

Ross	Shuster	Turner
Rothman	Simmons	Udall (CO)
Royal-Allard	Simpson	Udall (NM)
Royce	Skelton	Upton
Ruppersberger	Slaughter	Van Hollen
Rush	Smith (NJ)	Velázquez
Ryan (OH)	Smith (TX)	Visclosky
Ryan (WI)	Smith (WA)	Walden (OR)
Ryun (KS)	Snyder	Walsh
Sabo	Sodrel	Wamp
Salazar	Solis	Wasserman
Sánchez, Linda T.	Souder	Schultz
Sanchez, Loretta	Spratt	Waters
Sanders	Stark	Watson
Saxton	Stearns	Watt
Schakowsky	Strickland	Waxman
Schiff	Stupak	Weiner
Schmidt	Sullivan	Weldon (FL)
Schwartz (PA)	Tancredo	Weldon (PA)
Schwartz (MI)	Tanner	Westmoreland
Scott (GA)	Tauscher	Wexler
Scott (VA)	Taylor (MS)	Whitfield
Sensebrenner	Taylor (NC)	Wicker
Serrano	Terry	Wilson (NM)
Sessions	Thomas	Wilson (SC)
Shadegg	Thompson (CA)	Wolf
Shaw	Thompson (MS)	Woolsey
Shays	Thornberry	Wu
Sherman	Tiahrt	Wynn
Sherwood	Tiberi	Young (AK)
Shimkus	Tierney	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Barton (TX)	Doolittle	Ortiz
Boswell	Hefley	Towns
Camp	Kind	Weller
DeLay	Linder	

□ 1412

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOEHLERT. 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 material on H.R. 250, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 451 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. 250.

□ 1414

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. 250) to establish an interagency committee to coordinate Federal manufacturing research and development efforts in manufacturing, strengthen existing programs to assist manufacturing innovation and education, and expand outreach programs for small and medium-sized manufacturers, and for other purposes, with Mrs. CAPITO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

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

I rise in support of H.R. 250, and I want to congratulate the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and all the members of the Committee on Science on both sides of the aisle who contributed so significantly to this bill; but before I begin to speak about the bill, let me say something about the rule because I was not available to participate in the debate.

□ 1415

The Committee on Rules acted reasonably, following my request, for not making the amendments on the Advanced Technology Program in order. We did debate ATP fully in committee. I suspect we will debate ATP again during a motion to recommit. This is not a subject on which anyone has been denied process.

But our goal with this bill is to improve the lot of American manufacturers. ATP is a controversial issue that will weigh down the progress on this bill. There is no reason for that to happen. We ought to debate this bill on its merits, which are not contested, and then handle ATP separately. I support ATP. I helped create the program. I will work with the appropriators to try to keep it funded. But I also support this bill, and I see no reason to kill this important bill to allow a political debate on ATP.

Now, let me turn to the bill we are actually debating. This bill passed the House by voice vote last year, and this time around we should have enough to get time to get this measure to the President's desk. I expect another strong show of support from the House today.

It is easy to see why this bill has garnered such overwhelming support. It deals with a real problem by bolstering successful programs and authorizing innovative new approaches based on those programs. The problem the bill addresses is the decline of U.S. manufacturing. Our Nation needs a diverse economy, and that economy must include manufacturing. We cannot be wholly dependent on others for the goods that enable American families and American businesses to function. Manufacturing provides high-paying jobs and helps us hone our technical edge. Yet the signs of manufacturing decline are all about us.

So what can we do? Well, for starters, we can be sure we are adequately funding programs that have already proven themselves successful at helping domestic manufacturers. This bill does

that by authorizing funding for the laboratories of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, for its Manufacturing Extension Partnership, and for the Advanced Technology Education program of the National Science Foundation.

All these programs have proven track records. NIST, the Nation's oldest Federal laboratory, has long been a reliable partner of the private sector, conducting research needed to keep American industry at the cutting edge of technology. The MEP program, which provides technical assistance to small- and medium-sized manufacturers, has helped ensure that smaller businesses can apply the latest advances in technology and manufacturing know-how. Every study of this popular program has found that it has saved and created new jobs. And the ATE program has channeled critical funding to community colleges to enable the U.S. to have the technical workforce we need to retain manufacturing jobs. So this bill targets money to programs that have truly made a difference in helping American manufacturing.

But we cannot rest on our laurels, because the U.S. manufacturing sector is still not as robust as we would like. So while being mindful of fiscal constraints, and we have to be mindful of that, our bill authorizes pilot efforts to see if programs like MEP can be made even more effective. We create a program that would bring manufacturers and universities together to conduct research on specific problems of concern to manufacturers. We create fellowships to encourage more students to pursue research in areas related to manufacturing. In short, this is a targeted, practical bill that will provide real assistance to the Nation's manufacturers.

For that reason, the bill is endorsed by the National Association of Manufacturers, and I urge my colleagues to continue their overwhelming bipartisan support for this meritorious bill.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Chairman, the bill we have before us today is, in essence, an authorization for the National Institute of Standards and Technology. H.R. 250 authorizes all of NIST programs, except for the Advanced Technology Program.

I strongly support NIST and realize the importance of all its programs to the U.S. industrial sector. Dollar for dollar, NIST represents an excellent return for the investment to the American taxpayer in terms of its impact on our economy. However, H.R. 250 purports to be a bill to help the U.S. manufacturing base and to stimulate innovation. Unfortunately, H.R. 250 falls far short of these goals.

U.S. manufacturing is facing a crisis. Since 2001, we have lost 2.8 million

manufacturing jobs. While there is bipartisan agreement that we need to retain our high-skill, high-wage manufacturing jobs, this crisis has received little attention from the administration or Congress.

What we have today is a missed opportunity. Even within the bill's scope, H.R. 250 does little to address education or workforce training. For example, the only NIST program not included in this legislation is, once again, the Advanced Technology Program. The ATP is one NIST program designed to bridge the gap between basic research and proof of concept. Currently, almost one-third of all ATP projects focus on some aspect of manufacturing.

Long before the National Nanotechnology Initiative, with its hundreds of millions of Federal dollars to support nanotechnology research, ATP had already supported successful nanotechnology projects. An early nanotech project resulted in one of the earliest commercial successes. Currently, 10 percent of ATP projects are in the field of nanotechnology, representing a public-private investment of over \$170 million. Time and again witnesses have appeared before the Committee on Science recommending that ATP be fully funded.

Just last month, at the Committee on Science hearing on innovation, high-level business experts recommended that ATP be fully funded. As my chairman knows, the National Governors Association supports it, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the ITAA. It makes no sense that a bill whose goal it is to bolster manufacturing competitiveness and innovation does not include ATP funding.

In closing, I will vote for H.R. 250, but I am sorely disappointed that H.R. 250 does so little to rebuild the U.S. manufacturing base. And let me also conclude with this, Madam Chairman. My chairman spoke earlier about how we had already debated ATP; that we have had a chance. The committee debated ATP, but we did not have a chance on this floor. Why in the world should we not take every type of Democrat, Republican, and independent suggestion to help our manufacturing base? I would like to pose that question.

Also, and correct me if I am wrong, but I do not think a single person has come before our committee and said that the ATP program is not important, not as good, and does not create jobs. The idea that, well, let us not put it on here because it might weigh the bill down and the President may not like this, well, we know the President does not like it. But the fact of the matter is that the Senate has already appropriated money for it. Last week, the Senate voted 2 to 1 to reject taking it out, so why can the House of Representatives not stand up here also and get a majority vote, which we will get on the ATP program, which is a good program and would make H.R. 250 really a bill worth doing.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Madam Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), the very distinguished author of this bill. And I say that with some reservations, because as is the habit of the Committee on Science, bills are reported out after very thorough and complete consultation with the minority, and so a lot of fingerprints are all over the bill. But the driving force behind this very important legislation is my distinguished colleague from Michigan.

Mr. EHLERS. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise today in strong support of H.R. 250, the Manufacturing Technology Competitiveness Act.

This bill is essentially the same bill that I authored and which the House passed in July 2004. Unfortunately, the Senate did not take up the legislation because of a dispute involving the ATP program, so the bill died in the Senate. I am hopeful that this time the bill will make it all the way through the process and be signed into law by the President.

The goal of my legislation is simple: It is to help small- and medium-sized manufacturers be more competitive in the global marketplace. However, my passion for this issue is not related or restricted just to manufacturing. For some 20 years, I have been speaking out about the need for a better technology transfer system in this country, and repeatedly throughout that time I have used an existing system as a model; that existing program is the cooperative extension service in the Department of Agriculture.

I was amazed, when I was in the State legislature in Michigan, to learn that a new discovery made in the labs of Michigan State University one year was used by the farmers in the field the next year. That is a model of tech transfer that is worth copying. That is partly what this bill attempts to do, to strengthen a manufacturing extension service. I believe it is absolutely essential for us to do this. It is even more essential for us to fund it appropriately.

For those who have objected to the money authorized in this bill, I would simply remind them that every year, without the blink of an eye or a single question, this Congress appropriates over \$400 million for the agricultural extension service, which serves an industry which is very, very important but employs less than 2 percent of the people in this country. In view of that, I have always been troubled why it is so difficult for us to find \$100 million to help a manufacturing industry that employs 14 to 15 percent of the workers in this country.

Grand Rapids, Michigan, my hometown, like other communities all over the U.S., has been struggling with multiple threats to its industries. Globalization is rapidly changing the way business is done, and our small-

and medium-sized firms in particular are at the mercy of this process and the exposure to the increased competition that it brings. As the Congressman from Grand Rapids, I wanted to do what I could to help these small but important firms.

In talking to manufacturers in my district, one thing was clear: They said that the MEP program was a tremendously important program in helping them remain competitive. MEP has over 350 manufacturing extension offices located in all 50 States and Puerto Rico. These centers provide small manufacturers with tools and assistance in how to increase productivity and efficiency.

For example, the Michigan MEP center in Grand Rapids, known as the Right Place program, helped a struggling company, Wolverine Coil Spring, to develop more efficient packaging and auditing systems, and in this case turned it into a very successful company.

In the fiscal year 2004 appropriation, Congress cut funding from \$106 million in fiscal year 2003 to \$39 million in 2004. This limited funding caused many centers to lay off people and cut back their services. Fortunately, Congress has now restored their funding in the current fiscal year and the program has recovered. I am pleased that this year both House and Senate Appropriation Committees are recommending appropriate funding.

Another major concern that has been raised is the increasing technological advances being made by other countries. For our firms to compete today and in the future, we need more research and development into how to manufacture things better, faster, and cheaper, and that is also handled in this bill.

With all these thoughts in mind, I developed this bill, which will specifically:

Authorize the MEP program at \$110 million to ensure all centers remain open and provide additional ways for MEP to help small- and medium-sized manufacturers by establishing a competitive grant program for the centers;

Ensure that Federal agencies will coordinate their programs related to manufacturing R&D and target them on concerns that matter most to industry; help industry improve their manufacturing processes and technology by establishing a pilot grant program that would fund joint efforts by universities and industry to solve problems in manufacturing technology;

Authorize the laboratory programs at the National Institute for Standards and Technology, better known as NIST, which provide critical research and standards for most of our industries;

And train more students and senior researchers in the manufacturing sciences, and provide technology training programs for future manufacturing workers by establishing postdoctoral and senior research fellowships at

NIST. It will also increase support for the Advanced Technological Education program (ATE) at the National Science Foundation.

This legislation has received widespread and bipartisan support. I note that the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Small Manufacturers Coalition, and the National Coalition for Advanced Manufacturing, just to name a few, all support this legislation.

□ 1430

I also want to thank my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), for their help in providing the program with \$106 million in the next fiscal year budget.

As I said from the beginning, my goal was to develop legislation that would help our small manufacturers better compete in the global marketplace, and H.R. 250 does just that.

I want to conclude by thanking the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU), the ranking member of my subcommittee, and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON), the ranking member of the full committee, for their help and input throughout this process; and especially I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT) for his unwavering commitment to help move this legislation through Congress and get it signed into law.

I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support their small and medium-sized manufacturers by supporting this bill.

Mr. GORDON. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD).

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the Manufacturing Technology Competitiveness Act because this legislation will take some small steps to help strengthen manufacturing technology and education. It will help small and medium-sized manufacturing in Maine by authorizing \$2.1 billion for various activities intended to improve the competitiveness of our businesses.

Maine's manufacturing economy has been hard hit in recent years. Since the passage of NAFTA, Maine has lost over 24,000 manufacturing jobs. Job loss is all too familiar to too many Mainers.

During my first term in office after I was sworn in as a Member of Congress, I learned that the mill where I worked for over 28 years was closing its doors. It is the mill my father worked at for 43 years, my grandfather for 40 years, as did a lot of friends and neighbors. The region was devastated.

It is time to turn this economy around for all the mills all across the country. As a member of the House Manufacturing Task Force and Manufacturing Caucus, I have been working hard to promote Federal opportunities for businesses and nonprofit centers. I am also a strong supporter of the Manufacturing Extension Partnership. I am

glad to see that MEP gets some funding in this bill even though they deserve more after years of proposed cuts by this administration.

Madam Chairman, the fact is that this should only be a start. I believe this bill is a small step in the right direction, but our Nation is facing a massive loss of manufacturing jobs and businesses. We should pass this bill today; but if we let this be the only thing that we do to help manufacturing this year, then Congress has failed and our businesses and our workers will lose out.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO), one of the most outspoken and effective advocates for manufacturing.

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 250. I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT) for his leadership on the bill and commend the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman EHLERS) for introducing legislation that is so vital to the future of manufacturing in our country.

Recently, I met with a representative of Honeywell Federal Manufacturing & Technologies out of Kansas City. He discussed his research and development activities on micromechanical parts, such as gears and other smaller devices. This work is very similar to that performed at the EIGERlab which is also a Federal micro-manufacturing research and development facility that I recently helped establish in the district I represent.

EIGERlab has attracted a collection of scientists and researchers and has already proven to be a valuable center for advanced manufacturing R&D. H.R. 250 would help decentralize and streamline this type of manufacturing research so that efforts and duplication would be minimized, helping to ensure that American manufacturers can not only stay competitive, but thrive. The Kansas City facility uses a German process similar to an EDM wire. The EIGERlab uses a milling process, both making gears the size of Lincoln's nose on a Lincoln penny.

H.R. 250 also provides robust authorizations for numerous manufacturing initiatives, including the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, which is quite active in the area that I represent.

Steve Yagle, the president of Reliable Machine Company in Rockford, Illinois said "the training he received from IMEC has made Reliable more profitable, higher level of quality to our customers, increased our efficiency to be competitive," and, "from this will be job creation, and a plan to handle company development as we grow."

As we can see, funding programs like MEP are vital to helping our small manufacturers. I spend 75 to 80 percent of my time in Congress working on manufacturing issues, traveling the country and looking at new machines and new manufacturing processes. The

American manufacturer needs as much help as he can get. H.R. 250 goes a long way, and I would urge its passage.

Mr. GORDON. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON), the ranking member, and the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT). I rise to express my support for a comprehensive Federal manufacturing policy. I have been calling for this for at least 10 years. This is necessary. This is important.

This bill is doing more today to stimulate the economy than anyone realizes. We have been gimmicked on both sides of the aisle about how we are going to get people back to work. This is real. This is not reality TV. I want to associate myself with the words of my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS). He has hit the nail on the head. If we do not deal with this now, we will be so far behind we will never be able to catch up.

Members have to admit, not here on the floor, of course, that the manufacturing czar was a joke, was an absolute joke. I am not impressed with the fact that the National Association of Manufacturers supports this bill because they were at the throttle when New Jersey lost 40 percent of its manufacturing jobs since 1990. They were there as the guardians, and they did absolutely nothing, zero.

The Larson amendment, which will be offered later, would create a meaningful Under Secretary of manufacturing and technology. I plead with Members, I think this is a good move, not a bureaucratic move. I think it is important that we send a message to the entire Congress of the United States.

I am a native of Paterson, with one T, New Jersey. The gentleman has one in New York with two T's. I deeply understand the value of working with one's hands and the value that a manufacturing base can bring to individual communities. Paterson was founded by none other than Alexander Hamilton. It is interesting, as a Democrat I became a Hamiltonian.

Looking back, we find that things have not changed so much in the past 2 centuries. In his day, Hamilton urged Congress to promote manufacturing so the United States could be independent of other nations for military and other essential supplies. Once we have lost the manufacturing apparatus, our ability even to manufacture weapons, weapons, diminishes. God forbid if we ever get to that point, but we are talking about two gentlemen here. What you are talking about is critical, very critical to the economic base of this Nation. Unfortunately, a lot of the meeting is not listening because this is not a sexy enough subject. It is only about jobs.

Hamilton also rightly foresaw the importance of a diversified economy. Remember the battle with Jefferson?

Jefferson wanted to continue this as an agrarian society for the rest of the 18th and 19th centuries. It was impossible. We need a diversified economy. We cannot rely solely on an agrarian economy, and we cannot rely on the service sector. That has not worked.

As I said, we have lost over 40 percent of our jobs. New Jersey, New England, the Midwest, the whole Nation needs a manufacturing administration to step up to the plate, to focus on the ways we can keep a thriving manufacturing sector from all angles. I think this is important to homeland security. We need to discuss that more often.

We must have an agency dedicated to addressing some of our failed trade policies and the outsourcing of American jobs. Some of that outsourcing is good. Some of it is horrible. Service jobs, such as part-timing the American working force, and even we are paying for the folks that work at Wal-Mart whether they are full-time or part-time. We are picking up their medical services. This is a cost to the taxpayers of this country never mentioned. The middle class is paying for health services for these people. The loss of manufacturing jobs is leading to an erosion of the middle class with more families seeing their salaries and quality of life decrease.

This bill does some very good things. I ask that we support the amendments that are going to be put forward and also the Larson amendment. Let us make the bill a little better, and I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member. They are ahead of their time, but we need to catch up with what has happened in the past 20 years.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HART), who is a leader in the manufacturing and steel caucuses, and so many other caucuses that are involved with protecting American jobs and growing American jobs.

Ms. HART. Madam Chairman, I thank the chairman for his kind words and for recognizing me on this bill and for his continued support of manufacturing technology and advancements for our manufacturers so they can compete effectively.

I also am pleased that the ranking member and the subcommittee chairman also support this moving forward because H.R. 250 supports a number of important initiatives that will help American manufacturers be more competitive in the world economy. We live in a real world, a world economy.

One of the provisions in this bill that is most important to that competition is the reauthorization of the MEP, Manufacturing Extension Partnership.

MEP makes it possible for even the smallest firms to tap into expertise and knowledge that they could not afford on their own. Each center, such as Catalyst Connection in Pittsburgh, works directly with area manufacturers to provide expertise as well as services tailored to the most critical needs of

these manufacturers. The organization provides a wide variety of assistance. Some examples are process improvements, worker training, business practices, and applications of information technology.

Many of these items are required for firms to be competitive in today's market. Small manufacturers are the driving force behind our U.S. economy, and increasing productivity and job creation in this sector is critical.

In fact, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, which manages this program, recently showed positive results nationwide. In a single year, MEP clients reported a \$2.8 billion increase in sales. They have hired new workers and retained 35,000 workers; experienced \$681 million in cost savings; and \$941 million in plant and equipment investments have been made.

Last month I visited Sharon Custom Metal Forming in Farrell, Pennsylvania, and met with management and employees of this country. One of the issues they highlighted was how their utilization of MEP has improved their business and made them more competitive. They are not alone. That happens all over my district, and continuing to fund this program means we will continue to give our entrepreneurs and small business people a competitive edge that will help them to continue to succeed in today's global market.

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), who is one of the Members who gets it, who understands how important it is to protect our manufacturing base.

Mr. DENT. Madam Chairman, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 250, the Manufacturing Technology Competitiveness Act. Promotion of manufacturing technologies has traditionally been a key to wealth creation in this country. Manufacturing a better product, from automobiles to chemicals to computers to airplanes, has provided the means for this country to become the wealthiest in the history of the world.

As we enter the 21st century, our challenge to remain competitive becomes even more difficult. H.R. 250 provides many tools that will help us meet this challenge. For one thing, it reauthorizes funding for MEP. This is a highly successful program which has just been discussed. It brings together businesses and consultants and provides technical expertise for manufacturing and marketing in those particular businesses. In doing this, it helps small manufacturers improve performance, productivity and helps them remain competitive.

In my congressional district, the MEP has provided assistance to the Manufacturers Resource Center located at Lehigh University, which is a State-funded program. I should also mention we have the highly successful and criti-

cally acclaimed Ben Franklin Technology Development Authority, which I served on for many years, along with the NRC board at the State level.

I can tell Members firsthand that those programs have provided tremendous support to people in my community. I can give Members specific examples that are not far from home. I can take Members to Apollo Metals in the city of Bethlehem. There are about 125 people at Apollo Metals. They have become more productive as a result of the assistance they have received through this Manufacturers Resource Center.

□ 1445

In fact, I will just read a testimonial. "We will be implementing the changes recommended by the Manufacturers Resource Center and looking forward to our improved ability to add to our already excellent customer service by shortening lead times, improving the customers' ability to get information in a timely fashion, and in maintaining our cost competitiveness." And that is from their president.

I can also point to Solartech, another company in my district. Those solar panels we see on the road that tell us to slow down, tell us what the traffic conditions are, a small company of about 100 people in my district exports, again assisted by these particular operations.

I urge adoption of this bill.

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

Madam Chairman, let me sincerely say that I do not think anybody in the United States Congress serves with a better chairman than I do, with the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT). I also sincerely believe that there is not a more constructive voice on the Committee on Science than the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), and I want to thank them for really bucking the President and helping us to work to save the MEP program. It was important.

But I still have to say I am disappointed in this bill. I am disappointed that it is a missed opportunity. I am going to have to go home this weekend, and I am going to see folks as I travel around the district, as always, that are going to tell me they have lost their job, some with tears in their eyes. They are going to say, What can you do to help us? I am going to tell them we passed H.R. 250. But I am going to do so embarrassed, embarrassed that we did not do all that we could do.

It has been said before and I will say it again. The ATP program is a proven job-creating program. It is endorsed by the National Governors Association. It is endorsed by the National Association of Manufacturing. We had not one single witness before our committee to say it is not a good bill. The only thing that we said is that we cannot add this, we cannot even vote on it because the President might veto this bill, and we

had better have a little bit than the best we can.

The fact of the matter is that the other body has already voted money for the ATP program. Last week the other body voted down, more than 2 to 1, an amendment to do away with the program. And we have a President who in almost 5 years has never vetoed a single bill. I think that is a record, an historic record. Yet we are afraid to do our best when our constituents are losing their jobs left and right because of offshoring.

I am going to vote for this bill, but I am going to do so, and be embarrassed when I go home this weekend, that we did not do the best job we could.

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

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

Before I close on a bill that we can all be proud of, Republicans and Democrats alike, I want to thank the staff on both sides of the aisle who have worked on this bill over the past several years, including, not exclusive, but including Olwen Huxley and Amy Carroll, and particularly Eric Webster of our committee staff.

I want to give special thanks to Mr. Webster, who is leaving the Hill this week, after 12 years, to join the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. We are sure Mr. Webster will be just as effective at prodding NOAA from the inside as he has been for us, and that is very effective. We will sorely miss Eric Webster, who started in my office several years ago as an intern and became our top legislative assistant and also worked for the very distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) as legislative director before coming to the Committee on Science. He has added immeasurably to the products that we have produced in our committee, and all of us want to thank him for his efforts. And we want to wish him, his wife Natalie, and daughter Gabriella, all the best as they go forward in this new chapter in the continuing saga of “Eric Webster Comes to Washington.”

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this bill even though we have missed an opportunity to improve upon it.

While I am pleased that we are providing an authorization for the National Institute of Standards and Technology and supporting the vital MEP program, this bill falls short by failing to authorize the Advanced Technology Partnership, ATP.

I am also disappointed that this body did not pass my amendment increasing funding for the Advanced Technological Education program. ATE works with community colleges and industry to assure that students entering the workforce have the skills they need to be competitive. A technologically trained workforce is vital to strong manufacturing and technological industries, and ATE directly impacts the workforce.

We have heard over and over again today the need to better support our manufacturing

industry. And I believe there are portions of this bill that make important strides in that direction. For example, this bill includes authorizing the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, MEP, program at \$110 million for FY06. MEP provides vital support to small manufacturing companies in our country to remain successful and competitive in a global market. These small manufacturing companies make up 98 percent of the manufacturing industry in this country, yet they are continually struggling and jobs are being lost. MEP centers work directly with local manufacturers to provide expertise and services tailored to their most critical needs, which range from process improvements and worker training to business practices and information technology applications. This is a Federal, State, and private-sector partnership where every Federal dollar leverages two dollars in state and private-sector funding. A small Federal investment leverages billions of dollars in benefits for the economy in terms of jobs created and retained, investment and sales.

This bill also provides authorization numbers for the construction and maintenance of NIST facilities. The urgency of this is shown by the facilities in my district, which are 50 plus years old and in need of maintenance. These authorization levels will allow NIST to upgrade these facilities to ensure they continue to perform cutting edge research.

While this bill widely supports MEP it leaves behind another highly successful program, ATP. We have continually heard the majority express their support for this program, but time and time again they have not taken the opportunity to fund it. During the markup of this bill in the Science Committee Mr. HONDA offered a similar amendment to the one he offered before the Rules Committee. His amendment had the same authorization levels that were upheld in the Senate a week ago. Unfortunately, the majority did not support it. When I offered an amendment to fund current ATP projects through completion and cover close-out costs, Chairman BOEHLERT indicated that my amendment would mean that we have “given up on ATP.” But what I see is that the Republican majority supports this important program with words, rather than deeds. I was hopeful that we would agree with the Senate and support ATP aggressively since the program has proven to be effective. Now we must look to the Senate to improve this bill.

Madam Chairman, though we face a tough budgetary future we need to realign our priorities to provide the foundation for our economy to grow. We no longer have the luxury of only competing with ourselves. Countries across the globe have the skills, knowledge, and workforce to compete in manufacturing and technological innovation. At the same time, we are witnessing in this country a decline in science and math graduates, below average test scores in math, and jobs continually being moved overseas.

While this bill does improve upon the current situation, it in no way solves enough to truly invigorate our manufacturing industry. We need to truly support research and development, science and math education, and workforce training.

So Madam Chairman, it is with disappointment that I support this bill. It is a modest and narrow effort to support this country's manufacturing base, but it is better than nothing in terms of supporting manufacturing.

Mr. CASTLE. Madam Chairman, I rise today to strongly support swift passage of this legislation. I thank Representative EHLERS and Chairman BOEHLERT for their work on this important measure. I would like to highlight the success of The Delaware Manufacturing Extension Partnership, DEMEP, in its contributions to manufacturing across the First State.

The Federal funding Delaware MEP receives through the national MEP program has helped them to develop the resources necessary to contribute to the success of Delaware's small and medium-sized manufacturers in improving their global competitiveness. By identifying, transferring, and implementing appropriate best practices, Delaware MEP has helped manufacturers to substantially improve their quality, productivity, and profitability.

The manufacturing sector in Delaware is dealing with the same burdens that are affecting all U.S. manufacturers—rising costs of labor, health care, energy, and regulatory compliance. The Delaware MEP exists to strengthen local manufacturers by assisting them in dealing with these important issues. Of the 60 MEP centers in the U.S. and Puerto Rico, the Delaware MEP ranks No. 1 in impact to Client's bottom line dollars generated per Federal dollar invested, meaning \$65.08 for every \$1 invested in 2004; and they rank No. 2 in customer satisfaction. Additionally, the Delaware MEP helped retain or create 1,020 jobs in Delaware in 2003.

The Delaware MEP offers Delaware manufacturers a variety of public seminars and workshops, as well as confidential management assistance to help companies improve their competitiveness. Programs include: the Lean Enterprises program to support growth by enhancing work processes; the Quality Management program that ensures consistent product quality and minimizes waste; and the Driving Revenue Growth program to increase sales using marketing strategies. Programs such as these have helped Delaware companies record significant improvements in productivity and profitability while decreasing waste.

In its 11th year of service, Delaware MEP has successfully strengthened competitiveness, improved productivity, and increased profits for Delaware manufacturers by guiding them in the implementation of best practices.

The Delaware MEP will continue to work with its many local, regional, and national partners—including the United States Department of Commerce, National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, the Delaware Office of Economic Development, DEDO, Delaware Technical and Community College, and the Delaware State and local Chambers of Commerce—to bring innovative programs to Delaware manufacturers to serve their competitive needs and to help them compete and prosper.

Madam Chairman, these programs will continue to support manufacturing in Delaware and in the United States, contributing greatly to job creation and a stronger economy. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 250, the Manufacturing Technology Competitiveness Act of 2005. First allow me to congratulate my colleague from Michigan for his hard work in bringing this bill to the floor of the House today. He has been an important champion for manufacturing and this bill is a great example.

American businesses and workers are the most productive in the world. However, because of massive global competition and increasing non-direct costs, our manufacturers are under severe pressure. In many cases these businesses are being forced to deliver their products at constant or even lower prices in order to get their products sold.

At the same time, the costs of inputs they cannot directly control like health care, litigation, raw materials, energy, and many others are increasing. These trends are squeezing the industry incredibly hard.

Manufacturers throughout the country are reacting to this environment by taking the steps they can to become even more efficient and competitive. And they're continually making progress.

While American manufacturers are taking the steps they need to take, it's important for the government to look at appropriate ways we can help. Technology is an area where the federal government has an enormous impact. This bill includes some important steps forward in enhancing American manufacturing technology.

H.R. 250 provides grants, encourages scholarship and strengthens the Manufacturing Extension Partnership. MEP is an important Federal program that has had a documented positive impact on our manufacturing sector, and which is particularly vital to our small and medium-sized manufacturers.

As many Members of Congress know, MEP is a Federal-State-private network of over 60 centers with 400 locations in all 50 States. These not-for-profit centers work with small and medium-sized manufacturers to help them adopt and use the latest and most efficient technologies, processes, and business practices.

The results of MEP speak for themselves. In fiscal year 2003 alone, MEP served more than 18,000 manufacturers nationwide. Those manufacturers reported an additional \$2.6 billion in sales, \$686 million more in cost savings, \$912 million of additional investment in plant modernization, and more than 50,000 more jobs just as a result of their projects with MEP Centers that year. Additionally, an estimate of the federal return on our investment in MEP Centers is \$4 in Federal tax revenue for every \$1 invested in the program.

Madam Chairman, for all these reasons, it is important for Congress to pass this bill. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting American manufacturing by supporting this bill.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chairman, I am proud to support H.R. 250, the Manufacturing Technology Competitiveness Act. In this era of globalization, Congress must make a commitment to providing the right incentives and resources to keep our manufacturing sector competitive. I have met with a group of public and private organizations in Portland, Oregon, the Manufacturing 21 Coalition, and was told that a skilled workforce and incentives for innovation are their priorities.

This bill will provide funding for valuable research and development programs to develop new technologies and education dollars that will help ensure we develop a workforce that is able to efficiently work with new technologies. I was displeased to see that the Rules Committee ruled out of order some amendments that would have enhanced the benefits of this legislation. Nevertheless, I am pleased that the House is taking steps to en-

sure that we enhance manufacturing businesses in our local communities.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairman, the Manufacturing Technology Competitiveness Act of 2005 represents an important piece of legislation for this Congress as it did previously in the Science Committee and it is because of that I hoped this body would have taken into account all points of view.

After 8 years I am pleased that the Science Committee has decided to move an almost complete authorization for the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST. H.R. 250, the Manufacturing Technology Competitiveness Act of 2005, authorizes all of NIST's programs except for the Advanced Technology Program, ATP. I have always strongly supported NIST and fully recognize the importance of all of its programs to the US industrial sector. However, H.R. 250 purports to be a bill to help the American manufacturing base. I unfortunately feel that H.R. 250 falls far short of this goal.

This is virtually the same bill that passed the Committee and House a year ago and that the Senate never took up. The U.S. manufacturing sector is facing a crisis—since 2001 we have lost 2.7 million manufacturing jobs. In the first 3 months of this year, we have lost another 24,000 manufacturing jobs. A year ago, the administration announced its Manufacturing Initiative, the creation of an Assistant Secretary for Manufacturing and Services supported by a \$40 million dollar-plus bureaucracy, and established a Manufacturing Council. Since these announcements, very little has been heard from these organizations. While there is bipartisan agreement that the Federal Government needs to retain high-skill, high-pay, manufacturing jobs in the U.S., I am disappointed that this crisis has received so little attention from the Administration, the House, and the Senate.

This legislation directs the President to establish or designate an Interagency Committee to plan and coordinate Federal efforts in manufacturing research and development, with an Advisory Committee from the non-Federal sector. In addition, this bill amends the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act, NIST Act, to establish: (1) a pilot program of collaborative manufacturing research grants; (2) manufacturing sciences research fellowships; (3) manufacturing extension center competitive grants; and (4) standards education grants to develop higher education curricula on the role of standards in engineering, business, science, and economics.

Clearly, these provisions are positive in their intent, but they can be expanded without interfering with the core of the legislation. My Democratic colleagues have offered a number of good amendments which should be adopted in order to take in all points of view. Together this body can enhance the Manufacturing Technology Competitiveness Act of 2005.

Mr. BACA. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Madam Chairman, I am a strong supporter of American manufacturing and think this bill can be a good step in the right direction.

For too long, this administration's trade policies have led to a hemorrhage of manufacturing jobs out of Main Street and into Mainland China.

There is one particular program authorized by this bill that is important to my constituents in California—that is the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, MEP.

The MEP provides our manufacturers with the tools to compete in a competitive marketplace. It helps maintain our country's manufacturing productivity and competitiveness.

A survey of just one-third of MEP customers found that they had created or saved more than 35,000 jobs, and that is just one-third of the customers, thanks to this program. And the MEP centers help more than 18,000 small companies each and every year.

Assistance to manufacturers is more important than ever due to this administration's misguided view that sending American manufacturing jobs overseas is good for the economy. We need more American jobs, not less.

We need expanded economic activity and an enhanced tax base, not residential communities with nothing but service sector jobs.

Madam Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 250 for these very reasons. I hope that as the bill moves to conference, that Chairman GORDON will include Mr. HONDA's proposal to extend the authorization of the Advanced Technology Program for an additional year.

Mr. TURNER. Madam Chairman, I support H.R. 250, the Manufacturing Technology Competitiveness Act of 2005.

Mr. Chairman, Dayton, Ohio, in my district is a center for manufacturing innovation. Manufacturers from Dayton have invented everything from the airplane to the electric car starter. Dayton is one of the top cities in America for patents per capita. H.R. 250 will ensure that Dayton's strong tradition of innovation will continue into the future.

H.R. 250 reauthorizes the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, MEP, Program, a program that has created centers throughout the country which help teach manufacturers technology developed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology. The National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, helps American businesses move into new manufacturing frontiers, expanding opportunities for the American manufacturing sector.

The Edison Materials Technology Center, or EMTEC located in my district, Kettering, Ohio, is an NIST center, and recipient of MEP Program grant money. EMTEC has partnered with over 125 businesses, universities and government agencies to bring new technologies to the factory floor.

Additionally, H.R. 250 authorizes funding for the National Science Foundation's Advanced Technological Education, ATE, program. This program provides funds to community and technical colleges for workforce education and training at the university and secondary levels. The continuation of the ATE program will assure that Ohio manufacturers have the best trained personnel.

Madam Chairman, this legislation will help our manufacturers maintain and enhance their competitive edge. I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. WU. Madam Chairman, I am pleased that Congress is considering the authorization of the National Institute of Standards and Technology. There is no other federal agency that more directly supports American industrial innovation and competitiveness than NIST.

NIST's standards and metrology activities support the chemical, telecommunications, and energy sectors to name a few.

The Manufacturing Extension Partnership is a successful program under NIST that helps our small manufacturing community remain competitive in the face of increasing global competition. The result: high-wage, high-skill jobs remain in the U.S. rather than moving offshore.

While I believe that H.R. 250, the Manufacturing Technology Competitiveness Act, is a good start, we must do much more to make the bill's contents live up to its title. Our manufacturing base is facing a crisis. Since 2001, we have lost 2.7 million manufacturing jobs.

However, the Advanced Technology Program, which spurs the development of broad-based technologies that can create the industries of tomorrow, is not being included in this bill. This is a terrible mistake. The future of American manufacturing lies in our ability to promote risk taking and to promote the pursuit of new technologies that go well beyond the limits of conventional practices. ATP is a logical tool to use to achieve these goals.

For all the hype given to the Nanotechnology Initiative, few recall that it was an early ATP award that fostered the development of the use of nanoparticles in the cosmetic industry. This is one of the few examples of commercially viable nanotechnology. Yet, this bill ignores the potential that can come out of ATP.

If we wish to truly strengthen the U.S. manufacturing base, we need to bring our full resources to bear on this issue—including ATP and technical education.

Unfortunately, the underlying bill does not do this. I am extremely disappointed that this bill does not include ATP and vocational education. If we are going to grow our economy in the 21st century, we have to be the most innovative country in the world. This bill will not get us there.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 250

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Manufacturing Technology Competitiveness Act of 2005".

SEC. 2. INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The President shall establish or designate an interagency committee on manufacturing research and development, which shall include representatives from the Office of Science and Technology Policy, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the Science and Technology Directorate of the Department of Homeland Security, the National Science Foundation, the Department of Energy, and any other agency that the President may designate. The Chair of the Interagency Committee shall be designated by the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

(2) FUNCTIONS.—The Interagency Committee shall be responsible for the planning and coordi-

nation of Federal efforts in manufacturing research and development through—

(A) establishing goals and priorities for manufacturing research and development, including the strengthening of United States manufacturing through the support and coordination of Federal manufacturing research, development, technology transfer, standards, and technical training;

(B) developing, within 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and updating every 3 years for delivery with the President's annual budget request to Congress, a strategic plan, to be transmitted to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, for manufacturing research and development that includes an analysis of the research, development, technology transfer, standards, technical training, and integration needs of the manufacturing sector important to ensuring and maintaining United States competitiveness;

(C) proposing an annual coordinated interagency budget for manufacturing research and development to the Office of Management and Budget; and

(D) developing and transmitting to Congress an annual report on the Federal programs involved in manufacturing research, development, technical training, standards, and integration, their funding levels, and their impacts on United States manufacturing competitiveness, including the identification and analysis of the manufacturing research and development problems that require additional attention, and recommendations of how Federal programs should address those problems.

(3) RECOMMENDATIONS AND VIEWS.—In carrying out its functions under paragraph (2), the Interagency Committee shall consider the recommendations of the Advisory Committee and the views of academic, State, industry, and other entities involved in manufacturing research and development.

(b) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall establish or designate an advisory committee to provide advice and information to the Interagency Committee.

(2) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Advisory Committee shall assist the Interagency Committee by providing it with recommendations on—

(A) the goals and priorities for manufacturing research and development;

(B) the strategic plan, including proposals on how to strengthen research and development to help manufacturing; and

(C) other issues it considers appropriate.

(3) REPORT.—The Advisory Committee shall provide an annual report to the Interagency Committee and the Congress that shall assess—

(A) the progress made in implementing the strategic plan and challenges to this progress;

(B) the effectiveness of activities under the strategic plan in improving United States manufacturing competitiveness;

(C) the need to revise the goals and priorities established by the Interagency Committee; and

(D) new and emerging problems and opportunities affecting the manufacturing research community, research infrastructure, and the measurement and statistical analysis of manufacturing that may need to be considered by the Interagency Committee.

(4) FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT APPLICATION.—Section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act shall not apply to the Advisory Committee.

SEC. 3. COLLABORATIVE MANUFACTURING RESEARCH PILOT GRANTS.

The National Institute of Standards and Technology Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating the first section 32 (15 U.S.C. 271 note) as section 34 and moving it to the end of the Act; and

(2) by inserting before the section moved by paragraph (1) the following new section:

SEC. 33. COLLABORATIVE MANUFACTURING RESEARCH PILOT GRANTS.

(a) AUTHORITY.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director shall establish a pilot program of awards to partnerships among participants described in paragraph (2) for the purposes described in paragraph (3). Awards shall be made on a peer-reviewed, competitive basis.

(2) PARTICIPANTS.—Such partnerships shall include at least—

(A) 1 manufacturing industry partner; and

(B) 1 nonindustry partner.

(3) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the program under this section is to foster cost-shared collaborations among firms, educational institutions, research institutions, State agencies, and nonprofit organizations to encourage the development of innovative, multidisciplinary manufacturing technologies. Partnerships receiving awards under this section shall conduct applied research to develop new manufacturing processes, techniques, or materials that would contribute to improved performance, productivity, and competitiveness of United States manufacturing, and build lasting alliances among collaborators.

(b) PROGRAM CONTRIBUTION.—Awards under this section shall provide for not more than one-third of the costs of a partnership. Not more than an additional one-third of such costs may be obtained directly or indirectly from other Federal sources.

(c) APPLICATIONS.—Applications for awards under this section shall be submitted in such manner, at such time, and containing such information as the Director shall require. Such applications shall describe at a minimum—

(1) how each partner will participate in developing and carrying out the research agenda of the partnership;

(2) the research that the grant would fund; and

(3) how the research to be funded with the award would contribute to improved performance, productivity, and competitiveness of the United States manufacturing industry.

(d) SELECTION CRITERIA.—In selecting applications for awards under this section, the Director shall consider at a minimum—

(1) the degree to which projects will have a broad impact on manufacturing;

(2) the novelty and scientific and technical merit of the proposed projects; and

(3) the demonstrated capabilities of the applicants to successfully carry out the proposed research.

(e) DISTRIBUTION.—In selecting applications under this section the Director shall ensure, to the extent practicable, a distribution of overall awards among a variety of manufacturing industry sectors and a range of firm sizes.

(f) DURATION.—In carrying out this section, the Director shall run a single pilot competition to solicit and make awards. Each award shall be for a 3-year period.”.

SEC. 4. MANUFACTURING FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.

Section 18 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g-1) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a) IN GENERAL.—" before "The Director is authorized"; and

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

(b) MANUFACTURING FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—To promote the development of a robust research community working at the leading edge of manufacturing sciences, the Director shall establish a program to award—

(A) postdoctoral research fellowships at the Institute for research activities related to manufacturing sciences; and

(B) senior research fellowships to established researchers in industry or at institutions of higher education who wish to pursue studies related to the manufacturing sciences at the Institute.

“(2) APPLICATIONS.—To be eligible for an award under this subsection, an individual shall submit an application to the Director at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Director may require.

“(3) STIPEND LEVELS.—Under this section, the Director shall provide stipends for postdoctoral research fellowships at a level consistent with the National Institute of Standards and Technology Postdoctoral Research Fellowship Program, and senior research fellowships at levels consistent with support for a faculty member in a sabbatical position.”.

SEC. 5. MANUFACTURING EXTENSION.

(a) MANUFACTURING CENTER EVALUATION.—Section 25(c)(5) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k(c)(5)) is amended by inserting “A Center that has not received a positive evaluation by the evaluation panel shall be notified by the panel of the deficiencies in its performance and may be placed on probation for one year, after which time the panel may reevaluate the Center. If the Center has not addressed the deficiencies identified by the panel, or shown a significant improvement in its performance, the Director may conduct a new competition to select an operator for the Center or may close the Center.” after “sixth year at declining levels.”.

(b) FEDERAL SHARE.—Strike section 25(d) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k(d)) and insert the following:

“(d) ACCEPTANCE OF FUNDS.—In addition to such sums as may be appropriated to the Secretary and Director to operate the Centers program, the Secretary and Director also may accept funds from other Federal departments and agencies and under section 2(c)(7) from the private sector for the purpose of strengthening United States manufacturing. Such funds, if allocated to a Center or Centers, shall not be considered in the calculation of the Federal share of capital and annual operating and maintenance costs under subsection (c).”.

(c) MANUFACTURING EXTENSION CENTER COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 25 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

(e) COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director shall establish, within the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program under this section and section 26 of this Act, a program of competitive awards among participants described in paragraph (2) for the purposes described in paragraph (3).

“(2) PARTICIPANTS.—Participants receiving awards under this subsection shall be the Centers, or a consortium of such Centers.

“(3) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the program under this subsection is to develop projects to solve new or emerging manufacturing problems as determined by the Director, in consultation with the Director of the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership National Advisory Board, and small and medium-sized manufacturers. One or more themes for the competition may be identified, which may vary from year to year, depending on the needs of manufacturers and the success of previous competitions. These themes shall be related to projects associated with manufacturing extension activities, including supply chain integration and quality management, or extend beyond these traditional areas.

“(4) APPLICATIONS.—Applications for awards under this subsection shall be submitted in such manner, at such time, and containing such information as the Director shall require, in consultation with the Manufacturing Extension Partnership National Advisory Board.

“(5) SELECTION.—Awards under this subsection shall be peer reviewed and competitively awarded. The Director shall select proposals to receive awards—

“(A) that utilize innovative or collaborative approaches to solving the problem described in the competition;

“(B) that will improve the competitiveness of industries in the region in which the Center or Centers are located; and

“(C) that will contribute to the long-term economic stability of that region.

“(6) PROGRAM CONTRIBUTION.—Recipients of awards under this subsection shall not be required to provide a matching contribution.

“(f) AUDITS.—A center that receives assistance under this section shall submit annual audits to the Secretary in accordance with Office of Management and Budget Circular A-133 and shall make such audits available to the public on request.”.

SEC. 6. SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL RESEARCH AND SERVICES.

(a) LABORATORY ACTIVITIES.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce for the scientific and technical research and services laboratory activities of the National Institute of Standards and Technology—

(1) \$426,267,000 for fiscal year 2006, of which—

(A) \$50,833,000 shall be for Electronics and Electrical Engineering;

(B) \$28,023,000 shall be for Manufacturing Engineering;

(C) \$52,433,000 shall be for Chemical Science and Technology;

(D) \$46,706,000 shall be for Physics;

(E) \$33,500,000 shall be for Material Science and Engineering;

(F) \$24,321,000 shall be for Building and Fire Research;

(G) \$68,423,000 shall be for Computer Science and Applied Mathematics;

(H) \$20,134,000 shall be for Technical Assistance;

(I) \$48,326,000 shall be for Research Support Activities;

(J) \$29,369,000 shall be for the National Institute of Standards and Technology Center for Neutron Research; and

(K) \$18,543,000 shall be for the National Nanomanufacturing and Nanometrology Facility;

(2) \$447,580,000 for fiscal year 2007; and

(3) \$456,979,000 for fiscal year 2008.

(b) MALCOLM BALDRIGE NATIONAL QUALITY AWARD PROGRAM.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce for the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award program under section 17 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3711a)—

(1) \$5,654,000 for fiscal year 2006;

(2) \$5,795,000 for fiscal year 2007; and

(3) \$5,939,000 for fiscal year 2008.

(c) CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce for construction and maintenance of facilities of the National Institute of Standards and Technology—

(1) \$58,898,000 for fiscal year 2006;

(2) \$61,843,000 for fiscal year 2007; and

(3) \$63,389,000 for fiscal year 2008.

(d) ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM ELIMINATION REPORT.—Not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide to the Congress a report detailing the impacts of the possible elimination of the Advanced Technology Program on the laboratory programs at the National Institute of Standards Technology.

(e) LOSS OF FUNDING.—At the time of the President's budget request for fiscal year 2007, the Secretary shall provide the Congress a report on how the Department of Commerce plans to absorb the loss of Advanced Technology Program funds to the laboratory programs at the National Institute of Standards and Technology, or otherwise mitigate the effects of this loss on its programs and personnel.

SEC. 7. STANDARDS EDUCATION PROGRAM.

(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—(1) As part of the Teacher Science and Technology Enhancement

Institute Program, the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall carry out a Standards Education program to award grants to institutions of higher education to support efforts by such institutions to develop curricula on the role of standards in the fields of engineering, business, science, and economics. The curricula should address topics such as—

(A) development of technical standards;

(B) demonstrating conformity to standards;

(C) intellectual property and antitrust issues;

(D) standardization as a key element of business strategy;

(E) survey of organizations that develop standards;

(F) the standards life cycle;

(G) case studies in effective standardization;

(H) managing standardization activities; and

(I) managing organizations that develop standards.

(2) Grants shall be awarded under this section on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis and shall require cost-sharing from non-Federal sources.

(b) SELECTION PROCESS.—(1) An institution of higher education seeking funding under this section shall submit an application to the Director at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Director may require. The application shall include at a minimum—

(A) a description of the content and schedule for adoption of the proposed curricula in the courses of study offered by the applicant; and

(B) a description of the source and amount of cost-sharing to be provided.

(2) In evaluating the applications submitted under paragraph (1) the Director shall consider, at a minimum—

(A) the level of commitment demonstrated by the applicant in carrying out and sustaining lasting curricula changes in accordance with subsection (a)(1); and

(B) the amount of cost-sharing provided.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce for the Teacher Science and Technology Enhancement Institute program of the National Institute of Standards and Technology—

(1) \$773,000 for fiscal year 2006;

(2) \$796,000 for fiscal year 2007; and

(3) \$820,000 for fiscal year 2008.

SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) MANUFACTURING EXTENSION PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce, or other appropriate Federal agencies, for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program under sections 25 and 26 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k and 278l)—

(1) \$110,000,000 for fiscal year 2006, of which not more than \$1,000,000 shall be for the competitive grant program under section 25(e) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 278k(e));

(2) \$115,000,000 for fiscal year 2007, of which not more than \$4,000,000 shall be for the competitive grant program under section 25(e) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 278k(e)); and

(3) \$120,000,000 for fiscal year 2008, of which not more than \$4,100,000 shall be for the competitive grant program under section 25(e) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 278k(e)).

(b) COLLABORATIVE MANUFACTURING RESEARCH PILOT GRANTS PROGRAM.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce for the Collaborative Manufacturing Research Pilot Grants program under section 33 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act—

(1) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2006;

(2) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2007; and

(3) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2008.

(c) FELLOWSHIPS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce for Manufacturing Fellowships at the National Institute of Standards and Technology under section 18(b) of the National Institute of Standards

and Technology Act, as added by section 4 of this Act—

- (1) \$1,500,000 for fiscal year 2006;
- (2) \$1,750,000 for fiscal year 2007; and
- (3) \$2,000,000 for fiscal year 2008.

SEC. 9. TECHNICAL WORKFORCE EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Director of the National Science Foundation, from sums otherwise authorized to be appropriated, for the Advanced Technological Education Program established under section 3 of the Scientific and Advanced-Technology Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 1862i)—

(1) \$55,000,000 for fiscal year 2006, \$5,000,000 of which may be used to support the education and preparation of manufacturing technicians for certification;

(2) \$57,750,000 for fiscal year 2007, \$5,000,000 of which may be used to support the education and preparation of manufacturing technicians for certification; and

(3) \$60,600,000 for fiscal year 2008, \$5,000,000 of which may be used to support the education and preparation of manufacturing technicians for certification.

(b) **AMENDMENT.**—Section 3 of the Scientific and Advanced-Technology Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 1862i) is amended—

(1) by inserting “, including manufacturing” after “advanced-technology fields” each place it appears other than in subsection (c)(2); and

(2) by inserting “, including manufacturing,” after “advanced-technology fields” in subsection (c)(2).

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the committee amendment is in order except those printed in House Report 109-227. Each 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.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 109-227.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BOEHLERT

Mr. BOEHLERT. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. BOEHLERT:

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

SEC. 10. KATRINA ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) **PROGRAM ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall establish within the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program established under sections 25 and 26 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k and 278l) a Katrina Assistance Program, to provide assistance to impacted small and medium-sized manufacturers in the areas affected by Hurricane Katrina.

(b) **PURPOSES.**—The Katrina Assistance Program shall—

(1) establish triage teams, consisting of personnel from within the national network of Manufacturing Extension Partnership Centers established under section 25 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k) and local experts,

the purpose of which shall be to assist impacted manufacturers;

(2) develop virtual assistance centers, consisting of databases incorporating the results and recommendations of the triage team assessments;

(3) assess the potential disruption on national manufacturing supply chains as a result of Hurricane Katrina, and develop recommendations of how to minimize such disruption; and

(4) provide assistance to small and medium-sized manufacturers in the areas affected by Hurricane Katrina, consistent with the authorities of the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program established under section 25 and 26 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k and 278l).

(c) **NO MATCHING FUND REQUIREMENT.**—Assistance under the Program established under this section shall be exempt from matching requirements for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program under the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce such sums as may be necessary for the Katrina Assistance Program established under this section.

SEC. 11. BUILT ENVIRONMENT INVESTIGATION FOR HURRICANE KATRINA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall carry out an engineering performance study of the effects of Hurricane Katrina in the areas of Louisiana, Alabama, and Mississippi covered by the President’s major disaster declarations of August 29, 2005. The study shall be based on an examination of physical structures damaged due to excessive wind, storm surge, and flooding, including—

(1) key physical infrastructures such as ports, utilities, lifelines associated with infrastructure facilities, and transportation systems; and

(2) engineered and nonengineered buildings.

(b) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of the study shall be to—

(1) develop new knowledge concerning practices related to building standards and codes; and

(2) review the adequacy of current building codes and standards for excessive wind, storm surge, and flooding.

(c) **MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES.**—The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology may convene public meetings and conferences to inform the public, government authorities, and relevant professional associations regarding findings and recommendations of the study.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology \$3,000,000 for carrying out this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 451, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

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

(Mr. BOEHLERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. Let me start by thanking the gentleman

from Louisiana (Mr. MELANCON) for bringing forward the proposal that led to this amendment. And let me thank him and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) for working with us to craft this amendment in a way that should avoid controversy.

This amendment is designed to help the victims of Hurricane Katrina and to help save lives in future hurricanes, goals we obviously all share. The amendment would accomplish its goals in two ways.

First, it authorizes the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program to establish a special effort to help Katrina victims by drawing on all the resources of the nationwide network of MEP centers. The MEP centers have a wide variety of ways to help businesses that have had losses or have been wiped out by Hurricane Katrina. We all want to do everything possible to help gulf coast businesses and their owners and customers to get back on their feet, something that is critically important, brought to my attention once again very vividly in a meeting this morning with Governor Haley Barbour of Mississippi.

The Katrina program would also waive the usual matching requirements for assistance, as neither the States nor the businesses are in a position to provide such a matching payment now. I should add that we do not expect this program to be particularly costly as it draws on existing MEP resources, and the MEP program as a whole costs roughly \$100 million, not a number that stands out in comparison to the mega numbers we are hearing about necessary hurricane relief.

The second part of the amendment draws on the expertise of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to investigate why buildings and other structures failed during the storm. This is a traditional role for NIST, and it has played it many times after building failures and has resulted in greater understanding of building performance and stronger building codes. We ought to be learning from this hurricane to prevent future losses of life and property in storms to come. A NIST investigation is the best way to do that.

This bill is silent as to what legal mechanisms NIST should use to carry out its investigation. I would prefer and I know my colleagues across the aisle would prefer that NIST invoke the National Construction Safety Team Act that was signed into law after the World Trade Center collapsed. But the bill does not mandate that NIST take that approach.

In short, this amendment instructs NIST to take reasonable, affordable steps to help the victims of Katrina and to prevent losses from future storms. I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. GORDON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

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

Madam Chairman, in 1969 I was a college student when Camille hit the gulf coast, and I went down to Pass Christian to try to help clean up with the National Guard. Let me say one really has to be there to fully appreciate the devastation and the despair in the victims' hearts. I know it is there this time also.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MELANCON) has been there. He has worked with his constituents and folks all across that area and has brought back to us some good sense, and that is how we can make the MEP program help that area, helping the businesses come back, helping people develop jobs. And I want to compliment the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT), who I think well stated the purpose of this bill, for recognizing it, agreeing to accept it. I think this is going to be a positive addition to not only the bill but also to the lives and businesses in this hard-hit area.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 109-227.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GORDON

Mr. GORDON. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. GORDON:

At the end of section 5, add the following new subsection:

(d) PROGRAMMATIC AND OPERATIONAL PLAN.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall transmit to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a 3-year programmatic and operational plan for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program under sections 25 and 26 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k and 278l). The plan shall include comments on the plan from the Manufacturing Extension Partnership State partners and the Manufacturing Extension Partnership National Advisory Board.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 451, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON).

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

Madam Chairman, this is a very straightforward amendment. This

amendment requires the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to submit to Congress a 3-year operational and planning document for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program. The past 4 years, the administration's MEP budget request has been much less than required to maintain the existing national network of MEP centers. In fact, for 2 years the administration has proposed eliminating MEP funding altogether. Despite their meager budget requests, the administration has consistently maintained that it will maintain a fully operational MEP network. However, the administration has not consulted with the State partners or MEP centers to explain the rationale for its funding request or how they intend to maintain the current MEP center structure.

Both States and small manufacturers have been frustrated by the administration's lack of planning and cooperation. My amendment would address this issue by requiring the administration to put together a 3-year MEP operation plan that would include commitments of its State partners and the MEP National Advisory Board. This amendment has also been endorsed by the American Small Manufacturers Coalition, the umbrella operation of the MEP centers and the small manufacturers they serve.

I would urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Madam Chairman, I think this amendment enhances the bill. It adds to the quality of an already good bill, and we are pleased to accept it.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 109-227.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

Page 20, after line 14, insert the following: Funds shall be made available under this subsection, to the maximum extent practicable, to diverse institutions, including Historically Black Colleges and Universities and other minority serving institutions.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 451, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

□ 1500

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the chairman of the full committee and the ranking member of the full committee, and if I might add my appreciation for the cooperation of both staffs and both the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Ranking Member GORDON) for helping with this amendment, and as well the cooperation and the timeliness of this amendment.

My amendment would ensure that minority-serving institutions, including Historically Black Colleges and Universities, have access to the National Science Foundation's Advanced Technological Education Program. The ATE program promotes improvement in technological education at the undergraduate and secondary school levels by supporting curriculum development; the preparation and professional development of college faculty and secondary schoolteachers; internships and field experiences for faculty, teachers, and students; and other activities. We have often, Madam Chairman, spoken in the Committee on Science about the broadness of opportunity, and here lies in this bill the opportunity to enhance that with this amendment.

The Manufacturing Technology Competitiveness Act of 2005 is a perfect vehicle to emphasize the involvement of a diverse community, and the focus of science and technology in our Historically Black Colleges and Hispanic-serving colleges. With an emphasis on 2-year colleges, the program focuses on the education of technicians for the high-technology fields that drive our Nation's economy. It is vitally important that this high-value program is made available to minority-serving institutions, including HBCUs.

Unfortunately, we do not have nearly enough minority representation in the fields of science and engineering. Minorities represent only a small proportion of scientists and engineers in the United States. Collectively, blacks, Hispanics, and other ethnic groups, the latter includes American Indians and Alaska natives, constituted 24 percent of the total U.S. population but only 7 percent of the total science and engineering workforce in 1999. Blacks and Hispanics each accounted for about 3 percent of scientists and engineers and other ethnic groups represented less than 0.5. Furthermore, for science and engineering graduates, there are only 835,000 scientists who are female in the United States. Meanwhile, white students number 2 million, black students account for only 121,000 scientists, and Hispanic students for only 120,000 scientists.

Madam Chairman, I want to see all Americans be engaged in the sciences because that is the wave of the future. I have always said that science is the work of the 21st century, and we are in

the 21st century. I believe it is important to offer an amendment that provides for the opportunities for minorities.

Might I say, in the backdrop of Hurricane Katrina, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member, I want my colleagues to know that two of our Historically Black Colleges, Xavier and Dillard, are now underwater in New Orleans. We know that Dillard produced the most number of undergraduates that went into the sciences and then went on to medical school. So this amendment may be timely because of what we are going through, and prospectively what we might be going through with Hurricane Rita.

All I can say is that the opportunity for more in the sciences and more having the opportunity under this very important competitive bill, I believe makes a first step and a good step toward the improvement of the sciences and science graduates in America.

Madam Chairman, my amendment would ensure that minority serving institutions including Historically Black Colleges and Universities, HBCUs, have access to the National Science Foundation's Advanced Technological Education Program, ATE. The ATE program promotes improvement in technological education at the undergraduate and secondary school levels by supporting curriculum development; the preparation and professional development of college faculty and secondary school teachers; internships and field experiences for faculty, teachers, and students; and other activities. With an emphasis on two-year colleges, the program focuses on the education of technicians for the high-technology fields that drive our Nation's economy. It is vitally important that this high-value program is made available to minority serving institutions including HBCUs.

Unfortunately, we do not have nearly enough minority representation in the fields of science and engineering. Minorities represent only a small proportion of scientists and engineers in the United States. Collectively, Blacks, Hispanics, and other ethnic groups—the latter includes American Indian/Alaskan Natives—constituted 24 percent of the total U.S. population and only 7 percent of the total science and engineering workforce in 1999. Blacks and Hispanics each accounted for about 3 percent of scientists and engineers, and other ethnic groups represented less than 0.5 percent. Furthermore, for Science and Engineering graduates, there are only 835,000 scientists who are female in the United States, meanwhile white students number 2 million-plus, black students account for only 121,000 scientists and Hispanic students for only 120,000 scientists. This problem extends into the salaries paid to minorities in the fields of science and engineering. The median annual salaries of individuals in science and engineering show amongst individuals with less than 5 years experience, i.e. recent graduates, white individuals make an average of \$61,000, while their black and Hispanic counterparts make only \$53,000 and \$55,000 respectively. Clearly, there is a disparity here that needs to be filled and I believe this amendment makes a positive step in that direction.

For most of America's history, African Americans who received a college education could

only get it from an HBCU. Today, HBCUs remain one of the surest ways for an African American, or student of any race, to receive a high quality education. Seven of the top eleven producers of African American baccalaureates in engineering were HBCUs, including #1 North Carolina A&T State University. The top three producers of African American baccalaureates in health professions (#1 Southern University and A&M College, #2 Florida A&M University and #3 Howard University) were HBCUs. The twelve top producers of African American baccalaureates in the physical sciences, including #1 Xavier University of Louisiana, were all HBCUs.

Hispanic Serving Institutions, HSIs, are also instrumental in educating a growing minority population. According to the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities Hispanics are historically underrepresented in the areas of science, technology, engineering and mathematics. HSIs receive only half the Federal funding per student, on average, accorded to every other degree-granting institution. Indeed it seems sadly clear that HSIs are a long way from Federal funding parity with other institutions of higher learning.

I hope every Member of this Committee can agree on the importance of HBCUs and HSIs and I hope they will support my amendment to create equity in the fields of science and engineering.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Madam Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Madam Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman for offering this amendment, particularly the timing of it. It is very significant. I understand the gentlewoman will be asking for a rollcall vote, and I will proudly vote "aye."

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee. Again, that speaks to the work we do on this committee.

Madam Chairman, I am very honored to likewise yield to the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON).

Mr. GORDON. Madam Chairman, this amendment builds upon the good work that the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) does in ensuring that minority-serving institutions have equal access to Federal research and education programs. Our community colleges are at the forefront of educating minorities, and this amendment highlights their importance.

This is a good amendment, and I urge its adoption.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member and the distinguished chairman. Let me also thank my staff, Assad Akhter for his work, and the staff of the Committee on Science both on the majority and minority side.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 109-227.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. LARSON OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

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

SEC. 10. MANUFACTURING AND TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATION.

Section 5 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3704) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 5. MANUFACTURING AND TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATION.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Department of Commerce a Manufacturing and Technology Administration, which shall operate in accordance with the provisions, findings, and purposes of this Act. The Manufacturing and Technology Administration shall include—

“(1) the National Institute of Standards and Technology;

“(2) the National Technical Information Service; and

“(3) a policy analysis office, which shall be known as the Office of Manufacturing and Technology Policy.

“(b) UNDER SECRETARY AND ASSISTANT SECRETARIES.—The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to the extent provided for in appropriations Acts—

“(1) an Under Secretary of Commerce for Manufacturing and Technology, who shall be compensated at the rate provided for level III of the Executive Schedule in section 5314 of title 5, United States Code;

“(2) an Assistant Secretary of Manufacturing who shall serve as a policy analyst for the Under Secretary; and

“(3) an Assistant Secretary of Technology who shall serve as a policy analyst for the Under Secretary.

“(c) DUTIES.—The Secretary, through the Under Secretary, as appropriate, shall—

“(1) manage the Manufacturing and Technology Administration and supervise its agencies, programs, and activities;

“(2) conduct manufacturing and technology policy analyses to improve United States industrial productivity, manufacturing capabilities, and innovation, and cooperate with United States industry to improve its productivity, manufacturing capabilities, and ability to compete successfully in an international marketplace;

“(3) identify manufacturing and technological needs, problems, and opportunities within and across industrial sectors, that, if addressed, could make significant contributions to the economy of the United States;

“(4) assess whether the capital, technical, and other resources being allocated to domestic industrial sectors which are likely to generate new technologies are adequate to

meet private and social demands for goods and services and to promote productivity and economic growth;

“(5) propose and support studies and policy experiments, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, to determine the effectiveness of measures for improving United States manufacturing capabilities and productivity;

“(6) provide that cooperative efforts to stimulate industrial competitiveness and innovation be undertaken between the Under Secretary and other officials in the Department of Commerce responsible for such areas as trade and economic assistance;

“(7) encourage and assist the creation of centers and other joint initiatives by State or local governments, regional organizations, private businesses, institutions of higher education, nonprofit organizations, or Federal laboratories to encourage technology transfer, to encourage innovation, and to promote an appropriate climate for investment in technology-related industries;

“(8) propose and encourage cooperative research involving appropriate Federal entities, State or local governments, regional organizations, colleges or universities, nonprofit organizations, or private industry to promote the common use of resources, to improve training programs and curricula, to stimulate interest in manufacturing and technology careers, and to encourage the effective dissemination of manufacturing and technology skills within the wider community;

“(9) serve as a focal point for discussions among United States companies on topics of interest to industry and labor, including discussions regarding manufacturing, competitiveness, and emerging technologies;

“(10) consider government measures with the potential of advancing United States technological innovation and exploiting innovations of foreign origin and publish the results of studies and policy experiments; and

“(11) assist in the implementation of the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 (15 U.S.C. 205a et seq.).”

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 451, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me start by associating myself with the remarks of the distinguished Democrat from Tennessee and the accolades that have been given to the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) who was on the floor earlier, for the hard work and effort that they have put forward.

My amendment cuts right to the chase of a deep and abiding concern that I and a number of small manufacturers in the State of Connecticut and, I dare say, across this Nation have. We all know the statistics: 3 million Americans employed in manufacturing have lost their jobs, 110,000 in this year alone; 57,000 jobs have been lost in the State of Connecticut since 2001.

The genesis of this amendment came at a Chamber of Commerce meeting when small businessmen got up and

spoke out with great alarm, wondering out loud how is it that we can have a Department of Agriculture and not a department of manufacturing that focuses on these issues. Where is the ombudsman and voice for us at the national level? They prevailed upon me to introduce this legislation. I am proud to say it is endorsed by the National Council for the Advancement of Manufacturing and the IAM, to name a few. But the focus here is to make sure that we have an individual within a department that is doing its job.

Now, the President has appointed a so-called “manufacturing czar,” but he has no budget and he has no resources. This amendment is straightforward and pragmatic. It redirects and reorients the already existing resources that we have in order to create a position whose sole focus becomes manufacturing and who becomes the ombudsman for the small manufacturer who is crying out as they continue to see their jobs outsourced overseas, as they see very little voice that they have in terms of the larger scale dealing with the WTO and a number of the trade agreements that come forward.

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to reluctantly claim the time in opposition, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this might have been a reasonable amendment a couple of years ago, and, guess what? We are used to expecting reasonable amendments from my distinguished colleague from Connecticut. Back then, all of us, including the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) were calling on the administration to bring more focus on the Commerce Department to the problem of manufacturers. Quite frankly, I do not think they were paying enough attention. But guess what? The administration heeded our calls. It created a new Assistant Secretary for Manufacturing and took other steps to create a focus on manufacturers in the Department, and it did so in a streamlined way.

So I think it is really time to declare victory and go home on this issue. We have won what we were seeking: someone in that Department of Commerce to focus attention on manufacturing. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) wanted it, I wanted it, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) wanted it, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) wanted it, we all wanted it, and they listened. It is not too often that the administration listens to the Congress. The legislative branch is sometimes considered politically inconvenient for the executive branch. This time they listened.

Indeed, the Larson amendment would override or duplicate the administration's efforts, it is hard to tell which, and reorganize the Department yet again. That is a waste of time and money; it is utterly unnecessary.

Now, the gentleman from Connecticut may respond that the Assistant

Secretary appointed by the President has not accomplished very much. That person certainly has his hands full, and I am not going to debate his performance here. But if the gentleman is arguing that creating a new Assistant Secretary has not done any good, how is that an argument for his amendment? Why does he think that creating the similar positions he is proposing would be a panacea?

The way to help manufacturers is not by creating more bureaucracy in downtown Washington. What we need to do is fund programs that help manufacturers. That is what this bill would do by aiding the successful programs of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

If anything, the Larson language would actually impede this program. It would add to the bureaucracy that sits on top of NIST, when we want NIST to have as much of its own funding and latitude as possible. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON's) new officials would be in a position to siphon money away from this and interfere with its programs. How would that help manufacturers?

Let us speed this bill along and not weigh it down with new bureaucracies who would detract from the very programs we are trying to augment.

The House soundly defeated this amendment last year. We defeated it in committee this year. That was the right decision, and it is time to dispense with this amendment again.

Having said that, let me say that does not diminish one iota the respect I have for our distinguished colleague from Connecticut, who is one of the most valued members of the Committee on Science. But, having said all of the above, I have to once again indicate how reluctant I am to oppose the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) because of my affection and respect for him; I am not really opposing the gentleman, I am opposing his amendment, and I urge its defeat.

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman not opposing me, and I appreciate and I understand his unwillingness to debate what Mr. Frink has been able to accomplish in his position to date.

The hard truth is that we have not been able to accomplish much, and the reason is, I think as everyone knows, it has become intuitively obvious to the National Coalition for the Advancement of Manufacturing, that he is located within the bowels of an administration and given no budget and no resources to carry out a goal that all of us agree needs to be accomplished.

So that is why we take and reorient existing resources to accomplish that goal; so there is no new bureaucracy that is created, it is just reoriented and refocused in a manner that will provide a voice, with resources and a budget, to speak out on behalf of manufacturers. This bill is not of my creation. It

comes out of the mouths of those people who are directly impacted: the small manufacturers all across the State of Connecticut and this great Nation of ours.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAUR) who understands these issues and understands what is happening in our State of Connecticut with regard to manufacturing.

Ms. DELAUR. Mr. Chairman, as stated, 3 million Americans employed in manufacturing lost jobs in the last 4 years, 110,000 this year; total manufacturing losses in the State of Connecticut, 57,000.

It would seem to me that whomever we have at the head of this effort does not understand the scope of the job, the magnitude of it, and is not provided with enough authority to be able to conduct the job, as my colleague has pointed out. We do need someone who has real influence, substance, not a person who has marginal authority; because when you give marginal authority, it tells you what the administration thinks of the position's importance, quite frankly, of manufacturing importance.

As has been commented on, this agency and the czar that is housed within the Assistant Secretary, does not have a range of expertise to address the issues before our manufacturers, has no funding to support the position. If you have no funding, if you have no authority, then the position is one that does not really make any difference.

Mr. Chairman, we are coping with Katrina, we are coping with ongoing violence in Iraq, we are letting the moment to revitalize our manufacturing sector slip away. We need to send a signal that Congress takes this crisis seriously. If Katrina has taught us anything, it is that competence in government can make a difference in dealing with the crisis. Support the Larson amendment.

□ 1515

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to observe a few things. First of all, the original version of this bill, which I introduced last year, did establish an Under Secretary position, as the Larson amendment did.

The administration took the hint and created the present position of an Assistant Secretary. And furthermore, I would like to comment in spite of the comments made that there is no funding and no authority, this person does have authority, this person does have funding, this person does have staff.

In addition, he has formed a council of manufacturers. It is a good committee that is actively working. They held one meeting in my district, which I attended. And things are rolling. I think it would be inappropriate at this time to pull the rug out from under that operation and start fresh with a new position.

Let us give these folks and this individual a chance to perform and then make our judgment after we have seen how their performance ranks.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) whose sentiments that he expressed earlier today are mine, as well, with respect to this bill. I have the greatest admiration for my colleagues on the other side, but I have to go home and face constituents who wonder aloud why they do not have a voice, an ombudsman, and why moving at a snail's pace in this direction cannot wait.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, let me just very quickly say that my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), has been a great champion for the manufacturing sector of our economy.

And this is a very commonsense amendment that I think is a positive addition to a bill that as I said earlier missed the opportunity to be as good as it could be.

The only argument against his amendment is that the administration is doing a good job with the manufacturing sector and promoting it, so let us do not mess it up. Well, I would just say to all of my colleagues, if you are satisfied with what the administration is doing promoting manufacturing, then vote against this amendment. If you are not satisfied with what the administration is doing and think they can do more to help our manufacturing economy, then you need to vote for this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will make one comment. I have been here 22 years, and I go home every single weekend. I take great pride in that. I have never had a constituent say to me, I want you to create a new Under Secretary within the Department, and I want you to change the title of an Assistant Secretary.

All they want are results, and we are beginning to get results. And we have got to add to that impetus, and we are doing so with the base bill. I urge the adoption of the base bill and opposition, reluctantly, to the Larson amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 109-227.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. UDALL OF COLORADO

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

Page 20, line 3, strike "\$55,000,000" and insert "\$70,000,000".

Page 20, line 7, strike "\$57,750,000" and insert "\$73,500,000".

Page 20, line 11, strike "\$60,600,000" and insert "\$77,000,000".

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 451, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. UDALL of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, we have heard repeatedly today about the importance of supporting our Nation's manufacturing industry. One of the most critical elements of our manufacturing competitiveness is a technically trained workforce.

My amendment addresses this by increasing authorization levels of the Advanced Technological Education program.

This important amendment has the support of the American Association of Community Colleges. The ATE program works with community colleges to develop curricula designed to prepare students for the local job market. This program has been highly successful with only modest funding.

This amendment would boost the authorization for ATE from the \$55 million currently in H.R. 250 to \$70 million. The ATE program is different from other technical and vocational programs in that it works directly with industry to identify the skill sets students will need to compete and enter the workforce.

Arguments have been made that this is too high of a budgetary increase and that this would make the ATE program the highest funded education program in the National Science Foundation.

However, if you look at this, actually the level of authorization in my amendment is well within the NSF doubling authorization levels that passed this House overwhelmingly in 2002. At the same time, there are several programs that receive greater funding in the education directorate at NSF.

In fact, authorizing the ATE at \$70 million ranks the program sixth. This is a small investment that will provide long-term dividends for our manufacturing industry. I urge Members of this body to support the technological training of our workforce and to vote in favor of my amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset there are some things that I love in addition to my wife and family and everybody else. I love technology education. I love our community colleges.

It is easy to understand why this amendment is being offered, and it is easy to see why it needs to be defeated. It is easy to see why it is being offered, because it provides additional support to a very good program, the Advanced Technology Education program of the National Science Foundation.

As someone who has pushed for years at NSF to do more for community colleges, and when I first came here 23 years ago, community colleges were not even on the radar screen at NSF, but, boy they have got the message, and they are doing an outstanding job, and they recognize the capabilities of community colleges. And they understand the importance of the Advanced Technology Program, and so do I. I could not agree more with the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

But it is easy to see why this amendment needs to be opposed. Now, that may sound strange, but let me explain. We have already demonstrated our support for Advanced Technology Education quite tangibly in the base bill, H.R. 250. The bill would increase funding for ATE not by 2 percent or 5 percent or 10 or 20; it is a third over 3 years.

And the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) deserves a lot of the credit for ensuring that the additional funding was in the bill. But I will not let him claim all of that credit, because guess what, all of the members of the committee, Republicans and Democrats alike, recognized the importance of technology education and recognized the value of our community colleges in providing that education.

But now he wants to up the ante. His amendment would increase ATE funding by 70 percent. That is right: 70 percent over 3 years. Where is it going to stop? We do not have enough of this money. We cannot manufacture it fast enough. That would be an extravagant thing to do at any point, but it borders on the absurd in today's budget climate.

Such an increase is unrealistic, and it would make ATE a higher priority than other education programs at NSF, a step I am not prepared to take given our needs across the spectrum of science and math education programs.

So I would urge my colleagues to use their common sense in reviewing this amendment. Is a 33 percent increase in authorization levels not sufficient in this fiscal climate? I think it is pretty generous. I urge opposition to an amendment that I think is excessive.

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

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gen-

tleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

In 1992, I did author the legislation that created the Advanced Technical Education program. And with the help of Mr. BOEHLERT and many others, I got it passed on this floor. Today, ATE remains the only NSF program focused primarily on our Nation's community colleges, which educate the vast majority of the three to five technicians that support each engineer, scientist, and medical doctor in this country.

Over the last 3 years, the number of proposals for ATE funding has increased by over 40 percent. Success stories abound. It is obvious the program is working. Yet over these same 3 years, the number of awards has actually gone down, and the success rate for proposals has declined from 32 percent in 2003 to a projected 20 percent in 2005.

This means that nearly 80 percent of the community colleges that develop innovative curricula, teaching methods, and partnerships with local industry are being denied ATE support.

Over the years, I have worked on the Appropriations Committee to maintain adequate funding for the ATE despite the cuts often called for in the President's budget requests. Some years we have done better than others.

But this authorization does matter. If all we are doing is authorizing ATE at about the current funding level, we will continue to deny more and more community colleges a chance to equip American workers with the skills they need to compete in the global economy.

Twenty percent is simply not a high enough approval rate. The Udall amendment would allow ATE to achieve its potential, helping us to get back on track as the global leader in innovation. There is nothing extravagant about this, Mr. Chairman. It is a good program, and it deserves to be adequately funded.

I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) for sponsoring this important amendment. I urge all colleagues to give it their support.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, let me just point out to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), for whom I have the highest regard, he said if all we are going to do is fund it at about the current level, that is not good enough.

I would agree that is not good enough. That is why we are increasing it by 33 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS).

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the

amendment and would point out that growth is good, but not lopsided growth. Growth in the NSF budget is generally a very good idea, and the committee feels that way and has voted that way.

But this is lopsided growth, such that one program gets a 70 percent increase as a result of this amendment when others equally deserving like the math and science partnership would not get that level of increase.

Imagine what that does over at NSF. Yet one program that has some congressional supporters proposes a 70 percent increase, while the other programs are down in a middling kind of increase, that really does create some instability and some inequities, I believe, over at NSF.

So what we have got is, in tight budget times, as the chairman says, a 30 percent increase for this program which seems like an appropriate amount.

So I hope the House rejects the amendment and supports the committee's underlying bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) as well as the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS). The point of the authorized levels that we are proposing in this amendment is to meet the demand. This is not just a number that we pulled out of the air. It is a number that reflects the demand that the National Science Foundation is seeing for this particular area of ATE.

If we were to meet the demand that NSF typically will meet, it would be at 25 percent of the proposal that would be funded. That means 75 percent of the proposals are not funded. That number is about \$68 million. So all we are trying to do is give the appropriators the flexibility to meet this important demand.

Why is this demand important? Well, if you think about the jobs that are created because of this investment, and the debate we have had today about the importance of manufacturing in our future, this makes real sense.

□ 1530

The students that are being funded based on the American Association of Community Colleges numbers, 47 percent are African American, 56 percent are Hispanic. These colleges play a crucial role in serving our minority communities, populations which my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), knows are underrepresented in the science, technology, engineering, and math fields. There is no better way to make a real impact for a small investment on the long-term future of our economy. Please support this amendment.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

I have to say there are very few Members of this Congress who have worked harder to improve NSF funding than I have. I have spent many, many hours at it and we are grateful to get a few percent increase every year.

In this bill that is before us now, we have given a greater than 20 percent increase to this particular item. If that ends up being appropriated, it will be the largest increase for any part of NSF that they have received for many years, and yet the amendment would increase it even more. It would result in a huge increase; much, much greater. We simply cannot afford that in NSF.

We have a great deal of research to do to keep this Nation moving. We have to improve our math and science education programs in this Nation in order to meet competition from abroad and to have a better-educated electorate. We simply cannot afford to pour all that money into this one particular item without causing detriment to the rest of the National Science Foundation. I simply do not want to see that happen. I urge a rejection of this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) will be postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order: amendment No. 3 by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE); amendment No. 4 by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON); amendment No. 5 by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 416, noes 8, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 481]

AYES—416

Abercrombie	Deal (GA)	Jackson (IL)	Musgrave	Rogers (AL)	Stearns
Ackerman	DeFazio	Jackson-Lee	Myrick	Rogers (KY)	Strickland
Aderholt	DeGette	(TX)	Nadler	Rogers (MI)	Stupak
Akin	Delahunt	Jefferson	Napolitano	Rohrabacher	Sullivan
Alexander	DeLauro	Jenkins	Neal (MA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Sweeney
Allen	Dent	Jindal	Neugebauer	Ross	Tancredo
Andrews	Diaz-Balart, L.	Johnson (CT)	Ney	Rothman	Tanner
Baca	Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson (IL)	Northup	Royal-Allard	Tauscher
Bachus	Dicks	Johnson, E. B.	Nunes	Ruppersberger	Taylor (MS)
Baird	Dingell	Jones (NC)	Nussle	Rush	Terry
Baker	Doggett	Jones (OH)	Oberstar	Ryan (OH)	Thompson (CA)
Baldwin	Doyle	Kanjorski	Olver	Ryan (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Barrett (SC)	Drake	Kaptur	Oxley	Ryun (KS)	Thornberry
Barrow	Dreier	Keller	Pallone	Sánchez, Linda T.	Tierney
Bartlett (MD)	Duncan	Kelly	Pascrill	Sánchez, Loretta	Towns
Bass	Edwards	Kennedy (MN)	Pelosi	Sanders	Turner
Bean	Ehlers	Kennedy (RI)	Pence	Schwarz (MI)	Visclosky
Beauprez	Emanuel	Kildee	Peterson (MN)	Scott (GA)	Wadell (OR)
Becerra	Emerson	Kilpatrick (MI)	Peterson (PA)	Scott (VA)	Walsh
Berkley	Engel	King (NY)	Petri	Sensenbrenner	Wamp
Berman	English (PA)	Kingston	Pickering	Serrano	Wasserman
Berry	Eshoo	Kirk	Pitts	Shadegg	Velázquez
Biggert	Etheridge	Kline	Platts	Shaw	Waters
Bilirakis	Evans	Knollenberg	Poe	Shays	Watson
Bishop (GA)	Everett	Kolbe	Pombo	Sherman	Watt
Bishop (NY)	Farr	Kucinich	Pomeroy	Sherwood	Waxman
Bishop (UT)	Fattah	Kuhl (NY)	Porter	Shimkus	Weiner
Blackburn	Feeney	LaHood	Price (GA)	Shuster	Weldon (FL)
Blumenauer	Ferguson	Langevin	Price (NC)	Simmons	Weldon (PA)
Blunt	Filner	Lantos	Pryce (OH)	Simpson	Westmoreland
Boehlert	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Larsen (WA)	Putnam	Skelton	
Boehner	Flake	Larson (CT)	Radanovich	Slaughter	Wexler
Bonilla	Foley	Latham	Rahall	Smith (NJ)	Whitfield
Bonner	Forbes	LaTourette	Ramstad	Smith (TX)	Wicker
Bono	Ford	Leach	Rangel	Smith (WA)	Wilson (NM)
Boozman	Fortenberry	Lee	Regula	Snyder	Wilson (SC)
Boren	Fossella	Levin	Rehberg	Sodrel	Wolf
Boucher	Foxx	Lewis (CA)	Reichert	Solis	Woolsey
Boustany	Frank (MA)	Lewis (GA)	Renzi	Souder	Wu
Boyd	Franks (AZ)	Lewis (KY)	Reyes	Spratt	Wynn
Bradley (NH)	Frelinghuysen	Linder	Reynolds	Stark	Young (FL)
Brady (PA)	Gallegly	Lipinski			
Brady (TX)	Garrett (NJ)	LoBiondo			
Brown (OH)	Gerlach	LoFGREN, Zoe	NOES—8		
Brown (SC)	Gibbons	Lowey	Brown-Waite, Johnson, Sam		
Brown, Corrine	Gilchrest	Lucas	Ginny King (IA)		
Burgess	Gillmor	Lungren, Daniel E.	McHenry		
Burton (IN)	Gingrey	Lipinski	Culberson		
Butterfield	Gohmert	Lynch			
Buyer	Gonzalez	Mack	Barton (TX) DeLay		
Calvert	Goode	Maroney	Boswell Doolittle		
Cannon	Goodlatte	Manzullo	Camp Hefley		
Cantor	Gordon	Marchant			
Capito	Granger	Markey			
Capps	Graves	Marshall			
Capuano	Green (WI)	Matheson			
Cardin	Green, Al	Matsui			
Cardoza	Green, Gene	McCarthy			
Carnahan	Grijalva	McCaull (TX)			
Carson	Gutierrez	McCullom (MN)			
Carter	Gutknecht	McCotter			
Case	Hall	McCrey			
Castle	Harman	McDermott			
Chabot	Harris	McGovern			
Chandler	Hart	McHugh			
Chocola	Hastings (FL)	McIntyre			
Clay	Hastings (WA)	McKeon			
Cleaver	Hayes	McKinney			
Clyburn	Hayworth	McMorris			
Coble	Hensarling	McNulty			
Cole (OK)	Herger	Meehan			
Conaway	Hersheth	Meek (FL)			
Conyers	Higgins	Meeks (NY)			
Cooper	Hinchey	Melancon			
Costa	Hinojosa	Menendez			
Costello	Hobson	Mica			
Cramer	Hoekstra	Michaud			
Crenshaw	Holden	Millender-			
Crowley	Holt	McDonald			
Cubin	Honda	Miller (FL)			
Cuellar	Hooley	Miller (MI)			
Cummings	Hostettler	Miller (NC)			
Cunningham	Hoyer	Miller, Gary			
Davis (AL)	Hulshof	Miller, George			
Davis (CA)	Hunter	Mollohan			
Davis (FL)	Hyde	Moore (KS)			
Davis (IL)	Inglis (SC)	Moore (WI)			
Davis (KY)	Inslee	Moran (KS)			
Davis (TN)	Israel	Moran (VA)			
Davis, Jo Ann	Issa	Murphy			
Davis, Tom	Istook	Murtha			

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN
The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. TERRY) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in the vote.

□ 1559

Messrs. BARRETT of South Carolina, MILLER of Florida, MCKEON, BOUSTANY, Hensarling, Norwood, Gary G. Miller of California, Mrs. CUBIN, and Ms. WATERS changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. LARSON OF CONNECTICUT

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. TERRY). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 210, noes 213, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 482]

AYES—210

Abercrombie	Grijalva	Olver	Cannon	Hunter	Pickering
Ackerman	Gutierrez	Owens	Cantor	Hyde	Pitts
Allen	Harman	Pallone	Capito	Inglis (SC)	Poe
Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Pascarella	Castle	Issa	Pombo
Baca	Herseth	Pastor	Chabot	Istook	Porter
Baird	Higgins	Payne	Chocola	Jenkins	Price (GA)
Baldwin	Hinchey	Pelosi	Coble	Jindal	Pryce (OH)
Barrow	Hinojosa	Peterson (MN)	Conaway	Johnson (IL)	Putnam
Bean	Holden	Peterson (PA)	Crenshaw	Johnson, Sam	Radanovich
Becerra	Holt	Platts	Culberson	Keller	Ramstad
Berkley	Honda	English (PA)	Cunningham	Kelly	Regula
Berman	Hooley	Pomeroy	Davis (KY)	Kennedy (MN)	Rehberg
Berry	Hoyer	Price (NC)	Davis (KY)	King (IA)	Reichert
Bishop (GA)	Inslee	Rahall	Davis, Jo Ann	King (NY)	Renzi
Bishop (NY)	Israel	Rangel	Davis, Tom	Kingston	Reynolds
Blumenauer	Jackson (IL)	Reyes	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kirk	Rogers (AL)
Boren	Jackson-Lee	Ross	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kline	Rogers (KY)
Boucher	(TX)	Rothman	Dent	Knollenberg	Rogers (MI)
Boyd	Jefferson	Royal-Allard	Dreier	Kolbe	Rohrabacher
Brady (PA)	Johnson (CT)	Ruppersberger	Duncan	Kuhl (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Brown (OH)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush	Ferguson	LaHood	Royce
Brown, Corrine	Jones (NC)	Ryan (OH)	Flake	LaTatham	Ryan (WI)
Butterfield	Jones (OH)	Sabo	Foley	LaTourette	Ryun (KS)
Capps	Kanjorski	Salazar	Forbes	Lucas	Saxton
Capuano	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda	Franks (AZ)	McCaul (TX)	Schmidt
Cardin	Kennedy (RI)	T.	Frelinghuysen	McCotter	Schwarz (MI)
Cardoza	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta	Gallo	McCrary	Sensenbrenner
Carnahan	Kilpatrick (MI)	Sanders	Garnett (NJ)	McHenry	Sessions
Carson	Kucinich	Schakowsky	Gillmor	McHugh	Bishop (GA)
Case	Langevin	Schiff	Gingrey	McKeon	Bishop (NY)
Chandler	Lantos	Schwartz (PA)	Gohmert	Gibbons	Bishop (GA)
Clay	Larsen (WA)	Scott (GA)	Goodlatte	McMorris	Bishop (NY)
Cleaver	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)	Granger	Gilchrest	Bishop (GA)
Clyburn	Lee	Green (WI)	Graves	Gillmor	Bishop (NY)
Conyers	Levin	Serrano	Gutknecht	Gingrey	Bishop (GA)
Cooper	Lewis (GA)	Shays	Hart	Gohmert	Bishop (NY)
Costa	Lipinski	Sherman	Hastings (WA)	Goodlatte	Bishop (GA)
Costello	Lofgren, Zoe	Simmons	Hayes	Granger	Bishop (NY)
Cramer	Lowey	Slaughter	Hayworth	Graves	Bishop (GA)
Crowley	Lynch	Smith (NJ)	Hobson	Gillmor	Bishop (NY)
Cuellar	Maloney	Smith (WA)	Hobson	Gohmert	Bishop (GA)
Cummings	Markey	Stupak	Hof	Goodlatte	Bishop (NY)
Davis (AL)	Marshall	Tanner	Hensarling	Granger	Bishop (GA)
Davis (CA)	Matheson	Tauscher	Hertel	Hayes	Bishop (NY)
Davis (FL)	Matsui	Taylor (MS)	Hobson	Hayworth	Bishop (GA)
Davis (IL)	McCarthy	Thickstern	Hof	Hobson	Bishop (NY)
Davis (TN)	McCullum (MN)	Strickland	Hof	Hof	Bishop (GA)
DeFazio	McDermott	Stupak	Hof	Hof	Bishop (NY)
DeGette	McGovern	Tanner	Hof	Hof	Bishop (GA)
Delahunt	McIntyre	Tauscher	Hof	Hof	Bishop (NY)
DeLauro	McKinney	Taylor (MS)	Hof	Hof	Bishop (GA)
Dicks	McNulty	Thickstern	Hof	Hof	Bishop (NY)
Dingell	Meehan	Thompson (MS)	Hof	Hof	Bishop (GA)
Doggett	Meek (FL)	Tierney	Hof	Hof	Bishop (NY)
Doyle	Meeks (NY)	Towns	Hof	Hof	Bishop (GA)
Edwards	Melancon	Udall (CO)	Hof	Hof	Bishop (NY)
Emanuel	Menendez	Udall (NM)	Hof	Hof	Bishop (GA)
Engel	Michaud	Van Hollen	Hof	Hof	Bishop (NY)
Eshoo	Millender-	Velázquez	Hof	Hof	Bishop (GA)
Etheridge	McDonald	Visclosky	Hof	Hof	Bishop (NY)
Evans	Miller (NC)	Wasserman	Hof	Hof	Bishop (GA)
Farr	Miller, George	Schultz	Hof	Hof	Bishop (NY)
Fattah	Mollohan	Waters	Hof	Hof	Bishop (GA)
Filner	Moore (KS)	Watson	Hof	Hof	Bishop (NY)
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Moore (WI)	Watt	Hof	Hof	Bishop (GA)
Ford	Moran (VA)	Waxman	Hof	Hof	Bishop (NY)
Frank (MA)	Murtha	Weiner	Hof	Hof	Bishop (GA)
Gonzalez	Nadler	Weldon (PA)	Hof	Hof	Bishop (NY)
Goode	Napolitano	Wexler	Hof	Hof	Bishop (GA)
Gordon	Neal (MA)	Woolsey	Hof	Hof	Bishop (NY)
Green, Al	Oberstar	Wu	Hof	Hof	Bishop (GA)
Green, Gene	Obey	Wynn	Hof	Hof	Bishop (NY)

NOES—213

Aderholt	Bilirakis	Boustany
Akin	Bishop (UT)	Bradley (NH)
Alexander	Blackburn	Brady (TX)
Bachus	Blunt	Brown (SC)
Baker	Boehlert	Brown-Waite,
Barrett (SC)	Boehner	Ginny
Bartlett (MD)	Bonilla	Burgess
Bass	Bonner	Burton (IN)
Beauprez	Bono	Buyer
Biggert	Boozman	Calvert

RECORDED VOTE

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 210, noes 212, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 483]

AYES—210

Abercrombie	Green, Al	Olver
Ackerman	Green, Gene	Owens
Allen	Grijalva	Pallone
Andrews	Gutierrez	Pascarella
Baca	Harman	Pastor
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Barrow	Hinchey	Pelosi
Bean	Hinojosa	Peterson (MN)
Becerra	Hoyer	Peterson (PA)
Berkley	Honda	Pomeroy
Berman	Hooley	Porter
Berry	Hoyer	Price (GA)
Bishop (GA)	Inslee	Price (NC)
Bishop (NY)	Israel	Rahall
Blumenauer	Jackson (IL)	Rangel
Boren	Jackson-Lee	Renzi
Boucher	(TX)	Rothman
Boyd	Jefferson	Royal-Allard
Brady (PA)	Johnson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Brown (OH)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Brown, Corrine	Jones (NC)	Ryan (OH)
Butterfield	Jones (OH)	Sabo
Capps	Kanjorski	Kaptur
Capuano	Kaptur	Salazar
Cardin	Kennedy (RI)	Sánchez, Linda
Cardoza	Kildee	Sánchez, Loretta
Carnahan	Kilpatrick (MI)	Sanders
Carson	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Case	Langevin	Shakowsky
Chandler	Lantos	Stearns
Clay	Larsen (WA)	Sullivan
Cleaver	Larson (CT)	Sweeney
Clyburn	Lee	Cardin
Conyers	Levin	Kennedy (MN)
Cooper	Lewis (GA)	Kennedy (RI)
Costa	Lipinski	T.
Costello	Lofgren, Zoe	Sanchez, Loretta
Cramer	Lowey	Sánchez, Linda
Crowley	Lynch	Sánchez, Loretta
Cuellar	Maloney	Sánchez, Loretta
Cummings	Markey	Sánchez, Loretta
Davis (AL)	Marshall	Sánchez, Loretta
Davis (CA)	Matheson	Sánchez, Loretta
Davis (FL)	Matsui	Sánchez, Loretta
Davis (IL)	McCarthy	Sánchez, Loretta
Davis (TN)	McCullum (MN)	Sánchez, Loretta
DeFazio	McDermott	Sánchez, Loretta
DeGette	McGovern	Sánchez, Loretta
Delahunt	McIntyre	Sánchez, Loretta
DeLauro	McKinney	Sánchez, Loretta
Dicks	McNulty	Sánchez, Loretta
Dingell	Meehan	Sánchez, Loretta
Doggett	Meek (FL)	Sánchez, Loretta
Doyle	Meeks (NY)	Sánchez, Loretta
Edwards	Melancon	Sánchez, Loretta
Emanuel	Menendez	Sánchez, Loretta
Engel	Michaud	Sánchez, Loretta
Eshoo	Millender-	Sánchez, Loretta
Etheridge	McDonald	Sánchez, Loretta
Evans	Miller (NC)	Sánchez, Loretta
Farr	Miller, George	Sánchez, Loretta
Fattah	Mollohan	Sánchez, Loretta
Filner	Moore (KS)	Sánchez, Loretta
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Moore (WI)	Sánchez, Loretta
Ford	Moran (VA)	Sánchez, Loretta
Frank (MA)	Murtha	Sánchez, Loretta
Gonzalez	Nadler	Sánchez, Loretta
Goode	Napolitano	Sánchez, Loretta
Gordon	Neal (MA)	Sánchez, Loretta
Green, Al	Oberstar	Sánchez, Loretta
Green, Gene	Obey	Sánchez, Loretta

NOES—212

Aderholt	Bilirakis	Boustany
Akin	Bishop (UT)	Bradley (NH)
Alexander	Blackburn	Brady (TX)
Bachus	Blunt	Brown (SC)
Baker	Boehlert	Brown-Waite,
Barrett (SC)	Boehner	Ginny
Bartlett (MD)	Bonilla	Burgess
Bass	Bonner	Burton (IN)
Beauprez	Bono	Buyer
Biggert	Boozman	Calvert

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN
The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1608

Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. UDALL OF COLORADO

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fosseila
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilcrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde

Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaull (TX)
McCotter
McCrary
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering

Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryan (KS)
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walder (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Barton (TX)
Boswell
Camp
Conyers

DeLay
Doolittle
Hefley
Kind

Meeks (NY)
Ortiz
Weller

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN
The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1616

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BASS) having assumed the chair, Mr. TERRY, Acting Chairman 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. 250) to establish an inter-agency committee to coordinate Federal manufacturing research and development efforts in manufacturing, strengthen existing programs to assist manufacturing innovation and education, and expand outreach programs for small and medium-sized manufacturers, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 451, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, 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 OFFERED BY MR. HONDA

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

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

Mr. HONDA. I am, in its current form, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Honda moves to recommit the bill H.R. 250 to the Committee on Science with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of section 8, insert the following new subsection:

(d) ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce for the Advanced Technology Program under section 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278m) \$140,000,000 for fiscal year 2006, of which \$40,000,000 shall be for new awards.

Mr. HONDA (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion to recommit.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit with instructions would amend the bill by adding an authorization of the Advanced Technology Program within the National Institute of Standards and Technology at a level of \$140 million for fiscal year 2006.

The Advanced Technology Program partners with industry by providing funds for early-stage technologies that are viewed to be too technically risky

or too nascent by private funding sources.

It is one of the Federal Government's best means of promoting risk-taking and promoting the pursuit of new technology that go well beyond the limits of conventional practices.

Experts agree that these are key elements for maintaining American manufacturing competitiveness in the future. The opponents of this motion have claimed that ATP does not belong in a manufacturing bill, but the evidence shows that it does. In 43 peer reviewed ATP competitions, 39 percent of the awards have involved development of advanced manufacturing technologies.

At a June 2003 Committee on Science hearing on manufacturing R&D, the witnesses were unanimous in their belief that ATP was an important element to improving the U.S. manufacturing infrastructure and competitiveness. Supporters of H.R. 250 have mentioned that the bill is supported by the National Association of Manufacturers. But you should be aware that NAM also supports ATP, as most recently expressed in a letter to Senator SHELBY, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, and Science.

Other industry groups that support ATP funding include the Electronics Industries Alliance, the Alliance for Science and Technology Research in America, and the Council on Competitiveness. The Senate Committee on Science's own views and estimates on the fiscal year 2006 budget request state: "The committee continues to support the Advanced Technology Program and is disappointed that the administration has again included no funds for the program in the budget request."

It is the job of the Congress, not the President, to make these spending decisions. Year after year we provide funding for ATP in appropriations bills, but we fail to provide the certainty in the program that an authorization will bring. Today we have a chance to do so.

ATP has been targeted for termination because it has been tagged as corporate welfare, but this is a mischaracterization. ATP conducts peer-reviewed competitions open to all technology areas with demanding standards for awardees. Awardees receive relatively small amounts of funding that they must match with their own contributions.

Contrast this with the energy bill signed into law earlier this year that provides billions of dollars in direct spending, subsidies, loan guarantees, and tax breaks to an industry that is reaping record high profits.

While we engage in a philosophical debate about whether to fund ATP, other nations are taking even bigger steps to improve their manufacturing capabilities, and as a result advanced manufacturing work is now being done outside of the U.S.

It is essential that we do something to help American manufacturers stay at the cutting edge, ahead of foreign competitors, and keeping ATP alive is a good start.

I merely seek to authorize funding for ATP for fiscal year 2006 at the same funding level that is included in the Senate's CJS bill for fiscal year 2006, a level that was supported just last week by a vote of 68 to 29. Given this level of Senate support, the conference report on that bill is almost certain to include funding for ATP, so we might as well pass this motion and authorize that spending.

Now, I have heard claims that we cannot include ATP in this bill because the administration opposes it. Well, the administration opposed full funding for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program, but this bill contains full funding for MEP. Congress overrode the administration when it was the right thing to do. Including ATP is the right thing to do, too. If the President has such a problem with it, he can make this bill his first veto.

In April, President Bush told the National Small Business Conference that he "appreciates the fact that the small business entrepreneurs are some of the great innovators of our Nation" and that he "appreciates the fact that our small business owners are taking risks and pursuing dreams."

But his actions show that he fails to appreciate that some of the most important advances are extremely risky, and to take those risks, businesses need a little help from the government. That is what ATP does. The most risky ventures are the ones with the greatest potential. If we fail to provide that help to American businesses, other countries are going to do it. They are already doing it, and that is why jobs are going overseas.

I urge a "yes" vote on my motion to recommit with instructions.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, we have in this motion to recommit a textbook example of how the perfect is the enemy of the good. Personally, I support the Advanced Technology Program, although I know that many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle do not. But I support this bill, and the Members on the other side of the aisle support this bill as well.

We all want to demonstrate our support for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership which has served so well and the other programs authorized in this bill so we can facilitate assistance going to American manufacturers who desperately need it. That has been the entire tenor of the debate today.

But now, as we are on the verge of accomplishing our mutual goal of helping manufacturers, we have before us a motion that will have the effect of killing

the bill. That is not speculation. We know that disputes over ATP are why this bill died in the Senate in the last Congress. We know that the administration adamantly opposes ATP and will block the progress of this bill if ATP is included.

A vote for this motion is not a vote for ATP; it is a vote to kill a bill that will help American manufacturers. And killing this bill over ATP would be especially irresponsible because the Congress will have other chances to save the ATP program. For starters, we will vote on appropriations for the program. It is not clear at all how the gamesmanship behind this motion will benefit the ATP program. It just makes it more of a political football. It is very clear how that gamesmanship works to the detriment of the bill and the aid it will provide to American manufacturers, so I urge my colleagues to vote down this politically motivated amendment.

We will have other chances to debate ATP. We will not have another chance for this bill, which in its current form has widespread bipartisan support. Let us put politics aside and make some real progress. Defeat the motion and support H.R. 250.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 226, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 484]

AYES—196

Abercrombie	Carson	Engel	Cannon	Hayes	Kolbe
Ackerman	Case	Eshoo	Cantor	Hayworth	Kuhl (NY)
Allen	Chandler	Etheridge	Capito	Hensarling	LaHood
Andrews	Clay	Evans	Carter	Herger	Fitzpatrick (PA)
Baca	Cleaver	Farr	Castle	Hobson	Latham
Baird	Clyburn	Fattah	Chabot	Hoekstra	LaTourette
Baldwin	Conyers	Filner	Chocola	Hostettler	Leach
Barrow	Cooper	Ford	Coble	Hulshof	Lewis (CA)
Bean	Costa	Frank (MA)	Cole (OK)	Hunter	Lewis (KY)
Becerra	Costello	Gonzalez	Conaway	Hyde	Linder
Berkley	Cramer	Gordon	Crenshaw	Inglis (SC)	LoBiondo
Berman	Crowley	Green, Al	Cubin	Issa	Lucas
Berry	Cuellar	Green, Gene	Culberson	Istoek	Lungren, Daniel E.
Bishop (GA)	Cummings	Grijalva	Cunningham	Jenkins	Mack
Bishop (NY)	Davis (AL)	Gutierrez	Davis (KY)	Jindal	Manzullo
Blumenauer	Davis (CA)	Harman	Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson (CT)	Marchant
Boren	Davis (FL)	Hastings (FL)	Davis, Tom	Johnson (IL)	McCaull (TX)
Boucher	Davis (IL)	Herseth	Deal (GA)	Johnson, Sam	McCotter
Boyd	Davis (TN)	Higgins	DeFazio	Jones (NC)	McCrary
Brady (PA)	DeGette	Hinchey	Dent	Keller	McHenry
Brown (OH)	Delahunt	Hinojosa	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kelly	McHugh
Brown, Corrine	DeLauro	Holden	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kennedy (MN)	McKeon
Butterfield	Dicks	Holt	Drake	King (IA)	McMorris
Capps	Dingell	Honda	Dreier	King (NY)	Mica
Capuano	Doggett	Hooley	Duncan	Pearce	Miller (FL)
Cardin	Doyle	Hoyer	Ehlers	Pence	Miller (MI)
Cardoza	Edwards	Inslee	Emerson	Miller, Gary	Musgrave
Carnahan	Emanuel	Israel	English (PA)	Moran (KS)	Myrick

Jackson (IL)	Michaud	Schakowsky
Jackson-Lee	Millender-TX)	Schiff
Jefferson	McDonald	Schwartz (PA)
Johnson, E. B.	Miller (NC)	Scott (GA)
Jones (OH)	Miller, George	Scott (VA)
Kanjorski	Mollohan	Serrano
Kaptur	Moore (KS)	Sherman
Kennedy (RI)	Moore (WI)	Skelton
Kildee	Moran (VA)	Slaughter
Kilpatrick (MI)	Murtha	Smith (WA)
Kucinich	Nadler	Snyder
Langevin	Napolitano	Solis
Lantos	Neal (MA)	Spratt
Larsen (WA)	Oberstar	Stark
Larson (CT)	Obey	Strickland
Lee	Olver	Stupak
Levin	Owens	Tanner
Lewis (GA)	Pallone	Tauscher
Lipinski	Pascrall	Taylor (MS)
Lofgren, Zoe	Pastor	Thompson (CA)
Lowey	Payne	Thompson (MS)
Lynch	Pelosi	Tierney
Maloney	Peterson (MN)	Towns
Markey	Pomeroy	Udall (CO)
Marshall	Price (NC)	Van Hollen
Matheson	Rahall	Velázquez
Matsui	Rangel	Visclosky
McCarthy	Reyes	Wasserman
McCollum (MN)	Ross	Schultz
McDermott	Rothman	Waters
McGovern	Royal-Allard	Watson
McIntyre	Ruppertsberger	Watson
McNulty	Rush	Watt
Meehan	Ryan (OH)	Weiner
Meek (FL)	Sabo	Wexler
Meeks (NY)	Salazar	Woolsey
Melancon	Sánchez, Linda T.	Wu
Menendez	Sanchez, Loretta	Wynn

NOES—226

Aderholt	Everett	Kolbe
Akin	Feeley	Kuhl (NY)
Alexander	Ferguson	LaHood
Bachus	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Latham
Baker	Flake	LaTourette
Barrett (SC)	Foley	Leach
Bartlett (MD)	Forbes	Lewis (CA)
Bass	Fortenberry	Lewis (KY)
Beauprez	Fossella	Linder
Biggert	Fox	LoBiondo
Bilirakis	Franks (AZ)	Lucas
Bishop (UT)	Frelinghuysen	Lungren, Daniel E.
Blackburn	Galleghy	Mack
Blunt	Garrett (NJ)	Manzullo
Boehlert	Gerlach	Marchant
Boehner	Gibbons	McCaull (TX)
Bonilla	Gilchrest	McCotter
Bonner	Gillmor	McCrery
Bono	Gingrey	McHenry
Boozman	Gohmert	McHugh
Boustany	Goode	McKeon
Bradley (NH)	Goodlatte	McMorris
Brady (TX)	Granger	Mica
Brown (SC)	Graves	Miller (FL)
Brown-Waite,	Green (WI)	Miller (MI)
Brown, Waite,	Gunny	Miller, Gary
Burgess	Gutknecht	Moran (KS)
Burton (IN)	Hall	Murphy
Buyer	Harris	Musgrave
Calvert	Hart	Myrick
Cannon	Hastings (WA)	Neugebauer
Cantor	Hayes	Ney
Capito	Hayworth	Northup
Carter	Hensarling	Norwood
Castle	Herger	Nunes
Castile	Hobson	Nussle
Chabot	Hoekstra	Osborne
Chocola	Hostettler	Otter
Coble	Hulshof	Oxley
Cole (OK)	Hulshof	Paul
Conaway	Hyde	Pearce
Crenshaw	Inglis (SC)	Pence
Crowley	Issa	Peterson (PA)
Cubin	Istoek	Petri
Culberson	Jenkins	Pickering
Cunningham	Jindal	Pitts
Grijalva	Johnson (CT)	Platts
Hastings (FL)	Johnson (IL)	Poe
Herseth	Deal (GA)	Pombo
Higgins	DeFazio	Porter
Hinchey	Dent	Price (GA)
Hinojosa	Diaz-Balart, L.	Pryce (OH)
Holden	Diaz-Balart, M.	Radanovich
Holt	Drake	Regula
Hooley	Dreier	Ramstad
Hoyer	Duncan	Rehberg
Inslee	King (IA)	Knollenberg
Emanuel	King (NY)	
Israel	Emerson	
	Emerson	
	English (PA)	

Reichert	Shaw	Thornberry	Cole (OK)	Israel	Oberstar	Tiahrt	Walsh	Whitfield
Renzi	Shays	Tiahrt	Conaway	Issa	Obey	Tiberi	Wamp	Wicker
Reynolds	Sherwood	Tiberi	Conyers	Istook	Olver	Tierney	Wasserman	Wilson (NM)
Rogers (AL)	Shimkus	Turner	Cooper	Jackson (IL)	Osborne	Towns	Schultz	Wilson (SC)
Rogers (KY)	Shuster	Upton	Costa	Jackson-Lee	Otter	Turner	Watson	Wolf
Rogers (MI)	Simmons	Walden (OR)	Costello	(TX)	Owens	Udall (CO)	Watson	Woolsey
Rohrabacher	Simpson	Walsh	Cramer	Jefferson	Oxley	Udall (NM)	Watt	Wu
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NJ)	Wamp	Crenshaw	Jenkins	Pallone	Upton	Waxman	Wynn
Royce	Smith (TX)	Weldon (FL)	Crowley	Jindal	Pascrill	Van Hollen	Weiner	Young (AK)
Ryan (WI)	Sodrel	Weldon (PA)	Cubin	Johnson (CT)	Pastor	Velázquez	Weldon (FL)	Young (FL)
Ryun (KS)	Souder	Westmoreland	Cuellar	Johnson (IL)	Payne	Visclosky	Weldon (PA)	Young (FL)
Sanders	Stearns	Whitfield	Culberson	Johnson, E. B.	Pearce	Walden (OR)	Wexler	
Saxton	Sullivan	Wicker	Cummings	Jones (OH)	Pelosi			
Schmidt	Sweeney	Wilson (NM)	Cunningham	Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)			
Schwarz (MI)	Tancredo	Wilson (SC)	Davis (AL)	Kaptur	Peterson (PA)	Barrett (SC)	Hostettler	Musgrave
Sensenbrenner	Taylor (NC)	Wolf	Davis (CA)	Keller	Petri	Duncan	Johnson, Sam	Myrick
Sessions	Terry	Young (AK)	Davis (FL)	Kelly	Pickering	Flake	Jones (NC)	Pence
Shadegg	Thomas	Young (FL)	Davis (IL)	Kennedy (MN)	Pitts	Foxx	King (IA)	Royce
			Davis (TN)	Kennedy (RI)	Platts	Franks (AZ)	Marchant	Shadegg
			Davis, Jo Ann	Kildee	Poe	Garrett (NJ)	McHenry	Stearns

NOT VOTING—11

Barton (TX)	Doolittle	Ortiz	Davis, Tom	Kilpatrick (MI)	Peterson (PA)	Barrett (SC)	Hostettler	Musgrave
Boswell	Hefley	Waxman	Deal (GA)	King (NY)	Pomeroy	Duncan	Johnson, Sam	Myrick
Camp	Kind	Weller	DeFazio	Kingston	Porter	Hensarling	Jones (NC)	Pence
DeLay	McKinney		DeGette	Kirk	Price (GA)	Pombo	Gutknecht	Royce

□ 1645

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Would the Chair please make a ruling on when the vote has been signaled by the Chair. I was of the opinion that when the gavel came down, that was the end of it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona was on his feet attempting to reach the microphone.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I see there are no rules in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's demand for the yeas and nays was timely.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 394, nays 24, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 485]

YEAS—394

Abercrombie	Bishop (NY)	Burton (IN)	Harman	Mica	Slaughter	Simmons	Continuation of National Emergency with Respect to Terrorism—Message from the President of the United States (H. Doc. No. 109-57)
Ackerman	Bishop (UT)	Butterfield	Hart	Michaud	Smith (NJ)	Simpson	
Aderholt	Blackburn	Buyer	Hastings (FL)	Millender-McDonald	Smith (TX)	Skelton	
Akin	Blumenauer	Calvert	Hastings (WA)	Miller (MI)	Smith (WA)		
Alexander	Blunt	Cannon	Hayes	Miller (NC)	Snyder		
Allen	Boehlert	Cantor	Hayworth	Miller, George	Sodrel		
Andrews	Boehner	Capito	Herger	Moilahan	Solis		
Baca	Bonilla	Capps	Herseth	Higgins	Souder		
Bachus	Bonner	Capuano	Hobson	Moore (KS)	Spratt		
Baird	Bono	Cardin	Hinchey	Moore (WI)	Stark		
Baker	Boozman	Cardoza	Hinojosa	Moran (KS)	Strickland		
Baldwin	Boren	Carnahan	Hoyer	Moran (VA)	Stupak		
Barrow	Boustany	Carson	Hoekstra	Murphy	Sullivan		
Bartlett (MD)	Boyd	Carter	Holden	Murtha	Sweeney		
Bass	Bradley (NH)	Case	Holt	Nadler	Tanner		
Beauprez	Brady (PA)	Castle	Honda	Napolitano	Tauscher		
Becerra	Brady (TX)	Chabot	Hooley	Neal (MA)	Taylor (MS)		
Berkley	Brown (OH)	Chandler	Hoyer	Neugebauer	Taylor (NC)		
Berman	Brown (SC)	Chocola	Hulshof	Ney	Terry		
Berry	Brown, Corrine	Clay	Hunter	Northup	Thomas		
Biggert	Brown-Waite,	Cleaver	Hyde	Norwood	Thompson (CA)		
Bilirakis	Ginny	Clyburn	Inglis (SC)	Nunes	Thompson (MS)		
Bishop (GA)	Burgess	Coble	Inslee	Nussle	Thornberry		

NAYS—24

							NOT VOTING—15	
Barton (TX)	Doolittle	Ortiz	Davis, Tom	Kilpatrick (MI)	Peterson (PA)	Barton (TX)	Davis (KY)	Hefley
Boswell	Hefley	Waxman	Deal (GA)	King (NY)	Pomeroy	Bean	DeLay	Kind
Camp	Kind	Weller	DeFazio	Kingston	Porter	Boucher	Doolittle	Ortiz
DeLay	McKinney		DeGette	Kirk	Price (GA)	Camp	Feeley	Paul

□ 1657

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. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 485, I put my card in the machine but it didn't register my vote. Had it registered I would have voted "yea."

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 485, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HOEKSTRA, from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-228) on the resolution (H. Res. 418) requesting the President to transmit to the House of Representatives not later than 14 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution documents in the possession of the President relating to the disclosure of the identity and employment of Ms. Valerie Plame, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO TERRORISM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 109-57)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the