science and math respectively, so it is clear that our education system is not adequately serving our children, and it is not going to be fixed by Washington bureaucrats. Our education system can only be fixed by parents, teachers, aunts, uncles, coaches, and community leaders—the people who actually know what is best for our Nation's children.

That is why I am supporting H.R. 5. I am supporting this bill to put some restraints on the administration, to rein in the Department of Education, and to put the keys to our children's educations and futures back in local control where it belongs.

It repeals out-of-touch teacher qualification programs, and it allows State and local officials to determine who is qualified to teach their children. It also eliminates 65 programs and creates a grant program with greater flexibility for school districts.

We all know that children learn differently and at their own pace, and without this bill, the Secretary of Education can prohibit funds from being sent to States unless they adopt certain one-size-fits-all standards, like Common Core.

I will be the first one to say that additional reforms to our education system are needed. No, this is not the silver bullet, but it is a great start, and it is a great bill. I support this bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to state for the record that graduation rates have been up since No Child Left Behind was passed. Black and Latino children are doing better, so it has been working, but we need to continue to improve.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read the Statement of Administration Policy, which speaks to the administration position on H.R. 5. The Statement of Administration Policy goes as follows:

The administration strongly opposes H.R. 5, the Student Success Act, as approved by the House Committee on Education and the

Workforce. Congress must act in a bipartisan way to reform the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to help States prepare all children for college and careers by giving them flexibility from No Child Left Behind mandates. However, H.R. 5 represents a significant step backwards in the efforts to help all of the Nation's children and their families prepare for their futures.

H.R. 5 abdicates the historic Federal role in elementary and secondary education of ensuring the educational progress of all of America's children, including children from low-income families, students with disabilities, English learners, and students of color. It fails to maintain the core expectation that States and school districts will take serious, sustained, and targeted actions when necessary to remedy achievement gaps and reform persistently low-performing schools. H.R. 5 fails to identify opportunity gaps or remedy inequities in access to the resources and supports students need to succeed, such as challenging academic courses, excellent teachers and principals, afterschool enrichment or expanded learning time, and other academic and nonacademic supports.

Rather than investing more in schools, H.R. 5 would allow States to divert education funding away from the schools and students who need it the most through the so-called "portability" provision. The bill's caps on Federal education spending would lock in recent budget cuts for the rest of the decade, and the bill would allow funds currently required to be used for education to be used for other purposes, such as spending on sports stadiums or tax cuts for the wealthy. H.R. 5 fails to make critical investments for the Nation's students, including high-quality preschool for America's children, support for America's teachers and principals, and investment in innovative solutions for the public education system.

The administration agrees on the need for high-quality statewide annual testing as required in H.R. 5, so parents and teachers know how children and schools are doing from year to year and to allow for consistent measurement of school and student performance across the State. However, this bill should do more to reduce redundant and unnecessary testing, such as asking States to limit the amount of time spent on standardized testing and requiring parental notification when testing is consuming too much classroom learning time.

The administration opposes H.R. 5 in its current form for all of these reasons but particularly because it would deny Federal funds to the classrooms that need them the most and fails to assure parents that policymakers and educators will take action when students are not learning.

If the President were presented with H.R. 5, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections.

Mr. WALBERG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, since No Child Left Behind was put in place, the Federal Government has dictated how States and school districts spend money, gauge student learning and school performance, and hire classroom teachers.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, it isn't working. Washington bureaucrats, no matter how well meaning they are, will never have the personal understanding

of the diverse and special and unique needs of students than the teachers, administrators, and parents who spend time with them.

Mr. Chairman, I stand here today because I have to speak for Erin and Moses. Erin is my daughter-in-law and the mother of my four grandchildren. Moses was a student who tested her teaching ability and her passion for teaching.

Erin came to teach in a fourth and fifth grade classroom for special needs students in Cicero, Illinois. Freshly minted out of her educational training and master's program, she came in with a passion for teaching.

She came in because she was sent in that classroom as a full-time, continuing substitute because the teacher of that classroom had gotten up one day, had walked out of the classroom, and had never come back.

Erin was given the opportunity of a lifetime of teaching these students, and she began to invest her life into those students, especially in one young student, a fourth grader by the name of Moses.

Moses came from a difficult situation. Moses at that time in the fourth grade was not even fully potty-trained, but Erin invested her time and talent and, frankly, her treasure in the life of that student, as well as of the others. She had a wonderful outcome in working with the parent in the home, as well as with Moses in the classroom.

The next year, Erin was given the opportunity to be a full-time teacher, not a sub anymore. I will never forget the day when Erin came to me, with tears in her eyes, and said: "Dad, I'm not sure I'm cut out for teaching."

I said: "Erin, why? You had an amazing impact for that 6 months of time you spent in the same classroom last year."

She said: "Now, all I'm doing is filling out paperwork for Illinois, for Chicago, and for the Federal Government."

She ultimately had our twin grandsons and went from the classroom to the home, but there will be a day that comes when those four kids are at the stage when she can go back to the classroom. I want Erin to go back and have the ability to teach, to love on those kids, to direct them, to work with the parents, and not spend time filling out bureaucratic forms.

Mr. Chairman, that is why I support the Student Success Act. It replaces Federal control with State and local control.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KLINE. I yield the gentleman another 1 minute.

Mr. WALBERG. The bill allows States to establish and implement their own standards and assessments. The bill allows States to develop their own accountability plans for improving underperforming schools by eliminating federally prescribed school improvement and turnaround interven-

tions. The bill provides State and local school districts flexibility.

Mr. Chairman, that is what we are speaking for. It is for the Erins and for the Moseses of the world—educational opportunities that should lead us into the future in great ways for this country and to lead the world.

□ 1700

This is what we are talking about, Mr. Speaker. The Student Success Act places control back in the hands of education's rightful stewards: the teachers, the administrators, the States, the parents, and, ultimately, the students.

Let's pass this bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ABRAHAM). The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Consortium for Citizens With Disabilities says:

The Student Success Act does not fully support students with disabilities, and in fact, it creates incentives for schools and districts to take students with disabilities, unchecked, off the track from having equitable access to and achieving a regular high school diploma.

Incidence data reflects that less than 1 percent of all students have the significant cognitive disabilities, which corresponds to about 10 percent of students with disabilities.

Without this limitation, we fear that schools may inappropriately assign students to the alternative assessment. Data show assignment to these alternative assessments may lead to reduced access to the general curriculum and limit a student's access to earn a regular diploma.

That is why the disability groups oppose the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to end with a reminder that this limits the funding. It transfers money from low-income areas to high-income areas. That is not just urban areas. There are over 2,400 low-income rural districts that will lose about \$150 million, or 15 percent, of their total allocation, under the current law. The legislation eliminates targeting for English learners and those with disabilities. Finally, it fails to set meaningful standards.

For those reasons, we should join the administration in opposing H.R. 5, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

As is always the case in these debates on the floor, we hear a lot of things. Some of them are actually factual; some of them are not. There is, shockingly, some hyperbole that comes along with this.

We did hear some things, though, from both sides of the aisle that I think are worth underscoring. One of the speakers on the other side of the aisle talked about how schools and States need continuity—I think was

his word—predictability. That is exactly what we do not have now.

Right now, this country is operating under the law of the land, which is No Child Left Behind, and under a big, convoluted scheme of temporary conditional waivers which provide no continuity, no predictability, and that is why we are hearing on both sides of the aisle—from coast-to-coast and off the coast, as a matter of fact—that we need to replace No Child Left Behind.

I believe that as we replace No Child Left Behind, we need to put responsibility in the hands of parents and teachers and school boards and States, and not in the hands of Washington, D.C.

I think that it is not fair to say that there is not a problem. We heard from the ranking member that graduation rates have gone up. On the other hand, they haven't gone up much, and we are still in a position where a fourth, or 26 percent, of high school seniors are proficient in math. That means 74 percent—maybe I need to have a little math here—are not. Only 38 percent of those high school seniors can read at grade level. We have a problem with one in five students dropping out. We need to address that problem.

We heard a lot of talk about where title I funds go and portability to public schools. It is a question, I understand. There is a disagreement here, but we happen to believe it is fair that if you are a poor kid, if you are eligible for title I funds, you ought to get those funds. There is a disagreement. I think the children, if they are eligible, if they are in poverty, ought to get their share of title I funds.

One of the things we didn't talk much about today as we talked about the problems out there, we know that in some areas of the country you have children trapped in absolutely failing schools where less than half of the kids graduate and those that graduate are nowhere near ready to go to college or go to work.

So we have seen across the country and in most States public charter schools popping up, giving parents hope, giving them a chance to get those kids out of failing schools.

I said this the other day in the Rules Committee, because it was so moving to me. I went to a charter school in north Minneapolis. There were 430 kids in that school. Their parents are delighted with the education they are getting now and thrilled to get their kids out of failing schools.

When I asked the principal and the founder of the school if she could take more kids, she said: No, this is the right size for this school. She would like to replicate the school—and that is what this bill allows—so she can have another successful charter school. And how successful is it? There are a thousand kids, Mr. Chairman, on the waiting list to get in that charter school because their parents want to get out of a failing school system. This bill allows that to happen.

It comes down to, fundamentally: Who do you trust, Washington or local government? We want to put the control in the hands of parents and local school boards and States.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition of H.R. 5, the ill-named Student Success Act. H.R. 5 would undermine significant gains made by No Child Left Behind, and eviscerate the Elementary and Secondary Education Act by dismantling its foundation of equity and accountability.

Under this bill, school districts with the highest concentrations of Hispanic students would lose more than \$1.9 billion in federal funding. Los Angeles Unified School District which is more than 74 percent Hispanic faces the largest cut in Title I funds, over \$80 million, which amounts to nearly 25 percent of their budget.

School districts with a high concentration of students living in poverty could lose \$700 million in funding and high-poverty districts could see cuts as large as 74 percent. The portability of Title I funds would divert and dilute limited funds from schools with high needs and high concentrations of poverty. This undermines the fundamental purpose of Title I: to assist high needs and high poverty schools. With 35 percent of Latino children under the age of five living in poverty, this is the time to increase, not decrease funding.

Education is our nation's great equalizer. I would not be where I am today if it were not for the quality public education I received. For over 50 years, ESEA has been our nation's driving force for educational equity. Unfortunately, this Republican bill would dismantle the foundation of equality and accountability that ESEA has built over the last half-century. If we want our nation to remain a leader in the world, we must improve equal access to quality education for the next generation. Our students are the future of tomorrow, and we simply cannot let them down.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) having assumed the chair, Mr. ABRAHAM, 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. 5) to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### NATIONAL EATING DISORDERS AWARENESS WEEK

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Eating Disorders Awareness Week. This time is dedicated to educating parents and children about the causes and serious

health conditions and consequences of eating disorders.

Eating disorders affect more than 14 million Americans and have disproportionate impacts on teens and young adults. Beyond genetic links, factors such as consistent exposure to misleading advertising that distort one's own body image can lead to eating disorders. The key to containing this growing health issue is to spread awareness and promote authentic, healthy body images.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, along with a bipartisan coalition, we have urged the Federal Trade Commission to uphold their duty to protect American consumers by working with health professionals and the advertising industry to promote fair and responsible advertisements, especially for products geared for children and teens.

If you suspect that your child has an eating disorder, please seek professional help. There are many local resources available to families.

#### THE IMPORTANCE OF LOCAL BROADCASTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ABRAHAM). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extends their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of today's Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate so much this opportunity that we have this evening to inform and to educate my colleagues in the House, fellow Members of Congress, and even the American people through C-SPAN, about the importance of local radio and television broadcasters. They are important not only to our country, but I want to talk about how important they are to our communities—the communities we live in, the communities they live in, the communities they work in.

For decades, these broadcasters have been the first ones to respond to disasters and emergencies. They have saved numerous lives by their ability to be on the scene and to broadcast widely. They have helped communities pick up the pieces after a natural disaster or a manmade disaster. The broadcasters of our country, of our communities, have played a vital role in the quality of life in our communities.

I have been blessed throughout my career not just in public service but in other positions to work with local broadcasters hosting telethons to help find cures for diseases like muscular dystrophy, cancer, and many other diseases that our communities have tackled together.

Now, we need to remember that these radio and television stations are not monolithic corporations. They are owned and run and managed by our friends and neighbors, the people that we see every day.

Today is a big day. It is an appropriate day to celebrate—not just inform and educate but celebrate—the role of America's broadcasters in our communities. Because today, hundreds of Members of Congress were able to meet with their local television and radio station personalities and managers and representatives. Today, nearly 600 broadcasters came to Capitol Hill to tell their story of public service and to remind their Representatives of their role.

You may not know that these broadcasters are required by statute to serve the public interest. When I hear about the stories they cover, when I see the types of stories they cover, the lives they have touched, the service that they are providing, I am heartened to know that we have a vibrant, thriving system of local broadcasting in this country.

Unlike many other countries around the world, where national and regional news is what is available to their citizens, here in the United States, here in places like North Dakota and Texas and Arkansas and others, we have a system of local radio and TV stations so folks living in the same community are bound together by weather events, sporting events, news of the day, and human interest, all provided by an accurate local source.

I know in North Dakota we have seen weather emergencies where information from our local broadcasters was all that was available for those suffering the impacts of a storm. Several years ago, I myself, with my family, in 1984, spent all night—this was before cell phones, I know—spent all night in a car in a blizzard that came upon North Dakota suddenly. We were just off the interstate. The only communication we had was through KFGO Radio, which won a Peabody that year for broadcasting to us and to several others that were stranded in that storm.

So, today, we are going to hear a number of stories from Members of Congress across the country also touched by their local TV and radio stations. I thank them for sharing stories about their local stations. I will share some of mine as we go throughout this Special Order, but I want to call on somebody who knows a fair bit about broadcasting, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. CRAMER, I appreciate the opportunity. It is an honor to be able to stand up and advocate on behalf of our broadcasters, who are not only my constituents and your constituents, but my colleagues, because I am, as you mentioned, a former broadcaster, and I know firsthand the importance of broadcasting, as you indicated, to local and national communities.