

hope that the President will stand for equality and justice by signing this important bill.

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 579, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2272, 21ST CENTURY COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2007

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2272) to invest in innovation through research and development, and to improve the competitiveness of the United States, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

#### MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. HALL OF TEXAS

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Hall of Texas moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 2272, be instructed to:

(A) insist on the lower overall authorization level as set forth by the House in H.R. 2272; and

(B) insist on the language of subsection (a) of Section 203 of the House bill, relating to prioritization of early career grants to science and engineering researchers for the expansion of domestic energy production and use through coal-to-liquids technology and advanced nuclear reprocessing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

I rise today to offer a straightforward motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 2272, a bill to invest in innovation through research and development, and

to improve the competitiveness of the United States.

This motion to instruct the conferees simply insists that the House conferees support the House position. It does this in two important ways that I believe will make the conference report better and Members on both sides of the aisle proud to support it.

First, the motion to instruct encourages the conferees to insist on the overall House authorization level, which is considerably lower than the Senate authorization level. In fact, estimates put the bill as passed by the Senate at approximately \$40 billion higher than the total House authorization level.

Second, this motion to instruct insists that House conferees support the previously adopted House position with regard to giving priority to grants to expand domestic energy production through the use of coal-to-liquids. That type technology and advanced nuclear reprocessing should be used.

I believe this is an important section of the bill that will help to ensure that we are preparing our scientists and our engineers for the future of energy security.

Many Members of the House, both Republicans and Democrats, voted in favor of the authorization level and voted in favor of this program, including my good friend, the chairman of the Science and Technology Committee. I am encouraging Members to stand up for the House position on these two issues.

Before I explain the importance of the provision regarding grants to expand energy production, let me take a moment to compare the authorization level in the House bill with the authorization level in the Senate bill.

As the ranking member of the Committee on Science and Technology, I strongly support an increase in funding for the agencies that perform scientific research in this country. Without these agencies, we would fall far behind the rest of the world in innovation.

Some of the greatest inventions of our time have come from the brilliant scientists of our country. To remain competitive as a Nation, we must encourage new ideas and educate new young minds, but we must also be mindful to exercise fiscal responsibility. The young minds we are educating should not be taught irresponsible spending habits. We have to lead by example.

The House bill contains substantial increases for the sciences very close to the President's request, and moves us closer to the goal the President has set out in the State of the Union Message calling for a doubling of the spending on the sciences.

The Senate bill includes a vast increase in spending that is approximately \$8 billion above the budget request by the administration for this year alone. I encourage my colleagues to work with me to increase spending on science in a responsible fashion.

As we move to conference on the competitiveness bill, I also want to encourage my colleagues to support the provision in the House bill urging researchers to invest time and to invest money into advancing coal-to-liquids technology and nuclear reprocessing.

There are, as my colleagues stated previously on the floor of this Chamber, several pieces to the energy puzzle. One very important piece continues to be the efficient and affordable research and development of this Nation's domestic energy resources. Twenty-seven percent of the world's recoverable coal reserves are in the United States and spread throughout our country, which would minimize supply disruptions in the event of a natural disaster or in the event of a terrorist attack.

We are currently importing around 60 percent of our oil supply, and that number is projected to grow unless we do something about it. As the Saudi Arabia of coal, if our Nation can economically produce liquid transportation fuel from coal, we can reduce our dependence on foreign sources of oil and increase the security of this country.

We also need to better manage our nuclear energy resources. In the pursuit of expanding our nuclear fleet, we should encourage scientists and engineers early in their careers to focus on the development of abandoned nuclear reprocessing technologies. We need to invigorate our aging nuclear sector so this energy source continues to serve as a clean, affordable, domestic energy resource for our consumers.

The House may soon be taking up an energy package. To my knowledge, this energy package contains no language on coal-to-liquids and very little on nuclear energy. Given the fact that our Nation's continued growth and prosperity depend on affordable and reliable energy resources, I am disappointed that we are not promoting all options for Americans. This opportunity may be one of the few Members get to support our Nation's coal and our Nation's nuclear interests. We should take every opportunity to address citizens' concerns with rising energy prices. And that is why I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this provision on this date.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WU. May I inquire of the gentleman from Texas if he has any further speakers?

If the gentleman from Texas does not have any further speakers, I believe that I have the right to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has the right to close.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I just continue to reserve the balance of my time. I do want the right to close, and I have a speaker that is approaching at this time.

□ 1330

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, at this point, we have no further speakers, and

I would yield the floor to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Speaker, you have indulged me as long as I can ask you to, and so has this gentleman from way out in deep west Texas. I'm honored to be here with him, so I will go ahead and close.

As I wrap up here, I want to encourage the House Members to support the authorization level as it remains. It is as appropriate now as it was when the bill was passed overwhelmingly in the House.

And I also want to reiterate my frustration of America's continued dependence on foreign sources of energy and encourage my colleagues to explore domestic sources of energy.

For some reason, there's a war against energy from fossil fuels going right on down at this very time, this very day, and I'm not sure why. Anyone with just a little common sense is able to understand that in order to be less dependent on foreign sources of oil and to increase our national security, we need everything we can develop. We need conventional, renewable and alternative sources of energy. Our country at this time will not be able to continue to thrive and lead the world on renewable energy alone, so to punish the oil and gas industry and to not encourage alternative uses of coal and continued use of nuclear power is to ensure the United States will lose its place as a world leader.

Make no mistake, I support the continued development and increased use of renewable energy, but not at the expense of fossil fuels and clean nuclear energy.

Madam Speaker, the House is already on record supporting this language and this authorization level just 3 months ago. I can't think of a reason why it wouldn't be supported again today.

I urge my colleagues to vote to keep this House-passed language in the bill that will result from the conference committee. And, Madam Speaker, thank you for your indulgence.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, I rise to make a brief closing statement.

Madam Speaker, the issues raised by the gentleman from Texas have been solved to the satisfaction of a majority of the members of the committee.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### EIGHTMILE WILD AND SCENIC RIVER ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 580, proceedings will now resume on the bill (H.R. 986) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of the Eightmile River in the State of Connecticut as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When proceedings were postponed on Monday, July 30, 2007, 4 minutes remained in debate.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each control 2 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I will reserve the balance of my time for closing.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, the issue at hand today is not the 23 miles of wild and scenic river in what is called the Eightmile River. It is on the use of condemnation power to create it. It is sad in this situation that staff did not decide to work in a bipartisan way to try and come up with language accommodating everybody, instead, rejected in both the Rules and Resource Committees on straight party-line votes, simple and direct language that the Republicans submitted. We asked that it simply read that no Federal funds be used to condemn land to carry out the purpose of that act. Every Democrat, from the sponsor to the committee, said that was indeed their goal.

That is simple language in section B. It is short; it's direct; it's understandable to any citizen, any attorney, any judge. That's what we need.

Instead, the Democrats gave us a convoluted bit of double talk about zoning ordinances by some date in 2005, later on perhaps, willing sellers, all in the wrong section of the code, section C.

It is nice, but it is a loophole. Simply because if you read, not the bill, but the act, read the entire act, you'll find that all of the language that is presented in this section, in this bill comes after this sentence in the law which says, nothing contained in this section, that covers what we're talking about and what they're talking about, nothing contained in this section shall preclude the use of condemnation. This supersedes everything in their bill. All the gobbledygook they want to do, it supersedes it.

This is the language to which we object, and the Democrat bill does nothing to mitigate this power of condemnation.

I don't care if we're talking about an Eightmile River in Connecticut for Mr. COURTNEY or 8 miles of road in Detroit for Eminem. This is still the issue that is at hand. In the district where the State and local governments tried to take the home away from Suzette Kelo, we don't want it to be replicated again. This language has to be changed.

So all of us need to lose yourself in this language. Read it, for indeed our citizens will. The voters will. It is clear. This is what we need changed.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, the language in this bill is no different from other wild and scenic river bills that have passed both Democratic and Republican Congresses, including under the former committee chairman, the famed property rights defender, Richard Pombo.

To hear opponents tell it, this bill is a threat to private property with the Federal Government waiting in the wings to condemn land. In reality, nothing of the sort would happen, and that's because opponents of the bill have persistently refused to acknowledge the clear language of the legislation.

First of all, the bill prohibits condemnation under the authority of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Then the very next sentence states: "The authority of the Secretary to acquire lands for the purpose of this Act should be limited to the acquisition by donation or acquisition with the consent of the owner."

Therefore, I believe, Madam Speaker, this is an absolute, unambiguous blanket denial of condemnation authorities. We say it twice in the legislation. We don't need to say it three times.

My colleague, JOE COURTNEY, has done an outstanding job with this measure, which is supported by the entire Connecticut delegation, the Republican Governor of Connecticut, the State legislature and all of the affected local governments, and the Bush administration.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bipartisan measure.

I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 580, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

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

Mr. PEARCE. In its current form, I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Pearce moves to recommit the bill H.R. 986 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

(j) CLARIFICATION.—No Federal funds may be used to condemn land to carry out the purposes of this Act or the amendment made by subsection (b)."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from