

House Resolution 349, the Chair may reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting under clause 6 of rule XVIII and clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 349 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. 1867.

□ 1920

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. 1867) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2008, 2009, and 2010 for the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes, with Mr. ALTMIRE 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 Washington (Mr. BAIRD) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support today of H.R. 1867, the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2007.

H.R. 1867 was introduced by myself, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), and several other members of the Subcommittee on Research and Science Education. It was ordered reported by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Science and Technology, and is widely supported by industry and academia.

The National Science Foundation was last authorized by Congress in 2002 for 5 years, so we are right on track to ensure the continued growth and relevance of this very important agency.

The National Science Foundation is the only Federal agency whose mission is to support science and engineering research across all disciplines. Currently NSF funds 20 percent of all basic research conducted at American colleges and universities. In many fields such as mathematics, computer sciences and social science, NSF is the major source of Federal backing.

In its 57-year history, NSF has helped cultivate a scientific research enterprise in which the capacity for creativity and innovation is unrivaled in

the world. Some economists estimate that half of the U.S. economic growth since World War II has been the result of technological innovation stemming from basic research and development.

NSF also has a mission to achieve excellence in U.S. science, technology, engineering and mathematics education at all levels and in all settings from kindergarten through postdoctoral training.

I don't think we can stress enough the critical leadership role that NSF has in improving STEM education, and I want to especially thank Science and Technology Chairman GORDON for tireless efforts on these issues.

In addition to supporting research and education grants at colleges and universities across the country, NSF also helps to support the construction of world-class research facilities and equipment that help to attract the top scientists and engineers from around the world to U.S. universities.

As we have seen high-paying jobs outsourced, our children graduating high school well behind their international peers in understanding basic science, other nations surging ahead in export of high-tech products, it has finally sunk in, funding basic research and teaching our kids math and science has a huge impact on our economy, our competitiveness, our national security, and our population's well-being.

H.R. 1867, like H.R. 362 and H.R. 363, two other Science and Technology Committee bills that passed the House just last week, is one more important piece of the House leadership's innovation agenda. It is also consistent with the administration's own American Competitiveness Initiative, which called for a 10-year doubling for three science agencies, the National Science Foundation, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and the Department of Energy's Office of Science.

H.R. 1867 was developed with input received during two subcommittee legislative hearings, a number of other NSF policy hearings held over the last many months, and countless informal conversations with NSF stakeholders both inside and outside of government.

Dr. EHLERS and I personally traveled over to NSF last month to meet with the Director and all of the Assistant Directors to receive their personal input.

In drafting H.R. 1867, we tried to limit it to policy, administrative and budget issues that have arisen since the last authorization in 2002, while leaving the Foundation with maximum flexibility in translating our guidance into practice.

Likewise, we minimized the specific carve-outs, especially in the research account, where all of the grants are awarded through a competitive, merit-reviewed process, and where the Foundation often needs to respond quickly to new fields of science and new ways of doing science.

I want to especially thank all my colleagues on the committee, especially

Dr. EHLERS, Ms. JOHNSON, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. GINGREY, Chairman GORDON and Ranking Member HALL, for helping to improve this bill and move it expeditiously through the committee process. This was a bipartisan effort from beginning to end.

Mr. Chair, this bill is critical to American innovation and competitiveness. I urge my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 1867.

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, of course, in support of H.R. 1867, which authorizes funding for the National Science Foundation for the next 3 years. As most of us know, NSF is one of three agencies targeted by the President's American Competitiveness Initiative. The ACI aims to double the Federal investment in physical science research over the next 10 years. Appropriate investment in research development technology and math and science education will ensure that our country remains the world leader in competitiveness and innovation.

The National Science Foundation is the primary source of Federal funding for nonmedical basic research conducted at colleges and universities and serves as a catalyst for science, for technology, for engineering, and mathematics education reform at all levels. The return that we receive from our NSF investments far exceeds the cost. In addition, the NSF peer review process for receiving Federal funding is to be an example for all Federal agencies and one in which I hope all of my colleagues more fully recognize as an appropriate means of investment.

As reported, this is a good bill. I thank Chairman GORDON and Dr. BAIRD for working with Dr. EHLERS and with me to make improvements in the measure. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY), who has been a tireless member of this subcommittee and has championed the issue of undergraduate research, which is critical in preparing our students for the future.

Ms. HOOLEY. I would like to thank Chairman BAIRD for yielding me time to speak on this important piece of legislation and your incredible leadership on this issue.

The bill we have before us today will strengthen the National Science Foundation and allow it to better serve the needs of this country both today and well into the future.

The Foundation is unique among the Federal Government's scientific research agencies in that it supports science and engineering across all disciplines. Each year the National Science Foundation supports an average of 200,000 scientists, engineers, educators and students at universities,

laboratories and field sites all over the United States and throughout the world.

The NSF plays a critical role in helping the United States maintain its position at the forefront of global innovation and technology. The NSF provides funding and support for research at the Nation's leading universities and laboratories to develop products and materials to further our economy.

Examples of recent discoveries by NSF-funded research include new materials to make solar panels more effective, technologies to make airport screening more efficient, and the world's strongest superglue based on water-loving bacteria.

By supporting students at each phase in the educational system, the NSF helps our future scientists and engineers turn ideas into innovation.

I am particularly pleased that the committee has agreed to include language in the reauthorization that directly ties funding for the Research Experience for Undergraduates Program to funding levels at the NSF. One of the few NSF programs devoted specifically to undergraduates, this program has suffered from a declining budget for the past 3 years. By tying the funding for the program to the overall funding of NSF, we will allow students access to the resources they need to further their research at their own schools and at institutions across the country.

This legislation is not only good for students, teachers, scientists and engineers, but it is good for the United States in our leading the world on our innovation which drives our economy.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill. And again, I thank my colleague Representative BAIRD for all of his hard work on this piece of legislation.

□ (1930)

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

I am pleased to join the speakers in rousing approval of this bill, the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2007. As a scientist, I have been familiar with the National Science Foundation almost since its inception. It is an outstanding American institution. It is the best science research institution in the world in terms of their strong peer review and the good results.

Just a few weeks ago, we had the announcement of the latest round of Nobel Prize winners. All of the Nobel Prize winners this year in the sciences were from the United States, and one of them was formerly funded by the National Science Foundation.

The National Science Foundation has now provided funding for 170 individuals who have gone on to win the Nobel Prize. By far, we are the leader among all the Nations, and it is not just our population. It is our ability to engage in meaningful and good research, research that results in earth-changing

results, and that is extremely important to the foundations of science.

The National Science Foundation has done so many good things since its inception, and as I said, it is one of the leaders in the world.

It also has received awards from the Office of Management and Budget just within the past few years as the most efficiently run government agency. Now, that is indeed an important prize. I understand we are going to have a few amendments to try to reduce the budget of the National Science Foundation, and I think it is absurd to punish the best-operated government agency while we are continuing to fund other agencies which do not do as well, and we are not reducing their budget.

Another factor is we often talk in the Congress about investments. Sometimes I think we never spend a penny of our money; we invest it all because everyone talks about their particular project as a good investment. Well, let me tell you, if we are investing money here we will get a higher rate of return on the money that we invest in the National Science Foundation than in any other government agency, except perhaps NIH, simply because the results are so astounding and so ripe for development by the manufacturing sector.

I could give many, many examples, but let me just mention one. A friend of mine, Charlie Townes, a number of years ago, decided that he could develop a laser. Now, LASER stands for lamp amplification by stimulated emission of radiation. The initiative for that discovery came originally from Einstein in the early 1900s. In the 1930s, a theoretical physicist predicted that stimulated emission would result from a photon hitting an excited atom, yielding two photons of the same wavelength and the same phase traveling in the same direction. Mr. Townes decided he could build a laser out of this, and in fact, he did.

I do not know what types of grants he had, but I think the total was probably less than \$10 million. Today, the laser industry is a multi, multi, multi-billion dollar industry.

Every sewer that has been laid in this Nation and most parts of the world for the last 30 years has been leveled with a beam of laser light. Every suit, every piece of clothing that the people in this room are wearing has been cut out by a laser light, not scissors, but lasers guided around, cutting out the patterns before they are sewn together. I could go on and on with many other examples, including medical examples, by the way.

So that small investment of about \$10 million resulted in thousands and thousands of billions of dollars in our economy. That is why it is totally absurd for anyone to think about reducing the budget of the NSF. If anything, we should increase it because the payback on our investment there is so good, so strong, that we should be increasing NSF funding, not decreasing it.

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

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say how much I appreciate Dr. EHLERS for his wisdom, his knowledge, his friendship and his leadership on this. There are few Members of Congress, or even, I think, few other people in the country who know these issues as well as Dr. EHLERS. He has been a teacher to students for many years and a teacher to those of us on the committee as well.

I thank Dr. EHLERS for his fine comments.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN), a valued member of the committee who has led critical efforts on this legislation.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1867, the National Science Foundation Reauthorization Act of 2007.

I really want to thank Chairman GORDON, Chairman BAIRD and Ranking Member EHLERS for their work on this bill. Under their leadership, our committee has produced a remarkable amount of quality legislation, including this bill before the House tonight.

Our country's global competitiveness is directly linked to the ability of our math, science and engineering professionals to develop innovative technologies, policies and scientific breakthroughs.

Yet while it is important to support these professionals and their industries today, it is perhaps of even greater importance to support their professions and industries of tomorrow.

In order for our Nation to compete with countries around the world, we must ensure that we increase the educational opportunities for our youth to study and pursue careers in math, science and engineering, while also investing in programs to enrich the quality of these opportunities.

Making both research and the education of our children a national priority is not simply an investment in these fields. Our global competitiveness is directly tied to our Nation's economy and national security.

NSF plays a critical role in influencing our global competitiveness as it supports science and engineering across all disciplines.

Each year NSF supports an average of about 200,000 scientists, engineers, educators and students at universities, laboratories and field sites all over the U.S., including many great institutions in my home State of Missouri.

H.R. 1867 authorizes the necessary funds for NSF which will allow the agency to foster relationships between academia and industry in order to spawn U.S. competitiveness and further the Agency's traditions of education in science, technology, engineering and math, the STEM, fields.

I urge my colleagues to invest in the future of our children, in our country's global competitiveness and support this bill.

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

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, as a past NSF grant recipient, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1867, the National Science Foundation Reauthorization Act of 2007. I want to thank Chairman GORDON, Chairman BAIRD and Dr. EHLERS for their work in bringing this strong bill to the floor today.

Today, we stand at the cusp of numerous technological breakthroughs that will completely revolutionize our way of life; from hydrogen and other advanced fuels technologies that will free us from our addiction to oil, to nanotechnology that has the potential to impact virtually every sector of our economy.

Much of this research has been made possible by grants from NSF, and by passing this bill we are continuing our support of American researchers, scientists, engineers, educators and students who will ensure that these breakthroughs continue and that America continues to lead the world technologically and economically.

I would like to point out that consideration of this legislation comes on the heels of last week's passage of the 10,000 Teachers, 10 Million Minds and Sowing the Seeds legislation. Both of these bills were introduced in response to the recommendations of the Rising Above the Gathering Storm report, which was commissioned by Congress to help the U.S. compete, prosper and be secure in the global community of the 21st century.

This legislation we are considering today, which puts us on a path to double NSF funding over 10 years, will further build our commitment to competitiveness, being led in the House by Chairman GORDON.

The NSF has a broad mission of supporting science and engineering and funding basic research across many disciplines. Basic research is very necessary, yet oftentimes, because it does not directly, only indirectly lead to advances, does not receive private funding. The NSF does this.

This legislation also specifically calls on the director of NSF to give special consideration to research proposals having high importance for future national economic competitiveness. This is critically needed.

One example is nanotechnology, a very promising field of research that has the potential to revolutionize our society from defense to health care to energy to environmental cleanup. This will help.

The bill also gives special consideration to partnerships between academics, industrial scientists and businesses. I have spoken to a lot of professors and administrators at universities who say this is a major problem in our country of taking research and getting it to the market, and this will help to do this.

Mr. Chairman, earlier today I had the opportunity to meet with five American scientists who each just recently won a Nobel Prize. They all emphasize that continued support of the NSF is crucial to America's future success, just as it is critical to their successes.

So, as a proud cosponsor of this bill, I urge the House to heed the advice of those on the cutting edge of science and take another step in bolstering American competitiveness by passing H.R. 1867.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, it is a real privilege and honor to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON), Chair of the committee. Before he speaks, I just want to say what a privilege it is to serve with him and to offer that years from now, there will be Americans benefiting from technological and scientific innovations and in particular young people, scholars, benefiting from the education initiatives championed by Mr. GORDON. They may not know of the work done. He has done a great job, a bipartisan approach to this committee. It is a privilege to serve with him.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I thank Dr. BAIRD.

Let me just say that I have a 6-year-old daughter at home, and I am very concerned that she could be a part of the first generation of Americans to inherit a national standard of living less than their parents, a complete reversal of the American Dream. And if we are going to avoid this, it is very, very important that we follow through on the recommendations of the report on Rising Above the Gathering Storm.

Now, last week we did. We got a good start. Last week, we passed the K-12 improvements in math and science education, as well as investments in our education system in other regards. This week, we are going to take another step forward, and that is follow the recommendations of increasing our commitment to basic research.

Tonight, we are going to pass the National Science Foundation authorization which will double the National Science Foundation. Tomorrow, we are going to double the NEST budget.

Let me on behalf of my daughter, I want to thank Dr. BAIRD, I want to thank Dr. EHLERS and our excellent staff for working together in a bipartisan way. I want to remind everyone that this is a bill that came out of the Science and Technology Committee unanimously because it is a good bill, it was worked on together in a bipartisan, Democrats, Republicans, with a very good staff. Again, I thank you for the great work you did, and my daughter thanks you even more.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2007. I appreciate the kind words offered by Mr. BAIRD and Mr. GORDON, and frankly, producing this bill was a lovefest. I am

very impressed with the work they did on it. I am very appreciative of the very hard work that they did in putting together a bill, including direct interaction with members of NSF, talking to scientists who were familiar with the NSF, scientists who had received funds from NSF, and out of all that, we have written a bill that I think is a very good one.

□ 1945

My colleagues and I on the Science and Technology Committee have introduced a strong reauthorization bill for the National Science Foundation. It is a straightforward 3-year bill which provides authorization for the various research and education activities of the National Science Foundation.

I am pleased that this bill establishes a pathway to double the total budget of the Foundation. In 2002, Congress wholeheartedly supported a 5-year doubling path for the Foundation, and I strongly supported that and was very pleased to vote for it.

Unfortunately, appropriations have fallen far short of that target. Last year I had consultations with the President, and partly as a result of those consultations, the President introduced a plan known as the American Competitiveness Initiative that sought to double the research budgets of the National Science Foundation, National Institute of Standards and Technology and the Department of Energy's Office of Science over the next 10 years. In other words, twice as slow as the previous decision of the Congress.

I would prefer the faster increase, but I recognize realities and the tough financial conditions we have. So I am pleased to sign on with doubling over 10 years.

The National Science Foundation was included in the ACI because it conducts world-class research in areas that support new, innovative technologies, which, in turn, lead to advances in telecommunications, homeland security, alternative energy and other areas of great importance to our Nation.

I have the utmost confidence that the National Science Foundation will use the authorized funds in the most prudent manner, as NSF consistently earns the highest possible score in the annual Office of Management and Budget ratings of financial and budget performance.

The National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2007 will support the education and training of more than 225,000 scientists, engineers, teachers and students. In addition to discipline-specific research, NSF activities include cross-cutting initiatives on nanotechnology, networking and information technology, climate science change and the International Polar Year.

It also supports the construction of major research facilities that are shared within and across many disciplines of the scientific community.

NSF research and activities touch every State of this Nation and provide tremendous support at all levels of education.

NSF is a unique agency because it is the only agency with a primary mission of supporting fundamental scientific research, as well as engineering research. Unlike some of our other science agencies, NSF is not a mission agency in the sense that it has an established program to target. In fact, it solves many problems through the process of fundamental research, often in a serendipitous manner.

As Nobel Prize winner Theodore Svedberg remarked, as he accepted his reward in 1926, "A glance at the history of science and technics shows that it is precisely the search for truth without any preconceived ideas, research for the sake of knowledge alone, that in the long run has most benefited humanity. The investigations which have seemingly been the most purely abstract have often formed the foundation of the most important changes or improvements in the conditions of human life."

It is challenging in this day and age to support this type of research. The U.S. has many pressing needs that require solutions on very short time lines, particularly related to national security and the health of our aging population. For this reason and others, we have seen companies decrease their investments in long-term research projects. Nevertheless, economists have confirmed the accuracy of Dr. Svedberg's statement that fundamental research has, indeed, paid the highest dividends to humanity over the years.

Estimated return on investment in research and development is difficult to calculate, but generally ranges from 20 to 400 percent. That is an incredible payback. Furthermore, past investments in NSF have contributed greatly to major technological advances in areas and industries that are critical for U.S. economic growth such as biomedical applications.

The former Director of the National Institutes of Health, Harold Varmus, is well-known for his following statement: "Medical advances may seem like wizardry. But pull back the curtain, and sitting at the lever is a high-energy physicist, a combinational chemist or an engineer."

Continued support for fundamental research lays the groundwork for innovations in other disciplines that directly impact the lives of every American. We are here today to authorize a continued investment in this type of NSF groundbreaking work.

I thank Chairman BAIRD and his dedicated staff for their work on preparing this bill in a bipartisan manner, and encourage my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. BAIRD. At this point I understand Mr. KIRK would like to engage in a colloquy. Would Mr. EHLERS care to yield some time to him for that?

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to Mr. KIRK for a colloquy.

Mr. KIRK. I thank the gentleman, one of the only working scientists serving in the Congress.

I had intended to offer an amendment to this legislation with regard to the mercury issue, but working with the committee, I understand the better place I am talking about is in the EPA Office of Science.

So I would like to say that I strongly support investment in scientific and mathematical research, but I would like to engage in a colloquy with the chairman, especially to emphasize how essential it is for comprehensive and frequent research on mercury levels in one of our Nation's most treasured ecosystems, the Great Lakes.

Mercury pollution is now a serious problem for my district in northern Illinois, as well as across the Nation. The Great Lakes are particularly vulnerable to exposure, as 36 percent of mercury emissions are generated in the Great Lakes region.

In fact, there are currently 18 fish advisories for mercury contamination in the region, yet the Great Lakes are a source of food and especially drinking water for over 40 million Americans. This undoubtedly contributes to the recent estimate that the U.S. Government has seen more than 300,000 American babies born each year with a risk of mercury poisoning.

It's critical that we begin to take an annual inventory of mercury levels in the Great Lakes to understand the sources of this pollution and especially the trend to see whether this danger is growing. With this information the Congress would be able to provide more effective and comprehensive regulation of mercury pollution and mitigation of its harmful effects.

I would like to thank Chairman BAIRD for agreeing to engage in this colloquy on this important matter, and I appreciate all his support in working to ensure that we have the most comprehensive, scientific, accurate and timely information on mercury contamination. I look forward to working with the chairman on this issue.

Mr. BAIRD. I very much thank the gentleman for working so closely with us and with Ranking Member EHLERS on this. I absolutely agree with the gentleman from Illinois on the importance of mercury in the Great Lakes, and I applaud him for raising this issue. It is crucial that we continue to gather the necessary data in order to protect current and future generations in the environment from dangerous mercury exposure. I am aware and appreciate the gentleman understands that the National Science Foundation does not generally engage in this type of research, and, as indicated, it is really more the appropriate domain of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Accordingly, I will be happy to work with the gentleman from Illinois, and I look forward to the committee pro-

viding direction to the U.S. EPA in a letter to that effect.

Mr. KIRK. I thank the chairman for that. I look forward to seeing the committee's letter, because I think it will move the ball significantly to help this Congress redress a growing danger.

To the gentleman from Michigan, a leader on Great Lakes protection, and removing environmental contamination, I thank him for working on this issue.

Mr. EHLERS. I thank the gentleman for those comments. We will be happy to continue working with him.

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

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume in order to engage in a colloquy with the gentlelady from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me this opportunity to talk about the importance of research into the environmental, cultural and health impacts of introducing new genetically modified plants and animals into our agriculture, horticulture and aquaculture systems.

The National Science Foundation, which supports a broad range of basic research in the biological sciences, is well equipped to perform this basic research that will help us develop more sustainable approaches to pest management, understand and manage unique environmental and health risks, and even discover ways in which modified plants could provide environmental benefits.

Mr. Chairman, this is critical research that the National Academy of Sciences has called for in a recent report. While I am not offering an amendment to this bill before us today, I do ask for your help in raising the profile of this very important issue as you proceed with the bill.

Mr. BAIRD. I would like to thank the gentlelady for bringing this issue to our attention. It is indeed an important area of research for our Federal Government, and for NSF in particular. I appreciate and respect very much your continued interest and leadership on this. We would be happy to work with you as we proceed towards conference about raising the profile of this issue and the importance of this research.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I look forward to working with you.

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

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

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, to close, let me just once again express my deep gratitude and tremendous respect to Dr. EHLERS for his leadership, not only now as ranking member, but over the years he has served on this committee. Quite literally there has been no more tireless and effective advocate for this legislation and for science in general than Dr. EHLERS. We all respect and admire that and appreciate that greatly.

I also want to express my appreciation to Chairman GORDON, whom I acknowledged earlier and thanked for his leadership. Ranking Member HALL. I want to express a special gratitude to my own staff member, Hilary Cain, for her leadership on this and great counsel; as well as the committee staff, Jim Wilson and Dahlia Sokolov for their tireless efforts. They have spent hours and hours on this. We are grateful.

With that, as Dr. Ehlers and others have so eloquently said, this is a good bill, it is a bipartisan bill. It has the endorsement of a long list of sponsors, who I did not enumerate here in the interests of time, but virtually every major scientific organization as well as leaders in industry and in academia have endorsed this bill strongly. It is a bill that this committee and this body should pass. I urge its passage.

I urge a "yes" vote.

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.

No amendment to that amendment shall be in order except those printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so printed may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or his designee and shall be considered read.

Without objection, each section of the amendment shall be considered as read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

H.R. 1867

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 "National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2007".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1?

The Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) BOARD.—The term "Board" means the National Science Board established under section 2 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1861).

(2) DIRECTOR.—The term "Director" means the Director of the Foundation.

(3) ELEMENTARY SCHOOL.—The term "elementary school" has the meaning given that term by section 9101(18) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801(18)).

(4) FOUNDATION.—The term "Foundation" means the National Science Foundation.

(5) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term "institution of higher education" has the meaning given such term in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).

(6) SECONDARY SCHOOL.—The term "secondary school" has the meaning given that term by section 9101(38) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801(38)).

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 2?

The Clerk will designate section 3.

The text of section 3 is as follows:

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2008.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation \$6,500,000,000 for fiscal year 2008.

(2) SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS.—Of the amount authorized under paragraph (1)—

(A) \$5,080,000,000 shall be made available for research and related activities, of which \$115,000,000 shall be made available for the Major Research Instrumentation program;

(B) \$873,000,000 shall be made available for education and human resources, of which—

(i) \$94,000,000 shall be for Mathematics and Science Education Partnerships established under section 9 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n);

(ii) \$70,000,000 shall be for the Robert Noyce Scholarship Program established under section 10 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n-1);

(iii) \$44,000,000 shall be for the Science, Mathematics, Engineering, and Technology Talent Expansion Program established under section 8(7) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-368); and

(iv) \$51,620,000 shall be for the Advanced Technological Education program established by section 3(a) of the Scientific and Advanced-Technology Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-476);

(C) \$245,000,000 shall be made available for major research equipment and facilities construction;

(D) \$285,600,000 shall be made available for agency operations and award management;

(E) \$4,050,000 shall be made available for the Office of the National Science Board; and

(F) \$12,350,000 shall be made available for the Office of Inspector General.

(b) FISCAL YEAR 2009.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation \$6,980,000,000 for fiscal year 2009.

(2) SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS.—Of the amount authorized under paragraph (1)—

(A) \$5,457,400,000 shall be made available for research and related activities, of which \$123,100,000 shall be made available for the Major Research Instrumentation program;

(B) \$934,000,000 shall be made available for education and human resources, of which—

(i) \$100,600,000 shall be for Mathematics and Science Education Partnerships established under section 9 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n);

(ii) \$101,000,000 shall be for the Robert Noyce Scholarship Program established under section 10 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n-1);

(iii) \$55,000,000 shall be for the Science, Mathematics, Engineering, and Technology Talent Expansion Program established under section 8(7) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-368); and

(iv) \$55,200,000 shall be for the Advanced Technological Education program as established by section 3(a) of the Scientific and Advanced-Technology Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-476);

(C) \$262,000,000 shall be made available for major research equipment and facilities construction;

(D) \$309,760,000 shall be made available for agency operations and award management;

(E) \$4,120,000 shall be made available for the Office of the National Science Board; and

(F) \$12,720,000 shall be made available for the Office of Inspector General.

(c) FISCAL YEAR 2010.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation \$7,493,000,000 for fiscal year 2010.

(2) SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS.—Of the amount authorized under paragraph (1)—

(A) \$5,863,200,000 shall be made available for research and related activities, of which \$131,700,000 shall be made available for the Major Research Instrumentation program;

(B) \$1,003,000,000 shall be made available for education and human resources, of which—

(i) \$107,600,000 shall be for Mathematics and Science Education Partnerships established under section 9 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n);

(ii) \$133,000,000 shall be for the Robert Noyce Scholarship Program established under section 10 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n-1);

(iii) \$60,000,000 shall be for the Science, Mathematics, Engineering, and Technology Talent Expansion Program established under section 8(7) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-368); and

(iv) \$59,100,000 shall be for the Advanced Technological Education program as established by section 3(a) of the Scientific and Advanced-Technology Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-476);

(C) \$280,000,000 shall be made available for major research equipment and facilities construction;

(D) \$329,450,000 shall be made available for agency operations and award management;

(E) \$4,250,000 shall be made available for the Office of the National Science Board; and

(F) \$13,100,000 shall be made available for the Office of Inspector General.

(d) MAJOR RESEARCH INSTRUMENTATION.—

(1) AWARD AMOUNT.—The minimum amount of an award under the Major Research Instrumentation program shall be \$100,000. The maximum amount of an award under the program shall be \$4,000,000, except if the total amount appropriated for the program for a fiscal year exceeds \$125,000,000, in which case the maximum amount of an award shall be \$6,000,000.

(2) USE OF FUNDS.—In addition to the acquisition of instrumentation and equipment, funds made available by awards under the Major Research Instrumentation program may be used to support the operations and maintenance of such instrumentation and equipment.

(3) COST SHARING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An institution of higher education receiving an award shall provide at least 30 percent of the cost from private or non-Federal sources.

(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Institutions of higher education that are not Ph.D.-granting institutions are exempt from the cost sharing requirement in subparagraph (A), and the Director may reduce or waive the cost sharing requirement for—

(i) institutions—

(I) which are not ranked among the top 100 institutions receiving Federal research and development funding, as documented by the statistical data published by the Foundation; and

(II) for which the proposed project will make a substantial improvement in the institution's capabilities to conduct leading edge research, to provide research experiences for undergraduate students using leading edge facilities, and to broaden the participation in science and engineering research by individuals identified in section 33 or 34 of the Science and Engineering Equal Opportunities Act (42 U.S.C. 1885a or 1885b); and

(ii) consortia of institutions of higher education that include at least one institution that is not a Ph.D.-granting institution.

(e) UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION PROGRAMS.—The Director shall continue to carry out programs in support of undergraduate education, including those authorized in section 17 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n-6). Funding for these programs shall increase in proportion to the increase in the total amount appropriated to the Foundation in any year for which appropriations are authorized by this Act.

(f) LIMIT ON PROPOSALS.—

(1) POLICY.—For programs that require as part of the selection process for awards the submission of preproposals and that also limit the

number of preproposals that may be submitted by an institution, the Director shall allow the subsequent submission of a full proposal based on each preproposal that is determined to have merit following the Foundation's merit review process.

(2) **REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT OF POLICIES.**—The Board shall review and assess the effects on institutions of higher education of the policies of the Foundation regarding the imposition of limitations on the number of proposals that may be submitted by a single institution for programs supported by the Foundation. The Board shall determine whether current policies are well justified and appropriate for the types of programs that limit the number of proposal submissions. Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Board shall summarize its findings and any recommendations regarding changes to the current policy on the restriction of proposal submissions in a report to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate.

(g) **RESEARCH EXPERIENCES FOR UNDERGRADUATES.**—The Director shall increase funding for the Research Experiences for Undergraduates program in proportion to the increase in the total amount appropriated to the Foundation for research and related activities in any year for which appropriations are authorized by this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HONDA

Mr. HONDA. 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. HONDA:

At the end of section 3, add the following new subsection:

(h) **GLOBAL WARMING EDUCATION.**—

(1) **INFORMAL EDUCATION.**—As part of Informal Science Education activities, the Director shall support activities to create informal educational materials, exhibits, and multimedia presentations relevant to global warming, climate science, and greenhouse gas reduction strategies.

(2) **K-12 INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS.**—As part of Discovery Research K-12 activities, the Director shall support the development of K-12 educational materials relevant to global warming, climate science, and greenhouse gas reduction strategies.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman GORDON and Chairman BAIRD for the support of my amendment, and the Science Committee staff for their assistance in putting this amendment together.

I would also like to thank the chairman and ranking member for their excellent work on the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2007. I strongly support the work of the National Science Foundation, and as a co-sponsor of this legislation, I urge my colleagues to support this passage.

Some years ago, I was a high school science teacher, and I clearly remember my students stopping me during one of my favorite lessons to ask the timeless question, why do I need to know this? Science is difficult. Global warming is hard to understand also. Some people are asking, why do I need to know this? Hundreds of years ago, Galileo and Sir Isaac Newton made remarkable discoveries about gravity and

the behavior of falling objects, but to this day, most people couldn't explain the law of gravity or what determines the speed of a falling object if they had to. Most of the time people can go on with their lives, their everyday lives, without understanding scientific concepts, suffering no ill effects. You don't need to understand gravity to keep from falling. You don't need to understand your lungs in order to breathe. But global warming presents a new kind of a problem.

□ 2000

The understanding of global warming will play a significant role in our ability to actually address the problem. And, we don't have much time. Global warming will cause significant impacts, including shifting weather patterns, drought, rising sea levels, and disrupted wildlife migration patterns.

Nearly every point on the globe is getting warmer, and the debate is no longer if, but when, these changes will occur.

These threats are the most natural consequences of a worldwide overreliance on fossil fuels and destructive, wasteful use of resources. We have lived on the earth, but we have not yet learned to live with the earth.

But we can't just give in to the fear and the sense of helplessness. We can turn the tide of global warming if we have the knowledge. That is why we need to know this.

My amendment will allow the National Science Foundation to support the creation of K-12 science curriculum, informal education materials, exhibits, and multi-media relevant to global warming, climate science, and greenhouse reduction strategies.

The education provided by this amendment will help people of all ages and backgrounds to make choices in their daily lives and in their communities to stop global warming. They will learn about the complex interrelationships between natural cycles and human activity. They will understand how their own actions and their own informed choices can heal the earth. This amendment by itself is, however, not the answer. A comprehensive and sustainable energy and environmental policy will require the expanded use of green energy such as solar, wind, and geothermal. We will also need to continue to find ways to reduce carbon dioxide emissions from transportation, from industry, and energy production. We need to increase the efficiency of energy use and transmissions, especially in buildings. We need to change much more than just our light bulbs. But people need to know why we need these things, and this amendment provides for that.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SULLIVAN TO

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HONDA

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SULLIVAN to the amendment offered by Mr. HONDA:

At the end of paragraph (1), insert the following: "Such materials, exhibits, and multimedia presentations shall reflect the diversity of scientific opinion, including the diversity of opinion regarding the impact of human activities on climate change, and shall also reflect the impact of greenhouse gas reduction strategies on developing nations, United States energy security, United States energy costs, the global and United States economy, low income and middle class individuals, and those on fixed incomes."

At the end of paragraph (2), insert the following: "Such materials, exhibits, and multimedia presentations shall reflect the diversity of scientific opinion, including the diversity of opinion regarding the impact of human activities on climate change, and shall also reflect the impact of greenhouse gas reduction strategies on developing nations, United States energy security, United States energy costs, the global and United States economy, low income and middle class individuals, and those on fixed incomes."

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to reserve a point of order on this particular amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe Mr. HONDA is right on track with this amendment. However, I believe my amendment will strengthen his amendment.

Simply, my amendment ensures that children are educated on all aspects of global climate change, from global warming, climate science, and greenhouse gas reduction, to human activities on climate change, and the impact of greenhouse gas reduction strategies on developing nations, U.S. energy security, U.S. energy costs, and the global and U.S. economies.

The decisions we make today in this Congress will not only affect our children but will affect many generations to come. As the father of four children, I feel it is imperative that they know all the viewpoints on an issue so that they can make an educated decision. It is important that they obtain knowledge through schools and their parents to make informed decisions, especially when those decisions will affect the environment and the economy.

Our children are our country's future. What a bright future they have ahead of them. Every time I look at my four children, I think of the tough choices they will have to make on the road ahead, and hope that my wife and I have taught them to make the best decisions possible. I know that, between the education they receive at home and the education they receive at school, they will be well equipped to face the important choices later on in life.

It is important to me that the science education they receive in school reflect the diversity of scientific viewpoints on this very important issue. This is something my friends on the other side of the aisle have long advocated for and something my amendment achieves.

With 36.4 million elementary school-aged children and 16.8 million high school-aged children in our country, it is obvious that the science education they get today will dramatically affect their future tomorrow.

Thanks to advanced technologies, today's science classes are much more advanced than the ones I took when I was in school. Yet there are so many viewpoints out there on scientific subjects, especially climate change, it is sometimes difficult to present all views fairly to them. However, I feel that this is important, especially on an issue as sensitive and politically charged as global climate change.

Our children are our future, and we owe it to them to provide them with the best most balanced education possible. My amendment will help achieve that by presenting all viewpoints to students in kindergarten through 12th grade. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have long called for all scientific positions to be heard, and my amendment achieves this. I encourage all my colleagues to support this amendment and ensure that all students receive fair and balanced scientific education.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. BAIRD. I continue to reserve.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the sense of what the gentleman is raising with his second order amendment. Having taught science myself, I believe it is absolutely important to share different sides of it. My concern is I think you are sort of micromanaging the education process, however, positive your intent may be. And the gentleman himself just acknowledged that students from K-12 need to have balanced information.

I question whether we really want to mandate that a kindergarten teacher educate her or his students on the impact of greenhouse gases on U.S. energy security, global developing nations, et cetera.

I think it is a fair point and absolutely an important point that we present different sides of this issue, and I applaud the gentleman for raising that.

I would, however, note that the International Panel on Climate Change, which we have had two hearings of in this committee, has clearly unanimously agreed on some general principles: That the climate temperature is increasing; that humans are significantly responsible for at least a substantial portion of that increase; and, that it will have very important consequences for the well-being of the world.

So one of the problems I have is the gentleman's amendment would seem to suggest that there is an equal weight of evidence against that perspective as there is in favor of it. And I don't re-

call if the gentleman attended those two hearings, but if he did, I think it was pretty clear that scientists from around the world do not consider that there is an equal weight among those who might refute the evidence of global warming and the human causes thereof.

It is absolutely legitimate that we look at the pros and cons of the various strategies to remedy that; but to micromanage it in this way, which is not what the gentleman from California's initial amendment did, I think is a mistake. I certainly wouldn't want a kindergarten teacher who is trying to educate his or her students about the potential problems of global warming to say, "Oh, my goodness. I don't have in my curriculum for these 5-year-olds a lesson on the impact of greenhouse gas on developing nations or United States energy security." I think a kindergarten teacher might be much more likely to say, "Hey, kids the world is getting hotter. You and I and your folks can have a role in trying to reduce that problem, and it is in all of our best interests to do so."

I would hate to see a kindergarten teacher micromanaged like this, however well-intentioned the gentleman's amendment is. And I still reserve the point of order, but if we don't succeed in that, I certainly urge opposition to this at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, at this point I will withdraw the point of order, but I would urge opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. WELDON OF FLORIDA

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. WELDON of Florida:

In section 3(a)(1), strike "There" and insert "Except as provided in paragraph (3), there".

At the end of section 3(a), insert the following new paragraph:

(3) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), the total amount authorized to be appropriated under this subsection shall not exceed the amount actually appro-

priated for the Foundation for fiscal year 2007 if—

(A) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 2008 is less than \$17,309,400,000;

(B) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Exploration Systems for fiscal year 2008 is less than \$3,923,800,000; or

(C) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Space Operations for fiscal year 2008 is less than \$6,791,700,000.

In section 3(b)(1), strike "There" and insert "Except as provided in paragraph (3), there".

At the end of section 3(b), insert the following new paragraph:

(3) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), the total amount authorized to be appropriated under this subsection shall not exceed the amount actually appropriated for the Foundation for fiscal year 2008 if—

(A) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 2009 is less than \$17,614,200,000;

(B) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Exploration Systems for fiscal year 2009 is less than \$4,312,800,000; or

(C) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Space Operations for fiscal year 2009 is less than \$6,710,300,000.

In section 3(c)(1), strike "There" and insert "Except as provided in paragraph (3), there".

At the end of section 3(c), insert the following new paragraph:

(3) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), the total amount authorized to be appropriated under this subsection shall not exceed the amount actually appropriated for the Foundation for fiscal year 2009 if—

(A) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 2010 is less than \$18,026,300,000;

(B) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Exploration Systems for fiscal year 2010 is less than \$4,757,800,000; or

(C) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Space Operations for fiscal year 2010 is less than \$6,625,700,000.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to reserve a point of order on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the authors of this piece of legislation, and make very clear that I am a strong supporter of the National Science Foundation. Indeed, I have an undergraduate degree in a science field, biochemistry. I did basic science research as an undergraduate, and I fully recognize the need for this country to make a significant increase in our investment in basic science research as the kind of research that comes through the National Science Foundation.

My concern before the committee today is that the National Science Foundation is in the same budget category as NASA; and already, the new majority this year has chosen to significantly cut funding to NASA.

Specifically, over one-half billion dollars was reduced out of the NASA budget to fund the replacement for the space shuttle. The replacement for the space shuttle is badly needed. Our shuttle fleet is aging, and indeed we are looking at a scenario in the early part of the next decade where we will not have the capability of putting men and women into space. And we, the United States of America, the greatest country in the world, will be relying on the Russians to put our astronauts into space for many, many years. And, that the further reductions in NASA that will put forward by the new majority have the potential to lengthen that period even further, and possibly perhaps permanently cripple our manned space flight program.

So my amendment is very simple and very straightforward. Basically what it says is that we are not going to cut NASA for the purpose of plussing up the National Science Foundation. I believe we need to fund both of these programs, and that is my goal and that is the purpose of my amendment.

I think one of the things that the authors of this bill keep talking about, which is very revealing and I think very important to the debate we are having right now, they talk about the importance of training kids in math and science, and that we are falling behind in our international competitiveness. But I can tell you, when I talk to teachers all across the country about what motivates our young people to study math and science, it is not the level of grants that are coming out of the National Science Foundation, it is actually our space program and an enthusiasm for the possibility or the chance that they might some day be able to participate in the space program, the manned space flight program in particular that motivates our kids.

So I think these two programs are really linked at the hip, and I think it is important that we do not fund one at the expense of the other. The current language in this bill has the potential to create that climate, and so I think it is critically important that the point of order be waived and that my amendment move forward and be approved by this body.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the point of order, but I would like to move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. ANDREWS). The point of order is reserved.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate and admire and respect the gentleman from Florida, and I understand full well where he is coming from. He has been a passionate supporter of our manned space program, and I share some of his concerns about the impact on that budget. I do think, however, that his offsets are wrong, and that is why I reserved the point of order which in just a moment I will press.

□ 2015

There are many, many places in the Federal budget where we could find

possible money to support the gentleman's aims, many within, for example, the Commerce appropriations bill.

It is possible for the gentleman to adjust revenue impacts of tax cuts. It would be possible for the gentleman to seek offsets or matches through funding for the war in Iraq, which is burning about \$2.5 billion per week from our economy.

So if the gentleman is interested, as I know he is, in supporting space flight and continued investment in that, I would suggest that more appropriate offsets are available elsewhere in the Federal budget.

And I would also say it would be just terribly unfortunate to hold the Science Foundation budget, which this bill authorizes, hostage. You've got the wrong hostage. There are other places where lots more money is being reduced from the revenue stream or being expended on things that may not be in the best long-term national interest of this country. And for that reason, and for the fact that I actually consider the amendment nongermane, I will have to oppose it.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BAIRD. At this point, if it's appropriate to do so, I would wish to press the point of order with the Chair, if that's appropriate procedure at this point.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. ANDREWS). Will the gentleman state his point of order?

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chair, I have reserved a point of order. The amendment offered by the gentleman is not germane to the bill it is amending and, therefore, violates clause 7 of rule XVI.

The underlying section of the bill being amended is specific to the National Science Foundation, while the amendment introduces another unrelated agency, NASA, so the subject matter of the amendment is different than the underlying bill.

In addition, the amendment places an unrelated contingency on the authorization of NSF funds. On this point I would cite Deschler's Precedents, Chapter 28, 31.22.

Lastly, the purpose of the underlying section of the bill is to authorize appropriations for NSF, while the amendment seeks to affect the appropriations for NASA, so the fundamental purpose of the amendment is different from the underlying provision, and the scope of the underlying provision is significantly enlarged, and, therefore, I would urge that the amendment be ruled out of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would just simply point out to my friends on the other side that this amendment was duly and appropriately presented to the Rules Committee. The Rules Committee has all of the availability of the parliamentarians and the appropriate expertise

to be able to determine whether or not the amendment should be made in order. They determined, in their wisdom, that it should be made in order. And therefore, I would hope that the Chair would rule that, in fact, this amendment is appropriate, and that it addresses an issue that is of importance to the gentleman from Florida and importance to this Nation; and I would hope that we'd move forward with the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there any other Member who wishes to be recognized on the point of order?

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be recognized on the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is inappropriate to exercise a point of order on this amendment. It's quite clear that the NASA budget and the National Science Foundation are within the same budget category, function 250, and that there's a strong relationship between increasing the National Science Foundation that it can have a negative impact on NASA.

Furthermore, as my friend from Georgia just indicated, we have moved several bills through this body. Just today we did one where multiple points of order were waived. And the bottom line here, in my opinion, is NASA a priority for the new majority in this Congress. I don't believe it is. I don't believe it's a sufficient enough priority, and I ask that the point of order not be sustained.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order, seeing no other Members who wish to be recognized.

The gentleman from Washington makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida is not germane. The test of germaneness is the relationship of the amendment to the pending portion of the bill, section 3.

Clause 7 of rule XVI, the germaneness rule, provides that no proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment. One of the central tenets of the germaneness rule is that an amendment may not condition the effectiveness of legislation pending an unrelated condition. Examples of this principle may be found in the Deschler-Brown Precedents, chapter 28, section 30.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida proposes a condition on the level of authorizations contained in section 3. The condition relates to funding levels for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The activities of that separate entity are not related to an authorization for the National Science Foundation. As such, the amendment proposes an unrelated condition.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida is, therefore, not germane. The point of order is sustained.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Would it have been possible for the Rules Committee to propose a rule to the House to waive the rule under which the Chair has just ruled this amendment out of order?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman does not state a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman's question is hypothetical.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, isn't it true that the Rules Committee has the authority to waive the rules under which this House operates so that certain amendments may be brought to the floor?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole can only comment on the rule in operation for this bill.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the Chair.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. CAMPBELL of California:

At the end of section 3, insert the following new subsection:

(h) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized under this section may be used for research related to—

- (1) archives of Andean Knotted-String Records;
- (2) the accuracy in the cross-cultural understanding of others' emotions;
- (3) bison hunting on the late prehistoric Great Plains;
- (4) team versus individual play;
- (5) sexual politics of waste in Dakar, Senegal;
- (6) social relationships and reproductive strategies of Phayre's Leaf Monkeys; and
- (7) cognitive model of superstitious belief.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, we have a budget problem here in Washington, the Federal Government. The budget that was recently passed off of this floor has a deficit in it, continues that deficit for the next 4 years. It has a tax increase in it, the largest tax increase in American history, going forward. And it also continues to raid the Social Security funds, take the Social Security surplus that we have and spend it on things that are unrelated to Social Security. So we have a budget crisis going on.

What this amendment does is it says that there are certain things upon which we should not be spending money through this bill during this time of budget deficits, stealing Social Security funds, and increasing taxes.

What this amendment does, it says there's just a couple of things that we should not be increasing the deficit by spending money on, and I quote, "The Archives of Andean Knotted-String Records," or to study "The Accuracy in Cross-Cultural Understanding of Others' Emotions."

This amendment also says that we don't want to increase spending and, therefore, increase taxes in order to pay for a study of "Bison Hunting on the Late Prehistoric Great Plains" or "Team Versus Individual Play" or "The Sexual Politics of Waste in Dakar."

And it also says that we don't want to increase spending and spend any of this money in this authorization and, thereby, be continuing to raid the Social Security Trust Funds in order to study "The Social Relationships and Reproductive Strategies of Phayre's Leaf Monkeys" or "The Cognitive Model of Superstitious Belief."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I understand that there is a process of peer review from which these studies come in the National Science Foundation, and that's all well and good. But our job here is we are the elected representatives and stewards of the taxpayers' money, not the academics in the National Science Foundation, and it is our decision whether or not we wish to spend taxpayers' funds on studies of the social relationships and reproductive strategies of Phayre's leaf monkeys or on bison hunting on the late prehistoric Great Plains. I think we should not do that.

I am sure that some believe that these are very fine academic studies. That's excellent. Within the realms of academic halls, they may think a number of things are fine academic studies. That's not the question.

The question before us is, do these things rise to the standard of requiring expenditures of taxpayer funds in a time of deficits, proposed tax increases and raiding Social Security funds? I think the answer is a resounding no. I think the answer should be a resounding no, which means that I would hope that the vote on this amendment would be an equally resounding yes.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I appreciate the gentleman's comments about the budget deficit, and I would first suggest that the deficit rose to historic levels under the leadership of the former majority party, largest deficits in the history of this country, indeed, were accrued with President Bush and the former majority.

Looking to these studies, some of which are \$10,000, now absolutely we must make sure that we spend all the taxpayer dollars wisely. But let me just share with you what the American Association for Advancement of Science, probably the most prestigious scientific body in this country, has said. Prohibiting specific grants sets a dangerous precedent for scientific research that has progressed and ad-

vanced for decades through freedom of inquiry into a broad spectrum of subjects. While congressional oversight of Federal programs is, of course, important, second-guessing peer review in this way could compromise the fabric of our public research enterprise one thread at a time. Therefore, we urge you to oppose such amendments.

Similar sentiments have been voiced by the Association of American Universities.

And I would be tempted to ask the gentleman from California, except he's already stated his piece, why he would be opposing research that has been supported by the United States Army Research Institute; that is seen as critical to the security of our troops serving in Iraq.

Now, my wager is the gentleman's saying to himself right now, I have no idea what the chairman is speaking about here. And that's the problem. When you look at a cursory examination of the title, or an abstract, you don't have an idea. That's why we have peer review.

Which particular study am I talking about? I'm talking about the Study of the Accuracy of Cross Cultural Understanding of Others' Emotions. What we are talking about here is if you're going to be dealing with people from another culture, and you misread their expression of emotions, it can cost you your life, your buddies their life, or the innocent civilians their lives. The U.S. Army Research Institute believes this is important, and they support the basic elements of this kind of study.

I also am not sure, the gentleman seems to suggest, it seems, that we here in the Congress, with a cursory evaluation of the abstracts from studies, should insert ourselves in the peer-review process. I wonder if the gentleman had looked at chemistry research or physics research in the same way, and do we really want to spend this body's time, and do you, sir, or you, sir, have the expertise to evaluate these studies? That's why we have a peer-review process. That's why we have a National Science Foundation. It is why we have a Science Foundation Board to direct us.

I absolutely agree that if taxpayer dollars are going to be spent on research, it is incumbent upon the scientist to do the research well, ethically, responsibly, and that it be relevant. But I do not believe it is the place of either side of this aisle to single out particular studies, as has been done in this case, and presume that with a 5-minute examination we know better than peer reviewers who have the degrees in the relevant fields and have spent years studying them and have evaluated them. That is a dangerous precedent to set, and I would urge strongly opposition to this amendment and a similar one which will emerge shortly for the sake of our soldiers.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

These are always very difficult questions, and I have learned long ago never to judge the research by the title of the proposal. These are complex issues, and I don't know if the gentleman was here earlier when I spoke about the rate of return on research at the National Science Foundation. The best estimate is that the rate of return is a minimum of 20 percent and a maximum 400 percent on individual research projects.

□ 2030

Now, I challenge anyone in this Chamber to find investments that will year after year give you that rate of return on the investment.

Another point I would like to make is, as I said, you can't always judge the full proposal by the title. This was evident a few years ago when we went through exactly the same charade when discussing the National Science Foundation budget. Some of my colleagues came down to the floor to amend the NSF appropriations bill, and one offered an amendment to remove grants for the study of ATM. This person gave a magnificent speech why we should not spend money at the National Science Foundation or the Department of Energy to study ATM. His argument was, let the banking industry do the research on ATMs. What he didn't know is that the proposal was not on automatic teller machines but the proposal was on studying asynchronous transfer modes, which involves the way computers talk to each other. This research led to a substantial change in the speed at which computers were able to talk to each other. This is a good example of why it is dangerous to just look at titles and make a judgment.

I would also pick up on the comment of Mr. BAIRD about cultural studies. I think one of the basic problems in Iraq, and I have told this to people in the White House, is that there were not enough people in the White House, perhaps even in the State Department, who understood the culture of the countries we were dealing with, and we failed to realize what would happen once we moved into that country. A good NSF-funded study beforehand would have been invaluable in determining what would happen.

Another example: a few years ago there was a grant on game theory. Once again, one of our colleagues rushed to the floor and said we have to eliminate funding for that. In fact, game theory is extremely useful in calculating the operation of nuclear reactors.

So I urge defeat of this amendment. It is very easy to sit on the House floor and pontificate about these issues. But if we are going to cut the budget, there are much more fertile fields in which to cut. Why would we cut the one agency that gives us a guaranteed rate of return on our investment when there are many other areas we can cut where we are getting little or no payback at all?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I appreciate the comments of my good friend from Michigan, and I appreciate the comments of my fellow colleague from Washington. And I have been, as a physician, a strong supporter of the National Science Foundation. I believe strongly that, in fact, they need more money, not less. I would argue that we need to prioritize appropriately in our Federal budget and provide much greater resources in the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health and the CDC and others that ultimately work and derive huge benefit to our entire society and, in fact, to the world.

But I commend my good friend from California for bringing this amendment forward because, although I may not have pulled out a couple of the items that he notes, for the life of me, I have a difficult time understanding and appreciating why on earth it would make any sense, and I would ask my good friend from Washington can you fathom how studying bison hunting on the Late Prehistoric Great Plains might have some effect on contemporary society that would make a difference with the compelling argument that you made regarding the study of cross-cultural emotions?

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I thank very much the gentleman for yielding. And I would just caution I wouldn't state "for the life of me" on something that I hadn't studied very well no matter how obvious it may look.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I would be happy to reclaim my time or I would be happy to have you answer the question, one or the other.

Mr. BAIRD. I could answer the question. I am just giving you the caveat about staking your life on things.

Here is the issue: I don't think we want to say that we should never study the history of things. It is the perspective of this gentleman that we should not study history. And particularly, when you look at bison, I am not an expert in this, but to pretend to be so would be a mistake. To pretend to be so on your side or on my side would be a mistake. The authors of this study have contended that biologists and social scientists have tried to look at how humans make decisions to maximize and minimize risks in different environmental conditions. As you face different food supply systems, how do you deal with that? And that is part of the point here. How did people who live on the plains look at where they were going to harvest bison?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest candidly that it was a valiant attempt. It was truly a valiant attempt, and I appreciate the attempt, to make a justification for bison hunting on the Late Prehistoric Great Plains. I would

also suggest that the sexual politics of waste in Dakar, Senegal is a questionable study.

So I commend my good friend from California, and I would be happy to yield to him.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

I appreciate the academic arguments, and I understand them. I am a history buff myself. I love this stuff. I might actually love this report, might enjoy reading it, might find it fascinating. That's not the point. The point is do we want to spend taxpayer funds on this?

The United States taxpayer cannot fund every bit of academic research for every university, for everything that every professor wants to do across this country. We can't do that. The question before us is, are these the sorts of things we do want to spend taxpayer money on? I would suggest that they are not, and that is why I would suggest that to vote against this amendment is to say that you believe that taxpayer money should be spent on these specific items. That is the question before us. Not whether it is interesting. I am a Civil War buff. I love all kinds of interesting stuff about that, but I don't think the taxpayer ought to pay for research into it.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I would concur. I think that there are many things that are exciting and interesting to study, whether or not they ought to be priorities at this point, and again, I would point to the bison hunting on the Late Prehistoric Great Plains.

And if my good friend from Michigan would care to make a comment, I would be pleased to yield.

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

I just want to respond to the statement that we can't fund every proposal that comes along, and that is absolutely true. The National Science Foundation funds a small fraction of the proposals that come through, and that is why we are beginning to slip as a Nation compared to other nations, because we are simply not, as a Congress, providing sufficient funds for the National Science Foundation. And I forget the current figure, but I think it is in the neighborhood of 20 percent of the grant applications are being funded; 80 percent are not being funded. It's a tough business, and these are all peer-reviewed grants. I cannot defend them individually without looking at them. As I say, you can't judge a proposal or a grant by its cover.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding.

The challenge here, my friends, is you asked, I think, a question that is

just improperly placed. Neither of us is trained in these areas. You are challenging a fundamental tenet of how we do National Science Foundation research. If you truly believe that the most cost-effective use of this body's time, and that we are qualified to use our time in that fashion, is to, one by one by one, review National Science Foundation grants for our considered and qualified judgment of the appropriateness of those grants, it seems to me that that is a bit of a stretch. It seems to me that you are really making a political statement.

If the political statement you want to make is we should spend the taxpayers' dollars wisely, I, 100 percent, agree. You may not know it, and probably don't, that we are working with the National Science Foundation to establish a letter actually that scientists that receive public grants would have to sign saying they understand the money came from the taxpayers, they are committed to doing research that is well designed and ethically high quality and that is relevant.

The problem for us, in this brief time we have here and lacking expertise in the field, is it is really presumptuous of us on either side to say I can either attack or defend. I would yield time to either of you if you want to tell us what your personal qualifications are in the area of expertise of any of these studies, and I will hold you to it. What personal qualifications do you have in the broad area of this study to speak to that study?

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. We are qualified by virtue of the fact that we have been elected by people in our districts to be stewards of their money. As I said, this is not a question of whether or not these things have academic merit within a field of academics. It is a question of whether they are worthy of spending taxpayer money in that area. I think they are not.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. BAIRD. Let me just share with the gentleman the dangerous path you are on. There was a study some time back dealing with the sex life of the screw worm, perhaps aptly noted. The sex life of the screw worm, that would be pretty tempting to come to the floor and say, by God, why are we spending taxpayer dollars studying the sex life of screw worms? The reason being that that research saved the cattle industry millions of dollars by eliminating a parasite that deposited eggs in the placenta of newborn cows.

We don't have the knowledge. We are indeed stewards of the taxpayers' money, which is why we created the National Science Foundation, why we are very careful about designating how the peer-review process works, and, quite frankly, why we shouldn't mess

with that peer-review process. If we truly want to be stewards of the taxpayers' money, which I believe all of us want to be, then our best approach is to delegate some of the decision making about where some of that money is spent to those who best know the realm in which the research is spent. It is precisely because I believe in the task of being a steward of the taxpayer dollars that I oppose the general purpose of the amendment.

I understand you are trying to save money. I just don't think our best way to do so is by micromanaging either this or most of the other foundations.

And I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Just a couple of points and then I will yield.

I agree with the gentleman that in some respects, perhaps, this body should not be engaged in micromanaging various aspects of the Federal Government where we do not have expertise.

Earlier today, and in just the past week, we had a complete debate on that subject of whether this body, all 535 Members, were in appropriate position to micromanage the war, and I think some of us thought that we were not in the best position but that we should have, just as you are suggesting here, the trained professionals, the experts, the people on the field who are engaged in this activity on a daily basis make those decisions.

So I would agree with the gentleman there. And if we were to have consistency, then we should not be engaged in that matter and we should not be engaged in this case.

Let me make my second point and that is this: It is not incumbent upon the gentleman from California to be the expert in these areas that he is raising questions about. The underlying bill is not the gentleman from California's bill. It is the majority party's bill. It is your bill. You are coming to the floor making the case, or I should say the other side of the aisle, as I am speaking to the Chair, making the case that we should be spending all this money on these programs. So it is incumbent upon the offerer of the underlying legislation to make the case why we should be doing it and have the information why each one of these is justified so that when either the gentleman from California or Georgia raises the legitimate question, the same question that we are going to get when we go back to our constituents and are asked why did we vote on it, he should be making the justification for that.

With that, I will yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his comments. And he is making a very apt point.

And I appreciate the comments of my good friend from Washington, who said,

and I think it got down correctly, "We are neither trained nor have expertise in this area." And you are absolutely right. But consistency is a wonderful thing and inconsistency is a challenge.

□ 2045

I would suggest that none of us are pure in this area, but my good friend talks about we ought to delegate decisionmaking to authorities who have expertise, and we should. As a physician, I am compelled and have strong affinity for all of the advocacy groups that come to my office, as I know they come to yours, and advocate on behalf of specific diseases. Most recently this week, the folks who have suffered under the scourge of breast cancer have come, and they are asking for more resources. And I always suggest to them that it is appropriate for those decisions to be made by individuals at the National Science Foundation, at the CDC, at the National Institutes of Health. But, in fact, what my good friend from Washington does all the time, in his capacity in Congress, is to determine exactly what that line item ought to be from an appropriations standpoint.

As a physician, the medical profession has suffered under the decisions that have been made in this Chamber and in the Chamber on the other side of this building because individuals thought they had greater expertise in the area of health care. And as my good friend from New Jersey clearly stated, and appropriately stated, that just this week we've been dealing with folks who believe they have greater expertise in the area of military competence and battles than our generals on the ground.

So I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that my good friend from Washington is absolutely correct, that we ought to delegate in certain instances, but we ought to also utilize the prerogative that we have and the responsibility that we have as representatives in this body, representatives of our districts, and make certain that we are good stewards of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. EHLERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all, I'll make a deal with you; I won't make any judgments about medical research if you don't make judgments about NSF research.

The point of this really is that you cannot predict what will result from the research; that is the idea behind basic research.

Years ago when I was a graduate student at Berkeley, we were spending tremendous amounts of money to examine the behavior of elementary particles, protons, neutrons, mesons, and so on. And no one, even in the scientific community, could ever imagine any practical use for that. But later on the results from doing that research led to the development of a CAT scanner and

the MRI. Now, who would ever have thought that elementary particle physics would lead to major findings in medicine which every doctor relies upon today?

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to my good friend and colleague from Washington State (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. I thank the gentleman from California. Just a couple of brief comments, and it's getting late, so we don't want to carry this forever.

I would suggest that we all agree that consistency is a very dangerous thing. If the gentleman talks about being consistent, I would ask the gentleman why they chose not to micro-manage the vast expenditures of dollars, not even to have oversight hearings of the vast expenditure of dollars on the war.

If you really want to save the taxpayer dollars, we are burning \$2.5 billion a week in Iraq. This entire bill is \$21 billion over 3 years. We're talking about 3 full years to fund the basic scientific research of this entire Nation, from mathematics to physics to chemistry to social sciences. That's about 6 or 7 weeks or so of what you spend in Iraq. And yet when it came to oversight of the expenditures in Iraq, the majority, then-majority party was then just virtually silent. If you really want to save the taxpayers' money, and I do, you could have looked at that.

But let me suggest what the gentleman from New Jersey misrepresents. And I asked earlier if any folks on the other side were qualified to study this. The gentleman from New Jersey just doesn't seem to understand how this legislation works. He completely misrepresented when he said that it is incumbent upon the majority and the chairman who is bringing this forward to defend these studies. Sir, this bill does not authorize specific studies. That is not how the authorizing language for the National Science Foundation works. It would be ludicrous, and you should know that; and if you don't know it, you are not qualified to speak to this. But it would be ludicrous to suggest that when you authorize a foundation, that you are authorizing every single specific study or that you know what all those specific studies are. That's not how the National Science Foundation works. That's not how we authorize it. That's not how this bill functions. And it's indeed not how many, many of the authorizing bills function here. So to suggest that, to bring forward a broad authorization bill that gives responsibility to a foundation, one has to justify every single study is to misrepresent how this legislation works. And that's the problem. I think the gentleman either misunderstands or misrepresents how the legislation works.

I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. ANDREWS). The question is on the amend-

ment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

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

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL
OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. CAMPBELL of California:

At the end of section 3, add the following new subsection:

(h) REDUCTION.—Each of the amounts authorized to be appropriated or made available under this section shall be reduced by 1 percent.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Washington mentioned that he didn't think this last amendment that I proposed was the correct way to save money, so perhaps this is the more correct way; maybe this is something that he would find more to his liking.

H.R. 1867, this bill before us, would increase spending for the National Science Foundation by 9.9 percent in the first year, 7.4 percent in the second year and 7.3 percent in the third year, for an increase of over 25 percent over a 3-year period. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is an amount, and I, too, am someone who has sympathy for some of the things that the National Science Foundation does. However, even over the last few years where we have had very large percentage increases in our revenues to the Federal Government, they haven't been as large as this over the last 3-year period. In fact, in the next 3-year period, any of the prognosticators, whether it be the Office of Management and Budget or any of the other prognosticators, are not estimating that we will have a 25 percent increase in revenue over the next 3 years. So therefore, this proposes to increase spending at a rate greater than revenue is projected to increase over the next 3 years.

This amendment would simply reduce the amount of this increase by 1 percent per year. So instead of increasing by 10 percent the first year, it would increase by only 9; instead of increasing by 7.4 percent, the second year would increase by 6.4 percent; and 7.3 percent, it would increase by 6.3 percent in the third year. These are still large annual increases, larger than most taxpayers at home are likely to see the increases in their incomes, in their salaries, in their wages.

So this is just a small reduction. It does not deal with, as the gentleman from Washington mentioned, it does not specifically say what, it leaves that

issue open. So, therefore, it does not interfere with the selection of these various proposals and research things that the gentleman from Washington just supported in the last amendment.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I would ask for an "aye" vote.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, here's the problem with what the gentleman is proposing, however well-intentioned it may be. And I am deeply concerned; as the gentlemen know, I serve on the Budget Committee with some of the gentlemen who are speaking, and we are all concerned about the long-term deficit picture for this country. However, if you cut investments in scientific research and scientific education, in the long run you will increase the deficit of this country, and you will decrease our national security, our national health care and our national and international competitiveness. That is why this is a mistake.

And don't just take my word for it. The National Academies of Science, in *Rising Above the Gathering Storm*, a 2005 publication, called for more than a 10 percent increase; the U.S. Commission on National Security, the Hart-Rudman report, a similar level of increase; the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, in their publication, *Assessing the U.S. R&D Investment in 2003*; a coalition of 15 industry associations, in the publication *Tapping America's Potential*, in 2005; the Council on Competitiveness in their publication, *Innovate America*.

This is not just a Democratic proposal or Republican proposal. I would remind the gentleman that this bill passed unanimously out of committee with bipartisan support.

I would also encourage you to ask your faculty administrators, ask your high technology industries, do you think this country is spending sufficient quantities on fundamental basic research and investment such as that funded by National Science Foundation? And do you think we are doing enough to keep our young people educated in science and math in ways such as supported by this legislation? I guarantee you most of them would say no. You would, I think, by this cutting, with due respect, significantly be impairing, and it sounds like a small measure, but remember, we are already falling behind in a number of areas in science and math, not only in the education, but in the applied fields.

This is consistent with President Bush's own administration request of a 7 percent per year increase. Again, this is a bipartisan approach, not a Democratic or Republican approach. The President has called for this. And again, as Dr. EHLERS said so eloquently earlier, our return on investment from research is profound. And when you cut that investment, I think you're cutting that return on investment.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I will try to be brief. We have beat this subject to death, but I find it ironic that we talk about cutting the funding of the one agency that returns more on its money than any other agency does.

If we're talking about cutting the NSF by 1 percent, we should cut everything in the budget by 1 percent. And I might even vote for that if you are willing to cut defense by 1 percent; Cut every department, cut Social Security by 1 percent, and so on down the line. Then you might have something that would be worth doing. But to attack something that actually benefits this Nation, increases our health and wealth, and is allowing us to at least try to keep up with what other nations are doing, is utterly unrealistic.

I would point out, and I can show you graphs indicating that we are falling far behind other nations. We occupied the premier spot in research for a number of years. But now South Korea, as an example, is very rapidly getting very close to what we are spending on research as a percentage of GDP. I expect them to pass us in a few years.

It is incredible to me that we are supposed to be the brightest, most powerful Nation in the world, and yet we are losing ground compared to nations such as South Korea. If we are serious about competing with other countries, we absolutely have to keep investing our money in research, whether it's the National Science Foundation or whether it is the Department of Energy or the National Institutes of Health.

In addition to that, I would mention that the National Science Foundation is just about the lowest-cost research institution. We spend a lot less money in the National Science Foundation than we do in the Department of Energy, than we do in National Institutes of Health or that we do on NASA. One of the lowest costs with the highest rate of return, I don't see any reason in the world to cut the NSF.

Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Just a short clarification, that this amendment does not propose a cut in the funding, it proposes to very slightly reduce the rate of growth from what was proposed. That is my only clarification.

Mr. EHLERS. I thank you for the clarification.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to my good friend from Washington State (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief. I want to echo what the distinguished ranking member said.

The following countries are increasing their investment in basic research faster than this legislation would authorize, and they've already put the money up front. Listen to these countries and see if you think it is wise for our Nation to reduce its investment even further, and further fall behind: China, Taiwan, European Union, South

Korea, Singapore and others. Do we seriously want to further reduce our investment in basic research if we want to keep our Nation competitive? I submit we don't, and I would urge defeat of this amendment.

I thank the gentleman.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

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

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 2100

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

At the end of section 3, add the following new subsection:

(h) REDUCTION.—Each of the amounts authorized to be appropriated or made available under this section shall be reduced by 0.5 percent.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I, too, echo the words of my colleagues who are in support of the overall funding of the National Science Foundation, and I offer this amendment to H.R. 1867, which I hope will provide incentives for the NSF to identify waste and any abuse within the Agency, but also, very importantly, to help identify those programs which are either underperforming or simply just not working.

I believe this legislation will help be a model of fiscal responsibility. It is similar to the legislation we just heard from in two respects. H.R. 1867 authorizes the National Science Foundation to increase their spending, which goes to the point of the gentleman from Michigan was saying before, by 7 percent, and again in 2009 and 2010.

The point we must make here, though, is inflation has remained constant during this same time period at around 3 percent. So when we purport to be so concerned about the taxpayers' dollars and the debt we are leaving our children, which I just heard from the gentleman from the other side of the aisle previously, how can we justify programmatic increases for research that are actually more than twice the rate of inflation?

As I referenced before, when I go back to my constituents back at home in town hall meetings and the like, they are not seeing 7 percent increases in their wages and salaries. They are not seeing a doubling of their incomes and their family household incomes.

They may be seeing that as far as their expenses are concerned. They are seeing all other sorts of increases in spending, such as gasoline prices and the like that they have to put up with, but they are not seeing the increases in income and expenditures that we are seeing in this bill.

I will comment on one comment that the gentleman from the other side of the aisle made before as far as being consistent. I think we heard the American public on this past election day. The American public is concerned about overspending by Congress. They want us to prioritize where our dollars go. They want to make sure that we are spending every dime efficiently and appropriately.

I have yet, however, to hear one suggestion from the other side of the aisle, either here on the floor or on the Budget Committee, on which I serve with some of the gentleman on the other side of the aisle, as to where we with can make some of those cuts. Instead, what we are seeing is a continual increase in spending.

Another point to make as well: Time after time our constituents come to our office quoting the discrepancy between authorization levels and appropriation levels. It is my hope that instead of having to disappoint them once again, that we set realistic authorization levels that may actually be realistic to the appropriation levels that come down the line. Let's be realistic, both on what we can do for our constituents and also what the appropriators may be doing with this bill later on.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment, because it is our duty simply as stewards of our constituents' money, the taxpayers' dollars, as we step forward to make an honest assessment of what we can afford and should afford the American taxpayer.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have been over the basics. Let me just reiterate, this proposal for the increase in the National Science Foundation is thoroughly consistent with President Bush's own agenda. The competitiveness initiative calls for these kinds of increases. That is point one.

Point two: If we hope to maintain our competitiveness, if you look at the proportion of our economy today that is the direct result, and Dr. EHLERS illustrated a number of examples, but the direct result of research and inventions that have come out of funding by the National Science Foundation, a tremendous amount of our economic prosperity today came from those investigations.

As Dr. EHLERS so eloquently said, we don't know, "we" generally, not just we in the Congress, but especially we in the Congress, don't necessarily know which particular investigation, which particular study, is going to yield those profound results. But some will.

I will tell you, I just spoke to a scientist in my district last week and he

said to me, Congressman, the pipeline of U.S. scientists is drying up. You just really have to understand this. The pipeline of U.S.-based scientists is drying up, because the research funding is not adequate to meet the demand.

What is happening is many, many young researchers are either not entering the field or are dropping out of the field or abandoning potentially promising careers, promising not just for them, but for our society.

The hit rate, if you are a young researcher applying for a grant through NSF, your hit rate is low. You are going to spend a tremendous amount of effort applying for a grant, trying to further your research agenda, and your hit rate is going to be significantly low. That is demoralizing. It blocks important avenues of research that might yield promising results.

And when we make these cuts, it is easy for us. I agree that we have got a huge fiscal problem. But, again, I will tell you that if you look at the long-term drivers of the fiscal problems this country faces, nobody says it is that vast waste at the National Science Foundation that is driving this country into debt. That is not what they say. They say it is a combination of revenue, it is a combination of entitlement programs, it is a combination of defense. I agree we ought to debate those, but not on the back of the National Science Foundation, for goodness sake.

So I would urge defeat of this amendment for the same reasons I urged defeat previously.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the underlying bill, H.R. 1867, and rise to express my appreciation and thank the Science Committee for the bipartisan effort that they have always engaged in, and frankly, want, to thank them for the opportunity that I have had to serve on that committee for a number of years.

Usually we rise and say with great reluctance, I rise to oppose the amendment. I might say with great vigor I rise to oppose the amendment. Because as I served on the Science Committee for a number of years, I used to always start the hearings with the idea that science is the work of the 21st century, and certainly the National Science Foundation sets the framework for encouraging research and innovativeness.

I can't imagine that the distinguished gentleman who has offered this amendment would venture to argue with me, and I cite just a few examples that I think most of my colleagues and most of America frankly understand how our lives have been changed by simply these innovations. Of course, some of them were by private ingenuity and private concepts and funding possibly, but that was an America of yesteryear.

But where would we be without the Wright Brothers and the airplane?

Where would we be without Thomas Edison and electricity and the light bulb? Even though as we move into the 21st century, we want to be protectors of the environment and certainly want to be conservationists, look how that has changed our lives. And what about the Internet, interestingly enough, one of the success stories of DOD research.

The most important part of it is the work that was created, the work that was created by these inventions and by the opportunities to allow our imagination to generate a better quality of life for Americans.

This bill, H.R. 1867, which, as I said, I enthusiastically support, creates work for the 21st century. It emphasizes the underserved. It encourages research to be done by Historically Black Colleges and Historically Hispanic Serving Institutions, and as well, to encourage diversity in science, technology, engineering and mathematics.

There is an important provision that mentions, of course, the intent of this particular legislation to determine how different minority groups are impacted by this funding, which is whether or not we can increase the number of underrepresented minorities in the science, technology, engineering and mathematics fields, and how we can increase women in these fields. For the time I have worked on the Science Committee as a former member of the committee, these were issues that we worked on together.

What the gentleman is trying to achieve with this across-the-board cut is amazing to me, because what he is actually saying to the world and to America is we are second rate. We don't believe in investing in the next generation of research. We don't believe in uplifting those who are interested in these disciplines to give them merit and worth.

I would ask the gentleman, though I am sure his rebuttal will be that we don't pay those dollars. I don't know if we do. What is a high school football or basketball coach worth? What is a college football, basketball or any other sport's coach worth? Can we not, as a Nation, make a commitment to the research community by affirming their importance?

Dr. EHLERS and Dr. BAIRD have worked together affirming the importance of research, and not closing the door of this important responsibility that we have.

I am fearful, Mr. Chairman, of where this Nation is headed when we pull back on the ability of our Nation to invest in the 21st century technology. NASA represents that, the NASA Space Station represents that, the centers represent that, the laboratories represent that.

We want to encourage this funneling, this pathway, if you will, this farm team of researchers, and this particular legislation does that by increased funding, by highlighting the underserved, and I believe doing a lot more.

Let me conclude by saying I had intended to offer amendment to ensure that Historically Black Colleges and Hispanic Serving Institutions would be a viable part of the legislation. As I have reviewed it, I know that the intent is there, and that we will look forward to working with the members of the committee and working with this Congress to make sure that the United States is creating work for the 21st century.

Oppose the amendment and support the bill for the betterment of America.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1867, the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2007. This bill is another important 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, to ensure that the United States will continue to have a workforce ready for global competition, it is essential that we make a sustained commitment to federal research and development. The National Science Foundation is crucial to these goals, providing vital support to our Nation's science and engineering projects and researchers.

Created by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, the National Science Foundation, or NSF, is tasked with the broad mission of supporting science and engineering. This agency provides funding for basic research across many disciplines, and offers support for merit awards, state-of-the-art tools, and instrumentation and facilities. The majority of the research supported by the NSF is conducted at U.S. colleges and universities.

This bill reaffirms our commitment to scientific excellence by reauthorizing the National Science Foundation (NSF) for three years and providing nearly \$21 billion in funding for fiscal years 2008–2010. This legislation appropriates specific funding for each of the NSF's major accounts: research and related activities, education and human resources, major research equipment and facilities construction, agency operations and award management, the National Science Board, and the Office of the Inspector General. A number of specific programs within the science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) educational categories are singled out as the recipients of funding. Additionally, specific funding is designated for Major Research Instrumentation (MRI) awards. By raising the cap for these awards, this bill allows the NSF to support a wider range of state-of-the-art research tools.

This bill contains many other important provisions. It requires an evaluation of NSF's role in supporting interdisciplinary research, and encourages university and industry partnerships. It encourages young investigators through a new grant program, and it requires a National Academy of Sciences report on barriers to and strategies for increasing the participation of underrepresented minorities in STEM fields.

The NSF ensures a continued national supply of scientific and engineering personnel, while promoting basic research and education across a wide array of scientific and technological disciplines. In the interest of both economic prosperity and military capability, the United States must continue producing a workforce knowledgeable to maintain technological competitiveness. If we are to do this,

this Congress must continue funding and strengthening science and mathematics education. Supporting this bill is an important step, and I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I know my good friend from Texas did not intend to, but I would respectfully request the Chair make certain that he calls into order individuals who impugn the motive of other Members of this body. I think it is important that we not do that in this Chamber.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Let me be the first, because I believe we are all distinguished gentlemen, gentleladies and gentlemen, say that my remarks were to the value of this bill and to my philosophical disagreement with the author of this amendment, and certainly recognize that he is proud of America and all of the inventiveness that she has, and therefore any intent that might have been perceived by my words were only to glorify this bill and to celebrate our researchers and our science in this country.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentlelady's comments, and I would just respectfully suggest it might be appropriate to review the words that were spoken and reflect upon them.

Mr. Chairman, I would also suggest candidly that my recollection, I am not absolutely certain, but my recollection is that the Wright Brothers and Thomas Edison had no government subsidy, and the remarkable inventions that they came up with were without the benefit of government subsidy. That is not to say that government subsidy isn't appropriate for certain occasions, but I would suggest that those individuals had remarkable accomplishments without the kind of support that we are discussing today.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield to my good friend from New Jersey, the sponsor of the amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the other side of the aisle has mischaracterized what this amendment does when they speak of cuts and pullbacks from science and the Foundation. Nothing of the kind is in this amendment. Instead, we will still be increasing spending this year and next year and next year and next year up to \$20.87 billion for these appropriated expenditures on the National Science Foundation, instead of \$20.97 billion.

I am very much concerned about education and science and our research. Let me just add, I am also concerned about the education of our youth. My constituents are just as concerned

about educating their kids and being able to afford to send their kids to college and how do they pay for that? My constituents are concerned about the health care and the medical expenditures for their families and how do they pay for that? My constituents are concerned about the housing for their family and loved ones, and how do they pay for that?

They are not seeing a 7 percent increase in their wages and salaries, even though each and every one of those things are just as vitally important to them as it is that we spend money on overall Science Foundation research in the United States of America.

□ 2115

This amendment would not cut spending by a dime. This amendment would simply limit the growth rate from 7 percent down to 6.5 percent. The last amendment was seeing it go down from 7 percent to 6 percent. This would be even less, from 7 to 6.5 percent. You would still be seeing a growth year after year after year. The NSF would still be allowed to expend their dollars on those critical areas that my friend from Georgia and the Members on the other side of the aisle are so concerned about for the betterment of this country.

I would implore the Members on the other side of the aisle that if we are to be consistent when we talk about the overall spending and revenue side for this Congress, that we stop doing what the other side of the aisle has done. They have only looked at the revenue side of the equation so far in the last 3 or 4 months, giving us the largest tax increase in America's history on the other hand, but have done absolutely nothing for the American public when it says how are we going to set priorities for the American public and what we spend money on, and how are we going to try to rein in spending for the American public as well. I think we need to do it on both sides.

Finally, regarding what the gentleman from Michigan said, I agree with him. If we can do it across the board for all of the other programs, I am right in line with him, and I support him on that endeavor as well. Let's start here, and I will be the first one to cosponsor any of his amendments to do likewise, decreasing the overall increases of spending that this government has.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Just briefly, I want to comment on a comment made by my friend from New Jersey about health care, a very, very important issue. But the only way we are going to be able to offer better health care to everyone is by reducing the cost.

One huge element of cost in health care is cancer treatment. Today at lunch I met with the latest seven Nobel

Prize winners all of whom happen to be from America because we support this research.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Just to continue, today the Science Committee had lunch with the latest Nobel Prize winners, all of whom are from America because we try very hard to provide funding for the research. They, I might point out, did the research a number of years ago. I hope we can continue to provide Nobel Prize winners by adequately funding the National Science Foundation and others.

But in speaking to the gentleman who got the award in physiology and medicine, he talked about his discovery and the impact it is going to have on cancer treatment. That is very likely to cause a substantial reduction in the cost of the treatment of cancer using his approach.

What does his approach depend on? That is the Human Genome Project which we started a number of years ago in NIH and were the first Nation to do that.

It is always amazing to me how discoveries that we find in one area can have application, and no one, I think, dreamed that when we did the Human Genome Project that we might find the cure of cancer there rather than in medicine. So it is very important that we continue funding the fundamental basic research so we can continue to enjoy the fruits of their research.

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I thank Mr. EHLERS for his comments.

Very briefly, in 2002, 397 Members of this Congress, including 194 Members of the then-majority party Republicans, voted to double, double, the National Science Foundation.

For those members of your party who plan to vote against this bill or who plan to vote for this reduction in the authorized levels for this committee, I would just suggest you well may be voting against something that you voted for just a few years ago at much higher levels and that the President signed into law. The then-majority voted to double the budget. The President signed it into law at much higher levels than what we are talking about today.

In the last Presidential election, somebody ran around with a flip-flop guy chasing Mr. KERRY. If you do this, the flip-flop guy might be outside your door.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT
OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

At the end of section 3, add the following new subsection:

(h) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized under this section may be used for research related to—

(1) the reproductive aging and symptom experience at midlife among Bangladeshi Immigrants, Sedentees, and White London Neighbors; and

(2) the diet and social stratification in ancient Puerto Rico.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, just beginning where the last comment on the last bill ended up, I appreciate the gentleman pointing out that this side did support a doubling of the NSF, and I was probably one of those who was there to support the increase; so no one, I think, can take the position that we are not uniformly as a body or as a party opposed to the general notion of increasing, making significant increases to applied research or general research, I should say, by the NSF.

What we can ask, though, is after the last election, has the American voter spoken with regard to the overall growth in Federal spending in all areas, whether it is in science and health care, whether it is in the war, for veterans or other areas; should we not look at each one individually and decide some should go up, some should remain the same, and some should go up at a slightly different way? That is what we are suggesting in the last amendment, simply that they should go up at a slightly different arc than they are in the underlying bill, 6.5 percent instead of 7 percent.

In the amendment before us right now, we look to see what is the underlying mission of the NSF. If we look at their mission statement, we see it is: "To promote the progress of science, advance the national health, prosperity and welfare and secure the national defense."

But during these tough fiscal times, both at the Federal level and at the family level, as I pointed out before, Congress must exercise good stewardship over every penny of taxpayers' dollars. This includes helping the NSF to focus on its priority projects.

Just as the gentleman from Georgia indicated, he has been visited by a number of people from various groups dealing with health issues, so have I; people with serious health issues like Alzheimer's, Parkinson's and diabetes.

They come and ask what are we doing and how are we prioritizing for their concerns within the NSF.

The amendment before you simply says can we find more than a quarter million dollars to fund research on such programs as reproductive aging symptoms of midlife Bangladeshi immigrants, but not more funding for research projects which might bring progress and eventually cures for some of the serious illnesses we have already heard about on the floor?

In addition, how can we justify research like the diet and social stratification of ancient cultures when here at home current medical research is so desperately needed?

Now, I understand that the point has been already made that we do not specifically itemize in the authorization bills each one of these specific programs, but these are, as the gentleman knows, programs which have already been authorized in the past and are continuing under the law right now into 2007 and 2008.

So doesn't it behoove us here in Congress to make a statement, to make a stand and say that at least in several of these areas we can make a position that our limited dollars should not be going to those areas, but instead we would make the position that they should be going for Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, diabetes and cancer research and some other areas that we have previously spoken about?

So I encourage my colleagues, do not only exercise good stewardship over the taxpayers' dollars, but in essence to also ensure that worthy projects receive the funding they deserve within that noble mission that I set forth at the beginning, "To promote the progress of science, advance the national health, prosperity and welfare and secure the national defense."

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for making precisely the case I have tried to make myself. The case I have tried to make myself is that it is not in the best purview of this body to intervene and micro-manage specific studies.

The reason I point that out is because the gentleman spoke about important health issues. One of the studies he seeks to eliminate funding for addresses an important health issue. Menopause is tremendously important to the women of this society. It is fine for two men to get up here and decide whether we want to fund menopause research; but I will tell you, every woman in this country is going to go through it, and they think menopause matters.

One of the studies that the gentleman wants to reduce funding for is very important in terms of addressing the factors that influence how menopause develops. I would share with the gentleman, although my knowledge is somewhat limited, I believe there are correlations between menopause and a

number of the issues the gentleman mentioned like cancer and other factors.

So if we believe we want to address those important matters, one of the very studies this gentleman is suggesting we eliminate funding for could very well address those very important issues. I would just urge you go back to your women constituents and suggest to them that you decided, based on your vast medical and anthropological expertise, and your vast understanding of women's health, that menopause did not merit research funding from the National Science Foundation.

And you may try to pick the title and say what does that have to do with Bangladeshi immigrants, et cetera. It may have a lot to do because natural experiments in which one population and another population may be of the same age, different, but subject to different cultural or dietary or other factors, and thereby have different variations in how they manifest certain biological processes can often give us profound insights into disease processes and the development of natural rhythms.

And for you or I to presume that we have the expertise to say that we don't think this study will do that because we know so much about menopause, sir, and I count myself among those "sirs," I think is vastly presumptuous. Menopause is profoundly important to the women of this country. This study deals with menopause, and I am tremendously grateful to the gentleman for picking this study because in so doing, you have made the best possible case for not micromanaging this fine agency.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All Members are reminded to address their comments to the Chair.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the angst most recently demonstrated is curious in light of the events of recent history regarding what this House has dealt with over the past week or two or three, and a little longer history in light of what this House and what this Congress deals with over and over and over again; and that is not the kind of appropriate kind of decisionmaking that my good friend from Washington so passionately advocates here in this bill, which is to delegate appropriate decisionmaking to people who have the expertise and have the knowledge to determine where those resources ought be spent and where those decisions ought be made.

Would that we as a Congress and we as a House use that same brilliance in our decisionmaking when we make decisions regarding health care. Again, as a physician, this Chamber makes incredible decisions that affect the very personal health care of individuals about which it has no knowledge whatsoever, and takes the decisionmaking authority from physicians and patients in an inappropriate way, I believe.

We also this past week determined as a Chamber, the majority party has determined that they have greater knowledge about the specific military activities that ought to occur on the ground as it relates to our brave men and women who are fighting to defend our liberty and our freedom. However, the majority party apparently believes that it is appropriate for them to make specific decisions what our commanders ought to be doing on a day-to-day basis.

So I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it would be appropriate to have some consistency in the arguments that are being brought to the floor here this evening regarding delegation of appropriate decisionmaking to those who have the expertise.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

□ 2130

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, again, I thank the gentleman for yielding. The gentleman is a doctor and I am not going to ask him for his medical expertise because, as you say, that is not our role here to delve into these things but to simply raise the questions.

I will tell you this, that when I come back to my constituents and they tell me about their health concerns, whether it is menopause or cancer or otherwise, their first concern is how are they going to address their own health needs, how are they going to address their health care costs and what are we doing here about it. Their second question is what research are we doing here at home for these areas.

The study that you reference, reproductive aging and symptoms experienced at midlife among Bangladeshi immigrants, sedentees, and white London neighbors does not, of course, as the gentleman knows, look to those issues here at home, but rather elsewhere.

My constituents will raise the question, is that the first priority or should that be the first priority of the NSF. I am not an expert, I am not a doctor like the gentleman, so I cannot suggest that that is the most important one, but my constituents will certainly raise that question for me, and my constituents will certainly be consistent, as the gentleman from Georgia says, and that we should make sure that those dollars are spent here on their own health concerns first.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate section 4.

The text of section 4 is as follows:

SEC. 4. CENTERS FOR RESEARCH ON LEARNING AND EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT.

(a) *FUNDING FOR CENTERS.*—The Director shall continue to carry out the program of Centers for Research on Learning and Education Improvement as established in section 11 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n–2).

(b) *ELIGIBILITY FOR CENTERS.*—Section 11 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n–2) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by inserting “or eligible nonprofit organizations” after “institutions of higher education”;

(2) in subsection (b)(1) by inserting “or an eligible nonprofit organization” after “institution of higher education”; and

(3) in subsection (b)(1) by striking “of such institutions” and inserting “thereof”.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 4?

The Clerk will designate section 5.

The text of section 5 is as follows:

SEC. 5. INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Board shall evaluate the role of the Foundation in supporting interdisciplinary research, including through the Major Research Instrumentation program, the effectiveness of the Foundation’s efforts in providing information to the scientific community about opportunities for funding of interdisciplinary research proposals, and the process through which interdisciplinary proposals are selected for support. The Board shall also evaluate the effectiveness of the Foundation’s efforts to engage undergraduate students in research experiences in interdisciplinary settings, including through the Research in Undergraduate Institutions program and the Research Experiences for Undergraduates program.

(b) *REPORT.*—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Board shall provide the results of its evaluation under subsection (a), including a recommendation for the proportion of the Foundation’s research and related activities funding that should be allocated for interdisciplinary research, to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 5?

The Clerk will designate section 6.

The text of section 6 is as follows:

SEC. 6. PILOT PROGRAM OF GRANTS FOR NEW INVESTIGATORS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Director shall carry out a pilot program to award one-year grants to individuals to assist them in improving research proposals that were previously submitted to the Foundation but not selected for funding.

(b) *USE OF FUNDS.*—Grants awarded under this section shall be used to enable an individual to resubmit an updated research proposal for review by the Foundation through the agency’s competitive merit review process. Uses of funds made available under this section may include the generation of new data and the performance of additional analysis.

(c) *ELIGIBILITY.*—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an individual shall—

(1) not have previously received funding as the principal investigator of a research grant from the Foundation; and

(2) have submitted a proposal to the Foundation, which may include a proposal submitted to the Research in Undergraduate Institutions program, that was rated very good or excellent under the Foundation’s competitive merit review process.

(d) *SELECTION PROCESS.*—The Director shall make awards under this section based on the advice of the program officers of the Foundation.

(e) *PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION.*—The Director may carry out this section through the Small Grants for Exploratory Research program.

(f) *NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD REVIEW.*—The Board shall conduct a review and assessment of the pilot program under this section, including the number of new investigators funded, the distribution of awards by type of institution of

higher education, and the success rate upon resubmission of proposals by new investigators funded through this pilot program. Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Board shall summarize its findings and any recommendations regarding changes to or the continuation of the pilot program in a report to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. FLAKE:
Strike section 6.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I just have to say from the outset that I have been amazed, like the gentleman from Georgia who mentioned a while ago, you would think if you were listening to this debate at home that the only research, the only science research going on in this country is funded by government, and it is simply not the case, gratefully. In fact, just a fraction of the research going on in the scientific field is funded by government. The private sector funds it gratefully.

And unfortunately, one can make the case and the case is often made persuasively that as we increase government funding in this area, it displaces private sector funding because companies can then rely on government rather than their own R&D budgets.

There is also something called opportunity cost. Whenever you hear the word “investment” in terms of government funding, you have to be a little skeptical. You have to say what is the opportunity cost? If you had left this money in the private sector, would it have produced more? You will never know that. But we do know the private sector tends to do things a lot more efficiently than government does.

Let me speak to this amendment. This amendment would strike a new pilot project created in this bill. Keep in mind, people will say we cannot cut this bill or whatever else. This is a new program that I am seeking to strike here.

This pilot project would award one-year grants to individuals to assist them in improving research proposals that were previously submitted to the National Science Foundation but were not selected for funding. In other words, if you submit an application, it is not approved for funding, the government will give you money to improve the application so it might be approved next year.

The man that comes on television, running around in this crazy suit, Matthew Lesko I think is his name, comes to mind here. Are we going to fund like Matthew Lesko? Are we simply saying, all right, here is more money to help you get government money? Are there not sufficient programs within the National Science Foundation that we

should be funding, that we have extra money to actually fund people who did not get the grants to help them improve their proposals that they might get a grant next year?

I understand the defense will say, or those defending these grants that this pilot project is intended to help younger scientists who may be losing out on NSF grants because they do not know how to prepare proposals compared to more seasoned researchers or scientists. The answer does not lie in more Federal dollars to help them prepare grant proposals. If there are problems in terms of more tenured scientists getting these proposals, then perhaps we ought to look at the application process and procedures and tweak those or change those rather than say let us spend money and take money out of the National Science Foundation budget and give it to people who were rejected in their funding.

This is a tight budget environment. I need not remind the majority that we are in a deficit situation. I would support across-the-board cuts everywhere in government, but boy, to say that we have got to increase the budget here 25 percent over 3 years is a bit steep, and then to create a new program like this one and to say we are going to give money to those who are not getting the programs, and one more thing before I yield back.

I have heard from the other side, those defending the current budget and arguing against proposals to actually cut specific programs, that we have a peer review process and that research grants should only be given out that way. I am glad to hear that because my guess is when we come 3 months from now or 2 months from now to the appropriations process, in the SSJC budget, there will be earmarks from that side of the aisle, from this side of the aisle, to fund specific research grants, some of whom were turned down during the peer review process. So this notion that you have got to have peer review and that we do not have the knowledge, I will confess that, but then why in the world are we earmarking like we are?

The earmarks are specifically to say I know better than the folks at NSF or folks over here because I am going to give it to my university or somebody who may have lost out on a grant, and so the notion that, hey, you know, you guys do not know what you are talking about when you are trying to cut spending, leave it to the experts, we do not leave it to the experts. The Congress does not leave it to the experts. If we trusted the experts, we would not be earmarking like we are.

But, again, back to the specific amendment, this is a new program, a new program to take money from the existing budget of NSF that we have all heard is so important that we have to have for research, and giving it to people who did not get their projects approved, did not get a contract, did not get research dollars to help them prepare research dollars.

This reminds me actually of many of the earmarks that you will see in the given months. Many of those are given to people to prepare grants to receive more money.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 1867, legislation to reauthorize the National Science Foundation, and of this amendment that will give Hispanic-serving institutions, what we refer to as HSIs, the support they need to prepare our next generation of scientists, engineers and mathematicians.

I would like to thank my colleagues, Congressman JERRY MCNERNEY of California, Congresswoman GABRIELLE GIFFORDS of Arizona, and Congressman JOE CROWLEY of New York for bringing this amendment forward. It will make a great difference.

The McNerney-Giffords-Crowley amendment allows the National Science Foundation to establish a competitive, merit-based program to award grants to HSIs for science, technology, engineering and mathematics education. This program seeks to enhance the quality of undergraduate science, mathematics and engineering education and increase the retention and graduation rates for undergraduate students pursuing STEM degrees at 2-year and 4-year HSIs. The initiative will support curriculum and faculty development in STEM areas; stipends for undergraduate students participating in research; and funding for instrumentation purposes.

HSIs are the gateways for post-secondary education for most Hispanic students. Despite having fewer resources than other institutions, HSIs are among the top producers of our new Hispanic STEM professionals. Yet, these vital institutions are often overlooked, or at best, seen as junior partners in our national research and education enterprise. This amendment helps give HSIs the attention they deserve.

I applaud the leadership of Chairman GORDON, of Chairman BAIRD, Ranking Member HALL and Ranking Member EHLERS for their bipartisan commitment to ensuring the United States remains competitive in science, technology engineering and mathematics, better known as the STEM fields.

The Science and Technology Committee has acted with the sense of urgency that we should all share in order to put our Nation back on track to lead the world in the STEM fields. The National Science Foundation is central to developing our national capacity for research and innovation.

I am particularly pleased that this bill emphasizes our need to develop our human capital in the STEM fields. I would also like to thank my colleague and friend Congresswoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON for her work in including an amendment to require strategic planning for the education and human resources mission of the foundation so that we fully develop our STEM talent

across all fields and all communities, especially those that have been historically underrepresented.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment for HSIs strengthens that education and human resources mission.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill, H.R. 1867.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Who seeks recognition on the Flake amendment?

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I greatly respect and admire the gentleman from Arizona, who I know is committed to trying to reduce the deficit, as am I, and we have worked on other areas on that, but let me just share a couple of things about this.

First of all, the gentleman talked about private industry research, and he is right about that. There is a lot of private industry research. Let me share with the gentleman some of the private industry bodies that endorse this bill, and the list is very impressive. I have got it. I would be happy to share it. If it is such a bad bill or needs to be dramatically modified, these are the organizations that support it:

Computing Research Association, National Defense Industrial Association, American Chemical Society, Business Roundtable, Information Technology Association of America, National Venture Capital Association, Semiconductor Industry Association, Software & Information Industry Association, TechNet, Technology CEO Council, Accenture, Advanced Micro Devices, Agilent, Apple, Applied Materials.

I have only it four or five. I am just on the A's. I could go on.

The point being, yes, private industry does fund a great deal of research. They recognize government has a very important role, and far from being deeply suspicious of that role, they profoundly endorse it.

As for the gentleman's amendment per se, I share with the gentleman that much of this legislation develops from research conducted by the National Academy of Science presented in Rising Above the Gathering Storm, which the gentleman may or may not have read.

One of the key challenges we face in our research enterprise is keeping young investigators in the pipeline. If you look at the data on when people are most productive, it does not correlate particularly well with when they get the most funding. There are a host of reasons for that.

Part of the reason is it takes some time to learn how to do the grants, and what we are trying to do here is to say to people, just remember that only about 25 percent of grants are funded. So the mere fact you did not get funding the first time does not mean your application is a bad application at all. It does not mean we have said it is not worthy of funding. Quite the contrary.

What it may well have said is it is a very good application, but given the competition and the constrained funding, in its current state, we will not choose it.

What this bill does is basically say to the young investigator, we will give you some help in advancing your career so you can make a second run at this. This is supported by the National Science Foundation. Folks who have done this research, and I have written applications for grants, I am sure Dr. Ehlers has, it takes you a while to learn how to do it.

Sometimes the young professors who are the very people who are teaching the undergraduate classes, trying to get their labs put up, they lack the resources. And on top of that, you need to understand the dynamics of the peer review process.

Sometimes the more senior members, the people with the long established research credentials and careers are just going to have more access to research because the peer reviewers are going to say, look, it is a safe bet to bet on this guy or this woman, they have been around a long time. The unknown person, the new person who may hold the promise of tomorrow, has a comparative disadvantage.

□ 2145

So what we are trying to do is in a small way, a relatively small way with this program, redress the difference between the new investigators. We know what that's like. We have been relatively young Members, not so anymore here in the Congress. We have had the senior Members tell us where the bathroom was, to quit voting with our meal cards and stuff like that. Nobody threw us out. They get a second chance. But what I am saying, that's what this is about.

I profoundly respect the gentleman. I hope he knows that. He is committed to try to reduce the deficit. This is not the way to do it. This program is actually a good program. It's by a host of scientists, a host of scientific bodies. I think we ought to defeat the gentleman's amendment, with respect, because I know his intent. In this case I think he would have an adverse effect on what we are trying to do with this legislation.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I appreciate the valiant effort on behalf of my friend from Washington in attempting to dissuade Members from voting against this amendment, which I think is well founded. I appreciate the gentleman from Arizona for offering it.

I would remind the gentleman from Washington that one of the roles of our office, one of the roles of our office is to assist individuals with grant applications. So there are other resources which the Federal Government supplies for individuals who are searching to try to fill out their grant applications. We are happy to help.

I would also suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman makes the point, appropriately, that only 25 percent of the grants are accepted. So why should we waste Federal dollars on teaching individuals who have other avenues to

be able to determine how to fill out their grant application appropriately?

Why should we waste precious Federal dollars that could go to, in fact, the kinds of cures that he is endeavoring to fund with the moneys that he is promoting? Why should we waste those Federal dollars in this kind of endeavor, which, I think, is frankly ill-founded and not needed.

I am pleased to yield to my good friend from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, let me point out I have the utmost respect for my friend from Washington. We have worked together on many issues. First, he mentioned that the private sector groups are in support of this legislation and the National Science Foundation. I have no doubt. It doesn't surprise me at all. But I would submit that that's akin to the government saying we are in a position now to fund free lunches for everyone out there, and you can do it on the government's dime.

I would say that virtually every company in America would say that's a great idea. Now we don't have to fund that. We don't have to subsidize it for our employees. We can keep the profits, invest them elsewhere. If private companies don't have to expend that money in their R&D budgets, they would like not to. But that was a point I made, that this often supplants money that would be invested in the private sector, probably more efficiently if overall government spending is any guide.

To the amendment in specific, the gentleman from Georgia said it well. With all the high-priority items in the National Science Foundation budget, to take money out of that and to give it to those who didn't present a successful proposal would seem to me not the highest-priority use of money.

Remember, this is a new program. I am not cutting a program that exists. This is a new pilot project. I just don't think this is a road that we want to go down. I started to mention, before my time ran out before, we have seen this in other fields, in other earmark fields, where people are funding business consortiums. Many of the earmarks in this body go to business consortiums to help them draft grant proposals to get other earmarks or to get grants from government or to lobby to get earmarks. It's simply not a road that we want to go down as a Congress, I would submit.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentleman, and I commend him for his amendment.

I am pleased to yield to my good friend from Michigan.

Mr. EHLERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, to the gentleman from Arizona, I totally agree with your comments about earmarks. I have fought hard here to keep this body and the other body from providing earmarks

for scientific research, because all grants should go through the peer review process.

I might also add parenthetically that when the gentleman from Arizona was on the anti-earmark bandwagon a few years ago, I believe I voted with him more than most Members of the House, because I oppose earmarks in general, but particularly in scientific research.

I would also comment that the fact that industry supports us is not indicative of the National Science Foundation doing industry's research. National Science Foundation does the basic research, the fundamental research, which has no apparent immediate use. Industry picks up on that and says, okay, let's see whether we can develop something out of that. In other words, industry does not do very much research, they do a lot of development. NSF does almost totally research and essentially no development. So it's a very good symbiotic relationship.

As I mentioned earlier, before most of the people here were on the floor, the rate of return on our research money in the National Science Foundation has been incredible. Any accountant looking at this would say this is the best investment that the United States Government makes because it has great results in our economy.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

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

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

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

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time, as it is getting rather late, I would ask unanimous consent that we limit debate on subsequent amendments to 10 minutes.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I object.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will designate section 7.

The text of section 7 is as follows:

SEC. 7. BROADER IMPACTS MERIT REVIEW CRITERION.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—In evaluating research proposals under the Foundation's broader impacts criterion, the Director shall give special consideration to proposals that involve partnerships between academic researchers and industrial scientists and engineers that address research areas that have been identified as having high importance for future national economic competitiveness, such as nanotechnology.

(b) *PARTNERSHIPS WITH INDUSTRY.*—The Director shall encourage research proposals from institutions of higher education that involve partnerships with businesses and organizations representing businesses in fields that have been identified as having high importance for future national economic competitiveness and that include input on the research agenda from and cost-sharing by the industry partners.

(c) **REPORT ON BROADER IMPACTS CRITERION.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall transmit to Congress a report on the impact of the broader impacts grant criterion used by the Foundation. The report shall—

(1) identify the criteria that each division and directorate of the Foundation uses to evaluate the broader impacts aspects of research proposals;

(2) provide a breakdown of the types of activities by division that awardees have proposed to carry out to meet the broader impacts criterion;

(3) provide any evaluations performed by the Foundation to assess the degree to which the broader impacts aspects of research proposals were carried out and how effective they have been at meeting the goals described in the research proposals;

(4) describe what national goals, such as improving undergraduate science, mathematics, and engineering education, improving K–12 science and mathematics education, promoting university-industry collaboration and technology transfer, and broadening participation of underrepresented groups, the broader impacts criterion is best suited to promote; and

(5) describe what steps the Foundation is taking and should take to use the broader impacts criterion to improve undergraduate science, mathematics, and engineering education.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 7?

The Clerk will designate section 8.

The text of section 8 is as follows:

SEC. 8. POSTDOCTORAL RESEARCH FELLOWS.

(a) **MENTORING.**—The Director shall require that all grant applications that include funding to support postdoctoral researchers include a description of the mentoring activities that will be provided for such individuals, and shall ensure that this part of the application is evaluated under the Foundation's broader impacts merit review criterion. Mentoring activities may include career counseling, training in preparing grant applications, guidance on ways to improve teaching skills, and training in research ethics.

(b) **REPORTS.**—The Director shall require that annual reports and the final report for research grants that include funding to support postdoctoral researchers include a description of the mentoring activities provided to such researchers.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 8?

The Clerk will designate section 9.

The text of section 9 is as follows:

SEC. 9. RESPONSIBLE CONDUCT OF RESEARCH.

The Director shall require that each institution that applies for financial assistance from the Foundation for science and engineering research or education describe in its grant proposal a plan to provide appropriate training and oversight in the responsible and ethical conduct of research to undergraduate students, graduate students, and postdoctoral researchers participating in the proposed research project.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 9?

The Clerk will designate section 10.

The text of section 10 is as follows:

SEC. 10. REPORTING OF RESEARCH RESULTS.

The Director shall ensure that all final project reports and citations of published research documents resulting from research funded, in whole or in part, by the Foundation, are made available to the public in a timely manner and in electronic form through the Foundation's Web site.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 10?

The Clerk will designate section 11.

The text of section 11 is as follows:

SEC. 11. SHARING RESEARCH RESULTS.

An investigator supported under a Foundation award, whom the Director determines has failed to comply with the provisions of section 734 of the Foundation Grant Policy Manual, shall be ineligible for a future award under any Foundation supported program or activity. The Director may restore the eligibility of such an investigator on the basis of the investigator's subsequent compliance with the provisions of section 734 of the Foundation Grant Policy Manual and with such other terms and conditions as the Director may impose.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 12?

The Clerk will designate section 12.

The text of section 12 is as follows:

SEC. 12. FUNDING FOR SUCCESSFUL STEM EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

(a) **EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS.**—The Director shall, on an annual basis, evaluate all of the Foundation's grants that are scheduled to expire within one year and—

(1) that have the primary purpose of meeting the objectives of the Science and Engineering Equal Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 1885 et seq.); or

(2) that have the primary purpose of providing teacher professional development.

(b) **CONTINUATION OF FUNDING.**—For grants that are identified under subsection (a) and that are deemed by the Director to be successful in meeting the objectives of the initial grant solicitation, the Director may extend the duration of those grants for up to 3 additional years beyond their scheduled expiration without the requirement for a recompetition. The Director may extend such grants for an additional 3 years following a second review within 1 year before the extended completion date, in accordance with subsection (a), and the determination by the Director that the objectives of the grant are being achieved.

(c) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit a report to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate that—

(1) lists the grants which have been extended in duration by the authority provided under this section; and

(2) provides any recommendations the Director may have regarding the extension of the authority provided under this section to programs other than those specified in subsection (a).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 12?

The Clerk will designate section 13.

The text of section 13 is as follows:

SEC. 13. COST SHARING.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Board shall evaluate the impact of its policy to eliminate cost sharing for research grants and cooperative agreements for existing programs that were developed around industry partnerships and historically required industry cost sharing, such as the Engineering Research Centers and Industry/University Cooperative Research Centers. The Board shall also consider the impact that the cost sharing policy has on initiating new programs for which industry interest and participation are sought.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Board shall report to the Committee on Science and Technology and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, on the results of the evaluation under subsection (a).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 13?

The Clerk will designate section 14.

The text of section 14 is as follows:

SEC. 14. DONATIONS.

Section 11(f) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1870(f)) is amended by inserting at the end before the semicolon “, except that funds may be donated for specific prize competitions”.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 14?

The Clerk will designate section 15.

The text of section 15 is as follows:

SEC. 15. ADDITIONAL REPORTS.

(a) **REPORT ON FUNDING FOR MAJOR FACILITIES.**—

(1) **PRECONSTRUCTION FUNDING.**—The Board shall evaluate the appropriateness of the requirement that funding for detailed design work and other preconstruction activities for major research equipment and facilities come exclusively from the sponsoring research division rather than being available, at least in part, from the Major Research Equipment and Facilities Construction account.

(2) **MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION COSTS.**—The Board shall evaluate the appropriateness of the Foundation's policies for allocation of costs for, and oversight of, maintenance and operation of major research equipment and facilities.

(3) **REPORT.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Board shall report on the results of the evaluations under paragraphs (1) and (2) and on any recommendations for modifying the current policies related to allocation of funding for major research equipment and facilities to the Committee on Science and Technology and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(b) **INCLUSION OF POLAR FACILITIES UPGRADES IN MAJOR RESEARCH EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION PLAN.**—Section 201(a)(2)(D) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 1862(a)(2)(D)) is amended by inserting “and for major upgrades of facilities in support of Antarctic research programs” after “facilities construction account”.

(c) **REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS WITHIN THE RESEARCH DIRECTORATES.**—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 the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a report cataloging all elementary and secondary school, informal, and undergraduate educational programs and activities supported through appropriations for Research and Related Activities. The report shall display the programs and activities by directorate, along with estimated funding levels for the fiscal years 2006, 2007, and 2008, and shall provide a description of the goals of each program and activity. The report shall also describe how the programs and activities relate to or are coordinated with the programs supported by the Education and Human Resources Directorate.

(d) **REPORT ON RESEARCH IN UNDERGRADUATE INSTITUTIONS PROGRAM.**—The Director shall transmit to Congress along with the fiscal year 2011 budget request a report listing the funding success rates and distribution of awards for the Research in Undergraduate Institutions program, by type of institution based on the highest academic degree conferred by the institution, for fiscal years 2008, 2009, and 2010.

(e) **ANNUAL PLAN FOR ALLOCATION OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES FUNDING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of legislation providing for the annual appropriation of funds for the Foundation, the Director shall submit to the

Committee on Science and Technology and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, a plan for the allocation of education and human resources funds authorized by this Act for the corresponding fiscal year, including any funds from within the research and related activities account used to support activities that have the primary purpose of improving education or broadening participation.

(2) **SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS.**—The plan shall include a description of how the allocation of funding—

(A) will affect the average size and duration of education and human resources grants supported by the Foundation;

(B) will affect trends in research support for the effective instruction of mathematics, science, engineering, and technology;

(C) will affect the K-20 pipeline for the study of mathematics, science, engineering, and technology; and

(D) will encourage the interest of individuals identified in section 33 or 34 of the Science and Engineering Equal Opportunities Act (42 U.S.C. 1885a or 1885b) in mathematics, science, engineering, and technology, and help prepare such individuals to pursue postsecondary studies in these fields.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 16?

The Clerk will designate section 16.

The text of section 16 is as follows:

SEC. 16. ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENTS.

(a) **TRIENNIAL AUDIT OF THE OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD.**—Section 15(a) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 4862n–5) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “an annual audit” and inserting “an audit every three years”;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking “each year” and inserting “every third year”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

“(5) **MATERIALS RELATING TO CLOSED PORTIONS OF MEETINGS.**—To facilitate the audit required under paragraph (3) of this subsection, the Office of the National Science Board shall maintain the General Counsel’s certificate, the presiding officer’s statement, and a transcript or recording of any closed meeting, for at least 3 years after such meeting.”

(b) **LIMITED TERM PERSONNEL FOR THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD.**—Subsection (g) of section 4 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1863(g)) is amended to read as follows:

“(g) The Board may, with the concurrence of a majority of its members, permit the appointment of a staff consisting of not more than 5 professional staff members, technical and professional personnel on leave of absence from academic, industrial, or research institutions for a limited term and such operations and support staff members as may be necessary. Such staff shall be appointed by the Chairman and assigned at the direction of the Board. The professional members and limited term technical and professional personnel of such staff may be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and the provisions of chapter 51 of such title relating to classification, and shall be compensated at a rate not exceeding the maximum rate payable under section 5376 of such title, as may be necessary to provide for the performance of such duties as may be prescribed by the Board in connection with the exercise of its powers and functions under this Act. Section 14(a)(3) shall apply to each limited term appointment of technical and professional personnel under this subsection. Each appointment under this subsection shall be sub-

ject to the same security requirements as those required for personnel of the Foundation appointed under section 14(a).”

(c) **INCREASE IN NUMBER OF WATERMAN AWARDS TO THREE.**—Section 6(c) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1975 (42 U.S.C. 1881a) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) Up to three awards may be made under this section in any one fiscal year.”

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 16?

The Clerk will designate section 17.

The text of section 17 is as follows:

SEC. 17. NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD REPORTS.

Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 4(j) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1863(j)(1) and (2)) are amended by striking “, for submission to” and “for submission to”, respectively, and inserting “and”.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 17?

The Clerk will designate section 18.

The text of section 18 is as follows:

SEC. 18. NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCE REPORT ON DIVERSITY IN STEM FIELDS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Foundation shall enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences for a report, to be transmitted to the Congress not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, about barriers to increasing the number of underrepresented minorities in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields and to identify strategies for bringing more underrepresented minorities into the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics workforce.

(b) **SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS.**—The Director shall ensure that the study described in subsection (a) addresses—

(1) social and institutional factors that shape the decisions of minority students to commit to education and careers in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields;

(2) specific barriers preventing greater minority student participation in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields;

(3) primary focus points for policy intervention to increase the recruitment and retention of underrepresented minorities in America’s future workforce;

(4) programs already underway to increase diversity in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields, and their level of effectiveness;

(5) factors that make such programs effective, and how to expand and improve upon existing programs;

(6) the role of minority-serving institutions in the diversification of America’s workforce in these fields and how that role can be supported and strengthened; and

(7) how the public and private sectors can better assist minority students in their efforts to join America’s workforce in these fields.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. MATSUI

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Ms. MATSUI:

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

SEC. 19. COMMUNICATIONS TRAINING FOR SCIENTISTS.

(a) **GRANT SUPPLEMENTS FOR COMMUNICATIONS TRAINING.**—The Director shall provide grant supplements, on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis, to institutions receiving awards under the Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship program. The grant supplements shall be used to train

graduate students in the communication of the substance and importance of their research to nonscientist audiences, including policymakers.

(b) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall transmit a report to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, describing how the activities required under subsection (a) have been implemented. The report shall include data on the number of graduate students trained and the number and size of grant supplements awarded, and a description of the types of activities funded through the grant supplements.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, this amendment to the NSF reauthorization is designed to improve the ability of scientists to communicate with nonscientific audiences such as businesses, the media, the general public and, of course, Members of Congress. Specifically, my amendment would add a provision to H.R. 1667 that authorizes a science communications initiative at the National Science Foundation.

I believe this proposal will ensure that we are getting as much return on the Federal Government’s investment in the National Science Foundation as possible. By implementing this program, it would diversify the education of our scientists and would ensure that policymakers and other nonscientists have better access to the technical expertise fostered by NSF and the Nation’s broader research enterprise, because if scientists can’t tell the rest of us what they have discovered, we are not fully recognizing the benefits of our investment in scientific research. Unfortunately, the ability to articulate the content and significance of scientific information is often overlooked by graduate training programs.

My amendment directly addresses this unmet need and would create a pipeline of scientists who are increasingly engaged with nonscientists, including policymakers, business leaders and others. Providing communications training to our scientists will ensure that we, the policymakers, can make the most informed decisions possible as we debate technical issues and craft policy.

This amendment creates a competitively reviewed supplement within the Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship, or IGERT program. Investigators at IGERT-awardee institutions will compete for resources to develop and implement communications training. The IGERT program will administer the competitive review process for this communications training initiative.

I have received strong support for this program from stakeholders in my district of Sacramento and from across the country. Policymakers, scientists, educators, business leaders and science writers all agree we need to better integrate scientific expertise into the public debate.

This amendment represents an important step toward that goal. That is

why this amendment has received the endorsement of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and The Council of Graduate Schools.

This amendment is based on the Scientific Communication Act of 2007, H.R. 1453, that I introduced with Chairman GORDON as an original cosponsor. I would like to thank Chairman GORDON, Mr. Hope, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. INSLEE and Mr. HIGGINS for their cosponsorship of that legislation.

Before I close, I would like to address a few misconceptions about this amendment. I want to be clear, this amendment contains no new authorization levels. For those who said that this program would take away from other NSF grants, I want to make a few points. The NSF Director would determine the level of resources to devote to this program. If the NSF Director does not deem this program worthy of funding, it won't get any.

However, I think scientists, teachers, reporters, business owners, Members of Congress and all our constituents should support this program. This bill authorized \$21 billion for the National Science Foundation.

What good is that level of investment if we don't maximize the benefits? You should not need a Ph.D. to utilize the ideas and breakthroughs that NSF-supported research produces. That's why I am proposing this amendment. It will help to bridge the communication gap between scientists and the rest of us.

I hope all my colleagues here in the House will support this amendment. As policymakers, I promise you, you will personally benefit from this program when you hear expert testimony on technical topics. But, more importantly, you should support it because it will enable all your constituents to share in the excellent research supported by NSF.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise with some reluctance to speak against this amendment, because I like the idea of what the gentlewoman from California is trying to do. But my concern is twofold. First of all, this will cut into the funding that the NSF already has. It's an added requirement for them.

But my major objection is, I have taught at the university level and have taught at the college level. I have always felt this is the responsibility of the colleges and universities to do, and they shouldn't need an NSF grant to do this.

The job of the colleges and universities is to teach. What this is proposing is that the NSF will be responsible for teaching these students how to communicate their research.

I always tried to do that with my students when I had graduate students. I think that's an integral part of the education program. So I reluctantly urge defeat of this amendment, simply because I think we ought to make it clear to the universities and the colleges that this is part of their responsibility.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Matsui amendment. As Members of Congress, we all understand just how critical communications skills are, whether we are trying to influence our colleagues during debate such as tonight, or trying to explain a vote to our constituents.

□ 2200

If you cannot communicate effectively, the value of ideas can be lost and all of your work may be lost. The same is true for our Nation's scientists as they attempt to convey their work to colleagues and especially to nonscientific audience.

This afternoon, when I had the opportunity to speak with five recent American Nobel laureate scientists, I was very impressed by their ability to explain their work. I may even say I was surprised. Why? Because, unfortunately, scientists are not always the most gifted speakers, and this is not a skill that we regularly find taught in graduate schools. Dr. EHLERS was obviously doing a much better job when he was a professor, but this is not something that I have found as a professor that is taught very often. And I speak from experience both as a professor and as an engineer, and perhaps some may say I personally provide evidence supporting this generalization.

So the Matsui amendment addresses this problem by helping to provide communication training to our Nation's young scientists. If scientists can help better explain their research, it will help us as policymakers as they come to explain and we could choose the best path to move forward, especially in the Science Committee. And perhaps business leaders will be better able to turn some academic research into a good marketable product if they can understand what this research can do.

Finally, I believe that the ability of our scientists to more effectively communicate scientific information will inspire more children to pursue a career in science. No one is inspired by something that they don't know because they are unable to understand it.

I thank Congresswoman MATSUI for offering this amendment, and I urge my colleagues for joining me in supporting it.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentlelady from California's amendment, and let me share with you why.

I think most Members of this body have had people from the scientific community come and talk to us about why their research matters or how it is going to help society, and we have said to ourselves or to them, "Could you please put that in English so I know what you are talking about?"

The challenge is that the esoteric realm that some of the scientists work

in is really beyond some of our ken. And I think that is fine. But if we are going to make informed policy decisions, it is essential that we understand the research that we are making decisions about that may have been illustrated earlier tonight in some of the discussion.

Let me share with you, and I respect Dr. EHLERS immensely, as everyone knows. But the very researchers who, if there is concern that this proposal by the gentlelady from California would reduce funding for other research, let me point out that many of the associations whose members depend on the core research funding nevertheless believe there is merit to this amendment. And let me share with you, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, I will read in a moment what they have to say, the Federation of American Society for Experimental Biology, the Council of Graduate Schools, the Society for Neuroscience. I absolutely believe as a former teacher of science, I believe it is our obligation as teachers to help our young charges learn how to communicate what they do. But it is not being done well enough, that has been recognized, and the gentlelady is to be commended for it.

Let me share with you that the American Association for the Advancement of Science says the following, which I will submit for printing in the RECORD. "While Federal support of scientific research is of critical importance to innovation," and let me underscore this, "it is also very important that we find ways to make sure that science is effectively used to advance the human condition. Scientists and engineers must have the tools needed to communicate the work they do. The ability to more effectively communicate scientific information may inspire more children to pursue a career in science, and certainly will help a higher quality dialogue among the research community and the citizens whose investment it relies on."

So I commend the gentlelady. This is something that we don't talk about a lot; but when people have to communicate information to the policymakers or to the public or to the consumers of their research, it is important they do so in a way that is intelligible. This amendment moves an important step in that direction. I applaud her and urge its passage.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE,
Washington, DC, May 2, 2007.

Hon. DORIS MATSUI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. MATSUI: Thank you for your support in the recent passage of the reauthorization for the National Science Foundation (NSF) by the House Science and Technology Committee.

As you prepare to debate the NSF reauthorization bill (H.R. 1867) on the floor, I would like to express our support for your efforts to improve scientific communication with the public. For over 50 years, the NSF

has had a unique role in supporting basic research across the spectrum of scientific disciplines. This support has led to remarkable advances in fields as disparate as nanotechnology and economic theory.

While federal support of scientific research is of critical importance to innovation, it is also very important that we find ways to make sure that science is effectively used to advance the human condition. Scientists and engineers must have the tools needed to communicate the work that they do. The ability to more effectively communicate scientific information may inspire more children to pursue a career in science. It certainly will help create a higher quality dialogue among the research community, the citizens whose investment it relies upon, and the broad society it ultimately serves.

Sincerely,

ALAN L. LESHNER,
Chief Executive Officer.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am confused. The gentleman from Washington has been stating about micromanaging the NSF; and now that I see what this amendment does is not only try to micromanage what they do with their grants and their money, but it is also saying to me that these institutions that get these awards grants for the research from the NSF do not have a complete teaching ability to teach these graduate students how to put their thoughts to a nonscientist audience.

Now, to me, we are not only micromanaging the NSF, but now we are getting into some of these schools that receive these grants and saying: You are not doing a full curriculum enough that you can educate these young scientists and these young researchers into how to explain themselves to nonscientist audiences.

So I think you can't have your cake and eat it, too. Either we don't want to micromanage, and if we are going to micromanage, who is the ultimate decider of that? And also, are we going to start micromanaging what the curriculum is for these higher institutes of learning that are turning out these scientists?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. LYNCH). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. EHLERS

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. EHLERS:

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

SEC. 19. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING THE MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) although the mathematics and science education partnership program at the National Science Foundation and the mathematics and science partnership program at the Department of Education practically share the same name, the 2 programs are intended to be complementary, not duplicative;

(2) the National Science Foundation partnership programs are innovative, model reform initiatives that move promising ideas in education from research into practice to improve teacher quality, develop challenging curricula, and increase student achievement in mathematics and science, and Congress intends that the National Science Foundation peer-reviewed partnership programs found to be effective should be put into wider practice by dissemination through the Department of Education partnership programs; and

(3) the Director of the National Science Foundation and the Secretary of Education should have ongoing collaboration to ensure that the 2 components of this priority effort for mathematics and science education continue to work in concert for the benefit of States and local practitioners nationwide.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to address a particular problem with this amendment. We have, for some time, had activities within the National Science Foundation aimed at teaching future teachers, teaching them how to teach math and science, and this generally fell into the rubric of a math-science partnership, because the Foundation itself did not teach the teachers but rather responded to grants submitted by professors at various institutions who were pleased to set up programs to teach these future teachers or existing teachers how better to teach math and science. These have been very successful programs and are commonly referred to as the math-science partnership.

Recently, the Department of Education has developed programs involving professional development for teachers in elementary and secondary schools to try to bring them up to speed on the latest developments in math and science and how to teach them. They ended up calling it the math-science partnership.

This has resulted in a problem because some in the administration decided to cut the budget of the National Science Foundation because they felt this was a duplication of programs. It is not.

The National Science Foundation concentrates on doing research. The Foundation's model is designed for competitive grants to spur innovative programs that will be peer reviewed and evaluated to enhance research on effective math and science education, whereas the Department of Education ensures that this knowledge is disseminated to as many school districts as possible. Knowledge gained from the competitive foundation scholarships, in other words the National Science

Foundation math-science partnerships, can be used and is used to prove and enhance State investments in programs developed by the Department of Education.

In other words, these are two programs that happen to have the same names. They are very symbiotic. The discoveries out of the research at the National Science Foundation transfers directly over to the Department of Education, and is there applied to instructions in the classrooms and for teacher training programs.

□ 2210

Another reason I come to offer this amendment is because the other body, the Senate, is working on this same issue, this same bill, and they have added an amendment which clarifies the difference between the National Science Foundation programs and the Department of Education programs. I am offering essentially the same amendment so that when we go to conference with the Senate, this will be preagreed to. It's a necessary and important clarification of the functions of the two, and I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The superb gentleman from Michigan is absolutely right. It's a superb amendment. We're happy to accept it, and I commend him for offering it.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. MCNERNEY:

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

SEC. 19. HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTIONS UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director is authorized to establish a new program to award grants on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis to Hispanic-serving institutions to enhance the quality of undergraduate science, mathematics, engineering, and technology education at such institutions and to increase the retention and graduation rates of students pursuing associate's or baccalaureate degrees in science, mathematics, engineering, or technology.

(b) PROGRAM COMPONENTS.—Grants awarded under this section shall support—

(1) activities to improve courses and curriculum in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology;

(2) faculty development;

(3) stipends for undergraduate students participating in research; and

(4) other activities consistent with subsection (a), as determined by the Director.

(c) INSTRUMENTATION.—Funding for instrumentation is an allowed use of grants awarded under this section.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman GORDON,

Ranking Member HALL, and my good friend Dr. BAIRD for bringing H.R. 1867, the National Science Foundation Reauthorization Act, to the floor. This is a very important bill that will benefit our young scientists for generations to come.

I would also like to thank some of my colleagues, Ms. GIFFORDS and Mr. CROWLEY, for their support.

My amendment makes a needed change to H.R. 1867 by allowing the Director of the National Science Foundation to establish a competitive, merit-based program to award grants to Hispanic-serving institutions for science, technology, engineering and mathematics, or STEM education.

The U.S. is in danger of falling behind the rest of our competitors in the world in STEM education, and it is imperative that we improve academics in this country. We need initiatives that increase educational opportunities for all young adults in order to expand the number of students who pursue careers in science and math-related fields.

The National Academy of Science's study, *Rising Above the Gathering Storm*, paints a very sobering picture of our future if we continue to see declines in both the quality and the quantity of science and math students. However, we can alter this current trend by expanding options for our children.

The House has passed numerous bills in recent weeks to create new opportunities in STEM education. These are excellent first steps. Likewise, today's legislation, and my amendment, provide us with the building blocks for academic progress. We should continue working hard to improve access to education and offer better services for our students and families.

This amendment does that by allowing Hispanic-serving institutions throughout the country to participate in NSF programs. As the largest minority group in the United States, Hispanic populations should be encouraged to access the educational fields where we need the most talent, in science, technology, engineering and mathematics.

At San Joaquin Delta College in my district, and at hundreds of similar 2- and 4-year institutions, students benefit from existing funds and programs that will be enhanced by the adoption of this amendment.

We should give the NSF the ability to support improvement of curriculum and courses at Hispanic-serving institutions, while also providing for faculty development initiatives that will lead to better-educated students.

In addition to the benefits of these changes, my amendment is fiscally responsible. It authorizes no new funding. It simply provides the opportunity for Hispanic-serving institutions to compete for NSF funds in the same way as other institutions.

The NSF already supports similar programs for Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Tribal Col-

leges, and this amendment will allow Hispanic-serving institutions to better serve our future leaders and scientists.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in support of the McNerney-Giffords-Crowley amendment to the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2007.

I want to thank Congressman MCNERNEY and Congressman CROWLEY for their help in crafting this amendment. It has been a pleasure to work with both of them.

A Hispanic-serving institution is defined as an institution of higher education that has at least 25 percent Hispanic full-time enrollment, and at least 50 percent of the school's student population must be eligible for need-based financial aid.

This amendment will establish a new program in the National Science Foundation to award grants to Hispanic-serving institutions on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis. These grants will enhance the quality of undergraduate science, math, engineering and technology education. This will increase student retention and graduation rates for those students pursuing degrees in these critical areas.

Specifically, this grant program will support faculty development, which is critical; stipends for undergraduate students participating in research; and initiatives to improve courses and curriculum in science, math and engineering and technology.

In 2005, Mr. Chairman, a group of bipartisan congressional lawmakers asked the experts at the National Academies for steps that policymakers must pursue in order to ensure the United States remains globally competitive.

Their report, entitled *Rising Above the Gathering Storm*, which we refer to frequently on the Science Committee, found that the United States will stand to lose in terms of global competitiveness unless we act immediately.

One of the recommendations was to increase the participation of minorities in STEM education fields. That report stated that "increasing participation of underrepresented minorities is critical to ensuring a high-quality supply of scientists and engineers in the United States over the long term. And as minority groups increase in percentage within the United States population, increasing their participation in those STEM fields is critical."

In my home State of Arizona, 50 percent of the population 18 years of age and younger are Hispanic. My amendment will ensure that Hispanics, our Nation's largest ethnic minority, and many blacks, whites, Asians and Native Americans who attend Hispanic-serving institutions will be able to more fully contribute to American innovation. It will expand the number of students graduating with the creden-

tials to enter the critical fields that impact American competitiveness, those STEM fields.

This amendment truly benefits all of the United States of America.

In my district I have three Hispanic-serving institutions, Pima Community College, Cochise Community College and, of course, the University of Arizona South. All three of these institutions support this amendment which would give them the opportunity to improve their STEM education programs.

Dr. Karen Nicodemus, who is the president of Cochise College, told my office, "As President of a rural Hispanic-serving institution, I applaud and strongly support any and all efforts to fund and expand undergraduate student access to the STEM areas. Directing resources to a growing but historically underserved student population is essential, essential to fully engaging and preparing them for the 21st century," Mr. Chairman, which we know is so critical.

According to Dr. Roy Flores, who is the chancellor of Pima Community College, "Our ability to increase minority graduates in science, technology, engineering and math degree programs will determine our relative position in the global economy."

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is all about keeping America globally competitive in this 21st century. I encourage all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I just want to simply rise to congratulate my colleagues, both Mr. MCNERNEY as well as Ms. GIFFORDS, both leaders on the Science Committee on this issue, in advancing our Democratic innovative agenda.

This amendment will benefit Hispanic-serving institutions throughout our Nation to inspire more of our young people to seek careers in industries that will foster the growth in mathematics and science among primarily Hispanic-serving institutions.

□ 2220

And I stand wholeheartedly behind this amendment. This will include over 10,000 students in my district who will directly benefit from this amendment. Let me just read some of the institutions in Queens and the Bronx, including Lehman College, Bronx Community College, Hostos Community College, LaGuardia Community College, Vaughn College of Aeronautics and Technology at LaGuardia Airport, and the College of Mount Saint Vincent. They are just a few of the colleges that will benefit from this amendment.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support it and ask my colleagues to support this amendment as well.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the McNerney-Giffords amendment. This amendment establishes a new competitive grants program specifically for Hispanic-Serving Institutions at the National Science Foundation.

I would like to thank Representative MCNERNEY and Representative GIFFORDS for their leadership in offering this amendment, which will increase opportunities for so many undergraduate students.

This amendment will focus attention on the need to involve more Hispanic students in the science field by creating a specific program for Hispanic-Serving Institutions to receive infrastructure development funding.

I would also like to thank Chairman GORDON, Subcommittee Chairman BAIRD, and the staff at the Science and Technology Committee for their assistance in drafting this amendment, and for their commitment to increasing participation of minorities in the science and technology fields.

Hispanic-Serving Institutions serve the majority of the nearly two million Hispanic students enrolled in college today, and many of these institutions offer associate, undergraduate, and graduate programs and degrees in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields.

The Hispanic-Serving Institutions Undergraduate Program created by this amendment will allow these colleges and universities to access the funding they need to enhance their educational programs.

In my district alone, about 10,000 students attend Hispanic-Serving Institutions offering degrees in these science fields. Students at institutions throughout Queens and the Bronx, including Lehman College, Bronx Community College, Hostos Community College, LaGuardia Community College, Vaughn College of Aeronautics and Technology, and the College of Mount Saint Vincent, like those all across the country, will benefit from increased access to funding to improve these degree programs.

This amendment corrects a long-standing inequality at the National Science Foundation.

Unlike their counterparts of Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Tribal Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-Serving Institutions have not benefited from a specific program to provide them with grants for research, curriculum, and infrastructure development.

Without access to targeted capacity-building grants, Hispanic-Serving Institutions have difficulty increasing the ranks of Hispanics in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields, where they have been historically underrepresented. Studies show that Hispanics earn less than 3 percent of doctorates in these areas, compared to more than 50 percent by non-Hispanic whites.

This amendment also goes to the heart of the Innovation Agenda spearheaded by Speaker PELOSI and the new Democratic Coalition in the House to increase our Nation's competitiveness and create more math and science graduates.

To maintain our global competitiveness, we need to increase our pool of scientists, mathematicians, and engineers.

We can do this by ensuring that Hispanics, the youngest and fastest-growing ethnic population group in the nation, are prepared with the knowledge and skills that will contribute to our Nation's future economic strength, security and global leadership.

This grants program will educate and train a new generation of experts in the science, technology, engineering and mathematics areas. By engaging Hispanic-Serving Institu-

tions in this process, we can reach out to and involve more of the Hispanic educational community.

The National Science Foundation, through its undergraduate and graduate programs, can assist Hispanic-Serving Institutions in developing programs to prepare current and future generations of Hispanics and other minority professionals in the sciences.

I applaud the establishment of a Hispanic-Serving Institutions Undergraduate Program to achieve these goals, and I urge passage of this excellent amendment by Representatives MCNERNEY and GIFFORDS.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The prior speakers have been very eloquent in support of this and the hour is late; so I won't go into any detail. I just want to commend them for their leadership on this and urge support of this outstanding amendment.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I want to commend my colleagues as well for bringing what would on its face value be seen as a remarkably new and innovative program. In fact, I think as the gentleman said, advancing "the Democratic innovation agenda." Well, it is curious, Mr. Chairman, because if you view and look specifically at the language that is in this amendment, and it is to be commended indeed, it bears striking resemblance to the language in current law. In fact, the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002, section 24 has language that is exactly the same as is in this amendment.

So I want to commend my colleagues for being inventive and being innovative indeed.

I also think it would be appropriate for them to cite, in fact, where the original language came from, and that was the prior Republican Congress. So I commend my colleagues for their innovation, indeed, in formulating an amendment that is already in place in current law.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

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

SEC. 19. REQUIREMENT OF OFFSETS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No authorization of appropriations made by this Act or other provision of this Act that results in costs to the Federal Government shall be effective except to the extent that this Act provides for offsetting decreases in spending of the Federal Government, such that the net effect of this Act does not either increase the Federal deficit or reduce the Federal surplus.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms "deficit" and "surplus" have the meanings

given such terms in the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I know the hour is late and we are drawing to a close on this, and I think this is an appropriate amendment upon which to end for this is the amendment that allows us as a Congress to say, yes, indeed, we believe that fiscal responsibility is important.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, this bill, the National Science Foundation Authorization Act, authorizes \$20.973 billion, nearly \$21 billion, over 3 years and creates five new Federal programs. The National Science Foundation Authorization Act establishes a pilot program of 1-year seed grants for new investigators to help improve funding rates for young investigators and to stimulate higher-risk research. It encourages the NSF to foster relationships between academia and industry in order to spawn U.S. competitiveness and furthers the Agency's traditions of education in science, technology, engineering, and math.

The NSF has a mission to achieve excellence in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education at all levels and all settings from kindergarten through postdoctoral training, from classrooms to science museums and online resources, having done so for the last half century. And while what this bill does is extremely important, equally important is this amendment that will apply the principle of pay as you go to any new spending authorized by this legislation by requiring that any new spending have a specific offset.

The amendment provides that no authorization of appropriations made by this Act that results in costs to the Federal Government shall be effective unless there are decreases in spending elsewhere in the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, common sense dictates that that is what we should do. Not only common sense, but previous promises by this new majority. An excerpt of "A New Direction for America," which was proposed by House Democrats in the 109th Congress as their plan for the majority, it reads: "Our New Direction is committed to pay-as-you-go budgeting, no more deficit spending. We are committed to auditing the books and subjecting every facet of Federal spending to tough budget discipline and accountability, forcing the Congress to choose a new direction and the right priorities for all Americans."

Well, hear, hear, Mr. Chairman. I heartily agree. But on April 18, Majority Leader HOYER was quoted in Roll Call as saying, "We want to get the budget deficit under control. We have said that fiscal responsibility was necessary, but we're not going to be hoisted on the torrent of fiscal responsibility."

Well, Mr. Chairman, Americans all across this Nation are being shaken down by a "torrent" of fiscal irresponsibility.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, the rules are not rules if you only follow them when you want to. The Democrats promised pay-as-you-go rules for everything. Instead, they are picking and choosing, picking and choosing when to do so. At home, we call that breaking a rule and breaking a promise.

So while what this bill does is extremely important, \$20.973 billion is a considerable amount of money even here in Washington, and it is equally important that we are good stewards of the hard-earned money of the American people. We should not limit our talk about fiscal responsibility only when it is politically convenient.

So I urge the new majority to rededicate itself to the principle of pay-as-you-go spending. Fiscal responsibility shouldn't be something that is just talked about only on the campaign trail.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this commonsense, fiscally responsible, pay-as-you-go amendment.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

In the midst of all this serious debate about an extremely important bill, I would like to pause just a moment to have a lighter moment that we can all enjoy as we recognize that one of our leading Members in this Congress tomorrow reaches a major milestone. The ranking member of the Science Committee, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. RALPH HALL, tomorrow will begin the second half of his life. He reaches the age of 84 tomorrow. So we can all celebrate with him and appreciate the tremendous contributions he has made to this Congress and to this country.

And I think it is entirely appropriate that on the eve of this important occasion, he spends the entire evening in this Chamber debating the esoteric aspects of science and its results.

So I hope all of you will join me at some point in the next day of wishing Mr. HALL an immensely wonderful 84th birthday tomorrow.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to share the happy birthday wishes to the distinguished ranking member and thank him for his bipartisan participation in not only this, but so many endeavors.

Congratulations, RALPH. You are a dear friend and a model to many of us, and I very much appreciate all your service.

I also want to thank Chairman GORDON for his leadership in not only this bill but the entire innovation agenda that has been moving through this Congress so efficiently and with, again, good bipartisan support.

I mentioned Mr. EHLERS repeatedly earlier tonight. He has been so central to the passage of this bill. And I especially want to thank the majority staff and the minority staff. We have worked very well together.

And I want to thank my dear friends and colleagues on the other side.

Though we have had a spirited disagreement on some issues and agreed on some, it has been a civil debate, a well-intentioned debate, and I think it has advanced our discussion of the important role of this legislation.

The amendment by the gentleman from Georgia has been offered before. It has been defeated before on other bills. I would urge its defeat. And after we accomplish that, I would urge passage of this otherwise outstanding bill.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I just want to rise to first thank Dr. EHLERS and reiterate my support for H.R. 1867. I think we have a good bill here that propels us on down the innovation and competitiveness path that the President is on and that we have been on. I also thank Chairman GORDON and Chairman BAIRD.

Dr. EHLERS, I thank you again for helping to make this a better bill. In fact, I would argue that there is no one in this body more familiar with NSF than you are.

□ 2230

I thank you for your work for and against some of these amendments.

I rise in support of the bill and urge an "aye" vote on it.

And, Dr. BAIRD, I thank you personally for your kindness and the classy way you've handled yourself today.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

The amendment to Amendment No. 1 by Mr. SULLIVAN of Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. HONDA of California.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 8 by Ms. MATSUI of California.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SULLIVAN TO AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HONDA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a re-

corded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 166, noes 250, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 287]

AYES—166

Aderholt	Franks (AZ)	Nunes
Akin	Frelinghuysen	Pearce
Alexander	Galleghy	Pence
Bachmann	Garrett (NJ)	Peterson (PA)
Bachus	Gingrey	Petri
Baker	Gohmert	Pickering
Barrett (SC)	Goode	Pitts
Barton (TX)	Goodlatte	Poe
Billbray	Granger	Price (GA)
Bilirakis	Hall (TX)	Pryce (OH)
Bishop (UT)	Hastert	Putnam
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Regula
Blunt	Hayes	Rehberg
Boehner	Heller	Reichert
Bonner	Hensarling	Renzi
Bono	Herger	Reynolds
Boozman	Hobson	Rogers (AL)
Boustany	Hoekstra	Rogers (KY)
Brady (TX)	Hulshof	Rogers (MI)
Brown (SC)	Inglis (SC)	Rohrabacher
Brown-Waite,	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Ginny	Jindal	Roskam
Buchanan	Jones (NC)	Royce
Burton (IN)	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Buyer	Keller	Sali
Calvert	King (IA)	Schmidt
Camp (MI)	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Campbell (CA)	Kingston	Sessions
Cantor	Kline (MN)	Shadegg
Capito	Knollenberg	Shimkus
Carter	Lamborn	Shuster
Chabot	Latham	Simpson
Cole (OK)	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NE)
Conaway	Lewis (KY)	Smith (TX)
Costello	Linder	Souder
Crenshaw	Lucas	Stearns
Culberson	Lungren, Daniel	Sullivan
Davis (KY)	E.	Taylor
Davis, David	Mack	Terry
Deal (GA)	Manzullo	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, L.	Marchant	Tiahrt
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCarthy (CA)	Tiberi
Doolittle	McCauley (TX)	Turner
Drake	McCotter	Upton
Dreier	McCrery	Walberg
Duncan	McHenry	Walden (OR)
Ellsworth	McKeon	Wamp
Emerson	Mica	Weldon (FL)
English (PA)	Miller (FL)	Weller
Everett	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Fallin	Miller, Gary	Whitfield
Flake	Moran (KS)	Wicker
Forbes	Murphy, Tim	Wilson (NM)
Fortenberry	Musgrave	Wilson (SC)
Fossella	Myrick	Young (AK)
Fox	Neugebauer	Young (FL)

NOES—250

Abercrombie	Berman	Burgess
Ackerman	Berry	Butterfield
Allen	Biggart	Capps
Altmire	Bishop (GA)	Capuano
Andrews	Bishop (NY)	Cardoza
Arcuri	Blumenauer	Carnahan
Baca	Bordallo	Carney
Baird	Boren	Carson
Baldwin	Boswell	Castle
Barrow	Boucher	Castor
Bartlett (MD)	Boyd (FL)	Chandler
Bean	Boyd (KS)	Christensen
Becerra	Braley (IA)	Clarke
Berkley	Brown, Corrine	Clay

Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Emanuel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Ferguson
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)

Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter

Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry

NOT VOTING—21

Brady (PA)
Cannon
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Engel
Faleomavaega
Fattah
Feeney

Fortuño
Graves
Hunter
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Lampson
McMorris
Rodgers

Neal (MA)
Norton
Ortiz
Paul
Radanovich
Tancredo

□ 2255

Messrs. JOHNSON of Illinois, DAVIS of Illinois, REYES and RUSH changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. MACK and Mrs. SCHMIDT changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HONDA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by

the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

The question was taken; and the Acting 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 Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 252, noes 165, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 288]

AYES—252

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry

Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud

Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Reichert
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton

Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz

Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler

Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOES—165

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fossella

Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)

Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—20

Brady (PA)
Cannon
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Engel
Faleomavaega
Fattah
Fortuño

Graves
Hunter
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Lampson
McMorris
Rodgers
Mollohan

Norton
Ortiz
Paul
Radanovich
Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 1 minute remains in the vote.

□ 2259

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 222, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 289]

AYES—195

Aderholt	Flake	Moran (KS)
Akin	Forbes	Murphy, Tim
Alexander	Fortenberry	Musgrave
Altmire	Fossella	Myrick
Bachmann	Fox	Neugebauer
Bachus	Franks (AZ)	Nunes
Baker	Frelinghuysen	Pearce
Barrett (SC)	Gallely	Pence
Barrow	Garrett (NJ)	Peterson (MN)
Barton (TX)	Gerlach	Peterson (PA)
Bean	Gillibrand	Petri
Berkley	Gillmor	Pickering
Biggert	Gingrey	Pitts
Bilbray	Gohmert	Platts
Bilirakis	Goode	Poe
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	Porter
Blackburn	Granger	Price (GA)
Blunt	Green, Gene	Putnam
Boehner	Hastert	Ramstad
Bonner	Hastings (WA)	Regula
Bono	Hayes	Rehberg
Boozman	Heller	Renzi
Boren	Hensarling	Reynolds
Boustany	Herger	Rogers (KY)
Boyd (KS)	Hobson	Rogers (MI)
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Rohrabacher
Brown (SC)	Inglis (SC)	Ros-Lehtinen
Brown-Waite,	Issa	Roskam
Ginny	Jindal	Ross
Buchanan	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Burgess	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Burton (IN)	Keller	Sali
Buyer	King (IA)	Saxton
Calvert	King (NY)	Schmidt
Camp (MI)	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Campbell (CA)	Kline (MN)	Sessions
Cantor	Knollenberg	Shadegg
Capito	Kuhl (NY)	Shimkus
Carney	LaHood	Shuler
Carter	Lamborn	Shuster
Chabot	Latham	Smith (NE)
Chandler	LaTourette	Smith (NJ)
Cole (OK)	Lewis (CA)	Souder
Conaway	Lewis (KY)	Space
Cramer	Linder	Stearns
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Sullivan
Cuellar	Lucas	Taylor
Culberson	Lungren, Daniel	Terry
Davis (KY)	E.	Thornberry
Davis, David	Manzullo	Tiahrt
Davis, Tom	Marchant	Turner
Deal (GA)	Marshall	Upton
Dent	Matheson	Walberg
Diaz-Balart, L.	McCarthy (CA)	Walden (OR)
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCauley (TX)	Walsh (NY)
Donnelly	McCotter	Wamp
Doolittle	McCrery	Weldon (FL)
Drake	McHenry	Weller
Dreier	McHugh	Westmoreland
Duncan	McIntyre	Whitfield
Emerson	McKeon	Wicker
English (PA)	McNulty	Wilson (SC)
Everett	Mica	Wolf
Fallin	Miller (FL)	Young (AK)
Feeney	Miller (MI)	Young (FL)
Ferguson	Miller, Gary	

NOES—222

Abercrombie	Berry	Capps
Ackerman	Bishop (GA)	Capuano
Allen	Bishop (NY)	Cardoza
Andrews	Blumenauer	Carnahan
Arcuri	Bordallo	Carson
Baca	Boswell	Castle
Baird	Boucher	Castor
Baldwin	Boyd (FL)	Christensen
Bartlett (MD)	Braley (IA)	Clarke
Becerra	Brown, Corrine	Clay
Berman	Butterfield	Cleaver

Clyburn	Johnson (IL)	Reichert
Coble	Jones (NC)	Reyes
Cohen	Jones (OH)	Rodriguez
Conyers	Kagen	Rogers (AL)
Cooper	Kanjorski	Rothman
Costa	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Costello	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Courtney	Kilpatrick	Rush
Crowley	Kind	Ryan (OH)
Cummings	Kirk	Salazar
Davis (AL)	Klein (FL)	Sanchez, Linda
Davis (CA)	Kucinich	T.
Davis (IL)	Langevin	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis, Lincoln	Lantos	Sarbanes
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Delahunt	Lee	Schwartz
DeLauro	Levin	Scott (GA)
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Scott (VA)
Dingell	Lipinski	Serrano
Doggett	Loebbeck	Sestak
Doyle	Lofgren, Zoe	Shays
Edwards	Lowey	Shea-Porter
Ehlers	Lynch	Sherman
Ellison	Mack	Simpson
Ellsworth	Mahoney (FL)	Sires
Emanuel	Maloney (NY)	Skelton
Eshoo	Markey	Slaughter
Etheridge	Matsui	Smith (TX)
Farr	McCarthy (NY)	Smith (WA)
Finer	McCollum (MN)	Snyder
Frank (MA)	McDermott	Solis
Giffords	McGovern	Spratt
Gilchrest	McNerney	Stark
Gonzalez	Meehan	Stupak
Gordon	Meek (FL)	Sutton
Green, Al	Meeks (NY)	Tanner
Grijaiva	Melancon	Tauscher
Gutierrez	Michaud	Thompson (CA)
Hall (NY)	Miller (NC)	Thompson (MS)
Hall (TX)	Miller, George	Tiberi
Hare	Mitchell	Tierney
Harman	Moore (KS)	Towns
Hastings (FL)	Moore (WI)	Udall (CO)
Herseht Sandlin	Moran (VA)	Udall (NM)
Higgins	Murphy (CT)	Van Hollen
Hill	Murphy, Patrick	Velázquez
Hinche	Murtha	Visclosky
Hinojosa	Nadler	Walz (MN)
Hirono	Napolitano	Wasserman
Hodes	Neal (MA)	Schultz
Holden	Oberstar	Waters
Holt	Obey	Watson
Honda	Olver	Watt
Hooley	Pallone	Waxman
Hoyer	Pascarella	Weiner
Hulshof	Pastor	Welch (VT)
Inslie	Payne	Wexler
Israel	Perlmutter	Wilson (NM)
Jackson (IL)	Pomeroy	Wilson (OH)
Jackson-Lee	Price (NC)	Woolsey
(TX)	Pryce (OH)	Wu
Jefferson	Rahall	Wynn
Johnson (GA)	Rangel	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—20

Brady (PA)	Graves	Norton
Cannon	Hunter	Ortiz
Cubin	Johnson, E. B.	Paul
Davis, Jo Ann	Kennedy	Radanovich
Engel	Lampson	Tancredo
Faleomavaega	McMorris	
Fattah	Rodgers	
Fortuño	Mollohan	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised they have 1 minute remaining to vote.

□ 2305

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, during Rollcall vote No. 289 on H.R. 1867, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “no” when I should have voted “aye.” I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear

in the RECORD immediately following Rollcall vote No. 289.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 115, noes 301, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

AYES—115

Aderholt	Flake	Moran (KS)
Akin	Forbes	Musgrave
Alexander	Fossella	Myrick
Bachmann	Fox	Neugebauer
Bachus	Franks (AZ)	Nunes
Baker	Garrett (NJ)	Pearce
Barrett (SC)	Gohmert	Pence
Barton (TX)	Goode	Petri
Bean	Goodlatte	Pitts
Bilbray	Granger	Poe
Bilirakis	Hastert	Putnam
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Rehberg
Blunt	Heller	Rogers (KY)
Boehner	Hensarling	Rohrabacher
Boozman	Herger	Roskam
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Royce
Brown (SC)	Issa	Ryan (WI)
Brown-Waite,	Johnson, Sam	Sali
Ginny	Jordan	Schmidt
Burgess	Keller	Sensenbrenner
Burton (IN)	King (IA)	Shadegg
Buyer	Kingston	Shimkus
Calvert	Kline (MN)	Shuler
Camp (MI)	Knollenberg	Smith (NE)
Campbell (CA)	Lamborn	Smith (TX)
Cantor	Lewis (CA)	Souder
Carter	Lewis (KY)	Stearns
Chabot	Linder	Sullivan
Coble	Mack	Tanner
Conaway	Manzullo	Taylor
Crenshaw	Marchant	Tiberi
Davis (KY)	McCarthy (CA)	Walberg
Davis, David	McCotter	Wamp
Deal (GA)	McCrery	Weldon (FL)
Doolittle	McHenry	Westmoreland
Drake	McKeon	Whitfield
Duncan	Mica	Wilson (SC)
Ellsworth	Miller (FL)	Young (FL)
Feeney	Miller, Gary	

NOES—301

Abercrombie	Boswell	Cohen
Ackerman	Boucher	Cole (OK)
Allen	Boustany	Conyers
Altmire	Boyd (FL)	Cooper
Andrews	Boyd (KS)	Costa
Arcuri	Braley (IA)	Costello
Baca	Brown, Corrine	Courtney
Baird	Buchanan	Cramer
Baldwin	Butterfield	Crowley
Barrow	Capito	Cuellar
Bartlett (MD)	Capps	Culberson
Becerra	Capuano	Cummings
Berkley	Cardoza	Davis (AL)
Berman	Carnahan	Davis (CA)
Berry	Carney	Davis (IL)
Biggert	Carson	Davis, Lincoln
Bishop (GA)	Castle	Davis, Tom
Bishop (NY)	Castor	DeFazio
Bishop (UT)	Chandler	DeGette
Blumenauer	Christensen	Delahunt
Bonner	Clarke	DeLauro
Bono	Clay	Dent
Bordallo	Cleaver	Diaz-Balart, L.
Boren	Clyburn	Diaz-Balart, M.

Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Emanuel
Emerson
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin

Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaull (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez

Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tauscher
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—21

Brady (PA)
Cannon
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Doyle
Engel
Faleomavaega
Fattah

Fortuño
Graves
Hunter
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kennedy
Lampson
McMorris
Rodgers
Norton
Ortiz
Paul
Radanovich
Tancred

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised they have 1 minute remaining to vote.

□ 2308

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT
OF NEW JERSEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 126, noes 292, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 291]

AYES—126

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Duncan
Ellsworth
English (PA)

Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fossella
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)

Murphy, Patrick
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe
Putnam
Ramstad
Rehberg
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Walberg
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Young (FL)

NOES—292

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bono
Bordallo
Boren

Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke

Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt

DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Emanuel
Emerson
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)

LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Loifgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaull (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds

Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—19

Brady (PA)
Cannon
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Engel
Faleomavaega
Fattah

Fortuño
Graves
Hunter
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Lampson
McMorris
Rodgers
Norton
Ortiz
Paul
Radanovich
Tancred

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 2313

Mr. PERLMUTTER changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 128, noes 290, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 292]

AYES—128

Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	Neugebauer
Akin	Galleghy	Nunes
Altmire	Garrett (NJ)	Pearce
Bachmann	Gillibrand	Pence
Bachus	Gillmor	Petri
Barrett (SC)	Gohmert	Pickering
Barton (TX)	Goode	Pitts
Bean	Goodlatte	Poe
Billbray	Granger	Price (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Hall (TX)	Pryce (OH)
Blackburn	Hastert	Putnam
Blunt	Hastings (WA)	Ramstad
Boehner	Heller	Regula
Bono	Hensarling	Rehberg
Brady (TX)	Herger	Rogers (KY)
Brown (SC)	Hoekstra	Rohrabacher
Brown-Waite,	Issa	Roskam
Ginny	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Burgess	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Burton (IN)	Keller	Sali
Buyer	King (IA)	Schmidt
Camp (MI)	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Campbell (CA)	Kirk	Shadegg
Cantor	Kline (MN)	Shimkus
Carney	Kuhl (NY)	Shuler
Carter	Lamborn	Shuster
Chabot	Lewis (KY)	Simpson
Cole (OK)	Linder	Smith (NE)
Conaway	Lungren, Daniel	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	E.	Souder
Culberson	Mack	Stearns
Davis (KY)	Manzullo	Sullivan
Davis, David	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Deal (GA)	McCaul (TX)	Tiberi
Donnelly	McCotter	Walberg
Doolittle	McCrery	Wamp
Duncan	McHenry	Westmoreland
Everett	McKeon	Whitfield
Fallin	Mica	Wilson (NM)
Feeney	Miller (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Flake	Miller, Gary	Wilson (AK)
Fossella	Murphy, Patrick	Young (FL)
Foxx	Musgrave	
Franks (AZ)	Myrick	

NOES—290

Abercrombie	Bordallo	Clay
Ackerman	Boren	Cleaver
Alexander	Boswell	Clyburn
Allen	Boucher	Coble
Andrews	Boustany	Cohen
Arcuri	Boyd (FL)	Conyers
Baca	Boyd (KS)	Cooper
Baird	Braley (IA)	Costa
Baker	Brown, Corrine	Costello
Baldwin	Buchanan	Courtney
Barrow	Butterfield	Cramer
Bartlett (MD)	Calvert	Crowley
Becerra	Capito	Cuellar
Berkley	Capps	Cummings
Berman	Capuano	Davis (AL)
Berry	Cardoza	Davis (CA)
Biggert	Carnahan	Davis (IL)
Billakis	Carson	Davis, Lincoln
Bishop (GA)	Castle	Davis, Tom
Bishop (NY)	Castor	DeFazio
Blumenauer	Chandler	DeGette
Bonner	Christensen	Delahunt
Boozman	Clarke	DeLauro

Dent	LaHood	Rogers (MI)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Langevin	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lantos	Ross
Dicks	Larsen (WA)	Rothman
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Roybal-Allard
Doggett	Latham	Ruppersberger
Doyle	LaTourette	Rush
Drake	Lee	Ryan (OH)
Dreier	Levin	Salazar
Edwards	Lewis (CA)	Sánchez, Linda
Ehlers	Lewis (GA)	T.
Ellison	Lipinski	Sanchez, Loretta
Ellsworth	LoBiondo	Sarbanes
Emanuel	Loeb sack	Saxton
Emerson	Lofgren, Zoe	Schakowsky
English (PA)	Lowey	Schiff
Eshoo	Lucas	Schwartz
Etheridge	Lynch	Scott (GA)
Farr	Mahoney (FL)	Scott (VA)
Ferguson	Maloney (NY)	Serrano
Filner	Marchant	Sessions
Forbes	Markey	Sestak
Fortenberry	Marshall	Shays
Frank (MA)	Matheson	Shea-Porter
Gerlach	Matsui	Sherman
Giffords	McCarthy (NY)	Sires
Gilchrest	McCollum (MN)	Skelton
Gingrey	McDermott	Slaughter
Gonzalez	McGovern	Smith (NJ)
Gordon	McHugh	Smith (WA)
Green, Al	McIntyre	Snyder
Green, Gene	McNerney	Solis
Grijalva	McNulty	Space
Gutierrez	Meehan	Spratt
Hall (NY)	Meek (FL)	Stark
Hare	Meeks (NY)	Stupak
Harman	Melancon	Sutton
Hastings (FL)	Michaud	Tanner
Hayes	Miller (MI)	Tauscher
Herseth Sandlin	Miller (NC)	Taylor
Higgins	Miller, George	Thompson (CA)
Hill	Mitchell	Thompson (MS)
Hinchev	Mollohan	Thornberry
Hirono	Moore (KS)	Tiaht
Hobson	Moore (WI)	Tierney
Hodes	Moran (KS)	Towns
Holden	Moran (VA)	Turner
Holt	Murphy (CT)	Udall (CO)
Honda	Murphy, Tim	Udall (NM)
Hooley	Murtha	Upton
Hoyer	Nadler	Van Hollen
Hulshof	Napolitano	Velázquez
Inglis (SC)	Neal (MA)	Visclosky
Inslee	Obestar	Walden (OR)
Israel	Obey	Walsh (NY)
Jackson (IL)	Olver	Walz (MN)
Jackson-Lee	Pallone	Wasserman
(TX)	Pascrell	Schultz
Jefferson	Pastor	Watt
Jindal	Payne	Watson
Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter	Waxman
Johnson (IL)	Peterson (MN)	Weiner
Jones (NC)	Peterson (PA)	Welch (VT)
Jones (OH)	Platts	Weldon (FL)
Kagen	Pomeroy	Weller
Kanjorski	Porter	Wexler
Kaptur	Price (NC)	Wicker
Kildee	Rahall	Wilson (OH)
Kilpatrick	Rangel	Wolf
Kind	Reichert	Woolsey
King (NY)	Renzi	Wu
Klein (FL)	Reyes	Wynn
Knollenberg	Reynolds	Yarmuth
Kucinich	Rodriguez	
	Rogers (AL)	

NOT VOTING—19

Brady (PA)	Fortuño	McMorris
Cannon	Graves	Rodgers
Cubin	Hunter	Norton
Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson, E. B.	Ortiz
Engel	Kennedy	Paul
Faleomavaega	Lampson	Radanovich
Fattah		Tancred

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 2317

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. MATSUI

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a re-

corded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 186, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

AYES—232

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Miller, George
Ackerman	Gordon	Mitchell
Allen	Green, Al	Mollohan
Andrews	Green, Gene	Moore (KS)
Arcuri	Grijalva	Moore (WI)
Baca	Gutierrez	Moran (VA)
Baird	Hall (NY)	Murphy (CT)
Baldwin	Hare	Murphy, Patrick
Barrow	Harman	Murtha
Bartlett (MD)	Hastings (FL)	Nadler
Barton (TX)	Herseth Sandlin	Napolitano
Becerra	Higgins	Neal (MA)
Berman	Hill	Oberstar
Berry	Hinchev	Obey
Bishop (GA)	Hinojosa	Olver
Bishop (NY)	Hirono	Pallone
Blumenauer	Hodes	Pascrell
Bordallo	Holden	Pastor
Boren	Holt	Payne
Boswell	Honda	Perlmutter
Boucher	Hooley	Peterson (MN)
Boyd (FL)	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Boyd (KS)	Inslee	Price (NC)
Brady (TX)	Israel	Rahall
Braley (IA)	Jackson (IL)	Rangel
Brown, Corrine	Jackson-Lee	Reyes
Butterfield	(TX)	Rodriguez
Capps	Jefferson	Ross
Capuano	Jindal	Rothman
Cardoza	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Carnahan	Jones (NC)	Ruppersberger
Carson	Jones (OH)	Rush
Castor	Kagen	Ryan (OH)
Chandler	Kanjorski	Salazar
Christensen	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Clarke	Kildee	T.
Clay	Kilpatrick	Sanchez, Loretta
Cleaver	Kind	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Klein (FL)	Schakowsky
Cohen	Kucinich	Schiff
Conyers	LaHood	Schwartz
Cooper	Langevin	Scott (GA)
Costa	Lantos	Scott (VA)
Costello	Larsen (WA)	Sensenbrenner
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Cramer	Lee	Sestak
Crowley	Levin	Shays
Cuellar	Lewis (GA)	Shea-Porter
Cummings	Linder	Sherman
Davis (AL)	Lipinski	Shuler
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Sires
Davis (IL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Skelton
Davis, Lincoln	Lowey	Slaughter
DeFazio	Lynch	Snyder
DeGette	Mahoney (FL)	Solis
DeLahunt	Maloney (NY)	Space
DeLauro	Markey	Spratt
Dicks	Marshall	Stark
Dingell	Matheson	Stupak
Doggett	Matsui	Sutton
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)	Tanner
Edwards	McCollum (MN)	Tauscher
Ellison	McDermott	Taylor
Ellsworth	McGovern	Terry
Emanuel	McIntyre	Thompson (CA)
Eshoo	McNerney	Thompson (MS)
Etheridge	McNulty	Tierney
Farr	Meehan	Towns
Filner	Meek (FL)	Udall (CO)
Frank (MA)	Meeks (NY)	Udall (NM)
Giffords	Melancon	Van Hollen
Gilchrest	Michaud	Velázquez
Gillibrand	Miller (NC)	Visclosky

Walz (MN)	Waxman	Woolsey
Wasserman	Weiner	Wu
Schultz	Welch (VT)	Wynn
Waters	Wexler	Yarmuth
Watson	Wilson (NM)	
Watt	Wilson (OH)	

NOES—186

Aderholt	Fortenberry	Myrick
Akin	Fossella	Neugebauer
Alexander	Fox	Nunes
Altmire	Franks (AZ)	Pearce
Bachmann	Frelinghuysen	Pence
Bachus	Gallely	Peterson (PA)
Baker	Garrett (NJ)	Petri
Barrett (SC)	Gerlach	Pickering
Bean	Gillmor	Pitts
Berkley	Gingrey	Platts
Biggert	Gohmert	Poe
Bilbray	Goode	Porter
Bilirakis	Goodlatte	Price (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Granger	Pryce (OH)
Blackburn	Hall (TX)	Putnam
Blunt	Hastert	Ramstad
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Regula
Bonner	Hayes	Rehberg
Bono	Heller	Reichert
Boozman	Hensarling	Renzi
Boustany	Herger	Reynolds
Brown (SC)	Hobson	Rogers (AL)
Brown-Waite,	Hoekstra	Rogers (KY)
Ginny	Hulshof	Rogers (MI)
Buchanan	Inglis (SC)	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton (IN)	Johnson (IL)	Roskam
Buyer	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Calvert	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Camp (MI)	Keller	Sali
Campbell (CA)	King (IA)	Saxton
Cantor	King (NY)	Schmidt
Capito	Kingston	Sessions
Carney	Kirk	Shadegg
Carter	Kline (MN)	Shimkus
Castle	Knollenberg	Shuster
Chabot	Kuhl (NY)	Simpson
Coble	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Cole (OK)	Latham	Smith (NJ)
Conaway	LaTourette	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	Lewis (CA)	Smith (WA)
Culberson	Lewis (KY)	Souder
Davis (KY)	LoBiondo	Stearns
Davis, David	Lucas	Sullivan
Davis, Tom	Lungren, Daniel	Thornberry
Deal (GA)	E.	Tiahrt
Dent	Mack	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart, L.	Manzullo	Turner
Diaz-Balart, M.	Marchant	Upton
Donnelly	McCarthy (CA)	Walberg
Doolittle	McCaul (TX)	Walden (OR)
Drake	McCotter	Walsh (NY)
Dreier	McCrery	Wamp
Duncan	McHenry	Weldon (FL)
Ehlers	McHugh	Weller
Emerson	McKeon	Westmoreland
English (PA)	Mica	Whitfield
Everett	Miller (FL)	Wicker
Fallin	Miller (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Feeney	Miller, Gary	Wolf
Ferguson	Moran (KS)	Young (AK)
Flake	Murphy, Tim	Young (FL)
Forbes	Musgrave	

NOT VOTING—19

Brady (PA)	Fortuño	McMorris
Cannon	Graves	Rodgers
Cubin	Hunter	Norton
Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson, E. B.	Ortiz
Engel	Kennedy	Paul
Faleomavaega	Lampson	Radanovich
Fattah		Tancred

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 1 minute remains in this vote.

□ 2322

Mrs. GILLIBRAND changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a re-

corded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 235, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

AYES—183

Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	Nunes
Akin	Gallely	Pearce
Alexander	Garrett (NJ)	Pence
Bachmann	Gerlach	Peterson (PA)
Bachus	Gillmor	Petri
Baker	Gingrey	Pickering
Barrett (SC)	Gohmert	Pitts
Bartlett (MD)	Goode	Platts
Barton (TX)	Granger	Poe
Bilbray	Hall (TX)	Porter
Bilirakis	Hastert	Price (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)
Blackburn	Hayes	Putnam
Blunt	Heller	Ramstad
Boehner	Hensarling	Regula
Bonner	Herger	Rehberg
Bono	Hobson	Reichert
Boozman	Hoekstra	Renzi
Boustany	Hulshof	Reynolds
Brady (TX)	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (AL)
Brown (SC)	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Brown-Waite,	Jindal	Rogers (MI)
Ginny	Johnson (IL)	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Jones (NC)	Roskam
Burton (IN)	Jordan	Royce
Buyer	Keller	Ryan (WI)
Calvert	King (IA)	Sali
Camp (MI)	Kingston	Saxton
Campbell (CA)	Kirk	Schmidt
Cannon	Kline (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Cantor	Knollenberg	Sessions
Capito	Kuhl (NY)	Shadegg
Carter	LaHood	Shimkus
Castle	Lamborn	Shuster
Chabot	Latham	Simpson
Coble	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NE)
Cole (OK)	Lewis (KY)	Smith (NJ)
Conaway	Linder	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Souder
Culberson	Lucas	Stearns
Davis (KY)	Lungren, Daniel	Sullivan
Davis, David	E.	Terry
Deal (GA)	Mack	Thornberry
Dent	Manzullo	Tiahrt
Diaz-Balart, L.	Marchant	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCarthy (CA)	Turner
Doolittle	McCaul (TX)	Upton
Drake	McCotter	Walberg
Dreier	McCrery	Walden (OR)
Duncan	McHenry	Walsh (NY)
Emerson	McHugh	Wamp
English (PA)	Mica	Weldon (FL)
Everett	Miller (FL)	Weller
Fallin	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Feeney	Miller, Gary	Whitfield
Flake	Moran (KS)	Wicker
Forbes	Murphy, Tim	Wilson (NM)
Fortenberry	Musgrave	Wilson (SC)
Fossella	Myrick	Young (AK)
Fox	Neugebauer	Young (FL)
Franks (AZ)		

NOES—235

Abercrombie	Baldwin
Ackerman	Bishop (NY)
Allen	Blumenauer
Altmire	Bordallo
Andrews	Boren
Arcuri	Boswell
Baca	Boucher
Baird	Boyd (FL)

Boyda (KS)	Holden	Payne
Braley (IA)	Holt	Perlmutter
Brown, Corrine	Honda	Peterson (MN)
Butterfield	Hoolley	Pomeroy
Capps	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Capuano	Inslee	Rahall
Cardoza	Israel	Rangel
Carnahan	Jackson (IL)	Reyes
Carney	Jackson-Lee	Rodriguez
Carson	(TX)	Ross
Castor	Jefferson	Rothman
Chandler	Johnson (GA)	Royal-Ballard
Christensen	Jones (OH)	Ruppersberger
Clarke	Kagen	Rush
Clay	Kanjorski	Ryan (OH)
Cleaver	Kaptur	Salazar
Clyburn	Kildee	Sanchez, Linda
Cohen	Kilpatrick	T.
Conyers	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Cooper	King (NY)	Sarbanes
Costa	Klein (FL)	Schakowsky
Costello	Kucinich	Schiff
Courtney	Langevin	Schwartz
Cramer	Lantos	Scott (GA)
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Cummings	LaTourette	Sestak
Davis (AL)	Lee	Shays
Davis (CA)	Levin	Shea-Porter
Davis (IL)	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Davis, Lincoln	Lipinski	Shuler
Davis, Tom	Loeb sack	Sires
DeFazio	Loftgren, Zoe	Skelton
DeGette	Lowe	Slaughter
Delahunt	Lynch	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Mahoney (FL)	Snyder
Dicks	Maloney (NY)	Solis
Dingell	Markey	Space
Doggett	Marshall	Spratt
Donnelly	Matheson	Stark
Doyle	Matsui	Stupak
Edwards	McCarthy (NY)	Sutton
Ehlers	McCollum (MN)	Tanner
Ellison	McDermott	Tauscher
Ellsworth	McGovern	Taylor
Emanuel	McIntyre	Thompson (CA)
Eshoo	McNulty	Thompson (MS)
Etheridge	Meehan	Tierney
Farr	Meek (FL)	Towns
Ferguson	Meeks (NY)	Udall (CO)
Filner	Melancon	Udall (NM)
Frank (MA)	Michaud	Van Hollen
Giffords	Miller (NC)	Velázquez
Gilchrest	Miller, George	Visclosky
Gillibrand	Mitchell	Walz (MN)
Gonzalez	Mollohan	Wasserman
Gordon	Moore (KS)	Schultz
Green, Al	Moore (WI)	Waters
Green, Gene	Moran (VA)	Watson
Grijalva	Murphy (CT)	Watt
Gutierrez	Murphy, Patrick	Waxman
Hall (NY)	Murtha	Weiner
Hare	Nadler	Welch (VT)
Harman	Napolitano	Wexler
Hastings (FL)	Neal (MA)	Wilson (OH)
Herseth Sandlin	Oberstar	Wolf
Higgins	Obey	Woolsey
Hill	Olver	Wu
Hinchey	Pallone	Wynn
Hinojosa	Pascrell	Yarmuth
Hirono	Pastor	
Hodes		

NOT VOTING—19

Brady (PA)	Graves	McMorris
Cubin	Hunter	Rodgers
Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson, E. B.	Norton
Engel	Kennedy	Ortiz
Faleomavaega	Lampson	Paul
Fattah	McKeon	Radanovich
Fortuño		Tancred

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 1 minute remains in this vote.

□ 2326

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas) having assumed the chair, Mr. LYNCH, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1867) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2008, 2009, and 2010 for the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 349, 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? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 399, noes 17, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 295]

AYES—399

Abercrombie	Boozman	Cleaver
Ackerman	Boren	Clyburn
Aderholt	Boswell	Coble
Akin	Boucher	Cohen
Alexander	Boustany	Cole (OK)
Allen	Boyd (FL)	Conaway
Altmire	Boyda (KS)	Conyers
Andrews	Brady (TX)	Cooper
Arcuri	Braley (IA)	Costa
Baca	Brown (SC)	Costello
Bachmann	Brown, Corrine	Courtney
Bachus	Brown-Waite,	Cramer
Baird	Ginny	Crenshaw
Baker	Buchanan	Crowley
Baldwin	Burgess	Cuellar
Barrow	Burton (IN)	Culberson
Bartlett (MD)	Butterfield	Cummings
Barton (TX)	Buyer	Davis (AL)
Bean	Calvert	Davis (CA)
Becerra	Camp (MI)	Davis (IL)
Berkley	Cantor	Davis (KY)
Berman	Capito	Davis, David
Berry	Capps	Davis, Lincoln
Biggert	Capuano	Davis, Tom
Bilbray	Cardoza	DeFazio
Bilirakis	Carnahan	DeGette
Bishop (GA)	Carney	Delahunt
Bishop (NY)	Carson	DeLauro
Bishop (UT)	Carter	Dent
Blackburn	Castle	Diaz-Balart, L.
Blumenauer	Castor	Diaz-Balart, M.
Blunt	Chabot	Dicks
Boehner	Chandler	Dingell
Bonner	Clarke	Doggett
Bono	Clay	Donnelly

Doolittle	Lantos	Renzi	Woolsey	Wynn	Young (AK)
Doyle	Larsen (WA)	Reyes	Wu	Yarmuth	Young (FL)
Drake	Larson (CT)	Reynolds			
Dreier	Latham	Rodriguez			
Edwards	LaTourette	Rogers (AL)			
Ehlers	Lee	Rogers (KY)			
Ellison	Levin	Rogers (MI)			
Ellsworth	Lewis (CA)	Rohrabacher			
Emanuel	Lewis (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen			
Emerson	Lewis (KY)	Roskam			
English (PA)	Lipinski	Ross			
Eshoo	LoBiondo	Rothman			
Etheridge	Loeb	Roybal-Allard			
Everett	Loeb	Ruppersberger			
Fallin	Lofgren, Zoe	Rush			
Farr	Lowe	Ryan (OH)			
Feeney	Lucas	Ryan (WI)			
Ferguson	Lungren, Daniel	Salazar			
Filner	E.	Sanchez, Linda			
Forbes	Lynch	T.			
Fortenberry	Mack	Sanchez, Loretta			
Fossella	Mahoney (FL)	Sarbanes			
Fox	Maloney (NY)	Saxton			
Frank (MA)	Manzullo	Schakowsky			
Frelinghuysen	Marchant	Schiff			
Gallely	Markay	Schmidt			
Garrett (NJ)	Marshall	Schwartz			
Gerlach	Matheson	Scott (GA)			
Giffords	Matsui	Scott (VA)			
Gilchrest	McCarthy (CA)	Sensenbrenner			
Gillibrand	McCarthy (NY)	Serrano			
Gillmor	McCaul (TX)	Sessions			
Gingrey	McCollum (MN)	Sestak			
Gohmert	McCotter	Shays			
Gonzalez	McCrery	Shea-Porter			
Goode	McDermott	Sherman			
Goodlatte	McGovern	Shimkus			
Gordon	McHenry	Shuler			
Granger	McHugh	Shuster			
Green, Al	McIntyre	Simpson			
Green, Gene	McKeon	Sires			
Grijalva	McNerney	Skelton			
Gutierrez	McNulty	Slaughter			
Hall (NY)	Meehan	Smith (NE)			
Hall (TX)	Meek (FL)	Smith (NJ)			
Hare	Meeks (NY)	Smith (TX)			
Harman	Melancon	Smith (WA)			
Hastert	Mica	Snyder			
Hastings (FL)	Michaud	Solís			
Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)	Souder			
Hayes	Miller (MI)	Space			
Heller	Miller (NC)	Spratt			
Herger	Miller, Gary	Stark			
Herseth Sandlin	Miller, George	Stearns			
Higgins	Mitchell	Stupak			
Hill	Mollohan	Sutton			
Hinche	Moore (KS)	Tanner			
Hinojosa	Moore (WI)	Tauscher			
Hirono	Moran (KS)	Taylor			
Hobson	Moran (VA)	Terry			
Hodes	Murphy (CT)	Thompson (CA)			
Holden	Murphy, Patrick	Thompson (MS)			
Holt	Murphy, Tim	Thornberry			
Honda	Murtha	Tiahrt			
Hooley	Musgrave	Tiberi			
Hoyer	Myrick	Tierney			
Hulshof	Nadler	Towns			
Inglis (SC)	Napolitano	Turner			
Insee	Neal (MA)	Udall (CO)			
Israel	Neugebauer	Udall (NM)			
Issa	Nunes	Upton			
Jackson (IL)	Oberstar	Van Hollen			
Jackson-Lee	Obey	Velázquez			
(TX)	Oliver	Visclosky			
Jefferson	Pallone	Walberg			
Jindal	Pascarell	Walsh (OR)			
Johnson (GA)	Pastor	Walsh (NY)			
Johnson (IL)	Payne	Walz (MN)			
Jones (NC)	Pearce	Wamp			
Jones (OH)	Pence	Wasserman			
Kagen	Perlmutter	Schultz			
Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)	Waters			
Kaptur	Peterson (PA)	Watson			
Keller	Petri	Watt			
Kildee	Pickering	Waxman			
Kilpatrick	Platts	Weiner			
Kind	Poe	Welch (VT)			
King (IA)	Pomeroy	Weldon (FL)			
King (NY)	Porter	Weller			
Kirk	Price (GA)	Westmoreland			
Klein (FL)	Price (NC)	Wexler			
Kline (MN)	Pryce (OH)	Whitfield			
Knollenberg	Putnam	Wicker			
Kucinich	Rahall	Wilson (NM)			
Kuhl (NY)	Ramstad	Wilson (OH)			
LaHood	Rangel	Wilson (SC)			
Lamborn	Regula	Wolf			
Langevin	Rehberg				
	Reichert				

Barrett (SC)	Franks (AZ)	Linder
Campbell (CA)	Hensarling	Pitts
Cannon	Hoekstra	Royce
Deal (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Sali
Duncan	Jordan	Shadegg
Flake	Kingston	

NOT VOTING—16

Brady (PA)	Hunter	Ortiz
Cubin	Johnson, E. B.	Paul
Davis, Jo Ann	Kennedy	Radanovich
Engel	Lampson	Sullivan
Fattah	McMorris	Tancred
Graves	Rodgers	

□ 2344

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE RULES OF THE HOUSE TO CLARIFY CERTAIN MATTERS RELATING TO OFFICIAL CONDUCT

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 363) amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to clarify certain matters relating to official conduct, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COHEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 363

Resolved, That clause 15 of rule XXIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

“15. (a) Except as provided in paragraph (b), a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may not use personal funds, official funds, or campaign funds for a flight on an aircraft.

“(b) Paragraph (a) does not apply if—

“(1) the aircraft is operated by an air carrier or commercial operator certificated by the Federal Aviation Administration and the flight is required to be conducted under air carrier safety rules, or, in the case of travel which is abroad, by an air carrier or commercial operator certificated by an appropriate foreign civil aviation authority and the flight is required to be conducted under air carrier safety rules;

“(2) the aircraft is owned or leased by a Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner or his or her family member (including an aircraft owned by an entity that is not a public corporation in which the Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner or his or her family member has an ownership interest, provided that such Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner does not use the aircraft any more than the Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, or family member's proportionate share of ownership allows);

“(3) the flight consists of the personal use of an aircraft by a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner that is supplied by an individual on the basis of personal friendship; or