of the Bureau of the Census, including such procedures that have been implemented since the data breaches of systems of the Office of Personnel Management were announced in 2015.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives a report on the review required by subsection (a).

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall—

(A) identify all information systems of the Bureau of the Census that contain sensitive information;

(B) described any actions carried out by the Secretary of Commerce or the Director of the Bureau of the Census to secure sensitive information that have been implemented since the data breaches of systems of the Office of Personnel Management were announced in 2015;

(C) identify any known data breaches of information systems of the Bureau of the Census that contain sensitive information; and

(D) identify whether the Bureau of the Census stores any information that, if combined with other such information, would comprise classified information.

Mr. CHAFFETZ (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to submit for the RECORD a letter from John Thompson, Director of the Census Bureau, to Chairman MCCAUL, myself, and others, indicating the Bureau will comply with FISMA when developing the report required by H.R. 3116 and will continue to work with the Secretary of Homeland Security and others to secure the Bureau's network.

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

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, ECONOMICS AND STATISTICS ADMINISTRATION, U.S. CENSUS BUREAU,

Washington, DC, October 20, 2015.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This correspondence is regarding the U.S. Census Bureau's compliance with the Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) and the provisions of Senate Amendment (S. Admt.) 2710 to H.R. 3116. The Census Bureau is compliant at this time with the requirements of FISMA, and is working with the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Homeland Security to provide information on the data security procedures required by S. Admt. 2710.

We have implemented a formal risk management program in accordance with the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Special Publication 800–37r1. All of the FISMA reportable systems supporting the Census Bureau are continually assessed per this guidance and all have a current Authorization to Operate. In addition, the Census Bureau is currently behind a Managed Trusted Internet Protocol Service (MTIPS) provider and is protected by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Einstein 1 and 2, which looks at network flow information and network intrusion detection. The Census Bureau is engaged with DHS and MTIPS provider to move behind Einstein 3 Accelerated (E3A) as soon as the DHS and our MTIPS say they are ready. This will give us the added cybersecurity analysis, situational awareness and security response capabilities for DHS to augment our efforts.

The Census Bureau also is actively engaged with the Department of Commerce to implement Phase 2C of the Continuous Diagnostics and Mitigation (CDM) program by the end of calendar year 2016. This will provide us the capability to identify cybersecurity risks more efficiently and prioritize the risks based on potential impacts. The initial meeting with DHS and the service provider took place on October 15. 2015. The Census Bureau reports regularly on this and other aspects of its cybersecurity program to the Department of Commerce, Office of Management and Budget, and DHS.

Please know that the security of our respondents' information is paramount at the Census Bureau. We take seriously our responsibility to honor privacy and protect confidentiality. We will continue to work with the Department of Commerce and DHS to implement effective data security procedures and ensure compliance with FISMA requirements.

Thank you.

JOHN H. THOMPSON,
Director.

SCHOLARSHIPS FOR OPPORTUNITY AND RESULTS REAUTHORIZATION ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam 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. 10.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 480 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 10.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1552

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to reauthorize the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act, and for other purposes, with Mr. HOLDING 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 Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 10, the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results, or SOAR, Reauthorization Act.

The SOAR Reauthorization Act continues the three-sector approach to education within the District of Columbia. This approach gives equal funding to D.C. Public Schools, D.C. Public Charter Schools, and the Opportunity Scholarship Program, often referred to as the OSP.

The OSP gives scholarships to children in low-income families to attend a private school so that those children can experience a quality education. The average OSP family makes less than $22,000 per year. These scholarships allow families to place their children in learning-rich environments.

District of Columbia Public Schools rank at the top in spending per student, but are near the bottom in academic performance. The Opportunity Scholarship Program gives these students the education they deserve so they can pursue the American Dream.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 10 works not only to provide scholarships to students who need them the most, but also to improve the current state of public school and public charter school education. This bill authorizes equal funding for D.C. Public Schools and for D.C. Public Charter Schools in addition to the Opportunity scholarships.

My friends across the aisle claim that the SOAR Act takes money away from public education. However, that is quite the opposite. The SOAR Act increases funding for public education in the District of Columbia.

In fact, since the three-sector approach has been in effect, D.C. Public Schools and D.C. Public Charter Schools have received a combined $435 million in Federal funding for school improvement.

Mr. Chairman, the District of Columbia schools would not have received these funds had it not been for the OSP and this three-sector approach. Now we are debating reauthorizing this approach and giving $20 million annually to each sector for 5 years, $300 million across 5 years for D.C. education.

It is hard to imagine how anyone who advocates for public education would oppose such an approach that has poured millions of dollars into the D.C. public education system, particularly since the OSP is getting a great return on its investment and is producing results. The OSP produces $2.62 in benefits for every dollar spent on the program, according to a study conducted by one of the program's evaluators.

Mr. Chairman, you would be hard pressed to find another government program that generates this sort of result and bang for your buck. We are talking about a 162 percent return on investment here, an investment that has not taken one dime from public education.

Mr. Chairman, it is good stuff. We talk about how to keep this program going because it is really affecting real people and real lives. We talk about the individual students and their families, but it is also borne out in the statistics.

The Opportunity Scholarship students are averaging a 90 percent graduation rate—90 percent—compared to D.C. Public Schools, which was roughly less than a 60 percent graduation rate in 2013 and 2014.

Further, some 88 percent of the Opportunity Scholarship participants enroll in college. Not only are they graduating high school at record levels above and beyond what is happening in public schools, but they are also going on to higher education.

These children, though, are more than a graduation statistic. Their individual lives have been forever changed because of the OSP.

I want to remind our colleagues about Joseph Kelley's son, Rashawn Williams. He had fallen behind in every single subject. His father had to get the courts involved to ensure that his school was following its requirements pursuant to Rashawn's individual education plan. Mr. Kelley was able to get Rashawn a scholarship through the Opportunity Scholarship Program and has said: ''I truly shudder to think where my son would be today without it.''

Mr. Chairman, the OSP is changing outcomes for the least advantaged. The program places kids in safer high-quality schools that allow them to receive a good education. It brings funding to all sectors of education in D.C. to improve education opportunities for all.

Mr. Chairman, it is important to note that the bill requires all participating Opportunity Scholarship schools to be accredited. The accreditation standards give the taxpayer—and, more importantly, Opportunity Scholarship families—assurances that District students are receiving the education they deserve.

The Opportunity Scholarship currently limits entrance based on a control group for an evaluation study. H.R. 10 removes this arbitrary requirement, instituting a new study to track the results of the Opportunity Scholarships. Removing this barrier to entry increases access to the program and means more families can be afforded quality education for their children.

Mr. Chairman, we had the opportunity to debate this bill in the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and I appreciate the perspectives heard from both sides. We had a good, productive field hearing.

I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the Speaker of the House, our friend and colleague, for authoring this legislation. He has poured his heart and soul out, trying to do what he can do to help these young children. It has had a very positive effect on so many lives and in future generations. It is something we can all be proud about.

He has worked tirelessly to bring opportunity to students within the District of Columbia, and he will be remembered by this body for his effort to bring a quality education to all. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to give students in the District of Columbia the opportunity for a quality education by reauthorizing a program that actually works and produces results. It affects real lives. It is called the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I didn't really expect to be on the floor this afternoon managing this bill. Ironically, I was scheduled to host a briefing today for Members and staff on the constitutionality of the District of Columbia statehood bill, where I was going to show a 17-minute HBO ''Last Week Tonight'' clip from John Oliver that lampoons the Congress for denying District residents their voting rights, budget and legislative autonomy, and statehood.

Instead, here I am on the floor in a virtual reality show not speaking about the right to self-government, but fighting this latest attempt by the Republican Congress to impose its ideology on D.C. residents.

□ 1600

I ask to include the D.C. Council's letter opposing this bill in the RECORD.

COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, DC, October 8, 2015.

Hon. JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairperson, Committee on Oversight & Government Reform, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

CHAIRPERSON CHAFFETZ: We write as locally elected officials to express our opposition to renewed efforts to expand a federally funded school voucher program in the District of Columbia. We appreciate your interest in providing support to public education in the District. We strongly believe, however, that federal funds should be invested in the existing public education system—both public schools and public charter schools—rather than being diverted to private schools.

We support the decision by Congress and the President several years ago to phase out the voucher program. Multiple U.S. Department of Education reports indicate that the program has not lived up to the promises made by proponents. These studies along with two troubling Government Accountability Office reports have also revealed that many of the students participating in the voucher program attend private schools with fewer resources and lower standards than our public schools. The evidence is clear that the use of vouchers has had no statistically significant impact on overall student achievement in math or reading, or for students from schools in need of improvement.

We have serious concerns about using government funds to send our students to private schools that do not have to adhere to the same standards and accountability as do public and public charter schools. For example, private religious schools, which 80% of students with vouchers attend, operate outside the non-discrimination provisions of the D.C. Human Rights Act. Moreover, the voucher proposal is inequitable: if fully funded, the authorization would provide many more dollars per student for vouchers than is allocated per student in public schools and public charter schools.

Although we believe that students who are already receiving a voucher should have the opportunity to maintain and use that voucher through graduation from high school, we do not support expansion of the program to new students. The District devotes considerable funds to public education, and our local policies promote choice for parents. Indeed, over the past decade the quality of public education in D.C. has increased, as a result of reforms and targeted investment. Families can choose from an array of educational institutions based on publicly available performance metrics, both within the D.C. Public Schools system and among the myriad public charter schools. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan has called the progress of D.C. Public Schools ''remarkable'', while the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools has ranked the District's charter sector as the best in the country.

Despite such ample evidence that the Congressionally imposed voucher program is ineffective, while D.C. public schools improve every year, some members of Congress continue to see our city as their personal petri dish. It is insulting to our constituents, who vote for us but not for any voting member of Congress, that some of your colleagues push their personal agendas on D.C. in a way they could never do in their home states. Attacking D.C. home rule, including any expansion of the voucher program, is irresponsible governing on the part of Congress.

We call on you to respect the wishes of the District's elected officials on the quintessentially local matter of education as you consider this issue.

Sincerely,

David Grosso, DC Council, At-Large, Chairperson Committee on Education; Charles Allen, DC Council, Ward 6, Member, Committee on Education; LaRuby May, DC Council, Ward 8; Elissa Silverman, DC Council, At-Large; Anita Bonds, DC Council, At-Large, Member, Committee on Education; Yvette Alexander, DC Council, Ward 7, Member, Committee on Education; Brianne Nadeau, DC Council, Ward 1; Jack Evans, DC Council, Ward 2.

Ms. NORTON. Yet, Mr. Chairman, I have sought a compromise that should be acceptable to Republicans, as it is to President Obama.

We support, and I repeat, we support allowing our current D.C. voucher students to remain in the program until graduation. That ensures D.C. would have voucher students for many years to come.

That is the kind of sensible compromise that Congress must get back to or be content with the label ''least productive Congress,'' as it has come to be known each year under this majority.

This bill goes beyond the compromise, we have offered, by seeking to admit new students as well. We are here so that Speaker JOHN BOEHNER has a capstone to his own political career. The D.C. voucher program is his pet project, not D.C.'s. The Speaker has introduced only two bills this Congress: a bill on the Iran nuclear agreement and this bill.

Even if Members do not respect D.C.'s right to self-government, they should at least care whether the program improves achievement, which was the stated reason for vouchers in the first place. Far from helping students, however, the program has demonstrably failed.

According to the congressionally mandated evaluation of the program's effectiveness, this program, these vouchers, have failed to improve academic achievement, as measured by objective math and reading testing scores.

Most importantly, the program has not had significant impacts—that is also from the congressionally mandated evaluation—has not had ''significant impacts'' on the achievement of students whom the program was designed to most benefit: those who previously attended low-performing public schools.

The majority cites improved high school graduation rates. However, the evaluation did not examine dropout rates or the rigor of the schools' curriculum or graduation requirements.

The majority also cites high college attendance rates. However, the evaluation did not measure college attendance rates.

Even if the program were successful, Mr. Chairman, it would still not be needed, at least in the District of Columbia, which has perhaps the most robust public school choice program in the country. Almost 50 percent of our public school students attend charter schools, which the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools ranked as the strongest in the Nation. In addition, 75 percent of public school students in the District attend out-of-boundary schools. What D.C. has developed amounts to a model choice education program.

Moreover, the D.C. public schools have made some of the most impressive improvements in the country, by any measure, spurred by competition from the rapidly growing D.C. charter schools, not from the small number of voucher schools. In fact, a 2013 assessment of D.C. public schools indicated that the District had made the greatest improvement of any urban school district in the Nation.

D.C. charter schools have even higher educational achievement and attainment than D.C. public schools. D.C. charter schools outperform D.C. public schools across traditionally disadvantaged groups, including African Americans and low-income students, and have a higher percentage of such students, precisely the students the voucher program was ostensibly designed to serve.

Greater confidence in D.C.'s public schools is also clear. D.C. public school enrollment has increased for 7 consecutive years, right alongside the very large number of charter schools.

If Congress wants to support D.C. students, we ask that you support our home rule public choice, not impose yours. Any new funding for education in the District should reinforce the hard work of our city, our parents, and our residents, who have shown the Nation how to build a fully accountable public school choice program. D.C. residents, not unaccountable Members of Congress, know best what our children need and how to govern our own affairs.

During this debate, Mr. Chairman, we will consider an amendment I have offered to restore the scientific integrity of the program's evaluation, one like the evaluation Congress has always mandated, and another to crack down on so-called voucher mills.

Given that the Speaker's bill will surely pass, I want to work with Members who support vouchers to ensure that our voucher students attend high-quality schools, like our accredited Catholic and other parochial schools, not fly-by-night, often storefront schools in low-income neighborhoods that were opened only after the voucher program was created to get access to unrestricted Federal funds.

I appreciate that the majority indicated in committee and on the floor that they also want to prevent voucher mills. I look forward to continuing to work with them as this bill moves forward to protect our families from voucher mills.

Under the Home Rule Act of 1973, Congress gave the District authority to establish its own education system; and unlike some other local jurisdictions, D.C. has never created a voucher program. Instead, like many D.C. bills in Congress, this bill seeks to impose a program on the District that does not have national support.

Just think of it. Only 3 months ago, both the House and Senate defeated Republican national private voucher amendments on the floor. Members reject private school vouchers for their own constituents but want to impose them on mine. No wonder.

Since 1970, every single referendum to establish State-funded vouchers or tuition tax credits has failed, and by large margins. Now the majority wants to do to the District what it would not dare do at home. The recent vote to deny voucher funding on a national level shows where Republicans really stand.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. I thank the chairman for this opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor today, after looking in the eyes of the kids, students, their parents, eyes filled with hope and opportunity and success.

I come to the floor today to add my support for H.R. 10, the SOAR Reauthorization Act, because it works. This legislation will ensure the continuation of the successful D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program, which was established by Congress in 2004, to provide eligible low-income families in the District of Columbia with the opportunity to attend the school of their choice.

Innovative programs like the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program are necessary to fix our broken educational system and prepare our children for the 21st century workforce, and I am confounded that any of my colleagues would oppose a program that provides students with an opportunity for a better education, especially one that has been an unqualified success.

On average, students in the Opportunity Scholarship Program have a graduation rate of 90 percent, well above the national average, as well as D.C.'s overall graduation rate of 58 percent. These students continue to succeed in their pursuit of higher education, with 88 percent of the graduates going on to attend a 2- or 4-year college or university.

While the benefits to D.C. children are clear, the program also plays an important role in empowering parents to make the best choice for their kids and engaging them in their educational and academic progress. A recent survey of parents found that 85 percent of parents are happy with their child's current Opportunity Scholarship Program school.

H.R. 10 has garnered the support from a wide array of stakeholders. Just yesterday, in an op-ed entitled ''A Misguided Attack on D.C.'s Needy Students,'' The Washington Post editorial board defended the SOAR Act and wrote in support of reauthorizing the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program, noting that over 6,100 children have benefited from the program, while thousands more are on waiting lists.

The Washington Post also notes that nearly 75 percent of D.C. residents support the program, which has provided more than $600 million in funding for traditional public schools, charter public schools, and the voucher program.

It is important to note, Mr. Chairman, that this bill does not take any funding away from D.C. public schools. In fact, the legislation authorizes equal funding to public schools, charter schools, and scholarships.

With an average family income of less than $22,000 for participating families, this program really is a lifeline for low-income D.C. families, offering students up to $1,572 to pay for tuition, fees, and transportation. Why, Mr. Chairman, would any of us want to prohibit these students and families from opportunity and success?

This is a hand up to the American Dream. Ensuring our children have access to the best possible education

should not be a partisan issue, and receiving a quality education should not be limited to people of means.

I urge my colleagues to continue supporting this program and pass H.R. 10. It is the right thing to do. Let's do it for the kids.

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

I simply want to say, once again, that no child currently enrolled in the program under the compromise that I have offered would be stricken from the program and all current voucher students could stay until graduation. It is new students that we object to, given the evaluation that shows that the program had not met its goal, which was to improve reading and math scores. By contrast, we have had improvement in reading and math scores both in the D.C. public schools and the D.C. charter schools.

Also, Mr. Chairman, there is no waiting list for vouchers in the District of Columbia. However, there are long waiting lists for our charter schools, and now, even for some public schools.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

□ 1615

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank the gentlewoman from D.C.

Mr. Chair, it is extremely unfortunate that we are here yet again debating legislation that would interfere with the ability of D.C. residents to make decisions for themselves. So far this Congress, the House has attempted to block laws that would protect District women's reproductive rights and reform Washington's drug laws. And now we are asked to continue a failed private school voucher program, a program that a majority of the D.C. Council opposes and on which they are not even consulted, a program that D.C.'s own longtime Congresswoman opposes.

I am shocked at the arrogance of this body to set aside the will of the citizens of the District of Columbia so fleetingly. It is disgraceful that in this building, a symbol of our democracy, we impose such policies on a city that does not even get a vote on these decisions.

Additionally, I oppose this bill because it weakens D.C.'s public school system. Instead of taking public dollars to outsource our children's education to private schools, we should be focusing on truly reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We need an updated ESEA that strengthens public schools for all our children and prepares students for the globally competitive world we live in.

Education should be the great equalizer, and every student should have access to the best education, regardless of their ZIP Code or their socioeconomic status. There are public schools in this country that are among the very best in the world. I am proud that several of them are in my district.

Mr. Chair, we know that public schools can work when we properly support them; but, unfortunately, for certain communities, far too many schools continue to struggle due to lack of resources on one hand and relentless attempts to undermine them on the other. Private vouchers only further perpetuate these inequities by siphoning additional resources for few students while leaving the rest behind in underfunded public schools.

In our global economy, it is more essential than ever that every child receives a quality education. To do that, our public schools need adequate resources. Diverting public money to private and parochial schools only worsens the problem.

I support access to a world-class public education for all students; but too often, the majority in this body undercut that goal, whether through the so-called Student Success Act that leaves students in a lurch or today's SOAR bill that sorely misses the point.

I urge my colleagues to listen to the people of the District of Columbia and their elected representative, Ms. NORTON. Most importantly, listen to the teachers and the parents who oppose this bill, and reject this legislation.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER), the chairman of the Republican Policy Committee.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support today of H.R. 10, the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Reauthorization Act.

I want to commend Speaker BOEHNER for introducing this important legislation and thank him for a lifetime of extraordinary leadership on this issue. Throughout his speakership and under his leadership as a former chairman of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, Speaker BOEHNER improved educational opportunities for all students. Literally thousands of kids have access to the American Dream because of his dedication to the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program. As chairman of the Congressional School Choice Caucus, I was honored to have Speaker BOEHNER keynote a rally earlier this year with hundreds of Opportunity Scholarship recipients.

I have to tell you, I am amazed at some of the rhetoric that I have been hearing today, talking about it is disgraceful that this legislation is before you.

I will tell you what is disgraceful. It is disgraceful that any child in America has to go to a terrible school, and it is disgraceful that anyone would say that we should do anything but make sure that every one of these kids has an opportunity to go somewhere where they will have a chance to succeed.

Every child deserves equal access to a great education. Lots of kids have great public school options in America. Other families can afford to send their kids to private school if they don't have a great public school option. This debate today is about what we do for those who don't.

Unfortunately, too many kids in our country have their destiny determined by their ZIP Code. These children are stuck in poorly performing schools, and their parents feel powerless to do anything about it.

That is why education choice and the Opportunity Scholarship Program matter. Programs like D.C. OSP allow parents to choose the best educational environment for their child. The freedom provided by school choice levels the playing field and helps ensure all children have a chance to succeed.

This legislation will continue to bring greater educational opportunities to the most underprivileged students in the District of Columbia, and it takes zero—let me repeat that—zero dollars away from D.C. Public Schools. Because of this legislation, more than 6,000 students have had the opportunity to attend a great school. Even better, an incredible 90 percent of D.C. OSP students graduate from high school. The D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program is clearly a success and needs to continue.

Mr. Chair, I hope for a day when we will be talking about even bolder proposals on this floor, because the truth is we already have school choice in America if you can afford it. The only real question is: What are we going to do for everybody else?

Our Founding Fathers wrote in the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal and endowed with certain unalienable rights. In modern America, the pursuit of happiness comes on the back of a quality education.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chair, I want to remind the gentleman that the $100 million doesn't come out of the air, that this majority is cutting $2 billion from K–12. Most of our children are K–12. That money has to come from somewhere. We know it comes from education funds.

I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 10, legislation that would reauthorize the D.C. private school voucher program.

This bill prioritizes an ideological agenda over the rights of D.C. residents to self-govern and, more importantly, over the rights of all students to get a quality education.

In study after study, the voucher program has failed to show any meaningful improvement in student achievement, safety, satisfaction, motivation, or engagement; yet since 2003, it has received nearly $190 million while failing to adhere to basic accountability standards.

Its funding should be dedicated to improving our underfunded and underresourced public school system, a school system that is required by law to serve all students.

Unlike public schools, private schools receiving voucher students have no requirement to serve all students. Specifically, they are able to—and do—reject students based on prior academic achievement, language ability, socioeconomic background, and other discriminatory factors.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. NORTON. I am pleased to yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. TAKANO. Many do not offer the necessary services for students with disabilities.

It is a mistake to continue funding a program that fails to serve all students, damages the public school system, and disregards the District's right to choose its own education policy.

I thank the gentlewoman from D.C. for yielding me the time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time each side has.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Utah has 17 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I love America. America should be number one, and America's capital should be number one.

I love to talk to immigrants who do so much of the work in our Capital City. They all know America is great. They gush about how anybody can work in America and realize the American Dream.

But when I ask about their kids and where they go to school, they almost uniformly send their kids to Maryland or Virginia schools. Even immigrants who can barely speak English and come from Afghanistan, Pakistan, Eritrea, or Nigeria know that D.C. schools mean stay away. How embarrassing for our country that new immigrants who barely speak English view our Nation's Capital schools with contempt.

Finally, President Obama, we love you and Michelle for the love you show your daughters. You show your love for your daughters by spending some of your substantial salary to keep your daughters out of the D.C. Public Schools. Please, President Obama, show a little love for the children who don't have such wealthy parents and sign the SOAR Act.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chair, I just want to tell the gentleman that the so-called immigrants that he speaks to who send their children to schools in Maryland and Virginia live in Maryland and Virginia. Eighty percent of the jobs in the District of Columbia go to people who live in the suburbs.

As to the schools in the District of Columbia, as I have indicated, there are waiting lines to get into almost all the charter schools, and the D.C. public schools have improved so much that some of them also have waiting lines.

I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), our very distinguished ranking member.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia for yielding and for her leadership.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 10. We have been told that the purpose of this bill is to help all D.C. children get a better education. I strongly support that objective, but this bill does not do that.

Let me be crystal clear: public funds should support public education. But this bill proposes to spend more than $100 million over 5 years to fund vouchers to send public school students in the District of Columbia to private schools while House Republicans are proposing to cut $2 billion from public K–12 education nationally.

Coming from the city of Baltimore, I understand firsthand the complexities of turning around struggling inner-city schools. Almost 10 years ago, I became deeply involved in improving one of my own neighborhood schools—and I am still involved in that—the Maritime Industries Academy High School.

It takes vision, commitment, accountability, and, yes, resources to begin the process of turning troubled schools around. However, it is impossible to turn around public schools if we divert public resources to private schools.

Put simply, H.R. 10 attempts to help a few students at the expense of the vast majority of the District's children.

By dividing the funding it would provide among D.C.'s public schools, public charter schools, and private school vouchers, H.R. 10 provides a third of its total funding to a tiny fraction of the District's students. Specifically, the bill would fund vouchers to enable only 1,442 students—a tiny fraction of the District's 47,548 students—to attend private schools.

The lack of equity is stunning. Our focus should be on maximizing the impact of the Federal Government's limited resources to serve all of the District's students.

Since this bill last passed in 2011 over my strong objection and along party lines, studies of the program have demonstrated that the use of a voucher had no effect on academic achievement, as measured by math and reading scores, school safety, student satisfaction with their school, or motivation and engagement.

Previous studies of this program show that 50 percent of the students from the first two cohorts of the D.C. voucher program eventually dropped out of the program. Students in the program are also less likely to attend a school that offers support programs for those that are academically challenged or have learning difficulties.

In addition, this bill is a direct assault on D.C.'s home rule that was rushed through our committee shortly after Speaker BOEHNER announced his retirement, and the bill is not supported by D.C.'s elected representative in Congress or a majority of the D.C. City Council.

So all the rhetoric justifying massive cuts to education funding—all the talk about budget constraints, about tightening our belts, and about making sacrifices—all that goes out the window when Republicans want to give $100 million in taxpayer funds to private schools.

□ 1630

As a graduate of public schools and a longtime advocate of quality public education, I believe our highest priority must be to use limited taxpayer dollars to support programs that will truly meet the educational needs of all of our children. This bill does not do that. I urge our colleagues to reject H.R. 10.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman CHAFFETZ for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 10, the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Reauthorization Act. It is a bill to continue the popular and successful D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program.

This program is based on the simple notion that every child deserves an excellent education regardless of the family's background, income, or ZIP Code. The program provides scholarships to students in low-income families so they can escape underperforming schools and receive the quality education they need to excel both in the classroom and later in life. Our investment in this effort is paying off.

Last year, 90 percent of 12th graders who received a D.C. Opportunity scholarship graduated from a high-quality school, and 88 percent went on to pursue a college degree. What is more, when asked if they were satisfied with the child's education, 85 percent of the parents responded ''yes.'' It is no wonder every year the demand for scholarships far exceeds the number of scholarships available. These positive results also explain why this important program has long enjoyed bipartisan support.

Of course, there are some who don't believe these vulnerable families deserve the opportunity to do what is best for their children's education. At a time when this administration has spent billions of dollars pushing its own pet projects and priorities, it has routinely put this modest, successful program on the chopping block. Fortunately, Mr. Chairman, a majority in Congress has continued to stand by these students and families by continuing to support the program, and Speaker JOHN BOEHNER has always stood at the forefront of those efforts.

Few have fought harder or longer for the educational opportunities of D.C. students than Speaker BOEHNER. In fact, throughout his more than 20 years in public office, JOHN BOEHNER has been a tireless champion for families who simply want the opportunity—any opportunity—for their children to receive a quality education. The D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program began under his leadership. Thanks to his efforts, this initiative has made a positive difference in the lives of thousands of students across the District. This act reflects his continued commitment to these families. More importantly, it reaffirms a bipartisan commitment to the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program and the D.C. schoolchildren it serves.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to help more low-income students and support this legislation.

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

Mr. Chairman, this morning, a Member said that a letter had come from a member of the city council, Anita Bonds, asking that her name be removed from the letter sent by the council, the majority of the council, saying that they opposed reauthorization of this bill. That member has since called me. She writes:

''Dear Member of Congress,

''Due to some confusion about my position on the District of Columbia voucher bill (H.R. 10), I want to make my position clear. I oppose this bill, and I intend to remain a signatory of the letter previously acknowledged that seven of my colleagues on the D.C. Council and I sent to Chairman Jason Chaffetz dated October 8, 2015, in oppostion to the bill.''

Signed, Councilmember At-large, Anita Bonds.

Mr. Chairman, I submit her letter for the RECORD.

COUNCIL OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, DC, October 21, 2015.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS, Due to some confusion about my position on the District of Columbia school voucher bill (H.R. 10), I want to make my position clear. I oppose this bill, and I intend to remain a signatory of the letter previously acknowledged that seven of my colleagues on the D.C. Council and I sent to Chairman Jason Chaffetz dated October 8, 2015, in opposition to the bill.

Sincerely,

ANITA BONDS.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support today of H.R. 10, the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Reauthorization Act. In the 10 months that I have been here, one of the neat things that I have experienced is when we participated in a site visit with the Oversight and Government Reform Committee under Chairman CHAFFETZ earlier this year and had a firsthand opportunity to interact with the kids and families about the success of the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program.

I was recently reminded just a couple weeks ago when I was sitting in the hearing seeing the families, seeing the moms who were just beaming with pride about their children having this special opportunity. In the 2013 and 2014 school year, the Opportunity Scholarship Program had a graduation rate of 89 percent, which is astonishing compared to the D.C. Public Schools graduation rate of 58 percent.

As a former minister, I have taken groups in the heart of the inner cities, places like New York and Baltimore. Specifically, in Cleveland, there is a school there called Sunbeam Elementary School. Thieves had stolen the copper off the weathervane, the school was filthy, and there was a metal detector for an elementary school. We brought in a team of 60 or 65 people and refurbished the school and did our best. But do you know what? That was only a temporary fix. The SOAR Act is a fix that lasts for a lifetime. It gives scholarships to children in low-income D.C. families to attend a private school. This piece of legislation also allows parents the opportunity to provide a quality education for their children.

I believe that education will only be successful if two foundational truths are rediscovered: first, that parents know what is best for their child, and they should have the freedom to pursue the path that works for them; secondly, and finally, States must stand up to the Federal Government to reclaim their freedom to educate their children.

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

Mr. Chairman, once again, let's get this straight. The control study did not evaluate college attendance. It was not a part of the study. Now, it did evaluate graduation rates. Mr. Chairman, what it did not evaluate was dropout rates.

Private schools are notorious for sending back to the District of Columbia children who they think are not doing well or they are not acting as they think they should act. Unless we had those figures, we would have no idea what the graduation rates were, because the graduation rates are those who were left in the school and did not get sent back.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 10.

Now, why would I rise in support of this? If you hear the rhetoric from the other side, you are saying this is not a program that works; but if you compare the results, it does work. When you just hear that only 55 percent of people in D.C. Public Schools graduate from high school and yet if they have an opportunity to go to this other school, 89 percent graduate, my goodness, what more do you need to understand?

Look, it is very evident about what is going on here. If you want our children to succeed, if you want our children to excel, and if you want America to be able to compete worldwide, then education is the answer. The true issue here is a moral issue and a civil rights issue.

I really believe that President Obama, in 2008, was on to something. This is what the President said:

> The single most important factor in determining student achievement is not the color of their skin, it is not where they come from, it is not their parents or how much money their parents have. It is who their teacher is.

Mr. Chairman, if there is one thing that has made this country exceptional, it is that we have allowed everyone the opportunity to rise from whatever level they started at to whatever level they can achieve. It is only possible through education. This program works.

Mr. Chairman, $60 million is going to be equally divided between the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program, D.C. Public Schools, and the D.C. Public Charter Schools. When we give this money to the parents of these children, when they get a chance to see their children excel, when they get a chance to see their children grow, and when they see a chance for their children to have great success, how can we sit in America's House and debate about is this really what it is all about?

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

Mr. Chairman, Members can keep repeating all they want to figures that have come from the air. The only thing evaluated by the congressionally mandated evaluation was the test scores. Our public school students and our charter school students have to take these tests. These children took these tests.

Our public school students are doing better—not nearly as good as they should—and so are our charter schools. In fact, our charter schools are doing even better than our public school students, and these students didn't move at all. That is what the congressionally mandated study showed.

As to civil rights, these schools are exempted from many of the civil rights laws, and for that reason, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the NAACP, and a number of organizations wrote opposing reauthorization of this bill.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD.)

Mr. SANFORD. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I think that there is one fundamental question in this debate, and that is: Should a child be trapped in a school that traps them? Should a child be trapped in a school

that, for whatever reason, isn't working for them but would forever limit their capacity and their potential in life? To me, that is what H.R. 10 is all about.

I think it is important to remember that 98 percent of the kids that have entered this program have come from schools that were not performing; and in that regard, this is simply a way out, it is a hand up. I think it fundamentally recognizes that dignity and worth that comes with giving somebody a choice.

I think it is something that every human being wants, which is simply a choice. I think it is a recognition of the fact that one size never fits all, that God makes us all different, and therefore a plethora of different choices is vital in the marketplace.

Finally, it is recognition of the fact that the marketplace has the ability to create choices that might take forever in other systems, time that these kids do not have. I would ask that we refocus on the kids.

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

Mr. Chairman, I don't know about other Members' districts, but I challenge Members to meet what the District of Columbia has done to keep students from being trapped in bad schools.

In your districts, can 75 percent of the children choose to go to a better performing district? They can in mine.

In your district, are there 110 publicly accountable charter schools as an alternative to your own traditional public schools? There are in mine.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his leadership in bringing this excellent bill to the floor. This bill—of which, in full disclosure, I am an original cosponsor of—will continue to promote school choice and provide Opportunity scholarships to D.C. students that are most in need, while also expanding D.C. Public Charter Schools, therefore providing more opportunities for Washington students to excel and set themselves up for productive and successful lives.

Now, to date, the Opportunity Scholarship Program has been an educational lifeline for more than 6,000 children from very low-income D.C. families, and more than 16,000 have applied to participate since the 2004–05 school year. Quite simply put, this program works.

It is no secret I am a big proponent of school choice. As chairman of the Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education Subcommittee, I have heard about the challenges many students in schools are facing, and I firmly believe that when parents have a choice, kids have a chance. This program, which has helped pave the way for others like it across the country, gives that chance, and it creates a healthy competition that causes all schools to improve, therefore helping all students, even those who aren't in the program.

As I have seen in my home State of Indiana and across this great country touring schools and visiting classrooms, Opportunity scholarships provide students a hand up in improving their lives, their family's lives, and their communities. That is why we have a moral obligation to pass this legislation and why I urge my colleagues to join me and join the others here on the floor in reauthorizing the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program.

Mr. Chairman, a great education is a great equalizer. It opens doors to unlimited possibilities and provides students the tools that they need to succeed in life.

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

□ 1645

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Reauthorization Act.

Speaker BOEHNER led the Nation over 10 years ago when he provided flexibility to Washington, D.C., children and their parents through School Choice. I believe that School Choice is paramount to increasing educational gains for all children, but especially our Nation's students who are most in need.

The SOAR Act gives scholarships to low-income students to attend a private school, providing them an opportunity to access a quality education that would otherwise be out of reach.

School Choice has proven to be successful in Washington, D.C., as students using their scholarships have a 90 percent graduation rate compared to the 58 percent graduation rate for D.C. public schools in 2013 and 2014.

We heard today that these statistics have been questioned, and we hope that the public schools are improving. But with this act would they actually be improving?

I encourage my colleagues to stand up for School Choice by supporting the SOAR Act.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would draw our Members' attention to the editorial board comments from yesterday. This is from the Washington Post: A misguided attack on D.C.'s needy students.

I want to remind people, as they did in this document here in this editorial, that eight council members seem unaware that the program was established in 2004 at the initiation of the then-D.C. Mayor Anthony Williams, who was also supported by the chairman of the Council's Education Committee, and it has produced results.

The graduation rates are amazingly good, at roughly 90 percent, compared to D.C. public schools that are less than 60 percent. I think that is strong evidence that it is a winner, that it does provide a good opportunity for people, and that it should be reauthorized.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Utah has 6 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the author of this piece of legislation and the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, let me thank my colleague for yielding, and thank all my colleagues who are supporting this legislation today.

Many of us remember the story of ''The Little Engine That Could.'' What happened was that the train full of toys wanted to get over the mountain to get to the kids on the other side. The big engine said: No, I cannot. The rusty old engine said: No, I cannot. But the little engine says: I'm not very big, but I think I can. I think I can.

Well, from the beginning, the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program has been the little engine that could. We started this back in 2003 with the help of D.C.'s Mayor at the time, Anthony Williams, and D.C. councilman Kevin Chavous.

For years the government was promising the Moon to D.C. families and spending the Moon, essentially, but nothing changed. So we said: If we are going to support public schools and charter schools, let's also give low-income families the chance to apply for scholarships to attend the school of their choice. Let's give them that power.

Because if you have got the resources, you already have school choice. You can send your kids to whatever school you want to send them to. You can move from the neighborhood you are in to where they have got a better school. But if you are poor and you are stuck in a bad neighborhood and your child doesn't have that chance or, frankly, any chance, they are just dead in the water.

Well, the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program has been that little lifeline that could. All told, 6,100 students have escaped underperforming schools. In that time, the program has received some 16,000 applications. Last spring 90 percent of 12th graders using the Opportunity scholarships graduated and

88 percent enrolled in a 2- or 4-year college. Of the 1,400 students in the program this year, 87.4 percent would have been in a school that the government has identified as in need of improvement.

These are the kind of results parents dream of for their kids. And while it is my name on the bill, the best champions of this program are some of the most fearless kids you will ever see.

Not only did they have to overcome the doubts of the education establishment, they also had to withstand efforts by some of the most powerful people in this city to kill this program.

So today I am asking each of you to support H.R. 10, which reauthorizes this program for another 5 years. Here is why. Yes, this issue is personal to me and has been for a long time. But, frankly, it ought to be personal to every single Member of this body.

Those of us who work here, who make a good living here, owe something to the kids in this town. We owe these kids a fighting chance at success.

So what I am asking you to do today is help these kids get over the mountain. Help us keep building the movement that could. Vote for H.R. 10.

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

The Speaker has said that, without this program, these children would have been in bad neighborhood schools. Well, I think it must be noted that the District of Columbia has done more to make sure that those children are not trapped in such schools than any district I have yet read about or heard of.

I have noted that 75 percent—that means the overwhelming number—of children stuck in neighborhood schools that they believe are not good schools go to the other side of town, if necessary, to a better school. Far from being trapped, they are encouraged to choose a better school. And I have also cited the 110 charter schools that increase their choices.

And, Mr. Chairman, I want you to know that many of the voucher parents whom I have met with—after all, they are my constituents—have said to me that they tried to get into one of our charter schools, but the waiting lists were too long, which is why they went to the voucher schools.

Now, isn't it interesting that the voucher schools have no waiting list, but the D.C. charter schools and many of our public schools have waiting lists, so much so that D.C. has had to combine the public schools and the charter schools on one list in a lottery so that families can choose which school to go to.

How many Members on that side of the aisle have a lottery that lets the children, the parents, choose the best school for them to go to? Do not dare tell me that the District of Columbia leaves children trapped in failing schools. It has gone out of its way to do just the opposite.

And what does it get for it? The imposition by this body of yet another alternative. It is true that, a former mayor, who himself went to Catholic schools, said he was for vouchers. Well, Mr. Chairman, I ask you, then, since the District of Columbia has control of its own education apparatus, why hasn't the District of Columbia set up its own voucher schools? Some other districts have done that. Because the majority, they don't prefer vouchers, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, there are many reasons why I oppose this bill. First, it has failed the goal that the Congress gave it. Bring these children's test scores up. The public schools have brought their test scores up. The public charter schools have done even better in bringing their test scores up. These children's test scores have not risen.

Moreover, I can't fail to note how recently the majority has cut K–12 by $2 billion while taking $100 million out of, obviously, education funds to fund a private school voucher bill.

Mr. Chairman, not everybody on my side of the aisle is for public charter schools, but I have supported public charter schools because my own constituents wanted and needed a way out of neighborhood schools very often.

Yet, even though I come to this floor with home rule choices, this body is insisting on its choices, knowing full well that nobody in the District of Columbia can vote against their choices.

And it says to the District of Columbia residents: No matter what you do, people, no matter how good your choices are, no matter how much you meet the standards we often talk about when it comes to choice, you, who have no vote on this floor, who will not vote on this bill when the bell rings in a few minutes, must do what we say.

That, my good friends, is not a chapter in democracy. It shows once again that Republican do whatever they care to do to the District of Columbia, even when they reject the same choice for their own constituents, and vote down for their constituents what they now impose on mine. Just a few months ago, the House and Senate voted down vouchers, but today—today—they will vote to impose these same vouchers on the District of Columbia.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to correct the record there. I think, obviously, somebody misspoke. The House did not vote on vouchers in this Congress. That is not what has happened.

Mr. Chairman, I insert into the RECORD the letter we got from 500 families, D.C. residents, urging us in the adoption of this.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 20, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES: We are a large and diverse number of parents of children attending various schools within the District of Columbia. We write to urge your support of the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Reauthorization Act (SOAR) (H.R. 10).

The SOAR Act is bipartisan legislation which ensures our rights as parents to choose the best public, charter or private school for our children. It not only provides up to $20 million for Opportunity Scholarships for low-income families to attend private schools, but also authorizes an additional $40 million per year for public and charter schools in the District of Columbia. This three-sector initiative provides opportunities for all our children to succeed!

Nearly 6,200 children from very low-income families in the city have attended private schools through the Opportunity Scholarship Program over the past eleven years—88% coming from areas zoned for schools in need of improvement and 97% African-American or Hispanic. These students graduate at rates 30 points higher than the city's public schools and have a near 90 percent college enrollment rate. These are proven results!

The SOAR Act is an example of what works in education. When we can choose the best public, charter, or private school for our children, there are not only more opportunities to engage in their education, but also for them to achieve greater academic excellence. These outcomes strengthen the city's education system as a whole.

We believe that maintaining and fully funding all educational options are critically important for the city's families, especially low-income families served by the Opportunity Scholarship Program. No child should be denied a safe, quality education because of their family income or zip code.

We therefore urge you to support the swift passage of the SOAR Act.

Sincerely,

Ms. Nichelle Cluff, Mrs. Ifeyinwa Ikoli, Ms. Stephanie Montgomery, Ms. Mary Montgomery, Ms. Nina Harris, Ms. Eboni Purvis, Ms. Juliette Randolph, Ms. Ashley Adams, Ms. Naa Borle Sakeyfio, Mrs. Mariama Bah, Ms. Mia Wilson, Mrs. Sherri Calhoun, Ms. Lamonica Jeffrey, Mr. Darrell Cousar, Mr. James Calhoun, Mr. Andrew Cyr, Ms. Kayann McCalla, Mrs. Aldrina Cabrera, Ms. Kiana Wright, Ms. Albertine Cole.

Ms. Dianna Coley, Ms. Tonya Carter, Ms. Giovanna Grayson, Ms. Luciana Udeozor, Ms. Andrea Davis, Mrs. Obiagel nuel-Ejiofor, Mr. Emmanuel Ejiofor, Mr. Rogers Ferguson, Mr. Girma Mihretu, Ms. Molita Gaskins, Ms. Latoya Myers, Ms. Djenane Jeanty, Ms. Keona Lewis, Mrs. Nicole Knott, Mr. Rudy Knott, Mr. Hanna Boku, Mr. Rashawn McCain, Ms. Ann Mmayie, Ms. Rita Pineda, Mr. Okechukwu Mbarah.

Mr. Carlings McPhail, Ms. Ann Meruh, Ms. Shantel Powell-Morgan, Mrs. Marguerita Ramos, Mrs. Muanza Sangamay, Ms. Felicia Thomas, Ms. Sydney Williams, Ms. Caren Kirkland, Mrs. Temitope Tayo, Mr. Anthony Ugorji, Ms. Natasha Tutt, Ms. Dina Bayou, Ms. Natasha Tutt, Mr. Calvin Wright, Mrs. Julia Ugorji, Mrs. Chinwe Mbarah, Mr. Souleymane Bah, Julie McLaughlin, Sheila Martinez, Susan Morais.

Joan Sapienza, Eddie Donahue, Jeseph Yohe, Carter Jefferson, Vincent Browning, Jonathan Bender, Peter Frantz, Ellen Graper, Elizabeth LeBras, Kiandra Willis, Robert McKeon, Marcela Price Souaya, Stephen Lennon, Aleasa Chiles-Feggins, Sally Leakamariam, Juleanna Glover, Christopher Reiter, Cristina Khalaf, Tom Shea, Sean Vincent.

Karen Brennan, Ceci Smith, Adrienne Vincent, Pedro Smith, Donna Gibson, Colleen Cavanagh, Chris Long, Aleasa Chiles-Feggins, Mariela Alardon-Yohe, Jennifer Browning, Philippa Bender, Melanie Jefferson, Veronica Nyhan Jones, Michael

Truscott, Eavan O'Halloran, Sakinah Dupree, Morris Redd, Ron Josey, Susana Ramos-Izquierdo, Aimee Donahue.

Marisse Rovira, Linda Girardi, Sharlene Mentor, Lisa Richa, James McLaughlin, Glenda Morales, Samuel Parker III, Clarence Jones, Leyla Y. Teos, Mavian Nouget, Kip Ross, Beatriz Lopez, Charles Malloy, Steve Trynosky, Carlos Aquino, Yanira Reyes, Nelly Romero, Sandra Huerta, Eboni Curry, Amanda Lawrence.

Laura Hernandez, Mogus Meles, Danielle Aguirre, Julie Corsig, Andy Corsig, Alan Joaquin, Stephen Connors, Colton Campbell, Amy Dean, Flavio Cumpiano, John Menditto, Michelle Theic, Liza Figueroa, Shenelle Henry, Glenda Urquilla, Kelly Brown, Maria Granados, Catie Malloy, Ingrid Mejia, Jill Trynosky.

Marlene Aquino, Roselia Gonzalez, Nubia Easil, Jessica Martinez, Beatriz Jansen, Juan Carlos Acajabon Mendez, Betiel Zekarias, Maria Torres, Carrie Hillegass, Mike Hillegass, Barbara Richitt, Victoria Connors, Kiandra Willis, Marilyn Campbell, Bob Dean, Felice Goodwin, Shanti Stanton, Molly Robert, Jen MacLennan, Michael Grady.

Sharon Blume, Brendan O'Brien, Kenia Reyes, Salvador Hernandez, Rob Grabarz, Bentley Storm, Molly Bruno, Jennifer Leonard, Geoff Morrell, Christy Reap, Genet Demisse, Javier Aguirre, Neil McGrail, Kai Schmitz, Jimmy Kemp, Kathy Hagerup, Stephanie McGovern, Yohannes Z. Hadgu, Thomas Fitton, Melinda Johnson.

Theresa Nahazar, Ann McAllister, Dan Goodwin, Daphne de Souza, Darren MacLennan, Alexandra Walsh, Andrew Blume, Greg Talbot, Darren Jansen, Susan Tanis, Sarah Grabarz, Ashley Storm, Jaclyn Madden, Barton Leonard, Ann Morrell, Pat Reap, Jana Patterson, Barbara Swaboda, Stephanie McGrail, Adriana Schmitz.

Susan Kemp, Brian Crowley, John McGovern, Michael Scanlon, Kelly Fitton, Bassam Khalaf, John Nahazar, John McAllister, Marc Sozio, Tyson Redpath, Laverne Lightbourne, Nick Milano, Trisha Corcoran, Eleanor Hopkins, Liza Lindenberg, Katie Krantz, John Morrissey, Joe Patterson, Chima Oluigbo, Sonia Cruz.

Mercedes Rubio, Eddie Donahue, Gilbert Richa, Nick Saunders, Stephen Sexton, Thomas Faust, Meg Molloy, Michelle Wolf, Bruce Cormier, Ryan Angier, Jen Rowan, Lauren Buckley, Collin Cullen, Mary Santiviago, Kelly Sozio, Renee Redpath, Kevin Madden, Susan Milano, Joe Corcoran, Mary Glaser McCahan.

Kate McAuliffe, Meg Knight, Ann Morrissey, Courtney Knowles, Nnenna Oluigbo, Robert Cruz-Reyes, Lydia Dolan, Lauren Lennon, Tom Knight, Joe Beemsterboer, Sarah Sexton, Larisa Faust, Jim Molloy, Kristin Lindquist, Sarah Cormier, Katreena Vigil Pineda, Mike Rowan, Mark Buckley, Brenda Cullen, Sergio Santiviago, Gary Fabiano.

Rene McGuffin, Jorge Costa, Meghan Deerin, Kelly Stanton, Art Frye, John McGill, Mike Bruno, Matt Ritz, Margaret Bond, Billy MacArtee, Anthony Puglisi, Monica Micklos, Tim Yost, Ray Powers, Chris Dolan, Darrell Clark, Chris Connolly, Joni Veith, Courtney Taylor, Athena Meyers.

Joshua Corless, Allison Sheedy, Robin Barth, Sam Depoy, Jung Kang, Connie Fabiano, David McGuffin, Michelle Costa, JB Deerin, Mike Stanton, Barbara Frye, Stephanie McGill, Anne Zorc, Erin Ritz, Chris Delaney, Elena MacArtee, Laura Puglisi, Jeff Micklos, Liz Yost, Tom Hohman.

Desiree Gabbidon, Yves Clark, Michelle Connolly, Tom Veith, Jay Taylor, Greg Meyers, Shannon Corless, Stefan Hagerup, Woo Lee, Marty Depoy, Stephanie O'Leary, Susan O'Keefe, Luwam Berhane, Patti Exposito, Michael Henry, Dan Hickey, Carmen Burducea, Joseph Finnegan, Michael Hyatte, Peter Komives.

Eric Stogoski, Fred Dombo, Dave Madden, Justin Glasgow, Bernardo Ahlbom, Mark Emery, Doug Skomy, Stephen Grimberg, Brendan Delaney, John DiMartino, Jeffrey MacKinnon, Hirut Teklu, Erika Lopez-Padilla, Michelle Marshall, Abebe Kebede, Shayla Mack, Tesfaye Bune, Michael O'Keefe, Daniel McCahan, Lorenzo Exposito.

Sarah Henry, Stephanie Hickey, Radu Burducea, Elizabeth Finnegan, Theresa Hyatte, Irina Komives, Julia Stogoski, Michelle Dombo, Lisa Madden, Megan Glasgow, Tatiana Ahlborn, Celina Emery, Mary Skorny, Christina Grimberg, Celine Delaney, Ginny Treanor, Gail MacKinnon, Mekuria Gebremichael Bint, Renee Lopez-Padilla, Emebet Worku.

Carlotte Crawford, Solomon Meshesha, Etsegent Demissie, Sri Winarti, Denisha Dempster, Demssie Gebremedhin, Alembanchi Taye, Tezita Woldegebriel, Tesfaye Abebu Bune, Magie Maling, Jessica Cabrera, LaShawn Debnam, Barbara Destry, Jaanai Johnson, Hewan Abera, Siddiq Anderson, Markina Bailey, Odessa Brown, Rosa Caiza Maldonado, Sharon Coffey.

Dianna Coley, Felicia Dyson, Ruth Fekadu, Dana Grinage, Sandra Hall, Lakia Harris, Shirlene Jackson, Francine Johnson, Nicole Johnson, Rajeeyah Burks, Mohamad Nugroho, Woinishet Gelete, Johnny Kassa, Cynthia Downes, Genet Tirksso, Wosen Admasu, Sara Caceres, Johanna Rizo Martinez, Nikita Pray, Estela Arellano.

Sagrario Agaton, Mary Addae, Ruth Barnwell, Meka Burch, Sherri Calhoun, Catrice Coleman, Barbara Cunningham, Lashawn Durant, Moanick Fenner, Michelle Glover, Carmen Hall-Ali, Deborah Jackson, Darlene Johnson, Denise Johnson, Wendy Jones, Michael Jones, Alfreda Judd, Lynetta McClam, Adrienne Miles, Claudia Moreno.

Pauline Murray, Brigitta Nyahn, Naha Poindexter, Erin Skinner, Felicia Thomas, Sharon Waller, Lanita Wood, Ms. Myeshia Johnson, Ms. Venete Eason, Ms. Kanita Washington, Mrs. Barbara Graham, Sophie Alozie, Blanca Magarin, Jeanine Henderson-Lebbie, William Walker, IV, Tigistu Zewdie, Sydonie Fisher, William James, Akwilina Perry, Monalisa Reno.

Zakia Williams, Shonta Jones, Pamela Matthews, Cecilia Mensah, Tonya Moore, Priscilla Moultrie, Carolina Novoa, Deborah M. Parker, Michelle Roberts, Sandra Stackhouse, Leslie Void, Varnell Washington, Ms. Kitty Dawson, Ms. Mia Butler, Ms. Tiana Robinson, Mrs. Jill Gelman, Nejat Teman, Nathaniel Garbla, Tefaye Tamire, Patrice Aubrey.

Fatmatta Kamara, Stephon Knox, Dwishnicka Randolph, Nicole Wood, Erica Iweanoge, Amanda Brown-Parks, James Parker, Teata Sanders, Samora St. Firmin, Dionne Clemons, Vernessa Perry, Donald Matthews, Tashana Ellis, Donita Adams, Caroline Beruchan, Steven Garrison, Ms. Holly Destry, Ms. Victoria Heimbold, Mr. Solomon Weldeghebriel, Ms. Jamil Raspberry.

Anne Hedian, Atchoi Osekre-Bond, Margie Bacon, Jill Wright, Cathy Falk, Chanda Foreman, Colleen Scheidel, Kenny Stack, Juliette Randolph, Barbara Andercheck, Indra Thomas, Dog Harvey, Darah Tracy, Ginger Beverly, Tonya Wright, Brandon Winder, Antilecia O'Neal, Uanna Ferguson, Aster Robi, Bernadette Aniekwe.

Patrice Davis, Ms. Maria del Carmen Reyes, Ms. Ingrid Lucas, Ms. Stephanie Goodloe, Mrs. Helen Andemariam, Michael Thomasian, Neslyn Moore, Judy Steele, Kathleen Downey, Judith Home, Niamh O'Mahoney, Arleen Hall, Bobby Rienzo, Teresa Fitzgerald, LaShawne Thomas, Sarah Kane, Frank Washington, Mary Ann Welter, Shawn Hunter, Leslie Sherrill.

Donise Yeager, Keyana Caroline, Sandra Gray, Latasha Monnique Jones Ward, Anthony Speight, Deborah B. Jones, Kim Atwater, Alvena P. Toland, Loretta Henry, Marilyn Sharpe, Davon Wilson, Sherry Bryant, Elroy Black, Lisa Newman, Shakia Henderson, Octavia Powell, Anita M. Harris, Krestin Clay, Laneka Brakett, Ana Acedo-Garcia.

Garry Jones, John Wallace, Nakeisha Thompson, Donald Lampkins, Renard Hawkins, Tammy Williams, Tynisha Dunn, Jovanna Bailey, Latasha Johon, Bobby Perry, Shalita Knight, Keyana Howard, Kenneth Meredith, Calep Epps, Ty'ron Byers, Chase Blakney, Curtis Watts, Kishara Odom, Jeffrey Corry, Antonia Payne.

Denise L. Lowery, Stephanie Payner, Tanya Lambright, Elaine E. Harris, Elbert Laker, Ryan Storr, Sylvester Bynum, Lavelle Lamb, Dominique Johnson, Paulette Willims, Martasha Fermine, Oyhani Williams, Nasir McKeiver, Kenneth Wood, Neta Vaught, Mary Joyner, Michelle L. McIntyre, Kaitlin Gallagher, Will E. Henderson, Jeanette Hubbard, Ontavia Lynch, Tasha McKenzie, James R. Wills, Jr.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I also introduce into the RECORD The Washington Post editorial from yesterday, ''A Misguided Attack on D.C.'s Needy Students,'' actually supporting this.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 20, 2015]

A MISGUIDED ATTACK ON D.C.'S NEEDY STUDENTS

(By Editorial Board)

Is the federally funded scholarship program for poor D.C. families being forced on an unwilling city? It is safe to say that thousands of D.C. parents whose children are on the waiting list for a scholarship do not think so. Nor, we would venture, do the 6,100 children, predominantly minorities, who have used the scholarships to attend private schools. For that matter, students in the city's public schools who have benefited from the infusion of federal dollars that has accompanied the voucher program probably would not embrace the argument either.

So whom do members of the D.C. Council think they are helping as they urge Congress to kill this program?

Fortunately, it does not appear that the council members will succeed in inflicting this wound on their city. Congress appears poised to reauthorize the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program, which provides needy students with up to $12,572 to pay for tuition, fees and transportation to a school of their choice. The average family income for participating families is less than $22,000. A bill extending the program for five years and championed by outgoing House Speaker John A. Boehner (R–Ohio) is set for a floor vote Wednesday, while a bipartisan group of senators has filed a companion bill that would continue the program through 2025.

Seeking to derail those efforts, a misguided majority of the D.C. Council, undoubtedly egged on by Del. Eleanor Holmes Norton (D–D.C.) and other voucher critics, wrote a letter to Congress objecting to what they portrayed as an intrusion into local affairs. These eight council members seemed unaware that the program was established in 2004 at the initiation of Anthony Williams (D), then D.C.'s mayor, and with the strong support of Kevin Chavous (D), then chair of the council's Education Committee. Likewise, they were unmoved by polling that has shown 74 percent of D.C. residents support

the voucher program, which, despite the specious claims of critics, has improved outcomes for its students without taking a dime from regular public schools.

Indeed, the three-sector federal approach has brought more than $600 million to D.C. schools, with traditional public schools receiving $239 million, charter public schools $195 million and the voucher program $183 million. At stake for fiscal 2016 is an additional $45 million. It is fantasy to think there would be additional monies absent vouchers.

School reform has brought improvement throughout the system. Yet, many parents still lack the choices and the access to high-quality education that city politicians take for granted for their own families. We credit D.C. Council Chairman Phil Mendelson (D) and council members Vincent B. Orange (D–At Large), Mary M. Cheh (D–Ward 3), Brandon T. Todd (D–Ward 4) and Kenyan R. McDuffie (D–Ward 5) for not seeking to deprive those parents of choice, and we hope their eight colleagues will rethink their position and put constituents' welfare over misguided ideology.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is this program produces results. I like the variety of choices. And the Delegate has been a real champion for charter schools, and I applaud her for that, I support her in that. But the reality is the scholarships that we are talking about here, the Opportunity scholarships, have yielded the best results with nearly 90 percent graduation rates and roughly 88 percent of the people then going on to college. Those are amazing statistics.

But I have heard a lot of derogatory comments. I have heard everything from misguided, idiotic, disgraceful, weakens, underfunded. Underfunded? Underfunded? That is offensive to us from Utah. We happen to have the lowest per pupil funding in the entire United States. We are not proud of that fact. But the reality is we get roughly $6,500 per student, where in Washington, D.C. you get about $19,500 per student. It is not even close. And yet here we are championing and trying to help give more money, more resources, to what are underperforming students and giving them more choices.

I guess one of the things you should consider is if the Congress does support this bill, does pass this bill, it is appropriated, would anybody on the Democratic side of the aisle actually recommend that the city not take the money?

□ 1700

If it is so idiotic, if it is so awful, if it is so derogatory, if it is so negative, then why not cut it off right now? See, they want to continue to allow it to happen for those who have scholarships now because they know it is working, and they could never look those parents in the eye and take it away; but they are going to deny that choice to future generations where we know there has been demonstrable success.

So I am proud of Speaker BOEHNER and what he has done to champion this bill. I think it is a good bill. With that, I urge the adoption of this bill.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, today, I will vote against H.R. 10, which would continue a flawed program that pursues a partisan ideology at the expense of a child's quality education.

This bill would reauthorize Washington, D.C.'s private school voucher program, the only program in the country using federal money to send children to private and religious schools. The SOAR voucher program was a five year pilot set to expire in 2008. Despite four studies by the Department of Education and two General Accountability Office (GAO) reports concluding that the program wasn't working, Republicans in Congress are doubling down by allowing taxpayer dollars to prop up unaccredited, and even unsafe, schools. The last thing we need, as our students fall further behind their international peers, are voucher schools operating in relative isolation, free of oversight for curriculum, quality or management.

SOAR is the only program of its kind for a reason—there's no way our states would tolerate such nonsense. Sadly, because D.C. has not been freed from the partisan grips of Congress, it has become commonplace to see House Republicans impose their politics on D.C., despite widespread citizen and local government objection, from women's health care to marijuana reform to street design. There's justification for a program that funnels millions of dollars into a program shown to be ineffective and strongly opposed by the people that should matter—the parents, the educators, and taxpayers who support the system.

Worse, the SOAR Act strips students of constitutional protections of civil rights: federal funds can flow to schools that do not meet the federal standards to prevent discrimination against disabled persons, persons of color, persons of a religious group, women, or any other protected class. The SOAR Act is a sad step backward for education policy, civil rights, and good governance, and I strongly oppose it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise to speak in opposition to H.R. 10, the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Reauthorization Act.

H.R. 10 would reauthorize the District of Columbia private school voucher program, the Opportunity Scholarship Program (OSP), for five years through 2021.

H.R. 10 would reauthorize the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act, which provides Federal support for improving traditional public schools in the District of Columbia (D.C.), expanding and improving high-quality D.C. public charter schools, and offering private school vouchers to a limited number of students.

The Obama Administration continues to strongly oppose the private school vouchers program within this legislation, known as the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program.

Members of the House should respect the self determination of the residents of DC by not forcing education policy onto children or their families at taxpayer expense.

Rigorous evaluation over several years demonstrates that D.C. vouchers have not yielded statistically significant improvements in student achievement by scholarship recipients compared to other students not receiving vouchers.

In addition, H.R. 10 would extend this voucher program to a new population of students previously attending private schools.

Instead of using Federal resources to support a handful of students in private schools, the Federal Government should focus its attention and available resources on improving the quality of public schools for all students.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this bill.

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

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The amendments recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform printed in the bill are adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 10

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES IN ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Reauthorization Act'' or the ''SOAR Reauthorization Act''.

(b) REFERENCES IN ACT.—Whenever in this Act an amendment is expressed in terms of an amendment to or repeal of a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to that section or other provision of the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act (division C of Public Law 112–10; sec. 38–1853.01 et seq., D.C. Official Code).

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Parents are best equipped to make decisions for their children, including the educational setting that will best serve the interests and educational needs of their children.

(2) In 1995, Congress passed the DC School Reform Act, which granted the District of Columbia the authority to create public charter schools and gave parents greater educational options for their children.

(3) In 2003, in partnership with the Mayor of the District of Columbia, the chairman of the DC Council Education Committee, and community activists, Congress passed the DC School Choice Incentive Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–199; 118 Stat. 126), to provide opportunity scholarships to parents of students in the District of Columbia to enable them to pursue a high-quality education at a private elementary or secondary school of their choice.

(4) The DC Opportunity Scholarship Program (DC OSP) was part of a comprehensive three-part funding arrangement that provided additional funds for both the District of Columbia public schools and public charter schools of the District of Columbia. The intent behind the additional resources was to ensure both District of Columbia public and charter schools continued to improve.

(5) In 2011, Congress enacted the three-part funding arrangement when it reauthorized the DC OSP and passed the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results (SOAR) Act (division C of Public Law 112–10) with bipartisan support.

(6) While the National Center for Education Statistics indicates that per pupil expenditure for public schools in the District of Columbia is the highest in the United States, performance on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) continues to be near the bottom of the country when examining scores in mathematics and reading

for fourth and eighth grades. When Congress passed the DC School Choice Incentive Act of 2003, students in the District of Columbia ranked 52 out of 52 States (including the Department of Defense schools). Since that time, the District of Columbia has made significant gains in mathematics and reading. However, students in the District of Columbia still rank in the bottom three States out of 52 States. According to the 2013 fourth grade math NAEP results, 34 percent of students are below basic, 38 percent are at basic, and 28 percent are at proficient or advanced. The 2013 fourth grade reading results found that 50 percent of fourth grade students in the District of Columbia are at or below basic, 27 percent are at basic, and 23 percent are proficient or advanced.

(7) Since the inception of the DC OSP, there has been strong demand for the program by parents and the citizens of the District of Columbia. In fact, 74 percent of District of Columbia residents support continuing the program (based on the Lester & Associates February 2011 Poll).

(8) Since the program's inception, parental satisfaction has remained high. The program has also been found to result in significantly higher graduation rates for those students who have received and used their opportunity scholarships.

(9) The DC OSP offers low-income families in the District of Columbia important educational alternatives while public schools are improved. The program should continue to be reauthorized as part of a three-part comprehensive funding strategy for the District of Columbia school system providing equal funding for public schools, public charter schools, and opportunity scholarships for students to attend private schools.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this Act to amend the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act to provide low-income parents residing in the District of Columbia with expanded educational opportunities for enrolling their children in other schools in the District of Columbia, and provide resources to support educational reforms for District of Columbia Public Schools and District of Columbia public charter schools.

SEC. 3. PROHIBITING IMPOSITION OF LIMITS ON TYPES OF ELIGIBLE STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN THE PROGRAM.

Section 3004(a) (sec. 38–1853.04(a), D.C. Official Code) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) PROHIBITING IMPOSITION OF LIMITS ON ELIGIBLE STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN THE PROGRAM.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the program under this division, the Secretary may not limit the number of eligible students receiving scholarships under section 3007(a), and may not prevent otherwise eligible students from participating in the program under this Act, on any of the following grounds:

''(i) The type of school the student previously attended.

''(ii) Whether or not the student previously received a scholarship or participated in the program.

''(iii) Whether or not the student was a member of the control group used by the Institute of Education Sciences to carry out previous evaluations of the program under section 3009.

''(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) may be construed to waive the requirement under section 3005(b)(1)(B) that the entity carrying out the program under this Act must carry out a random selection process which gives weight to the priorities described in section 3006 if more eligible students seek admission in the program than the program can accommodate.''.

SEC. 4. REQUIRING ELIGIBLE ENTITIES TO UTILIZE INTERNAL FISCAL AND QUALITY CONTROLS.

Section 3005(b)(1) (sec. 38–1853.05(b)(1), D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (K); and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(M) how the entity will ensure that it utilizes internal fiscal and quality controls; and''.

SEC. 5. CLARIFICATION OF PRIORITIES FOR AWARDING SCHOLARSHIPS TO DETERMINING ELIGIBLE STUDENTS.

Section 3006(1) (sec. 38–1853.06(1), D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6316)'' and inserting ''identified as a low-achieving school according to the Office of the State Superintendent of Education of the District of Columbia''; and

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting the following: '', or whether such students have, in the past, attended a private school;''.

SEC. 6. MODIFICATION OF REQUIREMENTS FOR PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS AND ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.

(a) CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECKS; COMPLIANCE WITH REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 3007(a)(4) (sec. 38–1853.07(a)(4), D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (E);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (F) and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

''(G) conducts criminal background checks on school employees who have direct and unsupervised interaction with students; and

''(H) complies with all requests for data and information regarding the reporting requirements described in section 3010.''.

(b) ACCREDITATION.—Section 3007(a) (sec. 38–1853.07(a), D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''paragraphs (2) and (3)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (2), (3), and (5)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) ACCREDITATION REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds provided under this division for opportunity scholarships may be used by an eligible student to enroll in a participating private school unless one of the following applies:

''(i) In the case of a school that, as of the date of enactment of the SOAR Reauthorization Act, is a participating school, the school is provisionally or fully accredited by an accrediting body described in subparagraphs (A) through (G) of section 2202(16) of the District of Columbia School Reform Act of 1995 (sec. 38–1802.02(16)(A–G), D.C. Official Code), or by any other accrediting body determined appropriate by the District of Columbia Office of the State Superintendent for Schools for the purposes of accrediting an elementary or secondary school.

''(ii) In the case of a school that, as of the day before the date of enactment of the SOAR Reauthorization Act, is a participating school but does not meet the requirements of clause (i)—

''(I) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of such Act, the school is pursuing full accreditation by an accrediting body described in clause (i); and

''(II) not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of such Act, the school meets the requirements of clause (i), except that an eligible entity may extend this deadline for a single 1-year period if the school provides the eligible entity with evidence from such an accrediting body that the school's application for accreditation is in process and that the school will be awarded accreditation before the end of such period.

''*(iii) In the case of a school that, as of the date of enactment of the SOAR Reauthorization Act, is not a participating school, the school meets the requirements of clause (i) or, if it does not meet the requirements of clause (i)—*

''*(I) at the time the school notifies an eligible entity that it seeks to be a participating school, the school is actively pursuing full accreditation by an accrediting body described in clause (i);*

''*(II) not later than 5 years after the school notifies an eligible entity that it seeks to be a participating school, the school meets the requirements of clause (i), except that an eligible entity may extend this deadline for a single 1-year period if the school provides the eligible entity with evidence from such an accrediting body that the school's application for accreditation is in process and that the school will be awarded accreditation before the end of such period; and*

''*(III) the school meets all of the other requirements for participating schools under this Act.*

''(B) REPORTS TO ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of the SOAR Reauthorization Act, each participating school shall submit to the eligible entity a certification that the school has been fully or provisionally accredited in accordance with subparagraph (A), or has been granted an extension by the eligible entity in accordance with subparagraph (A)(ii)(II).

''(C) ASSISTING STUDENTS IN ENROLLING IN OTHER SCHOOLS.—If a participating school fails to meet the requirements of subparagraph (A), the eligible entity shall assist the parents of the eligible students who attend the school in identifying, applying to, and enrolling in another participating school under this Act.''.

(c) USE OF FUNDS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES AND PARENTAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 3007 (sec. 38–1853.07, D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (b) and (c) and inserting the following:

''(b) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES AND PARENTAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall make $2,000,000 of the amount provided under the grant each year available to an eligible entity receiving a grant under section 3004(a) to cover the following expenses:

''(1) The administrative expenses of carrying out its program under this Act during the year, including—

''(A) determining the eligibility of students to participate;

''(B) selecting the eligible students to receive scholarships;

''(C) determining the amount of the scholarships and issuing the scholarships to eligible students;

''(D) compiling and maintaining financial and programmatic records; and

''(E) conducting site visits as described in section 3005(b)(1)(l).

''(2) The expenses of educating parents about the entity's program under this Act, and assisting parents through the application process under this Act, including—

''(A) providing information about the program and the participating schools to parents of eligible students;

''(B) providing funds to assist parents of students in meeting expenses that might otherwise preclude the participation of eligible students in the program; and

''(C) streamlining the application process for parents.''; and

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

(d) CLARIFICATION OF USE OF FUNDS FOR STUDENT ACADEMIC ASSISTANCE.—Section

3007(c) (sec. 38–1853.07(c), D.C. Official Code), as redesignated by subsection (c)(2), is amended by striking ''identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6316)'' and inserting ''identified as a low-achieving school according to the Office of the State Superintendent of Education of the District of Columbia''.

(e) PERMITTING USE OF FUNDS REMAINING UNOBLIGATED FROM PREVIOUS FISCAL YEARS.—Section 3007 (sec. 38–1853.07, D.C. Official Code), as amended by this section, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''*(d) PERMITTING USE OF FUNDS REMAINING UNOBLIGATED FROM PREVIOUS FISCAL YEARS.—To the extent that any funds appropriated for the opportunity scholarship program under this Act for any fiscal year (including a fiscal year occurring prior to the enactment of this subsection) remain unobligated at the end of the fiscal year, the Secretary shall make such funds available during the next fiscal year and (if still unobligated as of the end of that fiscal year) any subsequent fiscal year for scholarships for eligible students, except that an eligible entity may use not more than 5 percent of the funds for administrative expenses, parental assistance, and tutoring, in addition to the amounts appropriated for such purposes under section 3007(b) and (c).*''.

SEC. 7. PROGRAM EVALUATION.

(a) REVISION OF EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3009(a) (sec. 38–1853.09(a), D.C. Official Code) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY AND THE MAYOR.—The Secretary and the Mayor of the District of Columbia shall—

''(A) jointly enter into an agreement with the Institute of Education Sciences of the Department of Education to evaluate annually the opportunity scholarship program under this Act;

''(B) jointly enter into an agreement to monitor and evaluate the use of funds authorized and appropriated for the District of Columbia Public Schools and the District of Columbia public charter schools under this Act; and

''(C) make the evaluations described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) public in accordance with subsection (c).

''(2) DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary, through a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement, shall—

''(A) ensure that the evaluation under paragraph (1)(A)—

''(i) is conducted using an acceptable quasi-experimental research design for determining the effectiveness of the opportunity scholarship program under this Act which does not use a control study group consisting of students who applied for but who did not receive opportunity scholarships; and

''(ii) addresses the issues described in paragraph (4); and

''(B) disseminate information on the impact of the program—

''(i) in increasing academic achievement and educational attainment of participating eligible students; and

''(ii) on students and schools in the District of Columbia.

''(3) DUTIES OF THE INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SCIENCES.—The Institute of Education Sciences of the Department of Education shall—

''(A) assess participating eligible students in each of the grades 3 through 8, as well as one of the grades in the high school level, by supervising the administration of the same reading and math assessment used by the District of Columbia Public Schools to comply with section 1111(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b));

''(B) measure the academic achievement of all participating students in the grades described in subparagraph (A); and

''(C) work with the eligible entities to ensure that the parents of each student who receives a scholarship under this Act agree to permit the student to participate in the evaluations and assessments carried out by the Institute under this subsection.

''(4) ISSUES TO BE EVALUATED.—The issues to be evaluated under paragraph (1)(A) shall include the following:

''(A) A comparison of the academic achievement of participating eligible students in the measurements described in paragraph (3) to the academic achievement of a comparison group of students with similar backgrounds in the District of Columbia Public Schools.

''(B) The success of the program under this Act in expanding choice options for parents of participating eligible students and increasing *the satisfaction of such parents and students with their choice*.

''(C) The reasons parents of participating eligible students choose for their children to participate in the program, including important characteristics for selecting schools.

''(D) A comparison of the retention rates, high school graduation rates, *college enrollment* rates, college persistence rates, and college graduation rates of participating eligible students with the rates of students in the comparison group described in subparagraph (A).

''(E) A comparison of the *college enrollment* rates, college persistence rates, and college graduation rates of students who participated in the program in 2004, 2005, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015 as the result of winning the Opportunity Scholarship Program lottery with the rates of students who entered but did not win such lottery in those years and who, as a result, served as the control group for previous evaluations of the program under this Act.

''(F) A comparison of the safety of the schools attended by participating eligible students and the schools in the District of Columbia attended by students in the comparison group described in subparagraph (A), based on the perceptions of the students and parents.

''(G) Such other issues with respect to participating eligible students as the Secretary considers appropriate for inclusion in the evaluation, such as the impact of the program on public elementary schools and secondary schools in the District of Columbia.

''(5) PROHIBITING DISCLOSURE OF PERSONAL INFORMATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Any disclosure of personally identifiable information shall be in compliance with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (commonly known as the 'Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974') (20 U.S.C. 1232g).

''(B) STUDENTS NOT ATTENDING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.—With respect to any student who is not attending a public elementary school or secondary school, personally identifiable information may not be disclosed outside of the group of individuals carrying out the evaluation for *such student or the group of individuals providing information for carrying out the evaluation of such student*, other than to the parents of such student.''.

(2) TRANSITION FROM CURRENT EVALUATION.—The Secretary of Education shall terminate the current evaluations conducted under section 3009(a) of the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act (sec. 38–1853.09, D.C. Official Code), as in effect prior to the date of enactment of this Act, after obtaining data for the 2015–2016 school year, and shall submit the reports required with respect to the evaluations in accordance with section 3009(b) of such Act. Effective with respect to the 2016–2017 school year, the Secretary shall conduct new evaluations in accordance with the provisions of section 3009(a) of such Act as amended by this Act, *and as a component of the new evaluations, the Secretary shall continue to monitor and evaluate the students who were evaluated in the most recent evaluation under such section prior to the enactment of this Act, along with their corresponding test scores and other information*.

(b) DUTY OF MAYOR TO ENSURE INSTITUTE HAS ALL INFORMATION NECESSARY TO CARRY OUT EVALUATIONS.—Section 3011(a)(1) (sec. 38–1853.11(a)(1), D.C. Official Code) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) INFORMATION NECESSARY TO CARRY OUT EVALUATIONS.—Ensure that all District of Columbia public schools and District of Columbia public charter schools make available to the Institute of Education Sciences of the Department of Education all of the information the Institute requires to carry out the assessments and perform the evaluations required under section 3009(a).''.

SEC. 8. FUNDING FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOLS.

(a) MANDATORY WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH CONDITIONS.—Section 3011(b) (sec. 38–1853.11(b), D.C. Official Code) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) ENFORCEMENT.—If, after reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing, the Secretary determines that the Mayor has failed to comply with any of the requirements of subsection (a), the Secretary may withhold from the Mayor, in whole or in part—

''(1) the funds otherwise authorized to be appropriated under section 3014(a)(2), if the failure to comply relates to the District of Columbia public schools;

''(2) the funds otherwise authorized to be appropriated under section 3014(a)(3), if the failure to comply relates to the District of Columbia public charter schools; or

''(3) the funds otherwise authorized to be appropriated under both section 3014(a)(2) and section 3014(a)(3), if the failure relates to both the District of Columbia public schools and the District of Columbia public charter schools.''.

(b) RULES FOR USE OF FUNDS PROVIDED FOR SUPPORT OF PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOLS.—Section 3011 (sec. 38–1853.11, D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

''(c) SPECIFIC RULES REGARDING FUNDS PROVIDED FOR SUPPORT OF PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOLS.—The following rules shall apply with respect to the funds provided under this Act for the support of District of Columbia public charter schools:

''(1) The Secretary may direct the funds provided for any fiscal year, or any portion thereof, to the Office of the State Superintendent of Education of the District of Columbia (OSSE).

''(2) The OSSE may transfer the funds to subgrantees who are specific District of Columbia public charter schools or networks of such schools or who are District of Columbia-based non-profit organizations with experience in successfully providing support or assistance to District of Columbia public charter schools or networks of schools.

''(3) The funds shall be available to any District of Columbia public charter school in good standing with the District of Columbia Charter School Board (Board), and the OSSE and Board may not restrict the availability

of the funds to certain types of schools on the basis of the school's location, governing body, or any other characteristic.''.

SEC. 9. REVISION OF CURRENT MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.

The Secretary of Education and the Mayor of the District of Columbia shall revise the memorandum of understanding which is in effect under section 3012(d) of the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act (sec. 38–1853.12(d), D.C. Official Code) as of the day before the date of the enactment of this Act to address the following:

(1) The amendments made by this Act.

(2) The need to ensure that participating schools under such Act meet fire code standards and maintain certificates of occupancy.

(3) The need to ensure that District of Columbia public schools and District of Columbia public charter schools meet the requirements under such Act to comply with all reasonable requests for information necessary to carry out the evaluations required under section 3009(a) of such Act.

SEC. 10. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 3014(a) (sec. 38–1853.14(a), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking ''each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years'' and inserting ''each of the 9 succeeding fiscal years''.

SEC. 11. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to school year 2016–2017 and each succeeding school year.

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in House Report 114–300. Each further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, 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. CHAFFETZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114–300.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. 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 9, beginning line 5, strike ''identified as a low-achieving school according to the Office of the State Superintendent of Education of the District of Columbia'' and insert ''identified as one of the lowest-performing schools under the District of Columbia's accountability system''.

Page 10, beginning line 25, strike '', or by any other accrediting body determined appropriate by the District of Columbia Office of the State Superintendent for Schools for the purpose of accrediting an elementary or secondary school''.

Page 16, beginning line 7, strike ''identified as a low-achieving school according to the Office of the State Superintendent of Education of the District of Columbia'' and insert ''identified as one of the lowest-performing schools under the District of Columbia's accountability system''.

Page 18, line 10, strike ''evaluate'' and insert ''report on''.

Page 21, line 12, strike ''A comparison of'' and insert ''A report on''.

Page 21, line 18, strike ''with the rates'' and insert ''as well as the rates''.

Page 21, line 22, after the period add the following: ''Nothing in this subparagraph may be construed to waive section 3004(a)(3)(A)(iii) with respect to any such student.''.

Page 25, beginning line 20, strike ''may direct the funds provided for any fiscal year, or any portion thereof,'' and insert ''shall direct the funds provided for any fiscal year''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 480, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, the manager's amendment that I am offering makes small technical changes to the bill.

First, the amendment substitutes the term ''low achieving schools'' for ''lowest performing schools,'' which corresponds to the language used by the District of Columbia on this topic.

Second, the amendment makes clear that the Secretary of Education and the Mayor of the District of Columbia will monitor and report on the use of funds authorized by this bill.

Third, the amendment clarifies reporting requirements in the bill to protect students against arbitrary exclusion from the program.

Finally, the amendment requires the Secretary of Education to direct funding for public charter schools to the District's Office of the State Superintendent of Education.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good amendment that reflects the ongoing conversations with the District of Columbia regarding this bill. I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana). Without objection, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I actually agree with the chairman, and the chairman has consulted with us on these changes, which are technical in nature.

I do not oppose this amendment. Indeed, I want to thank our chairman for working with us before this committee markup on this bill on some additional technical changes.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate working with the Delegate. It is a good working relationship. We have our opposition from time to time, but she did work with us in this way, and I appreciate her support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. NORTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114–300.

Ms. NORTON. 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:

Add at the end of section 6 the following new subsection:

(f) LIMIT ON PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL STUDENT POPULATION OF SCHOOL WHO RECEIVE OPPORTUNITY SCHOLARSHIPS.—Section 3007(a) (sec. 38-1853.07(a), D.C. Official Code), as amended by subsection (b), is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''paragraphs (2), (3), and (5)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (2), (3), (5), and (6)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) LIMIT ON PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL STUDENT POPULATION RECEIVING OPPORTUNITY SCHOLARSHIPS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds provided under this Act for opportunity scholarships may be used by an eligible student to enroll in a participating school for a school year unless the school certifies to the eligible entity that, for the school year, the number of students enrolled in the school who receive opportunity scholarships under this Act does not exceed the number of students enrolled in the school who do not receive opportunity scholarships under this Act.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—In determining the number of students enrolled in a school who receive opportunity scholarships under this Act for a school year under subparagraph (A), there shall be excluded any student who was receiving an opportunity scholarship as of the date of the enactment of the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Reauthorization Act and any student who is the sibling of a student who was receiving an opportunity scholarship as of the date of the enactment of such Act.''.

Page 18, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 19, line 5 and insert the following:

''(i) is conducted using the strongest possible research design for determining the effectiveness of the opportunity scholarship program under this Act; and''.

Page 20, strike lines 4 through 9 and insert the following:

''(C) work with the eligible entities to ensure that the parents of each student who applies for a scholarship under this Act (regardless of whether the student receives the scholarship) and the parents of each student participating in the scholarship program under this Act, agree that the student will participate, if requested by the Institute, in the measurements given annually by the Institute for the period for which the student applied for or received the scholarship, respectively, except that nothing in this subparagraph shall affect a student's priority for an opportunity scholarship as provided under section 3006.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 480, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

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

The Speaker's voucher bill is sure to pass, and I am sure it is offered with the best of intentions. Therefore, I want to work with him and with Members and with those in the Senate who support vouchers to provide much-needed oversight for the millions in

Federal dollars in this bill. It is in that spirit that I offer a two-part amendment, and both parts are entirely consistent with the underlying bill.

The Government Accountability Office, the GAO, said in 2007 and again in 2013 that the voucher program lacks quality control, transparency, and information.

In response, the first part of my amendment restores the scientific integrity of the program's evaluation, copied from prior authorizations of this bill, and the second prohibits voucher mills, not our accredited Catholic schools, which are attended by most of our children, but their competition for vouchers—a small, but significant, number of private schools that would not exist but for this Federal funding.

First, my amendment restores the evaluation of the program's effectiveness that Congress has required since the program was created in 2004—and I am quoting from Congress—''to be conducted using the strongest possible research design.''

In contrast, this bill requires the evaluation to be conducted using ''an acceptable quasi-experimental research design that actually prohibits the more scientific randomized controlled trial Congress mandated in prior authorizations.''

Yet the congressionally mandated evaluation said that randomized controlled trials ''are especially important in the context of School Choice because families wanting to apply for a Choice program may have educational goals and aspirations that differ from the average family's.''

I appreciate that this bill requires for the first time that schools be accredited, but it gives unaccredited schools 5 years, along with the grace period of a year, to become accredited.

This time frame is so long that it would allow existing and new unaccredited schools to accept voucher students well into the decade. The 50 percent cap that my amendment proposes at least would ensure that voucher schools would ultimately be eliminated.

For example, the GAO found that six participating voucher schools had more than 80 percent of their enrollment from voucher students. A Washington Post investigation found one school where voucher students comprised 93 percent of the total.

The majority concedes that there is a need for the ongoing evaluation of the program's effectiveness by requiring a study of this bill, but after the mandated study showed that vouchers did not improve student achievement, the majority took care of that by watering down the mandated evaluation.

The second part of my amendment prohibits fly-by-night, often storefront school voucher bills by eliminating the percentage of voucher students in the school to 50 percent of the school's total enrollment. No current voucher student or sibling would be affected by the cap.

My amendment would disqualify so-called voucher mills, a small, but significant, number of schools that cannot survive without government funding, most of which sprang up in low-income neighborhoods after the program was created to get unrestricted Federal funds.

Why should the major recipients of voucher funds—our fully accredited Catholic schools or other parochial and private schools—have to share the available funding with voucher mills of low quality? The way to eliminate these unaccredited schools, which are unworthy of our students, is to require that their enrollment not consist primarily of voucher students.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Post's investigation, entitled, ''Quality controls lacking for D.C. schools accepting Federal vouchers,'' be included in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 17, 2012]

QUALITY CONTROLS LACKING FOR D.C. SCHOOLS ACCEPTING FEDERAL VOUCHERS

(By Lyndsey Layton and Emma Brown)

Congress created the nation's only federally funded school voucher program in the District to give the city's poorest children a chance at a better education than their neighborhood schools offer.

But a Washington Post review found that hundreds of students use their voucher dollars to attend schools that are unaccredited or are in unconventional settings, such as a family-run K–12 school operating out of a storefront, a Nation of Islam school based in a converted Deanwood residence, and a school built around the philosophy of a Bulgarian psychotherapist.

At a time when public schools face increasing demands for accountability and transparency, the 52 D.C. private schools that receive millions of federal voucher dollars are subject to few quality controls and offer widely disparate experiences, the Post found.

Some of these schools are heavily dependent on tax dollars, with more than 90 percent of their students paying with federal vouchers.

Yet the government has no say over curriculum, quality or management. And parents trying to select a school have little independent information, relying mostly on marketing from the schools.

The director of the nonprofit organization that manages the D.C. vouchers on behalf of the federal government calls quality control ''a blind spot.''

''We've raised the question of quality oversight of the program as sort of a dead zone, a blind spot,'' said Ed Davies, interim executive director of the D.C. Children and Youth Investment Trust Corp. ''Currently, we don't have that authority. It doesn't exist.''

Republicans in Congress established the D.C. voucher program eight years ago to demonstrate the school-choice concepts that the party has been espousing since the 1950s. Vouchers were once thought to be moribund, but came roaring to life in 2010 in states where Republicans took control. Fourteen states have created voucher programs or expanded existing ones in recent years.

Some states, such as Wisconsin, now include middle-class families in their voucher programs. Other states, including Virginia, have begun indirectly steering public dollars to private schools by offering tax credits to those who donate to scholarship funds.

In some cases, the public has pushed back against the idea of routing state dollars from public to private schools. Legal challenges are pending in Colorado and Indiana. In the November elections, Florida voters rejected a ballot amendment that would have permitted tax dollars to flow to religious institutions, including parochial schools. That would have enabled the state to revive a voucher program that had been declared unconstitutional in 2006 by its highest court. Yet Florida continues to offer vouchers for disabled students who want to attend private schools and awards tax credits to corporations that donate to private-school scholarship programs.

In the District, it's clear that vouchers have provided many children with an education at well-established private schools that otherwise would have been out of reach, and their parents rave about the opportunity. Of the 1,584 District students now receiving vouchers, more than half attend Catholic schools and a handful are enrolled at prestigious independent schools such as Sidwell Friends, where President Obama sends his daughters.

But the most comprehensive study of the D.C. program found ''no conclusive evidence'' that the vouchers improved math and reading test scores for those students who left their public schools.

The study, released by the U.S. Department of Education in 2010, found that voucher students were more likely to graduate than peers without vouchers, based on data collected from families. And parents reported that their children were safer attending the private schools, though the students themselves perceived no difference.

Congress set aside $20 million for the D.C. voucher program this year. Since 2004, the federal government has appropriated $133 million for the program.

Private schools that participate in the D.C. program don't have to disclose the number of voucher students they enroll or how much public money they receive, and many declined to release such information to The Post.

While public schools must report test scores and take action when they don't meet goals, private schools participating in the D.C. voucher program are insulated from such interference.

The schools must administer a single standardized test, but can choose the type. Those scores are not made public, and schools can stay in the voucher program no matter how their students fare.

Schools that accept vouchers are required to hold a certificate of occupancy and employ teachers who are college graduates, but they do not have to be accredited. The Post found that at least eight of the 52 schools are not accredited.

Parents, not the government, should determine a school's quality, according to Kevin Smith, a spokesman for House Speaker John A. Boehner (R-Ohio), a proud product of Catholic schools who designed the voucher program. ''Our belief is that parents—when provided appropriate information—will select the best learning environment for their children,'' he wrote in an e-mail.

At Archbishop Carroll High School, where 40 percent of students receive vouchers, principal Mary Elizabeth Blaufuss agrees. ''The question is, to what extent do we trust parents to make educational decisions for their kids?'' she said.

Santa Carballo knew little about the Academia de la Recta Porta before enrolling her daughter, Emma, through the voucher program. She chose it because it was across the street from the Catholic school for boys that her son attends, also with a voucher, and it seemed better than a neighborhood public school that has failed for years to meet achievement targets.

''This is private, it's good,'' said Carballo, an immigrant from El Salvador who works

as a waitress and struggles with English. ''It's more intelligent. And it's religious, it's good. I'm so happy.''

A nondenominational Christian school, the Academia charges $7,100 a year and occupies a soot-stained storefront between a halal meat shop and an evening wear boutique on a busy stretch of Georgia Avenue NW near the Maryland line.

The K–12 school consists of two classrooms. A drum set and keyboard are stowed in a corner for music class; for gym, students travel nearly two miles down Georgia Avenue to the city's Emery Recreation Center.

Annette and Reginald Miles founded the unaccredited school 13 years ago. He is the pastor of the associated church, she is the school director, their daughter is a teacher and their grandson is a student.

Annette Miles declined to say how many of her 70 students receive vouchers. If the program were to end, the Academia would ''have to stretch with fundraising'' to continue operating, she said.

To be eligible for a voucher, families must qualify for food stamps or meet other income requirements.

Through the D.C. program, the federal government pays about $8,000 a year for each elementary school student and $12,000 for high schoolers. That's less than the $18,000 a year it costs to educate one child in the D.C. Public Schools. Many of the participating private schools do not offer costly services for children with disabilities, who make up about 18 percent of the DCPS school population.

The voucher payments are enough to cover tuition at most Catholic schools, which enroll about 52 percent of D.C. voucher students. But they pay only a fraction of costs at elite institutions such as the Sheridan School in Northwest D.C., where charges can reach about $30,000 a year.

Tiblez Berhane has a daughter in eighth grade who is attending Sheridan with a voucher and financial aid from the school. ''It's wonderful,'' said Berhane, an immigrant from Eritrea who works in a day-care center. ''We could never afford this.''

While Sheridan, Sidwell Friends and the Washington International School each have one voucher student, the Academy for Ideal Education depends almost entirely on the federal program.

Founder Paulette Jones-Imaan created the school more than two decades ago, aiming to provide a nurturing environment with small classes and a learning model known as ''Suggestopedia,'' a philosophy of learning developed by Bulgarian psychotherapist Georgi Lozanov that stresses learning through music, stretching and meditation. Jones-Imaan melds that philosophy with an African-flavored approach that includes students addressing teachers as ''Mama'' and ''Baba,'' honorifics meaning mother and father.

Jones-Imaan also founded a K–12 public charter school, Ideal Academy, based on the same educational philosophy, in 1999. She served on the board for more than a decade.

But the charter school ran into trouble. Last year, the D.C. Public Charter School Board threatened to close it because of chronic poor performance. Ideal Academy agreed to shutter its high school, which had a particularly poor record, in order to keep its lower grades open. The preschool–8th grade Ideal Academy was classified as ''inadequate'' this year by the city's charter officials, which means it could be closed if it doesn't improve.

Meanwhile, the private Academy for Ideal Education continues on. More than 90 percent of its approximately 60 students are paying the $11,400 tuition with vouchers, Jones-Imaan said. ''If this program were to end, this school would end,'' she said.

While some schools have libraries, art studios and athletic fields, the Muhammad University of Islam occupies the second floor of a former residence east of the Anacostia River. The unaccredited K–8 school is supported by the Nation of Islam, according to director Stephanie Muhammad.

Parents choose the school because of its small classes, safety and strict discipline, she said.

About one-third of the 55 students hold vouchers. Few of the others can afford the $5,335 annual tuition, Muhammad said. They are asked to help defray tuition by raising funds. Last month, they sold pizzas. This month, it's coffee and tea.

The classrooms are small, located in what were perhaps once bedrooms. On the walls are posters of Louis Farrakhan, the controversial leader of the Nation of Islam.

On a recent visit, the only bathroom in the school had a floor blackened with dirt and a sink coated in grime. The bathtub was filled with paint cans and cleaning supplies concealed by a curtain.

Muhammad said in a subsequent interview that the bathroom is used only in emergencies, and students typically use a restroom on the floor below in a day-care center that she had previously described as unrelated to the school.

Kevin P. Chavous, a former D.C. Council member and now a senior adviser to American Federation for Children, which lobbies for voucher programs nationwide, said schools receiving public funds should meet quality standards. But supporters of the D.C. program have been focused on overcoming political challenges, he said.

''There should be some accountability measures in all these programs,'' Chavous said. ''Our biggest challenge has been the constant threats to shut this down before we can even measure the schools.''

Since Congress created the voucher program in 2004, Boehner and Sen. Joseph I. Lieberman (I-Conn.) have regularly wrestled with Democrats over its fate. Republicans and Lieberman want to expand the program; Democrats want to phase it out.

''Our goal is to provide a quality education to all children—not just a few—which is why the Obama administration does not believe vouchers are the answer to America's educational challenges,'' said Justin Hamilton, a spokesman for Education Secretary Arne Duncan.

Del. Eleanor Holmes Norton (D) and D.C. Mayor Vincent C. Gray (D) also are opposed to the voucher program, saying public dollars should go toward improving public schools where they can help the most students.

Still, the program has offered some children a crucial path out of troubled city schools.

Ophelia Johnson and her daughters were homeless when she learned about the voucher program. She obtained vouchers for both her daughters and enrolled them at the Calvary Christian Academy, which she credits with providing her children a secure, caring and consistent environment as she pulled her life together.

''It's wonderful,'' Johnson said about the voucher program that allowed her daughters to attend the academy. ''The atmosphere, the education, and it's also a Christian school. They taught my girls.''

Now, Johnson is employed, newly remarried and living with her daughters in a condominium on Capitol Hill. Her older daughter, Tabitha, is applying to colleges.

''She'll be the first to go in the family,'' Johnson said, pride in her voice.

Ms. NORTON. The Federal vouchers give these schools the Federal Government's seal of approval. Considering that the purpose of the voucher program is to improve student achievement, voucher bills are inconsistent with the congressional intent and should not be enabled with Federal funds or get the Federal imprimatur.

I appreciate that the majority indicated in committee and also on this floor that they, too, oppose voucher mills and are willing to work with me on this issue. I hope to continue to work with the majority as the bill moves forward in order to eliminate voucher bills, which surely no Member supports.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment that Delegate NORTON offered to the bill during markup, but it was rejected by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

The amendment would cap the enrollment of OSP students, the Opportunity Scholarship Program, at 50 percent of the school's population without affecting current voucher students or siblings. The amendment would also restore the randomized controlled study requirement.

Mr. Chairman, this program is about opportunity and choice. Parents should be able to choose the best schools for their children, and private schools should have the flexibility to determine whether or not to enroll OSP students.

I understand the Delegate's concern that students maintain quality standards. In fact, I share it. That is why H.R. 10 requires participating OSP schools to achieve accreditation no later than 5 years after the passage of the act. This is a more effective way to ensure the quality than by arbitrarily excluding students from the program.

Mr. Chairman, the accreditation process required by H.R. 10 will ensure education and administrative quality control. The process will help weed out poor performers from this program without setting a cap on OSP student enrollment.

As for the return to the control group evaluation, this is unnecessary for the OSP. The OSP has been rigorously evaluated using the Gold Standard since 2003, and it has demonstrated positive results. The Gold Standard Evaluation, using a randomized controlled evaluation, deliberately limits participation in the program.

Under this evaluation method, some student applicants received scholarships while other student applicants were placed in a control group that did not receive scholarships. Given the OSP's proven success under this standard, it is time to allow as many students to receive scholarships as funding permits.

Mr. Chairman, it is important to note that the bill does not forsake evaluation. Instead, the bill requires the OSP students' performance base to be compared to that of students of similar backgrounds of the D.C. public schools. The evaluation method means no more students will be barred from a good education through OSP for the sake of the experiment.

Mr. Chairman, on average, 2.5 students apply for each scholarship that is ultimately awarded. We should be focused on meeting the demand for access to a good education rather than arbitrarily limiting students' ability to succeed.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, which would unnecessarily exclude children from the educational opportunities they desire and deserve.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ALLEN). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana) having assumed the chair, Mr. ALLEN, 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. 10) to reauthorize the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 480, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with a further amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

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. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Scott of Virginia moves to recommit the bill H.R. 10 to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end of section 6 the following new subsection:

(f) REQUIRING PROTECTION OF STUDENTS AND APPLICANTS UNDER CIVIL RIGHTS LAWS.—Section 3008 (sec. 38-1853.08, D.C. Official Code) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i) REQUIRING PROTECTION OF STUDENTS AND APPLICANTS UNDER CIVIL RIGHTS LAWS.—In addition to meeting the requirements of subsection (a), an eligible entity or a school may not participate in the opportunity scholarship program under this Act unless the eligible entity or school certifies to the Secretary that the eligible entity or school will provide each student who applies for or receives an opportunity scholarship under this Act with all of the applicable protections available under each of the following laws:

''(1) Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000c et seq.).

''(2) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.).

''(3) Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.).

''(4) The Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974 (20 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

''(5) The Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.).

''(6) The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 701 et seq.).

''(7) The Age Discrimination Act of 1975 (42 U.S.C. 6101 et seq.).

''(8) The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.).''.

□ 1715

Mr. CHAFFETZ (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

I rise to speak in support of the Democratic motion to recommit that would protect the civil rights of students at schools that receive vouchers by requiring the schools to certify that they provide each student with all applicable civil rights protections.

The D.C. voucher program calls into question multiple Federal civil rights protections and turns a blind eye to the government-funded discrimination. For example, religious schools that accept vouchers are permitted to discriminate on the basis of religion in hiring, a violation of traditional principles prohibiting discrimination based on religion when using Federal money.

The fact is that most religious schools are part of a ministry of the sponsoring church, and these schools either cannot or will not separate the religious content from their academic programs. So it is impossible to prevent a publicly funded voucher program for paying for these institutions' religious activities and education.

Furthermore, schools that accept vouchers are allowed to discriminate based on gender in admissions, a violation of the principles of title IX.

In addition to the discrimination based on religion or sex, the D.C. voucher program also raises serious concerns about the civil rights of students with disabilities. IDEA requires that schools that receive Federal IDEA funds provide appropriate education to all students with disabilities, but at least one study found that the schools that accept D.C. vouchers serve students with disabilities at a much lower rate than public schools.

Failing to meet the needs of students with disabilities is just one of the shortcomings of the D.C. voucher program, but another issue is the performance of the school. A 2010 Department of Education report concluded that the use of a voucher had no statistically significant impact on overall student achievement in math or reading.

Additional studies found that students from schools in need of improvement have shown no improvement in math or reading due to the voucher program. Furthermore, participating in the voucher program had no impact on student safety, satisfaction, motivation, or engagement.

Mr. Speaker, many of those who actually won a voucher cannot use them because the voucher does not cover the full cost of attending a private or religious school. As a result, many who win a voucher find that they cannot use it because they can't afford the remaining cost of the education. So studies have confirmed that fewer than 25 percent of the students who use the vouchers are from schools that were ''in need of improvement.''

The D.C. voucher program fails on all counts. It violates principles of traditional civil rights laws, it makes no improvement on student achievement, and it fails to reach the very children it was designed to help.

Our public schools need more funding, not less. Rather than funnel taxpayer funding to private or religious schools that lack civil rights protections and fail to meet the goals of helping the right students, we should focus our efforts on initiatives that will result in overall improvement of the educational system for all of our students.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support our children by supporting this motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, as I said before, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia is one of my favorite people in this body. I have the greatest respect. His perspective is one that I often share.

I would just highlight for this body here, because I do urge a ''no'' vote on this motion to recommit, that we had a field hearing in May. We have had good debate. We had a good markup.

We had always projected to move this bill in the fall. I think it is time to bring up this bill. So we have never had this issue ever brought to my attention as chairman of the committee.

I would also highlight that section 3008, Nondiscrimination and Other Requirements for Participating Schools—I will read just point A.

''In General.—An eligible entity or school participating in any program under this division shall not discriminate against program participants or applicants on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, or sex.''

I do look forward to working with the gentleman and anybody else on these issues moving forward, but I would urge a ''no'' vote 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.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, 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 and the order of the House of today, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Passage of H.R. 692;

The motion to recommit on H.R. 10; and

Passage of H.R. 10, if ordered.

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

DEFAULT PREVENTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 692) to ensure the payment of interest and principal of the debt of the United States, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 194, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 557]

YEAS—235

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—194

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
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
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—5

Bishop (UT)
Fattah
Kelly (IL)
Payne
Roskam

□ 1751

Mrs. LAWRENCE and Ms. KUSTER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 557, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

SCHOLARSHIPS FOR OPPORTUNITY AND RESULTS REAUTHORIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 10) to reauthorize the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 185, nays 242, not voting 7, as follows: