

shipments of waste to Michigan have increased 83 percent. Not only do these shipments crowd our landfills, but they also pose environmental, public health, and even national security risks. It is long past that time States are lawfully able to regulate the amount of municipal solid waste coming across the border and into their communities. H.R. 518 gives States the legal authority to regulate this waste until the Federal Government implements a 21-year-old bilateral agreement between the U.S. and Canada on this subject.

H.R. 518 does not violate trade agreements. The House has done its due diligence in crafting this legislation to avoid any potential trade issues. Simply put, H.R. 518 provides the legislative authority for the United States to implement the 1986 bilateral agreement this country signed with Canada.

More specifically, the legislation authorizes and directs the Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to implement and enforce the 1986 Agreement Concerning the Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Waste between the United States and Canada. The Administrator is required to issue final regulations within 24 months after the date of enactment. Under the 1986 agreement shipments of hazardous waste require notification to the importing country and that country's consent before waste may be shipped. The agreement was amended in 1992 to establish similar requirements for municipal solid waste. H.R. 518 provides the legislative authority for the agreement to be implemented and ensure both governments provide proper notice and shipment information before dump trucks cross the U.S. northern border.

Stopping trash coming into Michigan from Canada must be done through statute—not handshakes. H.R. 518 accomplishes this goal. This bill represents the first real opportunity in a long time to ensure States know in advance what is coming into their communities and where it is going.

The Michigan delegation in the House of Representatives has done a terrific job of helping bring H.R. 518 to the floor for a vote. I encourage all of my colleagues to support it. I am hopeful the Senate will soon consider the measure.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 518, the International Solid Waste Importation and Management Act of 2007. H.R. 518 adds a new section to the Solid Waste Disposal Act requiring the Environmental Protection Agency to implement and enforce the "notice and consent" provisions of a bilateral U.S.-Canadian Agreement signed in 1986 to govern the transboundary movement of hazardous waste. This agreement was amended in 1992 to include municipal solid waste, but neither administration since then has made any effort to implement the bilateral agreement. Enforcement legislation promised "soon" by the present administration almost 4 years ago has yet to arrive. H.R. 518 provides criteria to ensure that the views of the affected State and local governments are properly taken into account, and it adds the necessary statutory enforcement authority.

According to the most recent information for fiscal year 2006, the largest source of waste imported into Michigan continues to be from Canada, with total reported imports to landfills of more than 12 million cubic yards. That is a 23 percent increase from fiscal year 2003.

Even more disturbing is that the amount of Canadian waste being disposed of in Michigan has risen by 335 percent since 1996, when Michigan began collecting data.

Riverview and other downriver communities in my district have had to cope with hundreds of trucks full of Canadian trash rumbling down their streets on a daily basis for years. These trucks pass through our communities en route from the Ambassador Bridge to traffic dumps to the west. You can imagine the traffic congestion, environmental, and quality-of-life problems these truckloads of trash have created.

Local activists like Mr. George Read of Trenton and State Representative Kathleen Law have been working tirelessly alongside our congressional delegation to put an end to this never-ending flow of trash, and I am very pleased that the House today is taking a step toward that goal.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time and would be honored to yield back my time.

Mr. WYNN. Likewise, Madam Speaker, we have no further speakers. Again, I would like to commend Chairman DINGELL and the Michigan delegation for their leadership on this issue.

I yield back the balance of my time as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 518.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 362, 10,000 TEACHERS, 10 MILLION MINDS SCIENCE AND MATH SCHOLARSHIP ACT

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 327 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 327

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 362) to authorize science scholarships for educating mathematics and science teachers, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on

Science and Technology now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of H.R. 362 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H. Res. 327 provides for consideration of H.R. 362, the 10,000 Teachers, 10 Million Minds Science and Math Scholarship Act, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Science and Technology. The rule waives all points of order against the bill, except those arising under clauses 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The rule also makes in order and provides appropriate waivers for consideration of two amendments that

were submitted for consideration. A third amendment was submitted, but was withdrawn by its sponsors. All three amendments that were submitted to the Rules Committee were offered by Democratic Members.

H.R. 362 is a bipartisan bill aimed at improving K–12 science, technology, engineering and mathematics, STEM, education through recruitment, training, mentoring and professional development of teachers.

The major provisions of H.R. 362 are in response to recommendations laid out by the National Academy of Sciences in their recent report on American competitiveness. That report, "Rising Above the Gathering Storm," identified K–12 science and math education as the highest priority policy recommendations. This legislation intends to implement those important recommendations. The report concluded a comprehensive and coordinated Federal effort is urgently needed to bolster U.S. competitiveness and preeminence in these areas.

This report, initiated, as you know, by Congress, makes four recommendations along with 20 implementation actions that Federal policymakers should take to create high-quality jobs and focus new science and technology efforts on meeting the Nation's needs. Those include, one, increasing America's talent pool by vastly improving K–12 mathematics and science education; two, sustaining and strengthening the Nation's commitment to long-term basic research; three, develop, recruit and retain top students, scientists and engineers, both from the U.S. and abroad; and, four, ensure that the United States is the premier place in the world for innovation.

According to that report, in 1999, 68 percent of U.S. eighth graders received math instruction from a teacher with no, repeat, no math certification or degree. Also, according to that report, in the year 2000, 92 percent of the fifth through ninth graders, our kids, were taught physical science by a teacher with no science degree or certification. In 2004, the United States high school students ranked 24th, 24th, out of 29 countries in math proficiency, according to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, obviously a situation that is not tolerable.

This bill makes important strides towards achieving the goals laid out by the National Academy of Sciences report. H.R. 362 will authorize \$1.5 billion to be appropriated for new and existing programs within the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy that support the training and professional development of elementary and secondary school teachers in the fields of science, technology, engineering and mathematics. H.R. 362 addresses the academy's highest priority recommendations to invest in elementary and secondary education.

In summary, H.R. 362 creates programs at colleges and universities to improve the training of science, tech-

nology, engineering and math teachers; increases the size and duration of scholarships provided for those fields for people who become teachers; authorizes teacher training for advanced math and science courses; establishes a National Science Foundation grant program to support teachers institutes, including summer institutes for working math and science teachers; establishes master's degree programs for working math and science teachers through the NSF; and creates centers for improving undergraduate education in science, technology, engineering, and math.

The bill also authorizes scholarships for students majoring in these STEM fields who commit to teaching in our K–12 science and math programs.

The legislation has very broad support among our Nation's leading education and research institutions and broad bipartisan support in this body.

H.R. 362 will improve teacher preparation by providing our Nation's teachers with the necessary professional development, and it should improve our students' achievement by strengthening our math and science curriculum.

The reason for this legislation is clear: by 2010, one in four new jobs will be technically oriented, or will involve computers. Women still lag far behind in earning computer technology degrees and working in computer technology related professions, a situation we hope to change.

Constituents from my home State of Vermont have expressed their belief that this legislation provides the forward-thinking policy our Nation's education system requires.

H.R. 362 will provide a particular benefit to rural regions because of the number of rural school districts that currently don't have the resources to get these jobs done. High school lab courses not only reinforce what is going on in lecture, but obviously capture the attention and engagement of our students. These are useful tools for our students to acquire, no matter what career path they choose to follow.

An additional 10,000 math and science teachers across the United States will help ensure that our Nation can capture the imagination of our young people and give them the tools they need to succeed in the careers of science, engineering, technology, and math. The bill also supports the purchase of laboratory equipment, absolutely essential to achieving these goals, that will upgrade facilities in the development of programs that integrate laboratory experience with classroom instruction.

□ 1330

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 362 to invest in America's competitiveness. That is essentially what this bill is about. This bill will have a great impact on our teacher preparation, will strengthen and expand the science, technology, engineering and math workforce, and at-

tract more of our best and brightest students into these fields.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee met and granted a structured rule for consideration of the bill 10,000 Teachers, 10 Million Minds Science and Math Scholarship Act. Only two amendments were submitted to the Rules Committee and both were offered by the underlying bill's lead sponsor and the chairman of the Science and Technology Committee, Mr. GORDON.

Madam Speaker, I am disappointed the Democrat majority rejected, on a party-line vote, an open rule for consideration of this measure, thus denying Members of the House of Representatives the opportunity to come to the floor and offer his or her amendments to this bill. And I frankly view this as another opportunity of the promises made by the new majority that were wasted with this bill.

However, the underlying bill mirrors the Science and Mathematics Education for Competitiveness Act, which was approved by the House Science Committee unanimously in the last Congress. The underlying legislation aims to increase K–12 science, technology, engineering and mathematics or "STEM" teachers annually by 10,000. Specifically, the bill authorizes competitive awards through the National Science Foundation to institutions of higher education to improve the training of STEM teachers and provide scholarships to students in STEM fields who commit to teaching after graduation.

I applaud the Science and Technology Committee for working in a bipartisan manner to help address the need for America to be more globally competitive in math, science, technology and engineering fields by focusing on increasing the number of quality math and science teachers in our Nation's classrooms. Our students and educators certainly stand to benefit from this bipartisan bill which I support.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Washington.

Just in response to comments on the rule, the Rules Committee believes that this is a judicious rule. All of the amendments that were presented to the Rules Committee were made in order. This is essentially from our point of view an open rule, subject to a filing requirement. The filing requirement obviously gives Members as well

as the Rules Committee an opportunity to review what is being proposed. The rule was adopted by a voice vote.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. The gentleman stated that in his mind this is an open rule. An open rule historically in this body has been where the committee of jurisdiction marks up the bill, takes it to the committee, and then the Rules Committee, with no restrictions, allows Members that are not on that committee to come down if they wish and submit their thoughts or improvements to the bill.

The bill we are about to vote on is a structured rule. Only two amendments were offered. Actually three, and one was withdrawn. Two amendments were made in order. Those amendments were sponsored by the chairman of the committee that has primary jurisdiction on this and the sponsor of the bill, to which it has strong bipartisan support because, as I mentioned in my remarks, this mirrors a bill passed out of the Science Committee last year.

This bill very easily could have been amended in the committee by the chairman, because he is the one who wanted to have the amendments, and it could have been on the Suspension Calendar. It would have passed with strong bipartisan support.

So with due respect to my friend from Vermont, this is not an open rule. This is a structured rule where Members are denied the opportunity if they wish to come to the floor of the House and offer amendments or improvements to this bill.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I would inquire of the gentleman, were any rules offered by Members on the Republican side that were rejected?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I will simply say that a requirement of an open rule is not necessarily to have amendments submitted to the Rules Committee. The committee of jurisdiction is the one that marks it up and they take a lot of give-and-take within the committee. That is how we break this down, we break this whole cumbersome process down so committees can work in specific ways.

It is after that process, when it goes to the floor, that Members should have an opportunity to submit whatever they wish. And there is no requirement, never has there been a requirement on something like that where they have to go to the Rules Committee and essentially ask permission to offer an amendment on the floor.

So with this rule, contrary to the promises your party made going into the election, this is a closed process. Only two amendments are made in order. So Members are denied an oppor-

tunity to offer their thoughts on the floor.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, every amendment that was offered was allowed. There was one amendment that was offered and withdrawn. That is the reason it is not being offered. There was no denial of any proposed amendment by anybody in this body, Republican or Democrat. The only requirement under the rule is that if somebody had an amendment to propose, they had to do it in a timely way.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, let me thank our leaders on the committee. This is a very important bill. It is most especially for me, because for the last 15 years that I have been here, I have been preaching about this. So I rise in strong support of H.R. 362 for 10,000 Teachers, 10 Million Minds Science and Math Scholarship Act.

The Committee on Science and Technology has worked to produce legislation to act upon the recommendations of the "Rising Above the Gathering Storm" report which was published by the National Academy of Sciences. This bill addresses the issues that they recommended to improve the quality and number of math and science teachers across the Nation.

Of particular interest to me is the Noyce teacher scholarship program. This program provides grants to universities to give scholarships to math, science and engineering students who become math and science teachers. Original law stated that for every 1 year the scholarship was awarded, new teachers must spend 2 years teaching in a high-needs school. This high-needs school requirement was softened by H.R. 362, but I am pleased that the chairman agreed to modify the bill in conference to restore incentives for teachers to serve in high-need schools. We are losing so many students because they are from poor communities.

The new design will provide more money per scholarship for students who agree to teach in underserved classrooms. This incentive will hopefully entice passionate and high-quality Noyce scholars to share their talents with students most in need.

I want to commend the chairman's sensitivity to the great disparities that exist in availability of highly qualified math and science teachers in schools across the country. As a matter of fact, in my district we have the number one high school in the country in this area, but not without a great deal of effort.

The subcommittee chair, where I was ranking member for about 6 years, Mr. BAIRD, and ranking member, Mr. GINGREY, of the Research and Science Education Subcommittee have been great advocates for lessening the achievement gap as well.

H.R. 362 also contains a laboratory science partnership pilot program that

I have worked on with Mr. HINOJOSA from Texas, and he has been a strong advocate because many of these schools don't have equipment. Overall, this legislation is designed to strengthen our Nation's scientific competitiveness by producing thousands of talented and well-educated math and science teachers. That is the only way we are going to remain competitive in this country. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 362.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, we have had a discussion on the structure of this rule, and I just want to ask this question of my friend from Vermont, and I will be more than happy to yield to him.

This bill will be debated on the floor later on this afternoon. Is it possible under this rule for any Member, Democratic or Republican Member, to come down and offer an amendment on this bill?

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. No.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Thank you for your honest response on that.

Madam Speaker, I make the point that this, therefore, is not an open rule as was presented by my friend in his remarks. This is a structured rule, and what has happened is very simply that Members not on the committee are not given the opportunity to try to improve this bill. With that, I oppose the rule.

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

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, this bill has received bipartisan support. There has been a slight argument here about the nature of a structured rule, but I have heard from the gentleman from Washington that there is broad support for the content of this bill. It is a step that is going to move this Nation ahead in the important areas of improving science, math, technology, and engineering.

It is absolutely crucial that our country remain competitive. It is a disgrace that we are 24th out of 29 countries as measured in our performance in K-12 instruction in these critical areas to our present economy.

So we support this bill and ask full support of the Members of the House of Representatives for its passage.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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