

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

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 389, nays 22, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 254]
YEAS—389

Abercrombie	Costello	Herger
Ackerman	Courtney	Herseth Sandlin
Aderholt	Cramer	Higgins
Akin	Crenshaw	Hill
Alexander	Crowley	Hinchey
Allen	Cuellar	Hinojosa
Altmire	Culberson	Hirono
Andrews	Cummings	Hobson
Arcuri	Davis (AL)	Hodes
Baca	Davis (CA)	Hoekstra
Bachmann	Davis (IL)	Holden
Bachus	Davis, David	Holt
Baird	Davis, Lincoln	Honda
Baker	Davis, Tom	Hooley
Baldwin	Deal (GA)	Hoyer
Barrow	DeFazio	Hulshof
Bartlett (MD)	DeGette	Hunter
Barton (TX)	Delahunt	Inglis (SC)
Bean	DeLauro	Inslee
Becerra	Dent	Israel
Berkley	Diaz-Balart, L.	Issa
Berman	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jackson (IL)
Berry	Dicks	Jackson-Lee
Biggert	Dingell	(TX)
Bilbray	Doggett	Jefferson
Bishop (GA)	Donnelly	Jindal
Bishop (NY)	Doolittle	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Doyle	Johnson (IL)
Blumenauer	Drake	Johnson, E. B.
Blunt	Dreier	Johnson, Sam
Boehner	Edwards	Jones (NC)
Bonner	Ehlers	Jones (OH)
Bono	Ellison	Jordan
Boozman	Ellsworth	Kagen
Boren	Emanuel	Kanjorski
Boswell	Emerson	Kaptur
Boustany	Engel	Keller
Boyd (FL)	English (PA)	Kildee
Boyd (KS)	Eshoo	Kilpatrick
Brady (TX)	Etheridge	Kind
Braley (IA)	Everett	Kingston
Brown (SC)	Fallin	Klein (FL)
Brown, Corrine	Feeney	Kline (MN)
Brown-Waite,	Ferguson	Knollenberg
Ginny	Filmer	Kucinich
Buchanan	Forbes	Kuhl (NY)
Burgess	Fortenberry	LaHood
Burton (IN)	Frank (MA)	Langevin
Butterfield	Frelinghuysen	Lantos
Calvert	Gallely	Larsen (WA)
Camp (MI)	Gerlach	Larson (CT)
Cantor	Giffords	Latham
Capito	Gilchrest	LaTourette
Capps	Gillibrand	Lee
Capuano	Gillmor	Levin
Cardoza	Gingrey	Lewis (CA)
Carnahan	Gonzalez	Lewis (GA)
Carney	Goode	Lewis (KY)
Carson	Goodlatte	Linder
Carter	Gordon	Lipinski
Castle	Granger	LoBiondo
Castor	Graves	Loebsack
Chabot	Green, Al	Lofgren, Zoe
Chandler	Green, Gene	Lowey
Clarke	Grijalva	Lucas
Clay	Gutierrez	Lungren, Daniel
Cleaver	Hall (NY)	E.
Clyburn	Hall (TX)	Lynch
Coble	Hare	Mahoney (FL)
Cohen	Harman	Maloney (NY)
Cole (OK)	Hastert	Marchant
Conyers	Hastings (WA)	Markey
Cooper	Hayes	Marshall
Costa	Heller	Matheson

Matsui	Platts	Smith (TX)
McCarthy (CA)	Pomeroy	Smith (WA)
McCarthy (NY)	Porter	Snyder
McCaul (TX)	Price (GA)	Solis
McCollum (MN)	Price (NC)	Souder
McCotter	Pryce (OH)	Space
McCrery	Putnam	Spratt
McDermott	Radanovich	Stark
McGovern	Rahall	Stearns
McHenry	Ramstad	Stupak
McHugh	Regula	Sullivan
McIntyre	Rehberg	Tanner
McKeon	Reichert	Tauscher
McMorris	Renzi	Taylor
Rodgers	Reyes	Terry
McNerney	Reynolds	Thompson (CA)
McNulty	Rodriguez	Thompson (MS)
Meehan	Rogers (AL)	Thornberry
Meek (FL)	Rogers (KY)	Tiahrt
Meeks (NY)	Rogers (MI)	Tiberi
Melancon	Rohrabacher	Tierney
Mica	Ros-Lehtinen	Towns
Michaud	Roskam	Turner
Miller (MI)	Ross	Udall (CO)
Miller (NC)	Rothman	Udall (NM)
Miller, Gary	Roybal-Allard	Upton
Miller, George	Royce	Van Hollen
Mitchell	Ruppersberger	Velázquez
Mollohan	Rush	Visclosky
Moore (KS)	Ryan (WI)	Walberg
Moore (WI)	Salazar	Walden (OR)
Moran (KS)	Sánchez, Linda	Walsh (NY)
Moran (VA)	T.	Walz (MN)
Murphy (CT)	Sanchez,	Wamp
Murphy,	Loretta	Wasserman
Patrick	Sarbanes	Schultz
Murphy, Tim	Saxton	Waters
Murtha	Schakowsky	Watson
Musgrave	Schiff	Watt
Nadler	Schmidt	Waxman
Napolitano	Schwartz	Weiner
Neal (MA)	Scott (GA)	Welch (VT)
Neugebauer	Scott (VA)	Weldon (FL)
Nunes	Sensenbrenner	Weller
Oberstar	Serrano	Wexler
Obey	Sessions	Whitfield
Oliver	Sestak	Wicker
Ortiz	Shays	Wilson (NM)
Pallone	Shea-Porter	Wilson (OH)
Pascrell	Sherman	Wilson (SC)
Pastor	Shimkus	Wolf
Payne	Shuler	Woolsey
Pearce	Shuster	Wu
Perlmutter	Simpson	Wynn
Peterson (MN)	Sires	Yarmuth
Peterson (PA)	Skelton	Young (AK)
Petri	Slaughter	Young (FL)
Pickering	Smith (NE)	
Pitts	Smith (NJ)	

NAYS—22

Barrett (SC)	Franks (AZ)	Paul
Blackburn	Garrett (NJ)	Pence
Campbell (CA)	Hensarling	Poe
Cannon	King (IA)	Sali
Conaway	Lamborn	Shadegg
Duncan	Mack	Tancredo
Flake	Manzullo	
Foxx	Miller (FL)	

NOT VOTING—21

Bilirakis	Farr	Kirk
Boucher	Fattah	Lampson
Brady (PA)	Fossella	Myrick
Buyer	Gohmert	Rangel
Cubin	Hastings (FL)	Ryan (OH)
Davis (KY)	Kennedy	Sutton
Davis, Jo Ann	King (NY)	Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1708

Mr. POE changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 254, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted as follows: on rollcall No. 245—“yes”; 246—“yes”; 247—“yes”; 248—“no”; 249—“no”; 250—“yes”; 251—“yes”; 252—“yes”; 253—“yes”; and 254—“yea”.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, unfortunately, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall votes Nos. 253 and 254.

I take my voting responsibility seriously, and if I had been present, I would have voted “yes” on rollcall No. 253 and “yes” on rollcall No. 254.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 363, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

SOWING THE SEEDS THROUGH SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING RESEARCH ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 318 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. 363.

□ 1710

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. 363) to authorize appropriations for basic research and research infrastructure in science and engineering, and for support of graduate fellowships, and for other purposes, with Mr. WATT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

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

(Mr. GORDON of Tennessee asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, we spent quite a bit of time on the last bill talking about “Rising above the Gathering Storm,” the report. It charts a course for continuing American prosperity in the decades to

come. I recommend that my colleagues heed the warning of this report and pursue policies to implement its four major policy recommendations.

One of those recommendations is to “sustain and strengthen the Nation’s traditional commitment to long-term basic research that has the potential to be transformational, to maintain the flow of new ideas that fuel the economy and provide security and enhance the quality of life.” The Gathering Storm report goes on to propose specific high-priority action items to realize this recommendation.

In this bill, H.R. 363, we have identified several of these action items that have broad bipartisan support. We call the bill the Sowing the Seeds Through Science and Engineering Act.

I want to thank my colleague, Mr. HALL from Texas, ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology, who helped craft the current version of this bill.

Six weeks ago, the committee voted unanimously to favorably report this bill. We have heard from such groups as The Business Roundtable and the Council of Competitiveness expressing their support for the bill. These organizations represent a broad spectrum of business interests, understand that new technology ideas are necessary for the U.S. prosperity in a global 21st century economy. In fact, some economists have estimated that half of the economic growth in the United States since World War II can be attributed to technological innovation. H.R. 363 is needed to prevent the United States from falling behind other nations whose national commitments to research are increasing, just as ours have been decreasing. The fear is not just about falling behind scientifically, it’s about falling behind economically.

The first two provisions of H.R. 363 focus on support for early-career scientists and engineers through grant programs at the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy. These grants will identify and support our best and brightest young researchers who are engaged in high-risk, high-reward research that is transformational or highly innovative. By focusing on young researchers, we promote new ideas and research on the frontiers of knowledge.

The bill also supports graduate student training grants for individuals interested in research areas relative to industry’s technological needs, establishes a Presidential Award for Innovation, creates a planning mechanism for maintaining the Nation’s major research facilities, authorizes the National Science Foundation to support research on innovation, directs reports on Federal efforts to recruit new scientists and engineers, identifies NASA as a key player in the national competitiveness policy.

This bill doesn’t merely seek to fund all of science, it focuses on fostering the most innovative elements of a scientific enterprise. It is through re-

search such as these that we lay a foundation for future of global economic competitiveness. In the future, a healthy scientific and technological enterprise spawns innovation, creating jobs that pay good wages and produces products that make our lives better.

□ 1715

We must pave the way to that future, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support what is essentially the second piece of the Science Committee’s innovation and competitiveness agenda package. I am pleased that this Congress continues to advance the innovation agenda that the President laid out 2 years ago.

Primarily, this bill enhances the Faculty Early Career Development Program at NSF to help researchers establish a lab and pursue risky research in emerging fields. It establishes a similar program at the Department of Energy. It also ensures that funding increases proportionately to the overall NSF budget for the Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship, which supports graduate students in cutting-edge interdisciplinary fields.

Again, most of this bill was part of a Republican-led effort in the last Congress to incorporate many of the suggestions and various innovation and competitiveness reports without necessarily reinventing the wheel to do so. While H.R. 363 is similar to what we did last year, it does have some additions that were never vetted at the committee level, and I have some concern with that process. I hope as we continue the reauthorization process for NSF, the chairman will work with me, as he always has and as he does, and we can thoughtfully pass good legislation as we move forward.

With specific regard to H.R. 363, I do thank the chairman for working with us to restore a few of the provisions that had been previously accepted by the committee, particularly in NIST report language and a sense of the Congress that NASA also has a role to play in United States innovation and competitiveness.

It is important, Mr. Chairman, that our Nation continue to lead the world in technological innovation. To that end, we should support legislation that advances basic science research at the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy. Research conducted by these young scholars will yield countless advantages. Americans understand that if we are to become energy independent, we will need solutions that promote clean, affordable and reliable American energy resources. That is why we introduced the competitiveness agenda last year and that is why I continue to support this

initiative. America’s solutions for the future begin today.

This is a good bill. I thank the chairman for helping make it a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 363.

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

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to absolutely concur with Mr. HALL in that we will work as a partnership as this bill works its way through. He has been a constructive partner, and I want to continue that partnership.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. GIFFORDS), a valued member of our committee.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you Ranking Member HALL.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 363, the Sowing the Seeds Through Science and Engineering Act. In 2005, a bipartisan group of congressional legislators came together and asked the National Academies for a list of the top 10 action items that policymakers must take in order to assure that America stays globally competitive.

Their report, which was reduced, called “Rising Above the Gathering Storm,” found that the U.S. would stand to lose our global competitiveness if we did not act immediately. One of their recommendations was to invest in research in an effort to “sustain and strengthen the Nation’s traditional commitment to long-term basic research that has the potential to be transformational to maintain the flow of new ideas that fuel the economy, provide security, and enhance the quality of life.” This bill does exactly that.

This legislation provides early-career awards for scientists and engineers at the National Science Foundation and at the Department of Energy. Young researchers and scientists can shift paradigms, break out of traditions, and think of new ideas within their field; and it is this outside-of-the-box thinking that we must promote.

The early-career awards in this bill awards young scientists for engaging in both high-risk, but also high-reward, research that is transformational and innovative.

This bill does not fund all science. This bill focuses on fostering the most innovative of elements in the scientific enterprise. With countries such as India and China becoming more and more competitive, we have to take every action possible to ensure that the United States of America stays globally competitive.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for bringing this bill forward. I am honored to be a sponsor.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I do rise today in strong support of

H.R. 363, the Sowing the Seeds Through Science and Engineering Research Act.

This legislation, just like H.R. 362 which we just passed, is a fantastic opportunity for bipartisanship to support math and science education in this country. Taken in combination with that bill, 10,000 Teachers, 10 Million Minds, we lay a crucial foundation in maintaining America's competitiveness worldwide.

The National Academies released a report entitled "Rising Above the Gathering Storm." It looked at ways in which the Federal Government could enhance our country's science and technology enterprise so we can continue to compete and prosper in this global marketplace. In addition to its recommendations with respect to K-12 education, the commission came to the conclusion that there is a general lack of research in science and engineering in America.

Our country must face the reality that China and India are making significant strides and pouring major resources into science and engineering. Therefore, in order to stay competitive, we need to not only encourage young students to get excited by the possibilities that exist with technology advances, but we also need to support young scientist research. Since younger scientists are more likely to do innovative and transformative work, it is in our country's best interest to ensure that these young scientists indeed have the support that they need.

Mr. Chairman, the Sowing the Seeds Through Science and Engineering Act offers rewards for younger students in order to encourage them to continue their work in the fields of science and engineering.

This legislation also strengthens Federal support for science and engineering researchers at the early stages of their career by expanding the Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship program at NSF, establishing a Presidential Innovation Award, and authorizing NSF to authorize research on innovation.

Again, I want to emphasize that I truly believe in order for our great Nation to remain competitive in the ever-advancing global marketplace, we need to sustain and strengthen our commitment to long-term basic research. This is research that has the potential to be transformational in maintaining the flow of new ideas that fuel our economy, provide security and enhance the quality of life for all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe this legislation is a great first step to address this impending crisis, both in America's workforce and our country's research institutions, and I am proud to support the bill, and I ask all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Chairman, before I conclude, and hopefully I will not run out of time, but I did want to at this point say that as much as I am for this bill, I have to oppose one of the amendments that is going to be offered by the gentlelady

from New York, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the Gillibrand amendment. It is duplicative. We already do that under the Department of Education in regard to providing scholarships, merit scholarships for advanced students in our high schools. We already do that through the Department of Education, and it is a very well-funded program.

But more importantly, Mr. Chairman, the reason I am opposed to the amendment, in a way it contradicts what we just did in H.R. 362, where we said we will give these grants to these students to encourage them to study and pursue math and science and engineering types of advanced degrees in college with a payback, a two-for-one payback if they go into the teaching profession in a community where we have that great need for outstanding math and science teachers.

With that, Mr. Chairman, again, I support the bill. I am opposed to the Gillibrand amendment for the reasons outlined.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, let me thank my friend, Dr. GINGREY, for his support for this good bipartisan bill, and I yield 2 minutes to another active member of our committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong bipartisan support of H.R. 363, Sowing the Seeds Through Science and Engineering Research. Before my election to Congress, I spent my entire academic and professional career as a scientist, as a mathematician and an engineer.

I was particularly concerned when I read the sobering conclusions of the National Academies' "Rising Above the Gathering Storm" about America's declining competitiveness in a science and technology-based global economy. The report calls for an immediate action to maintain America's competitive advantage, and I agree with those recommendations.

We are already moving forward to carry out some of the report's recommendations in an effort to renew interest in scientific development. H.R. 363 will provide grants to support young researchers in the early stages of their careers to engage in the high-risk, high-reward innovative research that challenges existing assumptions. The bill also establishes a Presidential Innovation Award to stimulate scientific and engineering advances in the public interest.

As a Nation, we face many daunting and almost overwhelming challenges, the solutions to which will require serious and dedicated scientific research. Conclusive research can take years, so we must work now to inspire today's students and researchers to take up such scientific pursuits. This bill provides just the right kind of specific incentives to compel young researchers to do the kind of pioneering and groundbreaking research that will yield dividends for the public interest.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support this bill and thank Chairman GORDON and Ranking Member HALL, a fellow Texan, for their hard work and leadership on this issue.

I think we can all agree on the importance of ensuring America is competitive in science and engineering. As the National Academy of Sciences report "Rising Above the Gathering Storm" warned, this country is in danger of losing its leadership role in these fields.

Last year I sponsored the Research For Competitiveness Act to address this issue. Unfortunately, that legislation did not come to the floor of the House after being passed by the Science Committee. However, I am pleased in this Congress in a bipartisan fashion to note that H.R. 363 incorporates sections from last year's bill that establish early-career grants for young scientists and engineers. These grants will encourage scientists and engineers in the early stages of their academic careers to establish innovative lines of research. This approach continues the successful model of partnership between the Federal Government and America's universities.

As you know, many of the technologies we enjoy today, such as breakthroughs that enabled e-commerce to become a reality in the 1990s, are based on research initially conducted at universities like the University of Texas in my hometown of Austin.

When we fund programs such as these, we are investing in minds and helping create the next generation of America's high-tech workforce. Therefore, I strongly support this legislation and urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. MCCAUL for his support for this good bipartisan bill, and I yield 3 minutes to another Texan (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), who is an active member of the Science and Technology Committee.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, thank you for our committee leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 363, the Sowing the Seeds Through Science and Engineering Research Act. This legislation was based on policy recommendations from the "Rising Above the Gathering Storm" report to Congress by the National Academy of Sciences.

One of the greatest challenges new researchers face is getting grant funding for their research. In Dallas, the University of Texas Southwest Medical School has four Nobel laureates, where they earned them right there, and UT-Dallas has at least one. Baylor University and others are stellar research institutions, and they compete at the national level for grants and perform award-winning scientific research.

□ 1730

These universities depend on Federal research funding.

When new faculty are hired at research universities in Texas and elsewhere, they are expected to be able to write grant proposals and successfully win funding from Federal agencies such as the National Institutes of Health, National Science Foundation, Department of Energy, and others.

According to NIH, the average age at which the investigator first obtains RO1 major grant funding is age 42. If students are earning Ph.D.s in their late twenties, that means there are many years of struggle before they can establish themselves and eventually become full professors at these universities.

As a result, many scientists have dropped out of science. It is too hard to get funding. The stress level is too high.

Mr. Chairman, grant support targeted at new investigators is an important step toward resolving this problem. If Congress would fund Federal research as vigorously as our competitors overseas are doing, we wouldn't have such a problem.

H.R. 363 targets young investigator grant support at the National Science Foundation, Department of Energy, and other scientific research agencies under the purview of the Committee on Science and technology.

This is a good bill and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise with pleasure to support this bill.

The National Science Foundation for years has been one of the primary sources of research funding for outstanding research in this Nation. In addition, the Department of Energy Office of Science has been a leader in certain areas, particularly high energy or particle physics, but also in a number of other physics areas, including the high energy light sources such as we have at Berkeley and a few other labs.

I strongly support these programs, but a difficulty that has developed over the past few years is that we have some early career researchers, some young people just entering the field, and they really have difficulty obtaining funding because the tendency of the reviewers at the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy Office of Science is to say well, we have this group of very well-known good researchers. We know their backgrounds and we know they can produce and how well they can do; we should just give them the money because we don't know for sure about the early researchers. Now, I don't think they actually say that, but, unfortunately, I think it is in the back of the minds of the peer review folks as they consider proposals.

I experienced this personally with my son, who as a young scientist had trou-

ble breaking into the field and had a number of proposals denied before he finally received funding. Even though he had made some national strides and was well-known in the field, yet it was difficult to get the funding.

These programs will be very, very helpful to support the early career researchers. But there is another aspect about which we need some new thinking and some change, and that is the fact that more and more science is becoming interdisciplinary, where you may have biology and physics, or biophysics; and you have relationships between biology and chemistry or chemistry and physics. You can go on and on. There are all sorts of different variations. Sometimes you may need five or six different disciplines represented in the research program to really cover all of the aspects of the research. When you submit a proposal, usually you are required to specify one field and if you specify interdisciplinary, sometimes the other fields are not adequately represented on the peer review panel.

I admit these are perhaps exceptions; but, nevertheless, we have to make sure that all of these bright young scientists or those wishing to branch out into another discipline, for example, having a very good background in physics and deciding they can really do some good work in biophysics. So we need to take account of that, and this bill will provide that within both the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy.

I strongly support this bill. I believe both agencies, I know NSF supports it, and I am sure that the Department of Energy Office of Science also supports this bill because they have also noted the need for these changes.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I thank Dr. EHLERS for his support for this bill, and his help in bringing it to the floor today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Science.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend and chairman.

This is a good day for science and research, and that means it is a good day for the United States of America and for our economic prosperity and for our children's future.

As Chair of the Research and Science Subcommittee, I rise today in support of H.R. 363, the Sowing the Seeds Through Science and Engineering Act, and I want to commend Chairman GORDON for his strong leadership on this bill that we are considering now, and on the one that passed earlier today.

I share Chairman GORDON's absolute commitment and belief that we must take bold steps now to ensure that American students and workers are prepared for the careers of the future and so our Nation is equipped to compete in the global economy.

To accomplish this, however, we must make sure our young scientists receive the support they need. That is

why, as many of our prior speakers have pointed out, it is critically important to invest in the minds of young researchers now, because not only are they highly productive, but one day they will fill the ranks of our senior established and groundbreaking scientists on which our country's economy, competitiveness, and indeed our national security depend.

That is why I am so pleased we are considering H.R. 363 today. The bill will ensure continued innovation by supporting outstanding researchers in early career stages, and ensuring that graduate students in research fields of particular importance to our future competitiveness receive adequate funding. I also share Ranking Member EHLERS' commitment to the importance of interdisciplinary scientific studies which he so well articulated.

This bill and the one before it that we considered already and passed today, are critically important to the future prosperity of our country. I share Chairman GORDON's commitment to them, and I urge passage.

I also would like to take this opportunity briefly to express support for the amendment soon to be offered by Mrs. GILLIBRAND of New York. Her amendment will require the National Science Foundation to institute a program to award scholarships in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics to undergraduate scholars. As a former teacher of undergraduate scholars and researchers, I know how important this stage is to career development and I support her commitment to it, applaud her offering the amendment. I urge passage of that, as well as final passage of the bill.

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

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Science Committee, as well as the ranking member. We have had a long and I like to think of it as a productive relationship, and it is an honor to come and acknowledge that we are finally listening to the voices of the 21st century.

I want to hold up this document that claims the 110th Congress is a Congress that will move the innovation agenda. As a former member of the Science Committee I remember, as the century turned in 2000, listening to CEOs who indicated the crisis in both teaching, understanding and creative in math, science and technology.

Let me rise and belatedly say I have certainly supported the last legislative initiative dealing with 10,000 Teachers, 10 Million Minds that we just passed, and I am delighted to be able to support the Sowing the Seeds Through Science and Engineering Research Act of 2007 and to say this: Science is in fact the work of the 21st century, but we are falling behind.

We don't need to hear the statistics again of how many engineers China graduates, for example, compared to the United States. This workforce cannot be prepared for the 21st century without actual investment by this country, and understanding that without researchers and scientists and engineers, we do not create work.

Clearly, even though these might be considered *passee* and simple, but the light bulb, the typewriter, the car, all innovative aspects of our work, the airplane, created eons and years and decades of work.

This legislation in particular provides an opportunity for research, and the amendment provides an opportunity for research for undergraduate scholars.

At Texas Southern University, we have a transportation study program. It has a pharmacy school, all small aspects of science. It has a solar energy project that I was proud to take Members of Congress to in 2001.

There are budding opportunities all over America, but what must we do to ensure that it works? We have to invest and provide the resources. We have to encourage not only students, but teachers, and then researchers that their work is valued. NASA and our move to the moon all concentrate on having those who will be researchers, technologists, readers of software, and yes, we hope, astronauts.

I applaud this legislation for what it does for engineers and scientists and physicians who are pioneers of the work of the 20th century and now can be pioneers of the work of the 21st century.

I believe that we have a step further to go. We need geologists. As we look at global warming, we must find ways to be efficient in the securing of energy, balancing what we call the resources of the ground as well as nuclear as well as solar.

I think this is an outstanding bill, and I ask my colleagues to support it. I thank the distinguished chairman.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 363, the "Sowing the Seeds Through Science and Engineering Research Act," of which I am proud to be a cosponsor. This bill is the second component of the new Democratic majority's Innovation Agenda, which is designed to make our nation more able to compete successfully in the global economy.

Mr. Chairman, it is essential that we invest in a workforce ready for global competition by creating a new generation of innovators and make a sustained commitment to federal research and development. We need to spur and expand affordable access to broadband, achieve energy independence, and provide small business with tools to encourage entrepreneurial innovation. H.R. 363 a critical first step.

Charles Drew, Benjamin Banneker, Clarence Elder, and David Crosthwait, Jr. are only a few of the names associated with great American scientific history. These engineers, scientist, and physicians were pioneers in their respective fields, and have touched all our lives in ways that we probably never consider.

Whether it is enjoying the comfortable atmosphere of Radio City Music hall, navigating the streets of Washington, DC, or having a loved one receive a blood transfusion these men have all made significant contributions to America and the world. Yet, the beautiful thing about science is its' evolutionary nature. Innovation never sleeps, and great minds are always at work.

Therefore to continue the legacy of these great men, and to ensure that America is at the forefront of new technological and scientific discoveries, I rise in support of H.R. 363. Representing Houston, I realize the importance of institutions like NASA and the sense of national pride that NASA can produce when they are leading the global effort in advancing science and technology.

Mr. Chairman, according to the National Academies, the most important thing we can do for our future economic health is to increase the nation's expertise in science, technology, math, and engineering. H.R. 363 represents a critical down-payment toward achieving this goal. Therefore, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I just quickly yield myself the balance of my time to say this truly has been a collaborative, bipartisan effort. I thank Mr. HALL and his very able staff. We have worked together. We have a good bill, and we need to pass this bill.

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Chairman, tonight the House took a critical step in the effort to ensure that America remains at the leading edge of the global economy by passing H.R. 363, the Sowing the Seeds Through Science and Engineering Act. The provisions in the bill, including expanded grants through the National Science Foundation and Department of Energy for early career researchers, support for research in fields of national importance, and government recruitment of young scientists build on the recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences and will help to rebuild our knowledge infrastructure. By doing so, the legislation will help America maintain its leadership in scientific research and allow American innovators to strengthen our economy by finding solutions to achieve energy independence, greater environmental protection, the development of new medical treatments, and a host of other goals. It is for these reasons that I voted to support H.R. 363.

However, I am deeply opposed to language, added to the bill through a motion to recommit, that prioritizes support for research into advanced nuclear reprocessing. Although supporters of nuclear power have renewed their efforts to increase America's reliance on nuclear power, the reality is that there are significant safety and environmental concerns associated with nuclear energy. The storage of spent nuclear fuel is a growing problem facing individual power plants and communities throughout the nation. At the Indian Point Energy Center, there is an ongoing leak of radioactive material from spent fuel pools into the Hudson River, and throughout the country communities that host nuclear facilities are being forced to contemplate the cleanup and security costs associated with the storage of nuclear waste.

We must also clearly understand that, at a time when nuclear terrorism is one of the greatest threats facing our nation, the process used to recycle spent fuel would create a significant proliferation risk by resulting in the production of plutonium that can be used in nuclear weapons. The language prioritizing support for a technology that threatens to damage our environment and undermine our national security is misguided, and tarnishes an otherwise laudable piece of legislation. I am hopeful that this language will not be included in the conference report.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Sowing the Seeds Through Science and Engineering Research Act. Taking its name from the sixth chapter of the National Academies Report "Rising Above the Gathering Storm," H.R. 363 is part of an ambitious legislative portfolio that is part of the Innovation Agenda. I was proud to help craft the Innovation Agenda, on which our nation is dependent for its future prosperity.

Fifty thousand people hold postdoctoral appointments in the United States. In 1999, postdocs were 43% of the first authors in articles in the prestigious journal *Science*. Postdoctoral appointments are temporary by design and are compensated poorly. Postdocs are generally motivated by the idea of becoming professors, a goal to which three quarters of postdocs aspire. However, only 20 percent will attain faculty positions. This had led to an increasingly dramatic and problematic holding pattern which could select more for flexibility and perseverance than for talent and performance.

As science funding has become tighter, it's become more difficult for postdocs to find permanent academic positions and to remain in science. The availability of positions is entirely dependent on the likelihood of a new professor finding funding. As of 2002, the median age at which one receives a first NIH grant as a primary investigator is 42. In 1981, the median age was 35. In the biological sciences, in 1980, researchers under 40 years old received more than half of all competitive research grants. By 2003, this had fallen to less than 17 percent. At NSF, the funding rates for first-time grant recipients fell from 25 percent in 2000 to 17 percent in 2004.

H.R. 363 addresses this problem by setting aside funds specifically for early career researchers, which are defined as assistant professors or the equivalent thereof. Assistant professor is the role to which most postdocs aspire as their next step. It is one step short of having a tenured, permanent position in a research institution. H.R. 363 also requires DOE and NIST to report on how they are doing with recruitment and retention of early career engineers and scientists.

H.R. 363 supports the early career part of the science and technology professional pipeline in other ways, as well. The act requires NSF to set aside at least 1.5 percent of funds appropriated for research and related activities to the Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship (IGERT) program and permits the NSF to research the process of innovation and the teaching of inventiveness.

At present, the United States research infrastructure is deficient. In 2001, more than 60 percent of the Department of Energy Office of Science lab space was over 30 years old. This requires \$2 billion to correct. In 1998, the NSF estimated that \$11.4 billion were needed to

renovate U.S. academic research facilities. In 2001, the NIH estimated \$5.6 billion in health research infrastructure needs.

This problem is in part caused by a 26 percent cap on reimbursement to universities from research grants for infrastructure costs. Since this cap was created in 1991, universities have been unable to find sufficient sources of funding to keep their scientific facilities competitive or, in some cases, adequate. At the same time, they are using these facilities to attempt to compete internationally for scientists.

H.R. 363 addresses this problem by instructing the Office of Science and Technology Policy to create a National Coordination Office for Research Infrastructure. This office would prioritize deficiencies in research facilities at universities and national labs and then work to coordinate a response to these deficiencies.

I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution. Without its reforms to our research infrastructure and science talent pipeline we will continue to deteriorate.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 363, the Sowing the Seeds Through Science and Engineering Research Act.

I first want to thank Chairman GORDON for his leadership on the important issue of innovation, and commend our Committee's work towards investing in our research communities.

This past August, I invited Chairman GORDON to join me in a panel to discuss the subject of Innovation back in St. Louis. The Event was a tremendous success and sparked a conversation about competitiveness, STEM education and innovation that still continues with enthusiasm in St. Louis.

While this is an issue that warrants much discussion, the time has come for bold action. Unfortunately, our nation's standing as the global leader in science and technology has slipped in recent years.

H.R. 363 will counteract this worrying trend by investing in long-term scientific research and encouraging young scientists and researchers to pursue high-risk and high-reward research.

Specifically, the bill administers awards to outstanding early-career researchers in academia and in nonprofit research organizations, provides graduate research assistantships in areas of national need and establishes a national coordination office to prioritize university and national research infrastructure needs. By investing in our young researchers, we invest in the ideas that will shape our country's future.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill to advance our nation's status as a leader in the global economy.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 363, the Sowing the Seeds through Science and Engineering Research Act.

The bill authorizes appropriations for basic research in science and engineering, and provides support of graduate fellowships, as well as research grants, to scientists and engineers in the early phases of their careers.

As a member of the Science and Technology Committee, I commend Chairman GORDON for crafting this important legislation and bringing it to the House floor today.

We must take bold steps now to insure that American students and workers are prepared

for the careers of the future and that our nation is equipped to compete in the global economy.

The bill is based on the recommendations of the National Academies' widely-acknowledged "Rising Above the Gathering Storm" report, which found that the U.S. stands to lose its competitive edge in the international economy unless immediate action is taken.

Statistics show that U.S. 12th-grade students performed below the international average of 21 countries on a test of general knowledge of math and science.

In 2004, America graduated 70,000 engineers, while China turned out 10 times as many.

We know that American high-tech companies often look abroad for workers who are willing to work for less pay.

I am very concerned about the issue of offshoring and outsourcing, and it troubles me when companies say they need to go overseas just to find employees who are skilled in math and science.

I believe there is a clear link between offshoring and outsourcing and how these trends relate to future employment opportunities and career choices of students in the science and engineering fields.

I believe we have to raise awareness of this issue and work together in a bipartisan manner in order to keep high-wage science and engineering jobs here in the U.S. and maintain our competitive edge.

H.R. 363 puts us on the right path and demonstrates our commitment to strengthening our science, technology, engineering, and mathematics educational programs in order to produce a skilled and knowledgeable workforce here at home.

Maintaining U.S. innovation and leadership demands hard work and investment. While there are no quick fixes, we can take steps, like H.R. 363, now to accomplish these important goals.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, today we are considering several bills to implement the Innovation Agenda including H.R. 363, the Sowing the Seeds Through Science and Engineering Research Act.

In February I was pleased to support this legislation in Committee. H.R. 363 provides merit-based grants for researchers early in their careers, establishes a Presidential innovation award, and creates a national office to identify, prioritize, and coordinate research infrastructure needs at universities and national laboratories.

America needs innovators and leaders if we want to remain competitive in the global economy. This is especially true when it comes to science and engineering.

Retaining scientists and engineers, however, is often difficult, because they receive such low pay early-on in their careers.

If we don't invest early in our future innovators, we will fall behind.

H.R. 363 supports an important goal and I look forward to its passage today.

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 363, a piece of legislation that is desperately needed to enhance tomorrow's scientific research.

We all know what it's like to start out on our own—the uncertainty of your financial footing, but with great faith in yourself and your ideas.

Imagine that feeling on an exponential scale and that might be how a young, talented researcher feels as they work on a cure for autism, or traumatic brain injury for our troops, or a new source of cleaner, renewable energy.

The field of research is high-risk and high-yield, and the federal government is right to invest in research that benefits us all. H.R. 363 will help "sustain and strengthen the nation's traditional commitment to long-term basic research . . . to maintain the flow of new ideas that fuel the economy, provide security, and enhance the quality of life," as prescribed by the National Academies report, *Rising Above the Gathering Storm*, that has been the focus of our work in the Science and Technology Committee, and mentioned many times today.

Young researchers are the key to innovation, as they are more likely than established researchers to shift paradigms, break with tradition, or bring new ideas to a discipline or to a combination of disciplines. The early-career awards outlined in this bill reward young researchers for engaging in high-risk/high-reward research that is likely to be transformative or highly innovative. The establishment of a presidential innovation award is designed to identify and recognize people who develop the unique scientific and engineering innovations in the national interest at the time they occur. This bill doesn't simply seek to fund all science; it focuses on fostering the most innovative elements of the scientific enterprise.

I would also like to thank Chairman GORDON, as well as Ranking Member HALL, on their hard work on this legislation, and the bipartisan manner in which the Science and Technology Committee is run to produce such substantial legislation.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the 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 amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 363

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 "Sowing the Seeds Through Science and Engineering Research Act".

SEC. 2. NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION EARLY CAREER AWARDS FOR SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING RESEARCHERS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall carry out a program to award grants to scientists and engineers at the early stage of their careers at institutions of higher education and organizations described in subsection (c)(2) to conduct research in fields relevant to the mission of the Foundation. The existing Faculty Early Career Development (CA-REER) Program may be designated as the mechanism for awarding such grants.

(b) *SIZE AND DURATION OF AWARD.*—The duration of awards under this section shall be 5 years, and the amount per year shall be at least \$80,000.

(c) *ELIGIBILITY.*—Award recipients shall be individuals who are employed in a tenure-track

position as an assistant professor or equivalent title, or who hold an equivalent position, at—

(1) an institution of higher education in the United States; or

(2) an organization in the United States that is a nonprofit, nondegree-granting research organization such as a museum, observatory, or research laboratory.

(d) **SELECTION.**—Award recipients shall be selected on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis.

(e) **SELECTION PROCESS AND CRITERIA FOR AWARDS.**—An applicant seeking funding under this section shall submit a proposal to the Director at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Director may require. In evaluating the proposals submitted under this section, the Director shall consider, at a minimum—

(1) the intellectual merit of the proposed work;

(2) the innovative or transformative nature of the proposed research;

(3) the extent to which the proposal integrates research and education, including undergraduate education in science and engineering disciplines; and

(4) the potential of the applicant for leadership at the frontiers of knowledge.

(f) **AWARDS.**—In awarding grants under this section, the Director shall endeavor to ensure that the recipients are from a variety of types of institutions of higher education and nonprofit, nondegree-granting research organizations. In support of this goal, the Director shall broadly disseminate information about when and how to apply for grants under this section, including by conducting outreach to Historically Black Colleges and Universities that are part B institutions as defined in section 322(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1061(2)) and minority institutions (as defined in section 365(3) of that Act (20 U.S.C. 1067k(3))).

(g) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.**—For each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2012, the Director shall allocate at least 3.5 percent of funds appropriated to the National Science Foundation for Research and Related Activities to the grants program under this section.

(h) **REPORT.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall transmit to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report describing the distribution of the institutions from which individuals have participated in the Faculty Early Career Development Program since fiscal year 2001 among each of the categories of institutions of higher education defined by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the organizations in subsection (c)(2).

(i) **EVALUATION.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall transmit to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report evaluating the impact of the program carried out under this section on the ability of young faculty to compete for National Science Foundation research grants.

SEC. 3. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY EARLY CAREER AWARDS FOR SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING RESEARCHERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the Office of Science of the Department of Energy shall carry out a program to award grants to scientists and engineers at the early stage of their careers at institutions of higher education and organizations described in subsection (c)(2) to conduct research in fields relevant to the mission of the Department.

(b) **SIZE AND DURATION OF AWARD.**—The duration of awards under this section shall be up to 5 years, and the amount per year shall be at least \$80,000.

(c) **ELIGIBILITY.**—Award recipients shall be individuals who are employed in a tenure-track

position as an assistant professor or equivalent title, or who hold an equivalent position, at—

(1) an institution of higher education in the United States; or

(2) an organization in the United States that is a nonprofit, nondegree-granting research organization such as a museum, observatory, or research laboratory.

(d) **SELECTION.**—Award recipients shall be selected on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis.

(e) **SELECTION PROCESS AND CRITERIA FOR AWARDS.**—An applicant seeking funding under this section shall submit a proposal to the Director of the Office of Science at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Director may require. In evaluating the proposals submitted under this section, the Director shall consider, at a minimum—

(1) the intellectual merit of the proposed work;

(2) the innovative or transformative nature of the proposed research;

(3) the extent to which the proposal integrates research and education, including undergraduate education in science and engineering disciplines; and

(4) the potential of the applicant for leadership at the frontiers of knowledge.

(f) **COLLABORATION WITH NATIONAL LABORATORIES.**—In awarding grants under this section, the Director shall give priority to proposals in which the proposed work includes collaboration with the Department of Energy National Laboratories.

(g) **AWARDS.**—In awarding grants under this section, the Director shall endeavor to ensure that the recipients are from a variety of types of institutions of higher education and nonprofit, nondegree-granting research organizations. In support of this goal, the Director shall broadly disseminate information about when and how to apply for grants under this section, including by conducting outreach to Historically Black Colleges and Universities that are part B institutions as defined in section 322(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1061(2)) and minority institutions (as defined in section 365(3) of that Act (20 U.S.C. 1067k(3))).

(h) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Energy to carry out the Director's responsibilities under this section \$25,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2012.

(i) **REPORT ON RECRUITING AND RETAINING EARLY CAREER SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING RESEARCHERS AT THE NATIONAL LABORATORIES.**—Not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Science shall transmit to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on efforts to recruit and retain young scientists and engineers at the early stages of their careers at the Department of Energy National Laboratories. The report shall include—

(1) a description of Department of Energy and National Laboratory policies and procedures, including financial incentives, awards, promotions, time set aside for independent research, access to equipment or facilities, and other forms of recognition, designed to attract and retain young scientists and engineers;

(2) an evaluation of the impact of these incentives on the careers of young scientists and engineers at Department of Energy National Laboratories, and also on the quality of the research at the National Laboratories and in Department of Energy programs;

(3) a description of what barriers, if any, exist to efforts to recruit and retain young scientists and engineers, including limited availability of full time equivalent positions, legal and procedural requirements, and pay grading systems; and

(4) the amount of funding devoted to efforts to recruit and retain young researchers and the source of such funds.

SEC. 4. INTEGRATIVE GRADUATE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH TRAINEESHIP PROGRAM.

(a) **FUNDING.**—For each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2012, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall allocate at least 1.5 percent of funds appropriated for Research and Related Activities to the Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship program.

(b) **COORDINATION.**—The Director shall coordinate with Federal departments and agencies, as appropriate, to expand the interdisciplinary nature of the Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship program.

(c) **AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT FUNDS FROM OTHER AGENCIES.**—The Director is authorized to accept funds from other Federal departments and agencies to carry out the Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship program.

SEC. 5. PRESIDENTIAL INNOVATION AWARD.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The President shall periodically present the Presidential Innovation Award, on the basis of recommendations received from the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy or on the basis of such other information as the President considers appropriate, to individuals who develop one or more unique scientific or engineering ideas in the national interest at the time the innovation occurs.

(b) **PURPOSE.**—The awards under this section shall be made to—

(1) stimulate scientific and engineering advances in the national interest;

(2) illustrate the linkage between science and engineering and national needs; and

(3) provide an example to students of the contribution they could make to society by entering the science and engineering profession.

(c) **CITIZENSHIP.**—An individual is not eligible to receive the award under this section unless at the time such award is made the individual—

(1) is a citizen or other national of the United States; or

(2) is an alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence who—

(A) has filed an application for naturalization in the manner prescribed by section 334 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1445); and

(B) is not permanently ineligible to become a citizen of the United States.

(d) **PRESENTATION.**—The presentation of the award shall be made by the President with such ceremonies as he may deem proper, including attendance by appropriate Members of Congress.

SEC. 6. NATIONAL COORDINATION OFFICE FOR RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Office of Science and Technology Policy shall establish a National Coordination Office for Research Infrastructure. Such Office shall—

(1) identify and prioritize the deficiencies in research facilities and major instrumentation located at academic institutions and at national laboratories that are available for use by academic researchers; and

(2) institute and coordinate the planning by Federal agencies for the acquisition, refurbishment, and maintenance of research facilities and major instrumentation required to address the deficiencies identified under paragraph (1).

In prioritizing the deficiencies identified under paragraph (1), the Office shall consider research needs in areas relevant to the Nation's economic competitiveness.

(b) **STAFFING.**—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall appoint individuals to serve in the Office established under subsection (a) from among the principal Federal agencies that support research in the sciences, mathematics, and engineering, and shall at a minimum include individuals from the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy.

(c) *REPORT.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall provide annually a report to Congress at the time of the President's budget proposal—*

(1) *describing the research infrastructure needs identified in accordance with subsection (a);*

(2) *listing research facilities projects and budget proposals, by agency, for major instrumentation acquisitions that are included in the President's budget proposal; and*

(3) *explaining how these facilities projects and instrumentation acquisitions relate to the deficiencies and priorities arrived at in accordance with subsection (a).*

SEC. 7. RESEARCH ON INNOVATION AND INVENTIVENESS.

In carrying out its research programs on science policy and on the science of learning, the National Science Foundation may support research on the process of innovation and the teaching of inventiveness.

SEC. 8. REPORT ON NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY EFFORTS TO RECRUIT AND RETAIN EARLY CAREER SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING RESEARCHERS.

Not later than 3 months 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 and Technology of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on efforts to recruit and retain young scientists and engineers at the early stages of their careers at the National Institute of Standards and Technology laboratories and joint institutes. The report shall include—

(1) *a description of National Institute of Standards and Technology policies and procedures, including financial incentives, awards, promotions, time set aside for independent research, access to equipment or facilities, and other forms of recognition, designed to attract and retain young scientists and engineers;*

(2) *an evaluation of the impact of these incentives on the careers of young scientists and engineers at the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and also on the quality of the research at the National Institute of Standards and Technology's laboratories and in the National Institute of Standards and Technology's programs;*

(3) *a description of what barriers, if any, exist to efforts to recruit and retain young scientists and engineers, including limited availability of full time equivalent positions, legal and procedural requirements, and pay grading systems; and*

(4) *the amount of funding devoted to efforts to recruit and retain young researchers and the source of such funds.*

SEC. 9. NASA'S CONTRIBUTION TO INNOVATION.

(a) *SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—*

(1) *a balanced science program as authorized by section 101(d) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-155) contributes significantly to innovation in and the economic competitiveness of the United States; and*

(2) *a robust National Aeronautics and Space Administration, funded at the levels authorized under sections 202 and 203 of that Act, would offer a balance among science, aeronautics, exploration, and human space flight programs, all of which can attract and employ scientists, engineers, and technicians across a broad range of fields in science, technology, mathematics, and engineering.*

(b) *PARTICIPATION IN INNOVATION AND COMPETITIVENESS PROGRAMS.—The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall fully participate in any interagency efforts to promote innovation and economic competitiveness through scientific research and development within the spending levels cited in subsection (a).*

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to authorize programs for support of the early career development of science and engineering researchers, and for support of graduate fellowships, and for other purposes."

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the committee amendment is in order except those printed in House Report 110-99. 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 of the amendment, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HALL OF TEXAS

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 110-99.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. 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. HALL of Texas:

Page 4, line 15, insert " , except to the extent that a sufficient number of meritorious grant applications have not been received for a fiscal year" after "under this section".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 318, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to encourage my colleagues to support my amendment. One of the key elements of this bill is a grant program at NSF designed to help scientists and engineers at early stages of their careers at institutions of higher learning.

Eligible applicants are tenure-track faculty, and allow the existing faculty early career development program to be designed and designated as the mechanism for awarding such grants that we are talking about here.

We also require the director of the NSF to allocate at least 3.5 percent of funds appropriated to the NSF research and related activities account for the purposes in the bill.

This amendment would modify the 3.5 percent allocation provision to include the following clause: "except to the extent that a sufficient number of meritorious grant applications have not been received for a fiscal year."

I did this out of concern that the bill required the allocation of 3.5 percent of the funds appropriated to the earlier career awards for science and engineering, without taking into account there may be years in which there are not sufficient meritorious grant applications in that area and NSF could use the funds more effectively maybe in another area.

I hope my good friend, Chairman GORDON, and my colleagues will join me in support of this amendment.

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

□ 1745

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this is a good amendment and a thoughtful amendment and I recommend its passage.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman, and I thank the distinguished ranking member.

If I might inquire of Mr. HALL, your amendment does not cut funds, it just refines the use? That is what I was trying to understand. Does your amendment cut funds?

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. No, absolutely not.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. It just sends it back if they are not utilized?

Mr. HALL of Texas. Yes. It really provides a way for them to use the funds in other areas if they are not used up.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Reprogrammed?

Mr. HALL of Texas. Yes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Let me thank you. I know this is not in the bill, but I just wanted to mention a school district I have been working with where I tried to draw in private interests in helping with math and science labs.

I know that as you look at the Innovation Agenda, I want to make sure we do not frighten away the private financiers as well. This happens to be a large energy company, and I am going to openly say to them, I hope you have not abandoned the commitment to the North Forest Independent School District where we were committed to science labs and math labs and math scholar teachers. So it is tracking the same innovativeness of this particular bill, and I think we can work together as a partner.

I want to support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ms. JACKSON-LEE for her addition to this informational session here; and once again, let me say that I think Mr. HALL has a good amendment, and I support that amendment.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. TAUSCHER

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 110-99.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. 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 Mrs. TAUSCHER:

Page 4, line 10, insert "In awarding grants under this section, the Director shall give special consideration to eligible early-career researchers who have followed alternative career paths such as working part-time or in nonacademic settings, or who have taken a significant career break or other leave of absence." after "(20 U.S.C. 1067k(3))."

Page 10, line 9, strike "needs; and" and insert "needs;".

Page 10, line 10, redesignate paragraph (3) as paragraph (4).

Page 10, after line 9, insert the following new paragraph:

(3) show the potential of such innovation to substantively enhance the economic competitiveness of the United States through development of commercializable intellectual property; and

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 318, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend Chairman GORDON for reporting these two critical bills out of the Science Committee, one focused on math and science education and the second on science and engineering.

Taken together, these two bills are a critical step toward restoring our American technological base as well as giving students, engineers, and researchers the tools they need to compete in a global economy.

And they are a great way to kick off the Innovation Agenda, an effort that is vital to America's competitiveness, economy and security, and an effort the New Democrat Coalition, which I chair, is proud to be leading.

I am very proud to offer a bipartisan amendment with my good friend, Congresswoman JUDY BIGGERT of the Science Committee. Our amendment would expand eligibility for National Science Foundation Early Career Awards to thousands of scientists and engineers previously deemed ineligible. These men and women have followed alternative career paths such as working part-time or in non-academic settings, or have taken a significant career break or other leave of absence.

In particular, our amendment would level the playing field for women scientists who have taken maternity leaves, and for all scientists and engineers who have taken internships, worked in industry, or who have pursued entrepreneurial efforts.

The amendment would also expand the scope of the Presidential Innovation Award to recognize and reward innovations that result in intellectual property that significantly enhances

the economic competitiveness of the United States.

I strongly support Speaker PELOSI and Chairman GORDON's efforts to promote a strong Innovation Agenda that grows our economy and creates more jobs.

I appreciate working with JUDY BIGGERT on this issue and ask my colleagues to support our amendment.

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of the Tauscher-Biggert amendment to H.R. 363, the Sowing the Seeds Through Science and Engineer Research Act.

While I am pleased to have worked with my colleague from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) in developing this amendment, she deserves the credit for the substance of it. I just happen to think she had a great idea, and I am honored to lend my support.

Mr. Chairman, we face a world in which our economic competitors in Asia and Europe are making significant new investments in their own research capabilities, in terms of both infrastructure and human capital. These investments are beginning to pay off, as Asia and European countries challenge U.S. leadership in the sciences no matter how it is measured, by number of patterns won, articles submitted to scientific journals, Nobel Prizes won, the percentage of gross domestic product dedicated to research and development, and even the number of degrees awarded.

Report after report from the National Academies to the Task Force on the Future of American Innovation has concluded that we need more people with scientific expertise and engineering talent if we are to counter this threat. Only our national security and our economic competitiveness are at stake.

Unfortunately, the number of undergraduate degrees and Ph.D.s awarded in the U.S. in science and engineering has been flat or stagnant for over a decade; and of those undergraduates who have obtained a degree in science or engineering, only 28 percent actually go on to get their graduate degree or pursue a career in science and engineering.

That is why this amendment is so important. It expands eligibility for the NSF Early Career Awards to the thousands of scientists and engineers who have followed alternative career paths, such as working part-time or in non-academic settings, or who have taken a significant career break but want to get back into the lab.

For instance, over 12,000 men and women with doctorates in science or engineering currently are not working because of family responsibilities, according to the most recent statistics compiled by NSF. Of those, over 11,000 are women who may be raising children or caring for a sick parent. Imagine the countless benefits of just getting these 11,000 women back into the lab.

But this amendment has the potential to do so much more than that. It provides an opportunity for thousands of other people with scientific expertise and training, men and women, to get the support they need to reenter the scientific and engineering workforce and get back to doing the scientific work that is so important to the competitiveness of our Nation.

This amendment also recognizes and rewards those scientist and engineers whose innovative ideas enhance the economic competitiveness of the United States. It does so by making them eligible for the Presidential Innovation Award created by this bill.

Mr. Chairman, by creating additional opportunities to expand the ranks of scientists and engineers and rewarding them for innovative ideas that make the Nation more economically competitive, this amendment strengthens our ability to innovate.

It is our ability to innovate that has made and will make America the envy of the world in terms of our freedoms, our security and our culture, health and prosperity.

I thank the ranking member, Mr. HALL, for his support for this amendment. I urge my colleagues to support it as well.

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

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON), the chairman of the Committee on Science and a great leader on innovation.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding, but more importantly, I thank her for bringing this amendment before us.

It really is an example of why diversity of collaboration helps you make better decisions. This was a niche that we simply overlooked; and with her help, as well as our fellow member of the Science Committee, Mrs. BIGGERT, we have a better bill.

We thank you for the amendment. We thank you for another example of, again, why diversity helps us make better decisions. This is a good amendment. I support it.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his support of the bill. I appreciate the ranking member's support of the bill. I really want to thank my colleague from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) for her friendship and her support.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS.
GILLIBRAND

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 110-99.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. 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 Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

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

SEC. 10. UNDERGRADUATE SCHOLARSHIPS FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ENGINEERING, AND MATHEMATICS.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The National Science Foundation shall establish a program, to be known as the Undergraduate Scholarships for Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics, or US-STEM, program, for awarding scholarships to undergraduate scholars in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

(b) **ELIGIBILITY.**—A student is eligible for a scholarship under this section only if the student—

(1) is enrolled at a public, 4-year college or university;

(2) will have completed at least one-half of the credit requirements for an undergraduate degree before beginning studies to be funded by the scholarship;

(3) has maintained a grade point average in undergraduate studies of at least 3.0 on a scale of 4.0, or an equivalent level as calculated by the National Science Foundation, except that if the student's institution appeals this criterion on the basis of undue hardship on the student, the National Science Foundation may waive this paragraph;

(4) has a total family income of less than \$75,000 per year, with such amount to be adjusted annually by the National Science Foundation for inflation;

(5) has not been convicted of a felony; and

(6) is a citizen or permanent resident alien of the United States.

(c) **SELECTION CRITERIA.**—Scholarship recipients shall be selected on the basis of merit and such other criteria as the National Science Foundation shall establish.

(d) **AWARDS.**—The National Science Foundation shall announce awards before April 1 for each upcoming academic year, and may make up to 2,500 awards per year. Awards may be made for a maximum of 2 academic years for each student, and scholarship amounts shall be paid to the institution.

(e) **ADVISORY BOARD.**—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall establish an advisory board, which shall make recommendations to the Director for selection criteria for scholarship recipients, and provide guidance and oversight for the program.

(f) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation for carrying out this section—

- (1) \$30,000,000 for fiscal year 2009;
- (2) \$60,000,000 for fiscal year 2010;
- (3) \$61,800,000 for fiscal year 2011;
- (4) \$63,600,000 for fiscal year 2012; and
- (5) \$65,500,000 for fiscal year 2013.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 318, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank the chairman of the Committee on Science and Technology, Mr. GORDON, for putting forward H.R. 363, which will increase America's competitiveness in the world by strengthening our science and research base.

I offer this bipartisan amendment to build the pipeline for our country's future teachers, scientists, engineers and researchers by proposing 2,500 scholarships each year of full tuition to any State university or college.

My amendment is based on the National Academies' strong recommendation for the Federal Government to develop an undergraduate scholarship program for students studying science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. This amendment will create the recommended scholarship program through the National Science Foundation.

Under the amendment, an undergraduate student who comes from a family with an income of less than \$75,000, maintains at least a 3.0 grade point average and is studying science, technology, engineering, or mathematics may receive up to 2 years of paid tuition at that State university.

Since the year 2001, tuition at State universities has risen by 41 percent, making the task of paying for college much more difficult. Scholarships for bright students will increase the number of students who will have the resources to go into the STEM field and achieve their God-given potential.

Having a home-grown, educated workforce will be crucially important to the future strength of America's economy, not only by allowing families and students who are financially stretched to continue their education at high-quality programs such as the nanotechnology program in SUNY Albany, SUNY-Delhi's College of Technology, or the Cytotechnology program at SUNY Plattsburgh, all colleges that are very important to my district in upstate New York, but because by educating America's students in these fields, we will ensure that America retains our competitive advantage in the science field around the world.

My upstate New York district is beginning an exciting new economic revival based on the high-tech sector, and we need to maintain a local workforce that is skilled in engineering and mathematics.

Investments in higher education and science are some of the most important investments our government can make, and I urge everyone to vote "yes."

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The amendment would create a new merit scholarship program at NSF for undergraduate scholars pursuing science, technology, engineering, or mathematics degrees, the STEM degrees. To receive a scholarship, a student has to be a junior or a senior at a 4-year public institution, have at least a 3.0 grade point average, come from a family with an income of \$75,000 or less, and be a citizen or a permanent resident alien with no felony conviction.

Generally, I am supportive of merit scholarships, and while this particular concept sounds good, it is duplicative. An almost identical program already exists at the Department of Education. It is called the Science and Mathematics Access to Retain Talent Grant and is part of the President's American Competitiveness Initiative.

□ 1800

Therefore, our 2008 budget request for this scholarship program is \$1.2 billion. We don't need to add another \$281 million scholarship program at another agency that achieves essentially the exact same thing.

The other main reason I oppose this amendment is its effect on the bill we just debated, H.R. 362. The driving force between H.R. 362 is to expand the Noyce Scholarship Program for undergraduates to entice them to enter the STEM K-12 teaching profession. A requirement for this scholarship is that they give back to society by obligating to teach 2 years for every year of scholarship money they receive. This amendment includes no commitment of any kind from these proposed award-ees.

What kind of a message are we sending if we require Noyce scholarship recipients to give back to society with a teacher service obligation, when the recipients of scholarships under this amendment have nothing to repay?

In addition to the two bills before us today, the Science Committee is also working on NSF's reauthorization, which also includes quite a bit of undergraduate STEM education improvements. I just think the amendment currently before us is not only recreating a scholarship program that is already in existence, but it's entirely inappropriate for this legislation we are considering today. I encourage my colleagues to vote against it.

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

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my distinguished colleague from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of Mrs. GILLIBRAND's amendment to H.R. 363.

Our universities and research institutes lead the world in innovation. Today we stand at the cusp of new breakthroughs in fields ranging from medicine, to computer technology and renewable energy.

Unfortunately, too few of our undergraduates are choosing to enter

science-related fields. In order to continue our remarkable record of achievement, we must do a better job of encouraging students to pursue careers in science, mathematics and engineering. This amendment will provide scholarships for science students from low- and moderate-income families, and will help young Americans realize their potential.

We have a chance today to open new doors for our children, and we should seize this opportunity. This amendment will benefit students and our Nation. I hope that all of my colleagues will join me in support of this amendment.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to Dr. EHLERS, the gentleman from Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. EHLERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I also rise in opposition to this amendment, although I would say I would be delighted to support it if we could also be guaranteed that the budget of the National Science Foundation would be increased by another \$1 billion.

I say that because the National Science Foundation has not been treated well in its budgets over the last 12 or 13 years. It has increased very slowly. We even had a decrease 2 years ago for the first time in many, many years. It's a shame that we have not treated the National Science Foundation adequately. It has hurt our Nation, it has hurt our economy, and we certainly have to improve that situation.

We are in a catchup mode. I am reminded of former Speaker Newt Gingrich, who was instrumental in getting the doubling of the National Institutes of Health, who today has told me, and I have heard him tell audiences in speeches a number of times, that he regards one of his great mistakes, perhaps the greatest, the failure to double the National Science Foundation at the same time that we doubled the NIH.

Nevertheless, that didn't happen, so we are in a period of poverty for the National Science Foundation. Therefore, I oppose adding a new program. Even though at this point it's only \$281 million, I am sure it will be a popular program and end up costing well over \$1 billion. We simply cannot afford it at this time. I would be happy to consider this proposal at some time in the future if we, in fact, do double the NSF as we hope. But even that will leave us with a skimpy budget there.

The other factor is that this program does already exist in the Department of Education. It's a very good program. It has been in operation for several years.

I hope that we will keep that in mind, that we will turn down this amendment at this point, and perhaps consider it sometime in the future when we are bound to have an abundance of money at the National Science Foundation.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished chairman, Mr. GORDON.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, let me say I can understand the concerns of the opponent of this amendment. There are programs that are similar in the Department of Education.

Let me point out only 15 percent of the graduates in the United States receive a degree in engineering, where in China it's 50 percent; in Singapore it's 67 percent. It would seem there is still room to improve this statistic in the United States.

I support the gentlelady's amendment.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to briefly respond to my colleague's arguments.

I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS). I thought they were very thoughtful, and I appreciate your long-term vision for the growth of science and technology deficit in the Nation.

I disagree with the analysis of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL). Primarily his argument seemed to say that this program is too expensive. But this is about our national security, it's about our economic security, and what is so necessary right now in our vision for America's future is the investment in the next generation. What we need to be is producing graduates who have science, math and technology expertise so that we can be competitive with both China and India in the generations and decades to come. We need to begin to fund the pipeline. I think the argument of being too expensive is misplaced.

Second, I would like to say this is a priority for our Nation, and I think we can all agree to strengthen our economy, and our national security has to be number one.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Science Education, I rise in support of Ms. GILLIBRAND's amendment.

This amendment will require the National Science Foundation to institute a program to award scholarships in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics to undergraduate scholars.

Congresswoman GILLIBRAND and I share a commitment to recruiting and educating our young people to meet the growing need for a larger science and engineering workforce. I commend Congresswoman GILLIBRAND for her leadership on this issue and, as Chairman, look forward to continuing to work with her to strengthen math and science education in this country and ensure our future competitiveness.

I urge adoption of this amendment. The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 254, noes 165, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 255]

AYES—254

Abercrombie	Hare	Olver
Ackerman	Harman	Ortiz
Allen	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Altmire	Herse	Pascarell
Andrews	Herseth Sandlin	Pastor
Arcuri	Higgins	Payne
Baca	Hill	Perlmutter
Baird	Hinche	Peterson (MN)
Baldwin	Hinojosa	Platts
Barrow	Hirono	Pomeroy
Bean	Hobson	Porter
Becerra	Hodes	Price (NC)
Berkley	Holden	Pryce (OH)
Berman	Holt	Rahall
Berry	Honda	Rahall
Bishop (GA)	Hooley	Ramstad
Bishop (NY)	Hoyer	Rangel
Blumenauer	Inslee	Renzi
Bono	Israel	Reyes
Bordallo	Jackson (IL)	Rodriguez
Boren	Jackson-Lee	Ross
Boswell	(TX)	Rothman
Boucher	Jefferson	Royal-Allard
Boyd (FL)	Jindal	Ruppersberger
Boyd (KS)	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Braley (IA)	Johnson (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Brown, Corrine	Johnson, E. B.	Salazar
Butterfield	Jones (OH)	Sánchez, Linda
Capito	Kagen	T.
Capps	Kanjorski	Sanchez, Loretta
Capuano	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Cardoza	Kennedy	Saxton
Carnahan	Kildee	Schakowsky
Carney	Kilpatrick	Schiff
Carson	Kind	Schwartz
Castor	Kirk	Scott (GA)
Chandler	Klein (FL)	Scott (VA)
Clay	Knollenberg	Serrano
Cleaver	Kucinich	Sestak
Clyburn	Langevin	Shays
Cohen	Lantos	Shea-Porter
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Shuler
Costa	Lee	Sires
Costello	Levin	Skelton
Courtney	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Cramer	Lipinski	Smith (NJ)
Crowley	LoBiondo	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Loeb	Snyder
Cummings	Loftgren, Zoe	Solis
Davis (AL)	Lowey	Space
Davis (CA)	Lynch	Spratt
Davis (IL)	Mahoney (FL)	Stark
Davis, Lincoln	Maloney (NY)	Stupak
Davis, Tom	Markey	Tanner
DeGette	Marshall	Tauscher
DeLauro	Matheson	Taylor
Dent	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Dicks	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	McCollum (MN)	Tierney
Doggett	McDermott	Towns
Donnelly	McGovern	Udall (CO)
Doyle	McHugh	Udall (NM)
Edwards	McIntyre	Van Hollen
Ellison	McNerney	Velázquez
Ellsworth	McNulty	Vislosky
Emanuel	Meehan	Walden (OR)
Engel	Meek (FL)	Walz (MN)
Eshoo	Meeks (NY)	Wasserman
Etheridge	Melancon	Schultz
Faleomavaega	Michaud	Waters
Farr	Miller (NC)	Watson
Ferguson	Miller, George	Watt
Filner	Mitchell	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Mollohan	Weiner
Gerlach	Moore (KS)	Welch (VT)
Giffords	Moore (WI)	Weller
Gillibrand	Moran (VA)	Wexler
Gonzalez	Murphy (CT)	Whitfield
Gordon	Murphy, Patrick	Wilson (NM)
Green, Al	Murtha	Wilson (OH)
Green, Gene	Nadler	Wolf
Grijalva	Napolitano	Woolsey
Gutierrez	Neal (MA)	Wu
Hall (NY)	Norton	Wynn
	Oberstar	Yarmuth
	Obey	

NOES—165

Aderholt	Bachmann	Barrett (SC)
Akin	Bachus	Bartlett (MD)
Alexander	Baker	Barton (TX)

Biggert	Gillmor	Neugebauer
Bilirakis	Gingrey	Nunes
Bishop (UT)	Gohmert	Paul
Blackburn	Goode	Pearce
Blunt	Goodlatte	Pence
Bonner	Granger	Peterson (PA)
Boozman	Graves	Petri
Boustany	Hall (TX)	Pickering
Brady (TX)	Hastert	Pitts
Brown (SC)	Hastings (WA)	Poe
Brown-Waite,	Hayes	Price (GA)
Ginny	Heller	Putnam
Buchanan	Hensarling	Radanovich
Burgess	Herger	Regula
Burton (IN)	Hoekstra	Rehberg
Calvert	Hulshof	Reichert
Camp (MI)	Inglis (SC)	Reynolds
Campbell (CA)	Issa	Rogers (AL)
Cannon	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
Cantor	Jordan	Rogers (MI)
Carter	Keller	Rohrabacher
Castle	King (IA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Chabot	Kingston	Roskam
Coble	Kline (MN)	Royce
Cole (OK)	Kuhl (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Conaway	LaHood	Sali
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Schmidt
Culberson	LaTourette	Sensenbrenner
Davis (KY)	Lewis (CA)	Sessions
Davis, David	Lewis (KY)	Shadegg
Deal (GA)	Linder	Shimkus
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lucas	Shuster
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lungren, Daniel	Simpson
Doolittle	E.	Smith (NE)
Drake	Mack	Smith (TX)
Dreier	Manzullo	Souder
Duncan	Marchant	Stearns
Ehlers	McCarthy (CA)	Sullivan
Emerson	McCaul (TX)	Tancredo
English (PA)	McCotter	Terry
Everett	McCrery	Thornberry
Fallin	McHenry	Tiahrt
Feeney	McKeon	Tiberi
Flake	McMorris	Turner
Forbes	Rodgers	Upton
Fortenberry	Mica	Walberg
Fortuño	Miller (FL)	Walsh (NY)
Fox	Miller (MI)	Wamp
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	Weldon (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Moran (KS)	Wicker
Galleghy	Murphy, Tim	Wilson (SC)
Garrett (NJ)	Musgrave	Young (AK)
Gilchrest	Myrick	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—18

Bilbray	Cubin	Jones (NC)
Boehner	Davis, Jo Ann	King (NY)
Brady (PA)	DeFazio	Lampson
Buyer	Fattah	Latham
Christensen	Fossella	Sutton
Clarke	Hunter	Westmoreland

□ 1832

Mr. FORBES, Mr. COBLE and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. ROTHMAN and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SNYDER) having assumed the chair, Mr. WATT, 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. 363) to authorize appropriations for basic research and research infrastructure in science and engineering, and for support of graduate fellowships,

and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 318, 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 amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, isn't it true that under the rules of the House adopted in this 110th Congress, the five Delegate Members are allowed to vote in the Committee of the Whole, but not in the whole House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

Isn't it true that the number of eligible Members to vote in the whole House is 435 when all seats are filled?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Isn't it further true, Mr. Speaker, that the number of eligible votes in the Committee of the Whole is 440?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Currently it is 438 because of absences due to two deaths. But normally it is 440, that is correct.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Four hundred forty if all seats were filled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Isn't it further true, Mr. Speaker, that the vote in the Committee of the Whole on the Gillibrand amendment was adopted by a vote of 254-165?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

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. SULLIVAN

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

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

Mr. SULLIVAN. In its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Sullivan of Oklahoma moves to recommit the bill H.R. 363 to the Committee on Science and Technology, with instructions to report back the same forthwith with an amendment. The amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 19, insert " , giving priority to grants to expand domestic energy production

and use through coal-to-liquids technology and advanced nuclear reprocessing" after "mission of the Department".

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

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, today I stand before Congress to offer this motion to recommit because we must encourage new innovations in domestic energy supply. This motion to recommit gives priority to grants to expand domestic energy production through the use of coal-to-liquids technology and advanced nuclear reprocessing.

H.R. 363 already emphasizes the need for increased science and engineer research grants, especially with regard to our Nation's young people. What it does not emphasize is the need for further diversification of our energy sources that will help achieve American energy independence and energy security. World energy demand is expected to increase by over 50 percent by the year 2030, a startling statistic, for sure. In America alone, energy demand is expected to increase by one-third.

There is no one simple solution to arrive at energy independence and energy security. There are, in fact, several pieces to the energy puzzle. It is vital that we wean America off unstable foreign sources of energy.

Congress must urge researchers to invest time and money into the rich technology of coal-to-liquid and nuclear reprocessing. We must commit to support coal-to-liquid technologies for the total life cycle, from coal extraction, through beneficiation, processing, refining, packaging, distribution and end product consumption.

It has been said that the United States is the Saudi Arabia of coal. If we can economically produce liquid transportation fuel from coal, we could displace barrels of unstable foreign oil with barrels of domestically produced fuel. As America's most abundant domestic energy source, coal is an obvious choice to diversify our transportation fuels mix and to reduce our dependence on foreign energy sources. If we invest in coal-to-liquid fuels technology in the early stages, we can take one more step towards energy independence.

Several countries, including France and Japan, are already reprocessing their spent nuclear fuel. It is important for our young scientists and engineers to learn how to develop this progression of reprocessing nuclear fuel.

In 20 years, the number of university nuclear engineering programs has declined from 65 to 29. These young engineers should be encouraged to reuse nuclear fuel in an efficient and cost-effective way. This motion to recommit will promote our colleges to train our future scientists and engineers. In an aging nuclear workforce it is important that these young people are properly trained.

It is time to encourage American energy supply through the development

of coal-to-liquid and advanced nuclear technologies. With these technologies we can achieve this energy independence we so desperately need.

This motion to recommit will allow us to meet this energy demand on our own terms by giving priority to grants to expand domestic energy production through the use of coal-to-liquids technology and advanced nuclear reprocessing.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield some time to the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman SHIMKUS.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Oklahoma for bringing forth this motion to recommit.

I have been down here a couple of times on other motions to recommit, and they are very similar to what we are addressing now. This is a call to my fossil fuel Democrats, my coal Democrats, to address the need of our energy security issues and help us with this motion to recommit to say that what we need to do is address, in this bill, and prioritize coal-to-liquid research and development. And just as important, the global security needs and the global warming with carbon sequestration. This motion to recommit will help prioritize these educational funds to do that.

Likewise, for those who support nuclear power, especially those who feel that there is a concern of high-level nuclear waste, that we learn how to properly reprocess that fuel so we can use that to help our energy independence.

I appreciate my colleague from Oklahoma, and I hope I have my friends on the other side support this motion to recommit.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, we were not given the courtesy of seeing this motion to recommit until a matter of seconds before it was introduced.

But, with that said, we will accept this motion, and we will consider it in conference where it can be considered under the light of more scrutiny.

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 ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SULLIVAN. 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 of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 264, noes 154, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 256]

AYES—264

Aderholt	Fortenberry	Musgrave
Akin	Fox	Murphy
Alexander	Franks (AZ)	Neugebauer
Altmire	Frelinghuysen	Nunes
Bachmann	Gallegly	Oberstar
Bachus	Garrett (NJ)	Ortiz
Baker	Gerlach	Pastor
Barrett (SC)	Gillmor	Paul
Barrow	Gingrey	Pearce
Bartlett (MD)	Gohmert	Pence
Barton (TX)	Gonzalez	Peterson (MN)
Bean	Goode	Peterson (PA)
Biggert	Goodlatte	Petri
Bilirakis	Gordon	Pickering
Bishop (GA)	Granger	Pitts
Bishop (UT)	Graves	Platts
Blackburn	Green, Gene	Poe
Blunt	Hall (TX)	Pomeroy
Boehner	Hare	Porter
Bonner	Hastings (WA)	Price (GA)
Bono	Hayes	Pryce (OH)
Boozman	Heller	Putnam
Boren	Hensarling	Radanovich
Boswell	Herger	Rahall
Boucher	Hersteth Sandlin	Ramstad
Boustany	Higgins	Regula
Boyd (FL)	Hill	Rehberg
Brady (TX)	Hobson	Renzi
Brown (SC)	Hoekstra	Reyes
Brown, Corrine	Holden	Reynolds
Brown-Waite,	Hooley	Rodriguez
Ginny	Hulshof	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (MI)
Burton (IN)	Issa	Rohrabacher
Butterfield	Jindal	Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer	Johnson (IL)	Roskam
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Camp (MI)	Jones (NC)	Royce
Campbell (CA)	Jordan	Ruppersberger
Cannon	Kanjorski	Rush
Cantor	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Capito	Keller	Ryan (WI)
Carney	Kind	Sali
Carter	King (IA)	Saxton
Castle	Kingston	Schmidt
Chabot	Kirk	Sensenbrenner
Chandler	Kline (MN)	Sessions
Coble	Knollenberg	Shadegg
Cohen	Kuhl (NY)	Shimkus
Cole (OK)	LaHood	Shuster
Conaway	Lamborn	Simpson
Costa	Lantos	Skelton
Costello	Larsen (WA)	Smith (NE)
Courtney	Latham	Smith (NJ)
Cramer	LaTourette	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	Lewis (CA)	Snyder
Cuellar	Lewis (KY)	Souder
Culberson	Linder	Space
Cummings	Lipinski	Stearns
Davis (AL)	LoBiondo	Stupak
Davis (CA)	Lucas	Sullivan
Davis (IL)	Lungren, Daniel	Tancredo
Davis (KY)	E.	Tanner
Davis, David	Mack	Tauscher
Davis, Lincoln	Manzullo	Taylor
Davis, Tom	Marchant	Terry
Deal (GA)	Marshall	Thompson (CA)
Dent	Matheson	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, L.	McCarthy (CA)	Tiaht
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCarthy (NY)	Tiberi
Donnelly	McCaul (TX)	Turner
Doolittle	McCotter	Udall (CO)
Doyle	McCrery	Upton
Drake	McHenry	Walberg
Dreier	McHugh	Walden (OR)
Duncan	McIntyre	Walz (MN)
Edwards	McKeon	Wamp
Ellsworth	McMorris	Weldon (FL)
Emerson	Rodgers	Weller
English (PA)	Melancon	Whitfield
Eshoo	Mica	Wicker
Etheridge	Miller (FL)	Wilson (NM)
Everett	Miller (MI)	Wilson (OH)
Fallin	Miller, Gary	Wilson (SC)
Feeney	Mollohan	Wolf
Ferguson	Moran (KS)	Yarmuth
Flake	Murphy, Tim	Young (AK)
Forbes	Murtha	Young (FL)

NOES—154

Abercrombie	Baca	Berman
Ackerman	Baird	Berry
Allen	Baldwin	Bishop (NY)
Andrews	Becerra	Blumenauer
Arcuri	Berkley	Boyd (KS)

Braley (IA)	Jefferson	Price (NC)
Capps	Johnson (GA)	Rangel
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Reichert
Cardoza	Jones (OH)	Rothman
Carnahan	Kagen	Royal-Allard
Carson	Kennedy	Salazar
Castor	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda
Clay	Kilpatrick	T.
Cleaver	Klein (FL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Clyburn	Kucinich	Sarbanes
Conyers	Langevin	Schakowsky
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Crowley	Lee	Schwartz
DeFazio	Levin	Scott (GA)
DeGette	Lewis (GA)	Scott (VA)
Delahunt	Loeb sack	Serrano
DeLauro	Lofgren, Zoe	Sestak
Dicks	Lowey	Shays
Dingell	Lynch	Shea-Porter
Doggett	Mahoney (FL)	Sherman
Ehlers	Maloney (NY)	Shuler
Ellison	Mankey	Sires
Emanuel	Matsui	Slaughter
Engel	McCollum (MN)	Smith (WA)
Farr	McDermott	Solis
Filner	McGovern	Spratt
Frank (MA)	McNerney	Stark
Giffords	McNulty	Thompson (MS)
Gilchrest	Meehan	Tierney
Gillibrand	Meek (FL)	Towns
Green, Al	Meeks (NY)	Udall (NM)
Grijalva	Michaud	Van Hollen
Gutierrez	Miller, George	Velázquez
Hall (NY)	Mitchell	Visclosky
Harman	Moore (KS)	Walsh (NY)
Hastings (FL)	Moore (WI)	Wasserman
Hinchee	Moran (VA)	Schultz
Hinojosa	Murphy (CT)	Waters
Hirono	Murphy, Patrick	Watson
Hodes	Nadler	Watt
Holt	Napolitano	Waxman
Honda	Neal (MA)	Weiner
Hoyer	Obey	Welch (VT)
Inslee	Oliver	Wexler
Israel	Pallone	Woolsey
Jackson (IL)	Pascarell	Wu
Jackson-Lee	Payne	
(TX)	Perlmutter	

NOT VOTING—14

Bilbray	Fattah	Miller (NC)
Brady (PA)	Fossella	Sutton
Clarke	Hastert	Westmoreland
Cubin	King (NY)	Wynn
Davis, Jo Ann	Lampson	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1903

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. HARMAN and Messrs. BACA, PRICE of North Carolina, WALSH of New York, REICHERT, MITCHELL, GILCHREST, MEEHAN, HOYER and EMANUEL changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. SENSENBRENNER, GONZALEZ, CUMMINGS and BUYER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to instructions of the House on the motion to recommit, I report the bill, H.R. 363, back to the House with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment:

Page 5, line 19, insert “, giving priority to grants to expand domestic energy production and use through coal-to-liquids technology and advanced nuclear reprocessing” after “mission of the Department”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

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

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

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 20, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 257]

YEAS—397

Abercrombie	Clyburn	Goodlatte
Ackerman	Coble	Gordon
Aderholt	Cohen	Granger
Alexander	Cole (OK)	Graves
Allen	Conaway	Green, Al
Altmire	Conyers	Green, Gene
Andrews	Cooper	Grijalva
Arcuri	Costa	Gutierrez
Baca	Costello	Hall (NY)
Bachmann	Courtney	Hall (TX)
Bachus	Cramer	Hare
Baird	Crenshaw	Harman
Baker	Crowley	Hastings (FL)
Baldwin	Cuellar	Hastings (WA)
Barrow	Culberson	Hayes
Bartlett (MD)	Cummings	Heller
Barton (TX)	Davis (AL)	Herger
Bean	Davis (CA)	Herseth Sandlin
Becerra	Davis (IL)	Higgins
Berkley	Davis (KY)	Hill
Berman	Davis, David	Hinchee
Berry	Davis, Lincoln	Hinojosa
Biggert	Davis, Tom	Hirono
Bilirakis	Deal (GA)	Hobson
Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Hodes
Bishop (NY)	DeGette	Hoekstra
Bishop (UT)	Delahunt	Holden
Blumenauer	DeLauro	Holt
Blunt	Dent	Honda
Boehner	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hooley
Bonner	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hoyer
Bono	Dicks	Hulshof
Boozman	Dingell	Hunter
Boren	Doggett	Inglis (SC)
Boswell	Donnelly	Inslee
Boucher	Doolittle	Israel
Boustany	Doyle	Issa
Boyd (FL)	Drake	Jackson (IL)
Boya (KS)	Dreier	Jackson-Lee
Brady (TX)	Edwards	(TX)
Braley (IA)	Ehlers	Jefferson
Brown (SC)	Ellison	Jindal
Brown, Corrine	Ellsworth	Johnson (GA)
Brown-Waite,	Emanuel	Johnson (IL)
Ginny	Emerson	Johnson, E. B.
Buchanan	Engel	Jones (NC)
Burgess	English (PA)	Jones (OH)
Burton (IN)	Eshoo	Jordan
Butterfield	Etheridge	Kagen
Buyer	Everett	Kanjorski
Calvert	Fallin	Kaptur
Camp (MI)	Farr	Keller
Cannon	Ferguson	Kennedy
Cantor	Filner	Kildee
Capito	Forbes	Kilpatrick
Capps	Fortenberry	Kind
Capuano	Fox	King (IA)
Cardoza	Frank (MA)	Kingston
Carnahan	Frelinghuysen	Kirk
Carney	Gallely	Klein (FL)
Carson	Gerlach	Kline (MN)
Carter	Giffords	Knollenberg
Castle	Gillibrand	Kucinich
Castor	Gillmor	Kuhl (NY)
Chabot	Gingrey	LaHood
Chandler	Gohmert	Langevin
Clay	Gonzalez	Lantos
Cleaver	Goode	Larsen (WA)

Larson (CT)	Neal (MA)	Sherman
Latham	Neugebauer	Shimkus
LaTourrette	Nunes	Shuler
Lee	Oberstar	Shuster
Levin	Obey	Simpson
Lewis (CA)	Olver	Sires
Lewis (GA)	Ortiz	Skelton
Lewis (KY)	Pallone	Slaughter
Linder	Pascrell	Smith (NE)
Lipinski	Pastor	Smith (NJ)
LoBiondo	Payne	Smith (TX)
Loeback	Pearce	Smith (WA)
Lofgren, Zoe	Perlmutter	Snyder
Lowey	Peterson (MN)	Solis
Lucas	Peterson (PA)	Souder
Lungren, Daniel	Petri	Space
E.	Pickering	Spratt
Lynch	Pitts	Stark
Mack	Platts	Stearns
Mahoney (FL)	Poe	Stupak
Maloney (NY)	Pomeroy	Tanner
Marchant	Porter	Tauscher
Markey	Price (GA)	Taylor
Marshall	Price (NC)	Terry
Matheson	Pryce (OH)	Thompson (CA)
Matsui	Putnam	Thompson (MS)
McCarthy (CA)	Radanovich	Thornberry
McCarthy (NY)	Rahall	Tiahrt
McCaul (TX)	Ramstad	Tiberi
McCollum (MN)	Rangel	Tierney
McCotter	Regula	Towns
McCrery	Rehberg	Turner
McDermott	Reichert	Udall (CO)
McGovern	Renzi	Udall (NM)
McHenry	Reyes	Upton
McHugh	Reynolds	Van Hollen
McIntyre	Rodriguez	Velázquez
McKeon	Rogers (AL)	Visclosky
McMorris	Rogers (KY)	Walberg
Rodgers	Rogers (MI)	Walden (OR)
McNerney	Ros-Lehtinen	Walsh (NY)
McNulty	Roskam	Walz (MN)
Meehan	Ross	Wamp
Meek (FL)	Rothman	Wasserman
Meeks (NY)	Roybal-Allard	Schultz
Melancon	Ruppersberger	Waters
Mica	Rush	Watson
Michaud	Ryan (OH)	Watt
Miller (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Waxman
Miller (MI)	Salazar	Weiner
Miller (NC)	Sánchez, Linda	Welch (VT)
Miller, Gary	T.	Weldon (FL)
Miller, George	Sanchez, Loretta	Weller
Mitchell	Sarbanes	Wexler
Mollohan	Saxton	Whitfield
Moore (KS)	Schakowsky	Wicker
Moore (WI)	Schiff	Wilson (NM)
Moran (KS)	Schmidt	Wilson (OH)
Moran (VA)	Schwartz	Wilson (SC)
Murphy (CT)	Scott (GA)	Wolf
Murphy, Patrick	Scott (VA)	Woolsey
Murphy, Tim	Sensenbrenner	Wu
Murtha	Serrano	Yarmuth
Musgrave	Sessions	Young (AK)
Myrick	Sestak	Young (FL)
Nadler	Shays	
Napolitano	Shea-Porter	

NAYS—20

Akin	Franks (AZ)	Pence
Barrett (SC)	Garrett (NJ)	Rohrabacher
Blackburn	Hensarling	Royce
Campbell (CA)	Johnson, Sam	Sali
Duncan	Lamborn	Shadegg
Feeney	Manzullo	Tancredo
Flake	Paul	

NOT VOTING—15

Bilbray	Fattah	Lampson
Brady (PA)	Fossella	Sullivan
Clarke	Gilchrest	Sutton
Cubin	Hastert	Westmoreland
Davis, Jo Ann	King (NY)	Wynn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1912

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize programs for support of the early career development of science and engineering researchers,

and for support of graduate fellowships, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 362, 10,000 TEACHERS, 10 MILLION MINDS SCIENCE AND MATH SCHOLARSHIP ACT

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to conform the table of contents to the text of H.R. 362.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 363, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1332, SMALL BUSINESS LENDING IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2007

Ms. SLAUGHTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-108) on the resolution (H. Res. 330) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1332) to improve the access to capital programs of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 249, WILD FREE-ROAMING HORSES AND BURROS SALE AND SLAUGHTER PROHIBITION

Ms. SLAUGHTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-109) on the resolution (H. Res. 331) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 249) to restore the prohibition on the commercial sale and slaughter of wild free-roaming horses and burros, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1591, U.S. TROOP READINESS, VETERANS' HEALTH, AND IRAQ ACCOUNTABILITY ACT, 2007

Ms. SLAUGHTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-110) on the