PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 1172

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered as the first sponsor of H.R. 1172, a bill originally introduced by Representative Millender-McDonald of California, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprints pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2272, AMERICA COMPETES ACT

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rule, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2272) to invest in innovation through research and development, and to improve the competitiveness of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 602, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 1, 2007, at page H9414.)

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request, and also to thank him for his help on this bill we are going to be taking up.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. I want to applaud the work of Chairman GORDON, the conferees and the staff for getting us to this historic place in time on behalf of this COMPETES Act, which will make a great difference in America's economy in the future.

The issue of competitiveness has been at the top of our agenda since November 2005 when the House Democrats under the leadership of Speaker PELOSI, unveiled the Innovation Agenda.

The Innovation Agenda, which was developed in consultation with the business community, is aimed at keeping America competitive in our ever growing global economy.

In addition to the work by the Speaker, the Committee on Education and Labor focused the first hearings of this Congress on how to address the challenges posed by the middle class squeeze.

Through the Innovation Agenda and through our hearings, a common denominator was the desire by the business community to engage in ways to create a more innovative workforce that is better prepared to enter the growing high tech industry.

This conference bill meets this objective through partnerships that will engage the business community with higher education to create programs that will educate and train individuals to meet the industry's needs.

Additionally, I am particularly pleased that the conference bill addresses another key goal of the Innovation Agenda, which is to ensure a highly qualified teacher is in every classroom.

The new programs in the National Science Foundation and the Department of Education, modeled after the successful UTEACH and CalTEACH programs, will go a long way to better preparing teachers for the classroom.

I am also pleased to see a true vision for education in this bill with programs that encourage math education, ensuring access to advanced placement/IB courses, and the creation of P–16 councils which will help states better understand where students start and where they need to go.

Again, I applaud the work of the conferees. I look forward to continue working on securing funding for these valuable programs.

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

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that we have had differences of opinion, differences of policy and differences concerning procedure for the last couple of days. You have that at the end of a session before you go into a work period, and I am afraid we are going to have some more, and that is unfortunate. But we have an opportunity, at least for the next hour, to have a little window of civility, a little window to work together on a bill, a conference report that is bipartisan and bicameral. It is a competitiveness bill. It is a bill that is going to make America a better place for all of our kids and grandkids. I want to take just a little time to tell you about it.

This bill is a compilation of five bills that we passed out of the Science Committee on a bipartisan basis that came to the House floor, none of which received more than 23 votes against them. Then we piled them all together as a suspension and it passed unanimously.

LAMAR ALEXANDER in the Senate did yeoman's work by going to the Senators and getting 70 cosponsors. It passed in the Senate 88–8. Truly this is a bipartisan, bicameral bill.

The reason is, it is a good bill that is going to help manufacturers and businesses, it is going to help workers, it is going to help teachers, it is going to help students, to be able to help America to be in the lead in the world in terms of manufacturing, research, technology and innovation.

Again, I want to tell you how this bill came about. Three years ago, Sherry Boehlert, then the chairman of the Science Committee; LAMAR ALEXANDER, who was chairman of the Science Committee in the Senate; myself and JEFF BINGAMAN, we all asked the National Academies to do a report on the competitiveness of America in the 21st Century. It was a sobering report.

Norm Augustine, the former chairman of Lockheed, Craig Barrett, the chairman of Intel, and several noted scholars and other business individuals came together and said America was on a losing track, which meant that my 6-year-old daughter, many of your children and grandchildren, these two children right here, could be the first generation of Americans to inherit a national standard of living less than their parents, a complete reversal of the American dream. That is why so many of us came together to try to do something.

This is not a Democratic bill. It is not a Republican bill. This simply is a compilation of the recommendations of the report ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm.''

Let me tell you a little bit about this bill. It really composes three general areas.

The first is they said we have got to lead the world in terms of our science and our research, our innovation. So this bill is an authorization that is going to double over the next 7 years the National Science Foundation, the Office of Science and the Department of Energy, as well as the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

Let me remind you, because I know there are some folks who are going to say this is going to be too much money. This is an authorization. My friend from Tennessee and the other appropriators will determine whether it is going to be too much. We will work together to make that determination. This is a responsible, I think, 7-year increase.

Then they came back to us and they said that American manufacturers and American workers have to work at a higher skill level. There are 7 billion people in the world right now, and half of them make less than $2 a day. We don't want to compete like that. We can't compete like that. So that means if they are making one widget in India or China, we have got to make 50 widgets here in America. And we need to be not only making the widgets, we need to be inventing the widget maker and manufacturing that widget maker here in this country.

If we are going to do that, then whether you are a high school graduate, a junior college graduate, a college graduate, you have got to work at a higher level, which means you are going to have to have science and math skills.

But the report tells us we are not doing very well in that area. As a matter of fact, right now, only Cyprus and

South Africa have lower scores than we do in the science and math areas.

□ 1630

So what do we do about this? Well, they looked around and tried to figure out what the problem is. Are Americans just not as smart? No, that is not the problem. Do we need maybe smaller classrooms or more equipment? Those things would help. But the real problem is this, and listen to this: The fact is 67 percent of the teachers that teach in middle school in this country have neither a major nor a certification to teach math. And 87 percent of the physical science teachers in this country have neither a certification nor a major to teach those subjects. So it is very difficult to teach or inspire if you haven't had an opportunity to really understand those courses. This is not a slur to those good teachers. I want to give you a personal story.

My father was a farmer. World War II comes along. He enlists, comes back, and he wants to be even a better farmer. So he takes advantage of the GI bill and goes to college at Middle Tennessee State University. He gets a degree in agriculture. Well, a few years later I come along and my mother had to give up her job. She was working at a high school cafeteria. So my father applied to be a teacher in addition to being a farmer. He was the last person hired to teach at Smyrna High School in my home county. So since he was the last person hired, you might imagine, he was assigned to teach high school science and to coach girls basketball. I am not sure which he knew the least about, which really wasn't fair to him or his students.

And so we want to take care of those good smart people, those good smart teachers, and help them do a better job. So we are going to bring those kinds of teachers during the summer and, with stipends, allow them to get their certifications, hopefully AP, IB. Hopefully they will get a master's.

We are also going to have a whole new corps of teachers. We want to provide competitive scholarships for 10,000 students a year that will go into math, science and education and agree to teach for 5 years. And 5 years is important, because we find that half the teachers quit teaching in the first 5 years. We have to get them over that hump.

Next they said, and this may sound familiar, they said that America needs to be energy independent. This was before we started talking about the price of oil going up. This was before that. They gave us a way to do that. They suggested we look at the Department of Defense, DARPA, for a model. There is something in the Department of Defense called DARPA. It is an advanced research operation that takes high risk, high rewards. It is where the Internet was discovered and developed, and it is where stealth technology was developed.

They said this is a proven model. Take it over to the Department of Energy and set up a high-risk, high-reward agency there, but have very narrow management. Have a few employees and let them manage programs. Take the seven or eight most cutting-edge types of technologies, those that can really jump us ahead, and let's crash on them. Let's bring in the national labs, the private sector, the public sector and our universities, and let's make some real breakthroughs. Now, if one doesn't work, fine; pull the plug. But let's not be afraid to fail because we have to make these types of jumps in technology so we can have not only energy independence, but we will also have new jobs and new exports for America.

That is what we did. We brought all of these things together, and that is why we have a bipartisan, bicameral bill. I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the conference report on H.R. 2272, the COMPETES Act. This legislation is based on President Bush's American Competitiveness Initiative and is aimed at improving our competitive edge throughout science, technology and engineering, math education, research and innovation. I supported this legislation when passed by a voice vote in the House 3 months ago because we needed to take the steps to ensure our future competitiveness.

There are several good things in the conference agreement. I am pleased that H.R. 1868, the Technology Innovation and Manufacturing Stimulation Act of 2007, which I am an original cosponsor of, formed the basis of the NIST provisions in the House bill. In addition, the House bill includes language for manufacturing grant programs that have passed the House three times. Finally, our bill authorized the Technology Innovation Program.

I wish to thank Chairman GORDON and thank Dr. EHLERS and Dr. GINGREY, who contributed their expertise to the NIST provisions.

I would also like to mention the High Performance Computing Act language of Mrs. BIGGERT that is included in the House bill. I also thank Mr. SENSENBRENNER for his protection of the bill legally throughout the course. These excellent provisions have been retained in this conference report.

In regard to NASA, the House bill contains important provisions to address the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, directing NASA to be a full participant in any interagency effort to promote innovation and competitiveness through basic scientific research and development and promotion of science, technology and engineering and mathematics education.

While these and other programs move us in the right direction, I have serious concerns about other provisions in the conference report, and tried in committee and in conference to address these concerns. I had the honor of serving as a conferee and met informally with the two Senators and Chairman BART GORDON in an effort to work out our differences.

When we met with the entire conference committee on the Senate side, we were given only 1 hour to meet with the entire conference and come with the final agreement.

Our concerns, unfortunately, were not addressed, and I, along with most of the House Republican conferees, did not sign the conference agreement.

First and foremost was the cost. The House passed a $24 billion bill that roughly mirrored the President's ACI initiative and even increased the budget in many areas. However, the conference report goes way beyond that amount to authorize $43.3 billion in spending. That is close to $20 billion over the House-passed bill.

Finally, I think the report includes the creation of an Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy, called ARPA–E. I remain opposed to establishing an unnecessary bureaucracy at DOE that the agency itself does not want and does not support. I share concerns with some of the Department of Energy education provisions. I believe new programs in this bill go way beyond where DOE and our national laboratories should be involved.

At the end of the day, however, it is difficult for me on final passage to refuse to support a bill that contains many provisions good for my district, good for my State, and I think good for the Nation and that advances some of the President's American Competitiveness Initiative.

I will support a motion to recommit, however, that contains the same provisions that I offered in a motion to instruct that passed the House just 2 days ago. I will reluctantly vote ''aye'' to pass this bill on to the President for his signature.

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

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank my friend and ranking member for the work that he did in bringing this bill before us today. I also want to thank him on all of the good things that he said about this bill. It sounds like we almost got him.

We did have a conference, and when you have a conference, you have to make compromises. This is probably not a perfect bill, but as Dr. EHLERS said earlier, he has never seen that perfect bill. But I will remind everyone that every Senator, Democrat and Republican, signed the conference report, and it was bipartisanly signed in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2272, the 21st Century Competitiveness

Act of 2007. I was pleased to have served on the conference committee that produced this conference report, and it is the result of a 6 months or more longer process that began on the House side with a series of bills in the Science and Technology Committee.

I especially want to recognize the leadership of Chairman GORDON and Ranking Member HALL, and on the subcommittee which I chair, Dr. GINGREY, for their leadership and cooperation in producing this bill, and also the very hardworking staff who helped produce this bill. I frequently said that you don't have to be a rocket scientist to be on the Science Committee, but you need to be a rocket scientist to be on the Science Committee staff.

These many bills were ultimately packaged into H.R. 2272, which reflect a bipartisan consensus in the House on the immediate actions and funding we need to keep American innovation strong.

The conference agreement before us today preserves the key provisions of H.R. 2272 and lays the foundation for benefits that will be reaped by our children: good jobs, strong economic competitiveness, and a better quality of life.

I want to talk specifically about title III of the conference agreement, which reauthorizes the activities of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, or NIST. NIST's mission is to promote innovation and industrial competitiveness by advancing measurement science, standards and technology. The new technologies that are producing global winners in the 21st century, including nanotechnology, advanced manufacturing and information systems, rely on tools developed by NIST to measure, evaluate and standardize. These tools are enabling U.S. companies to innovate and remain competitive, which is why NIST's mission has never been more urgent than it is today.

This conference agreement puts NIST's budget on a 10-year path to doubling as an investment in the future of American innovation. It substantially increases the NIST lab budget to enable it to expand its work in new technical areas, and it funds the completion of current laboratory construction projects in both Boulder and Gaithersburg.

Title III also places the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, MEP, on a 10-year path to doubling. The MEP is a proven and highly successful public-private partnership that provides technical assistance to small and medium-sized manufacturers to improve their productivity and competitiveness. A fully funded MEP will go far to reinvigorate our manufacturing sector, which has lost almost 3 million jobs since 2001.

Title III also responds to changes in global competition by establishing the new Technology Innovation Program, TIP, to replace the old Advanced Technology Program. TIP will help small, high-tech firms with big ideas cross the technologic valley of death by providing them with limited cost-shared funding to develop technologies that address critical national needs either alone or in joint ventures.

If you support American jobs, maintaining our economic competitiveness and a high standard of living, you should support the conference report on H.R. 2272.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), a conferee.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report. While I applaud the overall goal of this legislation to ensure that America remains competitive in a global economy, particularly in the areas of math and science, research and education, several provisions included in the report remain of concern to me and should be of concern to the entire House.

The conference report authorizes $43.3 billion over 3 years. I appreciate that the conferees were willing to compromise by bringing the overall funding closer to the House version, but this agreement remains $20 billion above the House-passed level.

Members of this Chamber spoke in favor of the lower level of $24 billion when the House overwhelmingly passed the motion to instruct earlier this week. How soon we forget.

It is not fiscally responsible to pass a conference report that nearly doubles the House-passed authorization. We need to foster American science and mathematics innovation, but we shouldn't be breaking the bank to do so. I am afraid this bill will be another example of congressional over-promising and heightening expectations because the appropriators will never come close to funding these amounts.

Roughly half of the spending authorization included in the 21st Century Competitiveness Act conference report is designated for the National Science Foundation.

□ 1645

When I was chairman of this committee, I fought to increase funding for the NSF because I recognized that this agency is the foundation for new advances in medicine and technology. When the House passed H.R. 2272, we included language to double the NSF's budget over a 10-year period, a goal I support, thereby meeting the President's American Competitiveness Initiative's goal.

But the conference report goes well above and beyond this initiative, adding billions of dollars to the bill's final price tag. Finding ways to save is never a fun task, but given that our Federal deficit is expanding by the minute, increasing the NSF budget well above double over 10 years is not in our Nation's best financial interests.

If the economy is wrecked due to deficit spending and inability to manage the national debt, all of the good things that the sponsors of this legislation hope will come about will end up being ruined because the economy is not able to sustain what we propose here.

I'm also disappointed to see that the grants promoting coal-to-liquids technology and advanced nuclear reprocessing research were not included in the conference report. Language passed by the House would have given priority to grants to expand domestic energy production through coal-to-liquids and nuclear reprocessing research. With energy prices in constant flux, now more than ever we must find ways to reduce our dependence on foreign energy and encourage energy production here at home, also a keystone to continued economic prosperity.

A comprehensive, balanced energy policy is necessary to improve and sustain America's energy infrastructure. It's regrettable that the conference report does not reflect this objective.

For these reasons, I am opposed to this report. I will support the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I certainly understand my friend from Wisconsin's concerns. In the House, we did pass a 10-year doubling of the National Science Foundation. In the Senate, they passed an authorization for 5 years. Seven was a compromise, I think a reasonable compromise, and I remind everyone that we're in a pay-as-you-go budget, and the appropriators know they have to pay for what they appropriate. So I think that was a good and fair compromise.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY), a very valued member of the Science Committee.

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GORDON for giving me a chance to speak on this important legislation. I applaud your leadership and that of your subcommittee Chairs on these issues and for the expediency by which this conference report was put together.

America's greatest resource for innovation resides within our classrooms in Oregon and across this country. We must give our students more opportunities to be highly trained in math and science and technology so they can turn ideas into innovation.

Too many of our family wage jobs go overseas and too many of our children are falling behind their international counterparts in math and science achievement. With this legislation, we've taken bold steps to increase America's global competitiveness and to ensure that we have a robust, world-class science and technology workforce here in America.

The key to the United States maintaining its position at the forefront of global innovation and technology is to get more students interested in the science and math fields. This legislation does just that.

I urge the passage of this conference report.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

We've heard a lot of discussion, pro and con, on this bill. It is a good bill. Now, it spends more money than I would like. It actually lists more money than we will ever spend. This is an authorization bill; it is not an appropriations bill. And I know from 14 years of trying to get the appropriators to spend more money on science research that they will not appropriate anywhere near the money that we are authorizing in this bill. So, please don't think because it's a bigger bill than we expected that it's actually going to result in those expenditures.

Let me also comment about the investment aspect. I get tired of the word ''investment'' here. Everyone says we're going to invest money in this, we're going to invest in that, when actually we are just spending money. But this is a bill where we're clearly investing money, and there is a return on the investment in this money, because we are investing in research with a return on it.

When I first came to the Congress I was commissioned by Chairman Sensenbrenner and by Speaker Gingrich to write a report on where we should be going in science in this country. I did so and I examined this investment issue. I tried to pin it down.

There are lots of expert estimates on the return on investment on scientific research. The lowest figure I found was 25 percent annual return. The biggest number I found was 4,000 percent annual return. Take your pick between, but it's better than any other investment you can do. There is substantial return on science investment.

Let me give you one example. Years ago, when I was a graduate student, a friend of mine, Charles Townes, now a Nobel Prize winner, developed a laser. We all knew the principles of it. We knew he would likely succeed at some point. He operated with government funding, through a research contract. I don't know the exact amount, but I doubt if it was a great deal more than $10 million in the dollars of that day. He did develop the laser.

Today, the laser has created a multi-, multi-, multibillion dollar industry. The clothes you are wearing were cut out with lasers. Many of you have had laser surgery in hospitals or in doctors' offices. Every pipeline laid in this country is laid with directional laser beams. Every ceiling hung in this country and throughout the world is hung with the use of lasers.

The first laser I had cost about $1,000. I used it for research in the lab. Today, for $15.00 I can buy an equivalent laser in the gift shop in the Longworth building to use as a pointer. All of that, this multibillions of dollars simply from a $10 million Federal grant. That is the type of return we're talking about here.

This bill is a blueprint for the direction we want to go. We will by no means do all the projects in here. We will by no means invest all the money that is authorized here. Science is a progressive field. We will do the research. We'll find what pays off, and what doesn't pay off. This progressive process of science will allow us to efficiently allocate our resources as we determine the results.

Now, there are some things in this bill I don't think are that good. ARPA-E receives a lot of mention. I don't know if it will work. It worked fantastically in the Defense Department when we did it there. Will it work here? We don't know. We'll find out. If not, we kill the project.

We spent a lot of money here in the first years the Republicans took over this majority in doubling the investment in the National Institutes of Health. The amount of money we put into the National Institutes of Health alone during that period is greater than the total sum of money authorized in this bill. We put it in. It has paid off. Better health products, better analytical techniques to determine illness, to find cures. Very rarely, if you do the science carefully and it's peer-reviewed, very rarely do you find out that it is a bad investment.

Another aspect, we are losing out to other nations in international competition. We are losing out in science and math education. We're losing out in innovation. We're losing out, obviously, in manufacturing because of outsourcing.

If you look at the proof of that, simply examine the scores of our students in 12th grade classes in math and science in international tests across the entire world. Where do we come out? You've heard Chairman GORDON mention some of that a little while ago, but we are not proud of the results.

In physics, we are last of the developed countries in our student scores in 12th grade physics. We are second from the last to all developed nations in the scores for mathematics in 12th grade. We are about fifth from the bottom in general science, just a composite of science subject. In the PITA studies which were completed recently in mathematics comparing students in developed nations, the United States was last out of 21 nations.

We cannot compete in this world if we don't improve. We have to teach our students better. We have to train our teachers better. We have to train the teachers coming out of college so that they can teach in the high schools. We have to train the teachers who are already teaching, who from my experience I know want to teach better, but they have never been properly taught science and math or how to teach it. That again is part of this bill.

America is based on competition. We are a competitive Nation. We survive on competition. We thrive on it. Give us a chance. Give our kids a chance by properly training them to be able to do the scientific research and the technical work that this world needs.

We have to conquer this manufacturing problem we have now. We talk about jobs going overseas because there are cheaper wages. I have talked to manufacturers. I have a manufacturing district. That's not it. They're going overseas to get the talent, not to get the cheap salaries.

With our cutback on H–1B visas, many of my manufacturers are being forced to go abroad to get the work done. I don't like it. They don't like it. And if we do the job right, we will once again bring those jobs back to this country.

Finally, I just want to mention the huge number of endorsements this bill has received. The Chamber of Commerce has endorsed it and is scoring it. The National Association of Manufacturers has endorsed and is scoring it. And I've a list here and Chairman GORDON has also handed out a list of some 30 different scientific organizations supporting this bill.

This is not a fly-by-night bill. It may be more expensive than we want, but we won't spend all the money, I can guarantee that, because the research will be thriftily done and through a progressive scientific method of handing the money out and doing the research step by step.

This conference report represents the culmination of years of work by many people. Expert reports from the National Academies, Business Roundtable, National Association of Manufacturers and Business Higher Education Forum—just to name a few—kept telling Congress that the federal government must increase its investment in basic research and in science and math education, and must ensure that the funds it invests are spent on programs that will keep the U.S. competitive in the global economy. These reports had an enormous impact on the White House's thinking about competitiveness, and resulted in the President's introduction of the ''American Competitiveness Initiative''. Congress has responded to the recommendations about precisely what steps the government should take in the 21st Century Competitiveness Act of 2007 before us.

Beginning in 2006, the President's American Competitiveness Initiative (ACI), launched a three-pronged approach to competitiveness by strengthening research at the National Science Foundation, the Office of Science at the Department of Energy, and the laboratories and construction of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). This bill fully supports the ACI-requested improvements as well as strengthens programs focused on teacher training and education in science, technology, engineering and math.

The 21st Century Competitiveness Act of 2007 also includes some new ideas, such as the establishment of a DARPA-like agency at the Department of Energy. While I have been skeptical of this idea, it did originate with the experts at the National Academies, and, if it is able to achieve its goals of overcoming some of the great technology hurdles needed to

solve our energy problems, it would be revolutionary. The conference committee recommended $300 million to get this idea off the ground, a much lower amount than was originally proposed.

Last but not least, the bill also addresses the long-term problems facing our nation's manufacturers by broadening and strengthening manufacturing extension services and reviving manufacturing innovation through collaborative research and development. Although manufacturing has experienced tremendous technological gains over the last few years, international competition has exacted a toll on our nation's manufacturers. There is no evidence that these pressures are likely to go away, but this bill takes steps to help our manufacturing workforce grow and innovate.

It is clear that our nation is at a crossroads. The U.S. will either invest in innovation or witness the gradual erosion of our economic position and, quite possibly, the quality of life to which Americans have become accustomed. I recognize that many of my colleagues are concerned that this bill spends more than $40 billion dollars over the next three years. If there is ever an investment that will guarantee an economic return, this is it. To quote from the executive summary of the National Academy of Science (NAS) report, Rising Above the Gathering Storm: Energizing and Employing America for a Brighter Economic Future:

Having reviewed trends in the United States and abroad, the committee is deeply concerned that the scientific and technical building blocks of our economic leadership are eroding at a time when many other nations are gathering strength . . . [W]e are worried about the future prosperity of the United States . . . We fear the abruptness with which a lead in science and technology can be lost—and the difficulty of recovering a lead once lost.

Science and technology are the fundamental movers of our economy, and if we want to remain globally competitive, this bill is the sure fire way to guarantee results. The dividends paid by training scientists, engineers, and teachers will multiply throughout all sectors of our economy.

I want to thank Chairman GORDON and Ranking Member HALL for working on all of the bills that have become a part of the 21st Century Competitiveness Act. I hope my colleagues will support this investment in our nation's future.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to concur with the eloquent remarks of Mr. EHLERS. He's a great addition to our committee.

Mr. Speaker, would you report on the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee has 16 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the vice chairman of the Science Committee, Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I'd first like to thank Chairman GORDON for all his work on this bill and also Ranking Member HALL.

As vice chairman of the Science and Technology Committee, as an engineer, as a former professor, and just as an American who's concerned about our future, I stand today in strong support of H.R. 2272.

Today, America faces an enormous challenge. Two years ago, the National Academies warned us of a gathering storm that threatened our Nation in the 21st century. Their report told us that without immediate action the U.S. could lose its competitive technological edge in the world, meaning a dimmed future for our Nation. This bill will give us the jolt that we need to keep America in the lead, increasing our support for American researchers, scientists, engineers, educators and, most importantly, students, all of whom will turn their ideas into innovative new technologies which will advance our economy and ensure a brighter future for our Nation.

Dr. EHLERS very eloquently talked about how important investment is and what a great investment this bill is. As a former educator and researcher, I understand the immense value of investing in our future but especially in our children's education.

This bill provides $150 million for K–12 science, technology, engineering and math education, ensuring that American children won't be left behind as the world moves forward with new technology. These critical investments will create and equip thousands of new teachers and give current teachers the skills they need in order to be effective teachers of science and math.

The Competitiveness Act also creates an Advanced Research Projects Agency for Energy, which will invest in high-risk, high-reward R&D to help us overcome the technological barriers in the development of new energy technologies. These revolutionary new technologies will play a major role in securing our national energy security and protecting our environment.

And, finally, increasing NSF funding is a great advance and investment, and I urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

□ 1700

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to Dr. GINGREY, the gentleman from Georgia and a conferee.

Mr. GINGREY. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I was on the floor earlier today railing against the rule on this conference report, and I voted against the rule. The reason I did that is because I thought the rule and the bill, in fact, were rushed to the floor and didn't follow regular order. I thought it was appropriate that I voted against the rule.

But I am here today to tell you that I am going to vote for this conference report.

As a member of the Science Committee, and as a conferee, I am very proud of the work that has come through the Science Committee. I commend Chairman GORDON. I have been enjoyed being on the Science Committee. This is my second term serving on the Science Committee, first with Chairman Boehlert and now with BART GORDON and serving with DAVID WU on the Technology and Innovation Subcommittee. I think we do great work on the Science Committee.

Now, I typically associate myself with the more conservative, fiscally conservative members of the Republican conference. I know that some of my colleagues are going to vote against this conference report because they are concerned with the level of authorized spending, and they are maybe going to be a little surprised that I am voting in favor of it.

My good friend back in Georgia, Joe McCutchen from Ellijay, Joe from Ellijay, I bet you Joe is watching right now cringing that I am going to vote for this bill that increases spending. It does authorize more spending than I am comfortable with, but I am very, very hopeful that when we get to the point of appropriating, I will be standing here asking, probably, for 1 or 2 percent cut in the amount of money that's appropriated, as I have done on most every spending bill that has been brought before the 110th Congress.

But I think this is one of those situations where it's better that we spend a little too much than not quite enough, because we are at war in this country on an economic level. We are in an economic war.

We are also in a shooting war, and we all know that. Every Member on both sides of aisle is committed to funding and supporting our troops, give them the equipment and what they need to win.

Well, this is the same situation, the analogy is we need to give our soldiers, in this economic war, the equipment that they need to win. These soldiers are our students, particularly at the K–12 level. That's why it is important that we support this conference report.

I hope my colleagues on this side of the aisle will understand that. I hope that I will not lose my brand as being a strong fiscal conservative.

Now, it was mentioned earlier that there are some score cards going around, and I will do pretty well on some of them, and I will do rather poorly on others. But we can't always worry about score cards. Like I say, in this situation, you got both sides kind of tugging at you one way or another. You have to, in the final analysis, do the right thing.

We have members on this committee, on both sides of the aisle, I think there are five Ph.D.s, Dr. BAIRD, Dr. EHLERS, Dr. BARTLETT, Dr. MCNERNEY, Professor LIPINSKI, Dr. GINGREY. I am not a Ph.D. I am as much a doctor of art as I am a scientist. This is some serious business, as has already been stated. It's important for us to understand that.

We can remain to our fiscal conservative principles, but in a situation like this, let's give our kids a chance to compete so we can win this global war, this economic war we are in. I am going to support this conference report. I encourage all my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I thank my friend from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY, for not only his support for this bill but his very active, passionate work on the Science Committee. He is a valued member.

Also let me point out that I think the endorsements of this bill, by the National Chamber of Commerce, by the National Association of Manufacturers, by Business Roundtable indicate very well that this bill very much is in the economic scope.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a valued member of the Science Committee, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Let me express my appreciation to Mr. GORDON and Mr. HALL, Dr. GINGREY, Dr. EHLERS and others who have been active on the other side and shown interest, not just recently, but over the years.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I in the Science and Technology Committee have held numerous hearings and markups to prepare the legislation that is before us today in the form of a conference report. Today this bill authorizes $33 billion over fiscal years 2008–2010.

You know, I grew up with my father saying nothing is free, and you get what you pay for. If you invest, you will get a return, and that's just where we are. We are in need of stimulating our teachers and our students to specialize in these areas so that we can be competitive in the world.

We have allowed ourselves to get behind, we are investing less than almost any other developed country, and we must step up to the plate now, the time has come. It will help to prepare thousands of new teachers and provide teachers with better materials and skills through our expanded Noyce Teacher Scholarship Program and through the Math and Science Partnerships Program.

In my district are the number one and number two public schools in the Nation, as Newsweek says. Texas Instruments has invested numerous dollars, thousands, in that school, and it is very good. We put out some of the best students in the Nation from our schools, but it only has about 20 to 25 percent of the students that need all of this. It is needed across the Nation. We are not going to get it until we provide for it. We will not get competitive until we do this.

So I would say please support the conference committee for H.R. 2272. It only provides what we need, and we cannot get it for free.

I know that we have spent a lot of money on this war, a lot more than they are asking for in here; but we have got to take care of this Nation.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time we have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 11 minutes.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) for 3 minutes.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, upon conclusion of this debate, I will be offering the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit will require the House conferees to adopt the House position, which was supported in a motion to instruct conferees on this floor only 2 days ago by a vote of 258–167, 69 of them being Democrats, including nine Science Committee Democrats.

For fiscal conservatives, this would require the conferees to insist on the overall House authorization level, which is $20 billion less. For the second part of this motion, it would require the House conferees to again support the previously adopted House position with regard to giving priority grants to expand domestic energy production through the use of coal-to-liquid technology and advanced nuclear reprocessing.

Again, this was the exact motion to recommit of 2 days ago.

I have heard the debate of my friends: if we want to have a blueprint to where we want to go, we want to go for energy security. We are going to take up a bill on the House floor in a day or two that has no energy production. So how are we going to go advance science research, the next generation, if we don't have priority grants in nuclear reprocessing and coal-to-liquid technology?

We heard the debate. We know that people want to go to coal-to-liquid technologies, but we don't know if it's going to work. We don't know if we can sequester. We don't know if we can refine it less than the barrel of crude oil. That's what this energy is for. Energy security.

Let's get our best minds on this, but the conference report pulled it out. That's why I will offer the motion to recommit.

Two things on coal-to-liquid, I could talk about nuclear reprocessing all day. It should be in this bill. But I want to focus on coal-to-liquid technology, economic security, national security.

Look what coal-to-liquid does, are 80,000 barrels, 1,000 new jobs, 2,500 to 5,000 construction jobs, 15 million tons of coal per year, up to 500 coal mining jobs in one coal-to-liquid refinery.

Talk about national security? Here's national security for you. Are you tired of our reliance on imported crude oil from the Middle East? If you are tired of it, then you go to coal-to-liquid technologies. You take our coal that's under our ground. You move it up to a refinery that's not on the gulf coast, that's in the Midwest, or wherever there are coal fields in this country, you refine it, you put it in our pipelines, and as this shows, you know where it goes? To our jet fighter planes, to our jet cargo planes.

The Department of Defense is crying for us to provide jet fuel for them through this technology. But, no, we can't do it.

Here you got a science bill, you want to give grants to help us move in the next generation, you pull out nuclear reprocessing, and you pull out coal-to-liquid technology. You are going to bring to the bill an energy bill with no energy. That's why I am moving this motion to recommit.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I will remind my friend from Illinois that there is nothing, nothing in this bill that says that the Department of Energy, the Office of Science, or RPE cannot do research on coal-to-liquid. Nothing in this bill stops that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Science, Mr. LAMPSON from Texas.

Mr. LAMPSON. Thank you, Chairman GORDON, for your time and also for your great leadership on the Science Committee. All of us on the committee are doing great work.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to support the America COMPETES Act and to be a conferee on this important legislation. We are now showing that we are dedicated to investing in America's future.

More specifically, we are investing in students and teachers and businesses and hardworking Americans to keep our great Nation the leader in the sciences. This bill, the product of hard work and bipartisan efforts, is inspired, some might say, by the National Academies' report, ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm,'' which raised the alarm that America could lose its competitive edge in sciences and academics unless we, the Congress, acted quickly.

Well, we have acted, and this package of key bills addresses numerous areas, including stronger support for National Science Foundation and the National Institute for Standards and Technology, funding for more teachers in undergraduate education in science and engineering. Academics, industry and our economy all depend on strong Federal support.

By authorizing billions for our research and education programs, technology, career and academic development programs, we ensure that America sets the gold standard in these various fields.

I, of course, know the importance of this funding firsthand, having been a former teacher. My colleagues know how much of an advocate I am for NASA with the Johnson Space Center being in my district.

I am proud to represent many of the Nation's best and brightest minds who continue to turn our dreams of further scientific knowledge and technological advancement into reality.

It's not just talking about space travel. The energy industry plays a significant presence in my district, and the future of alternative fuels and higher fuel efficiency and stronger and more reliable infrastructure depends on training the energy experts of tomorrow.

Well, the Texas Medical Center, also located in southeast Texas, is a leader

in cutting-edge health care and technology and needs future health care providers who have a strong science background. Therefore, I know that the America COMPETES Act, by supporting both academics and science, will be a boon to southeast Texas for our Nation.

□ 1715

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the minority leader, Mr. BOEHNER, for 1 minute.

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague from Texas for yielding, and say to my colleagues, the issue of competitiveness is an important issue in America. We are competing with countries all over the world and, as a result, real competition brings out the best in all of us.

When I look at the bill that we have before us, it really shows me everything that is wrong with Washington. This bill left the House with a $23 billion authorization. It comes back with a $43 billion authorization, creating 40 new programs.

Now, these are well-intentioned programs. I am sure there are some very good things in this bill. But when you begin to think about 40 new programs that are being authorized, there is no spending available for these. We authorize all kinds of bills, but then we have to go find the money to pay for them.

We know what the appropriations process is like, and I will just point out one tiny example. There are 208 math and science programs that are operated by 13 Federal agencies; 208 math and science programs, 13 different agencies. And guess what we do in this bill. We create five or six new ones.

Now, I have been trying to get my arms around this for about the last 5 years. Why can't we find a way to take these programs and the money that we are spending on them and try to do some coordinated approach that really will produce more math and science majors? That is not what we do. We just keep adding new programs. It happened last year. It is going to happen again this year.

It just reminds me of the old adage: If you throw enough mud against the wall, some of it is sure to stick. In Washington, that adage has been turned around: If you throw enough money at the wall, some of it is bound to stick. But at the end of the day I don't think that is what the American taxpayers want us to do. I think they want us to do things that pass the straight-face test. And adding five more or six more math and science programs to the 208 that we have makes no sense to me at this time.

If we are serious about competitiveness and serious about allowing our manufacturers and our companies, our software companies and others in our country to be able to compete, let's look at the regulatory burden that we put on our companies that doesn't exist around the world. We regulate things until it can't hardly breathe, and we wonder why our companies can't compete as well around the world.

Why don't we talk about extending and making permanent the tax cuts, giving companies in America certainty about the reasons to invest in the American economy, reasons to invest in their own future? And if we were to make those tax cuts permanent, people would have some feeling and some certainty about what the tax regime is going to be in our country so that we can in fact allow them to put greater investment here.

What about tort reform? Nowhere in the world do our companies get beat up by the courts and the trial lawyers and no place any more than here in America. If we want to be able to compete around the world, if we want to bring the cost of doing business down, why don't we do something about tort reform?

Let's talk about expanding free trade and markets around the world. We have got three or four trade bills that are laying around here languishing for countries in Central and South America. Again, we want to be competitive, but why don't we help work with countries around the world to reduce those barriers so that we have more markets for our companies to go out and compete in?

And, at the end of the day, if we are serious about being able to compete in a worldwide market, we have got to do something about educating our children. I think most of us that are here today know that we educate about half of America's kids. Maybe a little more than half get a high school diploma. Some of them can't read it. But the fact is that we have never been serious in this country about providing all of America's children a chance for a decent education.

And that doesn't mean that Washington has to drive all of it. But we as a country, as a Nation, need to get serious about finding ways to give every person in this country a chance at a good education. Because if we educate more of America's kids, we will have more math teachers, we will have more scientists, we will have more engineers, we will have more teachers. But we can't do that if we don't get serious about improving our schools and making sure that all kids have a chance.

This bill creates a lot of Washington bureaucracies and a lot of Washington bureaucrats, and the only thing competitive about this bill will be the competition for office space created by all the new bureaucrats that will be employed as a result of this bill.

I know there are some good things in this bill, and I know my colleagues worked hard at it. But at the end of the day, this looks too much to me like Washington as usual and, as a result, I am unable to support this bill.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I know the minority leader is very sincere about his concerns here. I wish I had the time to address them one by one.

Let me just quickly remind everyone that we look at this bill, the American Chamber of Commerce thinks it is a good investment, the National Association of Manufacturers thinks it is a good investment, the Business Roundtable thinks it is a good business. Virtually every business major in America thinks this is a good investment. All the universities and research agencies thinks it is a good investment. But there can be sincere differences of opinion.

Mr. Speaker, could you report to me the time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¾ minutes of those to my friend and colleague from the Energy and Commerce Committee, Ms. ESHOO.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished Member, the chairman of the House Science and Space Committee.

Mr. Speaker, Americans of my generation and my parents' generation as well have always accepted it as an article of faith that the United States of America would lead the world in innovation, in ingenuity, and in invention. And, no matter what the challenge would be, that we as a Nation would rise to that test, we would meet the competition, and we would come out on top.

It was true in the 1930s, when President Roosevelt responded to the concerns of scientists in our country about the Nazi government and what they might develop with the Manhattan Project. It was true in 1961, when America awoke to the fact that a Soviet cosmonaut had been launched into space, and President Kennedy responded by saying as a Nation we have to commit ourselves to achieving the goal that, before the decade was out, that we would land a man on the moon and return him safely to Earth. And we did when Neil Armstrong landed on the moon in 1969 and took a giant leap for mankind.

We know that there is a gathering storm when it comes to innovation and competition for our country, and that is what this legislation directs itself to.

We have to perform. We have to produce more scientists, more mathematicians, educate our children, invest in science, and research. That is what this bill is about.

I have an optimistic view of America. I don't share the somewhat depressed view that the distinguished minority leader offered. We can, we have in the past, we will in the future. This legislation today helps to lay the groundwork for our sure economic footing so that the 21st century is an American century.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) for 2 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership. I know of no other Member who is kinder or wiser than the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), and I appreciate that.

I also appreciate the earlier comments of the gentleman from Georgia who sits beside me. I want to assure, Mr. Speaker, all the people of Georgia that he is one of the great leaders of fiscal conservativism in this body, and his fellow fiscal conservatives understand if he is wrong once a year.

I somewhat reluctantly rise in opposition to this conference report. The goals contained within this conference report are very lofty goals. I know that many good things could be done with this money and that there are many good programs contained within it. But I have to ask a most inconvenient question, which I frequently find myself asking on this House floor: How are you going to pay for it?

Mr. Speaker, we continue to run deficit, which means now, by definition, when you are running a deficit, the first money is coming from raiding the Social Security Trust Fund. Is this program worth that?

I have Members coming to the floor to decry, well, we are borrowing money from China. Well, if you are floating T-bills and they are buying that debt, yes, then you are borrowing money from China. Is this worth borrowing money from China?

We know within the budget resolution passed by the Democrat majority, it contains the single largest tax increase in American history, which, over the course of 5 years, can amount to a $3,000 per American family tax burden. Is that where we are going to take the money from?

Mr. Speaker, there are already 10,000 Federal programs spread across 600 agencies; and since I have been here for almost 5 years, we are adding them at an alarming rate, and I see very few go away. How are we going to pay for it?

We are on the road right now to leave the next generation with a lower standard of living if we don't correct our spending ways. Let's get rid of some of the old programs before we add some new programs, no matter how worthy they may be.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report for the America COMPETES Act. I am pleased that the new Democratic majority in Congress is providing this new direction for our country.

As an active member of the New Democratic Coalition, I support this bill that will help ensure our Nation's global economic competitiveness through investment in math, science, engineering, and technological education and a renewed commitment to basic research.

As a former member of the House Committee on Science, I have worked for years working with the committee to get here. I want to thank them for this piece of legislation. I want to congratulate Chairman BART GORDON and Ranking Member RALPH HALL and the staff of the Science Committee for their hard work in producing this outstanding product.

As a former State school chief now serving in Congress, I am pleased that this bill will invest in 25,000 new teachers through professional development, Summer Institute training, graduate education assistance, and NSF scholarships. The bill also broadens the participation of minorities and women in science and engineering fields at all levels from kindergarten to advanced researchers. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 2272, the America COMPETES Act.

I am pleased that the new Democratic Majority in Congress is providing a new direction for our country. As an active Member of the New Democrats' Coalition, I support this bill that will help ensure our nation's global economic competitiveness through investment in math, science, engineering, and technology education and a renewed commitment to basic research.

As a former Member of the House Committee on Science, I have worked for many years to pass legislation to encourage innovators and develop the most valuable workforce in the world. I want to congratulate Chairman BART GORDON and Ranking Member RALPH HALL and the staff of the Science Committee for their hard work in producing this outstanding product.

As the only former state schools chief serving in Congress, I am pleased that this bill will invest in 25,000 new teachers through professional development, summer training institutes, graduate education assistance, and NSF scholarships. The bill also broadens the participation of minorities and women in science and engineering fields at all levels from kindergarten students to advanced researchers.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the authors of this legislation for their success on this fine product, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to pass it.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I yield ZACH WAMP, the gentleman from Tennessee, 2 minutes.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report, and I thank the leadership from Tennessee for the role they played in formulating this bill. The chairman of the Science Committee, Mr. GORDON, and Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER listened.

If being fiscally conservative means turning a deaf ear to the leaders of our extraordinary free enterprise system, like the Augustine participants who recommended these solutions, then we are being penny wise and pound foolish as fiscal conservatives. If we do not invest, you will not balance the budget again.

I was here in 1995 when the budget wasn't balanced, and then it became balanced. Not by cutting spending but by rightly slowing the growth of spending and restraining government spending. But we balanced the budget with a dynamic growth economy.

The chairman of the Science Committee pointed out that the Internet itself came out of a DARPA investment through programs like this, and it was telecommunications that gave the United States this dynamic global economy where revenues soared. If we want to lead the world in energy technologies, you had better invest now.

This is not a social program transferring wealth from one to the other. This is an investment in the next generation. This reaps the highest return of investments we make in the Federal Government, and this is an authorization. I am an appropriator. We might not be able to appropriate all this money, but the authorization allows us to try every year as the priorities come to the committee.

What is important? Is it important to invest in the next generation? You bet it is. Are we falling behind? You bet we are. Are we going to do something about it? We had better. And you can't vote ''no'' all the time. All year, I have come down here at the committee and on the floor and voted to restrain spending or even cut spending. Not now. Not on this. It is too important. This is a generational legacy.

I am proud of what we are doing in our national laboratories, and we need to stoke that fire and allow this country to be all that it can be.

Vote ''yes'' on this conference report in a bipartisan way and say to the next generation we are going to lead the world.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I say to my friend from Tennessee, ''Well said.''

And now I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the great Speaker of the House of Representatives (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What an exciting day for the Congress. Some of you are too young to know this, but you have read about it in the history books. Mr. HALL and I remember when President Kennedy came forward and said that he was going to inaugurate a program that would send a man to the moon and back, safely, within 10 years.

Now, for those of you who weren't born yet, you have read about it in history, you have to know that sending a man to the moon as an idea was such an impossibility. It would be almost like a magician cutting somebody in half and then putting them together again.

□ 1730

How could this possibly happen, that somebody would go into the sky, to the moon and come back?

At the time that he did that, it was a remarkable lift to the American people because it had followed upon Sputnik, as many of you know or have read in the history books and some of us remember. When he did that, President

Kennedy made the following statement. He said, ''The vows of this Nation can only be fulfilled if we are first, and therefore, we intend to be first. Our leadership in science and in industry, our hopes for peace and security, our obligations to ourselves as well as others all require us to make this effort,'' hearkening back to our Founders, those magnificent, courageous, optimistic, confident people, and President Kennedy referenced our vows to their great work.

This is our innovation agenda which is reflected in the legislation before us today. In answering President Kennedy's call, at that time, to put a man on the Moon, America unleashed unprecedented technological advances that built the world's most vibrant economy. The talent, intellect and entrepreneurial spirit of the American people that made this country the leader is being seriously challenged today by other countries. Americans must continue to innovate in order to create new, thriving industries that will produce millions of good jobs here at home and a better future for the next generation.

The distinguished chairman of the Science and Technology Committee and the distinguished ranking member, in bringing this bill to the floor today, are giving us our opportunity at our time to meet the challenge for the future. Today Congress has the opportunity to make a decision for the future.

Nearly 2 years ago, House Democrats created our innovation agenda in a very bipartisan way, which guarantees our national security and our economic prosperity, expands markets for American products, and asserts our leadership throughout the world in the decades to come. Already this year the New Direction Congress has led the way in promoting innovation and investments in education, science, research and development.

Today, with the COMPETES Act, we have bipartisan, bicameral legislation that implements much of the innovation agenda. Again, I want to recognize the extraordinary leadership of Chairman BART GORDON and the Science and Technology Committee and the ranking member for their leadership on this conference report. Chairman GORDON has energized this committee, ensuring that our Nation will continue to be the world leader in education, innovation and economic growth.

The COMPETES Act focuses on four key areas, as has been referenced: education, research and development, energy independence, and small business.

In education, the COMPETES Act recognized that America's greatest resources for innovation are in the classrooms across this country. This legislation invests in creating the most highly qualified teachers and training the next generations of scientists, mathematicians and engineers through public-private partnerships. This bill also takes steps to ensure that future innovators reflect the diversity of our country.

What I love about this bill and this legislation is that it's market-oriented, public-private entrepreneurial partnerships to keep us number one.

We know that innovation begins in the classroom and that scientific research provides the foundation for innovation and future technologies. The COMPETES Act makes a sustained commitment to research and development by putting us on a path to doubling funding for the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Standards and Technology and the Department of Energy's Office of Science.

I heard Congressman WAMP with great enthusiasm talk about the ARPA—Energy. I'm excited about it as well. To help achieve energy independence, the COMPETES Act focuses on energy research and innovation by creating a new Advanced Research Projects Agency for Energy, ARPA-E.

Mr. Chairman, I know your enthusiasm for that issue for a long time, and congratulations on bringing it to fulfillment here. This initiative will provide talent and resources for high-risk, high-reward energy research and technology development and attract investment for the next generation of revolutionary technologies.

And finally, the COMPETES Act recognizes that small businesses are often the catalyst for technological innovation and the backbone of the strong economy. It puts us on a path to doubling the funding for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership and creates a new initiative, the Technology Innovation Program, to support high-risk, high-reward, pre-competitive technology for small and medium-sized companies.

Because this bill is a decision in favor of future jobs and future economic strength, it's earned the endorsement of the Chamber of Commerce, many university presidents, ITI, TechNet, and the National Association of Manufacturers, among others.

I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it. And before I close, I want to acknowledge the great leadership of Congresswoman ANNA ESHOO, Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN and Congressman GEORGE MILLER, who is the Chair of our Policy Committee, for the work they did bringing people together, Democrats and Republicans, entrepreneurs, high tech, biotech, academics, people in the work force, students, venture capitalists, entrepreneurs, all to come to bear, all over the country. Meetings were held all over the country to put together the innovation agenda which is reflected in this legislation. Mr. BAIRD had an event in Washington State. As I look around, I could name so many Members who had events in their States. In doing so today, in passing this bill, we will assert our global economic leadership, create new business ventures and jobs, and give future generations the opportunity to achieve the American Dream.

I began my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by quoting President Kennedy, who was an inspiration to so many of us of a certain generation who are active in public service today.

He hearkened back to our Founders and our vows to our Nation, and I want to hearken back to that place too, because our Founders were among the earliest American entrepreneurs. They were magnificent disrupters. They thought new and fresh and different ways. They came together. Imagine the confidence. They came together, declared their independence from the greatest naval power in existence at the time, did so in a declaration that asserted the equality of all people, and then went forward to win the Revolutionary War, write a Constitution that made us the freest people in the world. Thank heavens they made it amendable so that we could even become freer. And when they did so, they designed the Great Seal of the United States. And on it, it's in your pocket. You're carrying it around if you don't know it. It's on the dollar bill. And on that great seal it says, ''Novus Ordo Seclorum.''

These people, with all that revolutionary spirit, with all that disruption of the status quo, had so much confidence in what they were doing, so much faith in themselves, faith in this country to be and faith in God that they said that what they were establishing was for the centuries, for the ages, ''seclorum.'' Those of you who know Latin know that that means ''forever.'' And it was that optimism, that confidence that built America. And it is in that spirit of disruption, of change, of doing something different, of having a big goal of aspiring to greatness, that we, as President Kennedy said, do honor the vows of our Nation. And this legislation is very much in their pioneer and entrepreneurial spirit.

I thank you again, Chairman GORDON, for your tremendous leadership.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, before I close, I want to thank the Speaker. I thank BART GORDON, the very capable Dr. BAIRD, who has given good advice and good leadership.

I want to especially, though, point out the work of a highly talented and dedicated staffer who will be leaving the committee next week to join the ranks in the Senate. Amy Carroll, we thank you for your hard work and dedication as a public servant for our Nation.

Also want to thank Dr. Lesslee Gilbert; our counsel, Margaret Caravelli; Attorney Katy Crooks; Mele Williams for her good work; Ed Feddeman; Elizabeth Stack, our energy advisor. And as has been pointed out by Dr. GINGREY and by Dr. EHLERS, this is an authorization, and this culminates a work of a program that started 3 years ago, and it's a good program.

I thank Representative HENSARLING for his warning and his admonition, his pointing out the cost, and of course, the minority leader's position, I respect that.

But I would say this, that we fought the soaring cost at every hedgerow. We fought the new agency created within DOD against their wishes as best we could. We took a position, as we all met together for the conference committee. And at the end of the day, I have to say that this is a good program for a deserving generation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to a new but valued member of our committee, Mr. MCNERNEY from California.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished chairman for his diligent work in passing the conference report on the America COMPETES Act. This is an important day for the Congress, it's important for the educators, and it's important for the students across this great land.

When the National Academies report, ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm,'' was presented to Congress, it painted a sobering picture of how dependent America's economy is on an educated public and how easily we could fall behind the rest of the world. Thankfully, the report also provides specific recommendations on how to increase educational achievement, which is the backbone of our economy.

As a mathematician and an engineer, I understand clearly the advantage of having a STEM education. This COMPETES Act will spur the creation of high-quality jobs and ensure that American companies won't have to look overseas for talented employees.

Again, I thank the chairman. I thank the ranking member.

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

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to one of our very able subcommittee chairmen, Mr. BAIRD.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, as Chair of the Subcommittee on Research and Education, as a scientist, as an educator, and perhaps most importantly of all, as a parent, I commend this legislation. I'm very proud to support it fervently.

I want to focus in particular on some of the sections of the bill that we authored along with my dear friend, Dr. EHLERS, on the Science Committee. I especially want to commend Ranking Member HALL and Mr. GORDON for his great leadership.

Title VII of this bill reauthorizes the National Science Foundation and is based on legislation authored by Mr. EHLERS and myself. This title includes some very exciting provisions. It helps ensure the strength and vitality of basic research at U.S. colleges. It strengthens and expands K–12 science, technology and math education. It provides additional support for new investigators to help keep the best and brightest in the STEM pipeline. It strengthens STEM programs for 2-year institutions. It focuses attention on interdisciplinary research, and to stretch our Federal dollars, it encourages university and industry partnerships to make every dollar go further. It expands the range of state-of-the-art research tools supported by the foundations. It requires NSF grantees to train their students in responsible and ethical conduct. It specifically recognizes the importance of social science to our Nation's security and competitiveness. And it acknowledges the increasing importance of service science to our Nation's competitiveness.

Finally, it includes needed improvements to planning and coordination for the major Federal interagency research program in information technology.

□ 1745

I am grateful to all the committee members and to our staff: Chuck Atkins, Jim Wilson; Dahlia Sokolov; Alisa Ferguson; Lewis Finkel; Hilary Cain on my own staff; and soon to depart but with much gratitude, Marc Korman on my staff.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation was founded by scientists. We don't talk about that often enough. But Franklin, Jefferson, and Washington were passionate about science. They would be proud of what we are doing today.

In the Dome of this magnificent Capitol, if you look up and see the great picture of the Apotheosis of Washington, he is surrounded by images in many cases representing the science and engineering achievements of this great Nation.

For the sake of our future, for the sake of our children, for the sake of our economy and our security, pass this good bill.

I commend all those who participated in making it a success.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GORDON, Chairman BAIRD, and all of my staff.

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

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. HALL earlier in the presentation said that he was going to have a motion to recommit on coal to liquid. Let me just remind all of my colleagues there is not one word, not one single word, in this bill that would stop any investment, any research in coal to liquid.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to say thank you to the Democratic and Republican Members that attended all those meetings where we could develop this good bill. I want to say thank you to subcommittee Chairmen BAIRD, LAMPSON, UDALL, and WU; Ranking Members EHLERS, INGLIS, FEENEY, and GINGREY for their effort in putting this bill together.

Let me also say we have 70 Democratic and Republican staff members that have worked on this bill, and that is basically what we have been doing for the last few months. I would like to thank every one of them personally, but there is not going to be the time. So let me just say thanks to Chuck Atkins, our chief of Staff; Leslie Gilbert; and Mr. HALL's chief of staff for all the work they have put together. I hope that the staff's thank you is seeing this bill enacted, seeing the good work that is going to come from this, knowing that their kids and grandkids are going to live in a better America. I don't know a better thank you.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker I reluctantly rise today in opposition to the America COMPETES Act of 2007, H.R. 2272. I am a firm supporter of education and innovation in the fields of science, technology, engineering and math. Unfortunately, I cannot endorse a bill that creates 40 new programs and spends tens of billions of dollars.

I devote a great amount of my time working on manufacturing issues. The congressional district I represent has over 2,500 industries. Manufacturing has several components, one of which is getting workers with adequate skills to be machinists, plus having an adequate supply of engineers and others involved in that aspect of manufacturing. At present I am involved in trying to solve workforce problems, which in turn, in many cases, depend upon people who have a good understanding of science, tech, engineering and math. I am a member of the Council on Competitiveness, a co-chair of the Manufacturing Caucus, and Chairman of the Republican Policy Committee Task Force on Manufacturing. As previous Chairman of the House Committee on Small Business, I held countless hearings on competitiveness. I travel this country and overseas studying machine tools, manufacturing efficiencies, global supply chains, manufacturing financing, IP protection, export controls, etc. I've also lectured extensively on America's need to be globally competitive.

In a good faith effort by both parties to make America more competitive, I believe we may be sliding a slope very few realize even exists. For example, this bill forgives student loans for individuals who teach math and science. While this is a noble idea, this sets the precedent for other vocations to receive loan forgiveness. When will we draw the line? Will we forgive loans for firefighters, policemen, federal government employees, doctors, and lawyers? Who decides which profession deserves preferential treatment? Extending the years of loan payment or perhaps reducing interest rates on critical professions in underserved areas may be a consideration, but loan forgiveness can put us on the road to ''free'' federal education for everybody. The price tag is unimaginable.

Furthermore, today's bill is a composite of five different bills which have already passed the House. Attaching these bills together is not prudent legislation because it forces a Member of Congress to vote for or against the entire package even though he may have been in favor of a more modest approach. For example, I voted in favor of the authorizations for the National Science Foundation (H.R. 1867) and the National Institute for Standards and Technology (H.R. 1868)—two agencies whose missions are vital to America's competitiveness. In addition, a third bill, H.R. 1068, updating research goals of the National High-Performance Computing Program, is also worthy

and actually passed on a voice vote. However, these three bills were combined with: H.R. 362, 10,000 Teachers, 10 Million Minds Science and Math Scholarship Act and H.R. 363, Sowing the Seeds through Science and Engineering Research Act. These two latter bills forced me to reluctantly vote against the whole package—especially since this combined bill contains $20.3 billion more than the five original bills and creates forty new science, tech, engineering and math (STEM) programs. I find this to be particularly wasteful when considering the fact that scores of current programs have not been found to be effective as evidenced in three separate studies by the Government Accountability Office (GAO), the US Department of Education (DOE), and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

The GAO in October, 2005, issued a report stating that in fiscal year 2004 there were over 207 different science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) programs spending approximately $2.8 billion annually spread throughout 13 agencies. Only half of the programs have been internally evaluated, with the reporting agencies stating the programs were effective and met established goals of attracting more students to study STEM courses, but, GAO added, ''some programs that have not been evaluated have operated for many years.'' These agencies made suggestions to GAO, but GAO concluded that before adopting any suggestions ''it is important to know the extent to which existing STEM education programs are appropriately targeted'' so as to make the best use of available federal resources. The purpose of GAO is to determine whether taxpayers' money is being spent wisely. GAO's language indicates there is no basis to make that conclusion because too many programs simply have never been evaluated for efficiency.

The second study—a Report of the Academic Competitiveness Council conducted by the U.S. Department of Education in May of 2007—showed 115 evaluations were submitted for 105 STEM programs and only ten evaluations were found to be ''scientifically rigorous.'' The report went on to say that, ''[b]ased on the 115 evaluations, the ACC's review that despite decades of significant federal investment in science and math education, there is a general dearth of evidence of effective practices and activities in STEM education (emphasis original).''

The third study was conducted by the OMB through a Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) Analysis of 88 programs within the Department of Education and only four were proven to be effective. Among those programs whose results were not demonstrated was the Department of Education Mathematics and Science Partnership program. This program provides grants to state and local education agencies to improve student's academic achievement in math and sciences. The program was not found to be well managed, and it did not establish performance measures.

On the basis of the information provided by GAO, DOE, and OMB, I am surprised that we are considering the creation of 40 additional STEM programs. We should be evaluating and consolidating all existing STEM programs, and save money at the same time. Instead, the House of Representatives is adding more programs and spending tens of billions more.

While I continue to remain a firm supporter of U.S. industry and competitiveness, I believe that there are better ways to accomplish this than spending billions of dollars on new and unproven programs while hundreds of programs continue with little or no accountability. That is why I encourage my colleagues to vote for the Motion to Recommit, which still spends too much money, but as opposed to the combined bill reduces the overall spending of the combined bill by $20.3 billion.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my concerns about the final conference report on H.R. 2272.

There are many good provision in the bill, and as a medical doctor, I share the goal of increasing participation in math and science education and in fostering research in these critical areas. In particular, I applaud funding for the National Science Foundation.

However, I am concerned about the level of increase that is in this bill for the National Science Foundation—amounting to a 12 percent increase in each of the next four years. The NSF bill that the House approved earlier this year, and which I voted for, provided about an 8 percent annual increase for NSF. I was concerned over the fact that because NSF and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) compete for the same pot of money, increasing NSF by more than this amount might cause problems for our national space program. Now that the bill has come back from the Senate and the House-Senate Conference Committee with a 13 percent annual increase for NSF each year through 2011, I am very concerned about the threat this poses to our human space flight program.

While this bill says that it is the sense of the Congress that NASA should be funded at the 2005 authorization level in FY08, the Democrat Majority could not even accomplish this goal for FY07 when the new Democrat leadership cut over a half a billion dollars for the space exploration account and funded NASA at only $16.2 billion—$1.7 billion below the authorized level. In addition, the House-passed Commerce State Justice Appropriations Bill for FY 2008 actually funded NASA at $17.6 billion—$1.2 billion below the authorized level. So, while H.R. 2272 includes nice rhetoric about fully funding NASA, the authors of H.R. 2272 know that such rhetoric is empty.

Additionally, I am concerned that the bill creates 40 new federal programs, 20 more than were in the House-passed version. Many of these new programs are duplicative of over 200 existing federal science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) programs and will siphon money away from research in order to fund bloated bureaucracies.

My belief is that there is no program that inspires interest and study in math and the sciences like our nation's space program. So recognition of this fact should follow with adequate and fair funding levels. This bill jeopardizes that and, unfortunately, I cannot support it.

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the conference report on the ''Water Resources Development Act of 2007,'' and in particular Section 1001, which authorizes approximately $712 million for the Craney Island Eastward Expansion in Norfolk Harbor at a Federal cost share of 50 percent, or approximately $356 million. The Virginia Port Authority's Eastward Expansion is a project of national significance and is vital to the efficient movement of goods for our country.

At the outset, I would like to acknowledge the contributions of those individuals whose strong commitment and tireless efforts made Section 1001 possible. First and foremost, I would like to recognize my distinguished leader of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Ranking Member JOHN MICA for once again delivering on his promise to support the needs of his Committee members on issues of importance to them and their districts; also, Congressman RICHARD BAKER, Ranking Republican on the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, for his leadership and legislative expertise without which WRDA would have once again gone unauthorized; and Senator JOHN WARNER, Craney Island's champion and the Commonwealth of Virginia's leader in the Senate; for his steadfast dedication to seeing this vision to fruition.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay special tribute to two other individuals, not Members of Congress, but without whom we would not be here today. As Governor of Virginia and then Senator, George Allen always supported the expansion of Craney Island, recognizing its impact not only on the Commonwealth but the Nation. Robert ''Bobby'' Bray, who retired this year after 29 years as Executive Director of the Virginia Port Authority, always saw the Craney Island Eastward Expansion not only as a major port development project but also as an opportunity to enhance the quality of life for all Americans. To these and countless others, on behalf of the 2nd District of Virginia, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and our Nation, I extend my sincere gratitude.

The Eastward Expansion of Craney Island is truly a matter of national significance. When complete, this landmark project will provide capacity for additional material dredged to maintain navigability of the region's shipping channels in addition to providing land on which to build a much-needed fourth marine terminal in Hampton Roads.

In 1997, the U.S. House of Representatives passed a resolution that directed the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to conduct a study of Craney Island. The study has been completed and the Eastward Expansion of Craney Island was recommended as the best alternative. Initially, the project costs considered for Federal participation comprised only the design and construction of the dredged material placement site, known as the Eastward Expansion. At that time, the Federal cost share for the project was identified as approximately 4 percent, and the Virginia Port Authority share as approximately 96 percent. It is important to note that the cost of the marine terminal construction (approximately $1.6 billion) will be solely the responsibility of the Virginia Port Authority.

Because the Corps had been constrained by policies that did not take into account the unique dual nature of the Craney Island Project, the initial plan formulation and cost share were determined based only on the Federal interest in the least cost for dredge material placement only part of the authorization to conduct the study. This method of determining the cost share did not take into account the substantial National transportation savings benefits associated with the port construction on the Eastward Expansion of Craney Island, which is the second part of the study authorization.

This Craney Island Marine Terminal will provide national economic development benefits of nearly $6 billion in transportation savings. The Port of Virginia is a major international gateway to the Midwest. In fact, more than 55 percent of the cargo handled by the Port originates in or is destined for locations outside the Commonwealth. More than 3,000 companies outside Virginia use the Port because of the cost-effective and reliable movement of freight to and from the Port of Virginia.

Container traffic in Hampton Roads is projected to triple by 2030 and will exceed the Port's capacity by 2011. Without the additional capacity created by a new marine terminal at Craney Island, cargo that would otherwise use the Port of Virginia will be rerouted to other ports, resulting in freight moving over longer distances at a higher cost. This increase will generate a total of $6 billion in additional transportation costs when applied to the amount of cargo that would be rerouted to other ports over a 50-year period.

However, with a new marine terminal at Craney Island, this additional $6 billion cost is avoided and becomes an origin-to-destination cost savings to the Nation in terms of maintaining the efficient, low-cost transportation afforded through the Port of Virginia.

The Eastward Expansion of Craney Island also meets National Defense needs. The ability of the United States to respond to military contingencies requires the availability of adequate U.S. commercial port facilities. The Port of Virginia is one of 14 port facilities designated by the Department of Defense as a strategic port through which military deployments are conducted. The Port of Virginia is expected to be able to make its facilities available to the military within 48 hours of written notification. When complete, the Craney Island project will provide additional capacity to meet military logistical needs and ensure the safe, secure, and smooth flow of military cargo through the Port of Virginia while minimizing commercial cargo disruptions.

Mr. Speaker, the Virginia Port Authority has been working for many years in partnership with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to develop a plan for the Eastward Expansion of Craney Island. By authorizing the Federal cost share at 50 percent, the WRDA Conference Report acknowledges the importance of expanding Craney Island to both Hampton Roads and to the entire Nation. I am grateful the Congress has supported this endeavor. And, I look forward to seeing the same support from the President.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 2272, the Americn Competes Act. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for it.

I am pleased that the new Democratic Majority in Congress is providing a new direction for our country through common sense legislation. As an active Member of the New Democrats' Coalition, I support this bill that will help ensure our nation's global economic competitiveness through investment in math, science, engineering, and technology education and a renewed commitment to basic research.

The conference report on H.R. 2272 is a bipartisan measure to implement an Innovation Agenda boldly responds to the global economic challenges identified in the 2005 National Academy of Science report, ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm.'' As a former member of the House Committee on Science, I have worked for many years to pass legislation to encourage innovators and develop the most valuable workforce in the world. I want to congratulate Chairman BART GORDON and Ranking Member RALPH HALL and the staff of the Science Committee for their hard work in producing this outstanding product.

As the only former state schools chief serving in Congress, I am pleased that this bill will invest in 25,000 new teachers through professional development, summer training institutes, graduate education assistance, and National Science Foundation scholarships. It ensures more highly qualified teachers in the classroom, in the fields of mathematics, science, engineering, technology and critical foreign languages.

H.R. 2272 establishes a public-private partnership with the business community and institutions of higher education to develop efforts to educate and train mathematicians, scientists and engineers to meet the workforce demands of the business community. The bill expands access to Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate classes and increases the number of qualified AP/IB teachers. The conference report enhances the ability of states to build more competitive workforces to meet the challenges of recruiting and retaining students in innovative fields.

The bill also broadens the participation of minorities and women in science and engineering fields at all levels from kindergarten students to advanced researchers. The bill focuses on small business innovation by doubling funding for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership and creates a new Technology Innovation Program for small and medium-sized companies. Finally, this legislation creates a ground-breaking initiative, the Advanced Research Projects for Energy (ARPA–E), modeled after DARPA that has brought us such innovations as the Internet, to provide talent and resources for high-risk, high-reward energy and research and technology development, and to help attract investment for the next generation of revolutionary technologies.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the authors of this legislation for their success on this fine product, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to pass it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, in 2005, the National Academies released a report, Rising Above the Gathering Storm. Its authors, a team of scientists, academic leaders, and business executives, gave Congress a strong warning—unless we take comprehensive action, America will lose its competitive edge in the world economy.

Today, I am proud to join my colleagues in a bipartisan effort to respond to that call to action with the 21st Century Competitiveness Act. This bill addresses this century's challenges with new investments in education, research, and small businesses. It is a comprehensive way to ensure that America remains at the forefront of discovery and innovation.

We recognize the need to foster student potential and encourage them to enter the fields of science, math, technology and engineering. This bill invests in 25,000 new teachers, helping them pay for school and training them to enter our nation's classrooms and engage students in math and science. It increases the number of teachers who can teach Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate classes and push our students to work with more challenging curricula. It puts new science and math teachers in high-needs schools so we can reach more students. And it establishes public-private partnerships so business and community leaders can identify high-needs fields and help students pursue innovative careers.

We recognize the need to push the boundaries of current research, explore new ideas, and foster innovation. This bill puts us on a path to double funding for our research institutions—the National Science Foundation, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and the Department of Energy's Office of Science. Our scientists at these institutions are engaged in remarkable, ground-breaking work, and we must redouble our support to ensure that America continues to be a leader in scientific advances. This bill will also provide grants to young researchers at the early stages of their careers to allow them to pursue their ideas and encourage them to continue their study in U.S. institutions. And, recognizing the importance of research into new energy technology as we work to combat global warming and reduce our dependence on foreign oil, this bill creates a new Advanced Research Projects Agency for Energy.

Finally, we recognize the importance of small businesses and entrepreneurial success in the development of our economy. This bill will double funding for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership over 10 years and will create a Technology Innovation Program to support revolutionary technology development at small and medium sized companies.

Mr. Speaker, we must take proactive steps to secure America's place in an era of global economic and scientific competition. This bill, by increasing the number of students entering STEM fields and stimulating exciting research at our national scientific institutions and in our business community, will do just that. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the 21st Century Competitiveness Act of 2007. Taking most of its content from the National Academies Report ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm,'' H.R. 2272 is the compilation of an ambitious legislative portfolio that will fulfill the Innovation Agenda. I was proud to help craft the Innovation Agenda, on which our nation is dependent for its future prosperity, and to serve on the conference committee of H.R. 2272.

As a scientist and educator, I have had the opportunity to work at several stages of our nation's science research pipeline. This bill contains sound strategies for addressing our lagging competitiveness at every stage of this pipeline, from K–12 education to research and development. Such a comprehensive approach is badly needed. H.R. 2272 creates programs for training teachers and for encouraging students to enter into fields where there is national need. It sets us on a necessary path to doubling our investment in the National Science Foundation, the Department of Energy Office of Science, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology. To ensure we are harnessing all available talent, this bill encourages underrepresented students to enter science and technology. It ensures that we do not lose talent at the early career bottleneck that follows completion of a terminal research-based degree.

I am also pleased that the two initiatives that I have championed in the House of Representatives have made it into the conference

report. The first is the Foreign Language Partnership, which is a competitive grant program to enable institutions of higher education and local educational agencies working in partnership to establish articulated programs of study in critical foreign languages so that students from the elementary through postsecondary level can advance their knowledge successfully and achieve higher levels of proficiency in a critical foreign language.

The second is State P–16 Councils—that is, primary school through college. The bill authorizes the Secretary of Education to award competitive grants to states to promote better alignment of elementary and secondary education with the knowledge and skills needed to succeed in academic credit-bearing coursework in institutions of higher education, in the 21st century workforce.

This bill will make us not only successful, but also a nation more worthy of success. It gives students with financial need better access to science and technology careers, empowering them to improve their lives and contribute to society. It makes necessary investments in energy research that will give our children a world we are proud for them to inherit.

I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution. Without its reforms, we will continue to lose our global lead in science, technology, and quality of life.

Mr. HINOJOSA. I rise in strong support of the Conference Report on H.R. 2272, the America COMPETES Act.

There has been a steady drumbeat across the country to call the nation to action to renew its leadership in the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) fields. The National Academies of Science Report, ''Rising above the Gathering Storm'' has become the rallying cry that Sputnik was a generation ago.

Today, with the passage of this conference report, the 110th Congress answers the call.

The America COMPETES Act ensures that American students, teachers, businesses, and workers are prepared to continue leading the world in innovation, research, and technology well into the future. It takes a comprehensive approach with investments in education, research and development. It moves us towards energy independence and harnesses the potential of small businesses to drive innovation.

The American COMPETES Act recognizes that America needs to draw on all of its talent—especially a growing population of minority students who continue to be under-represented in the STEM fields.

According to the U.S. Census, 39 percent of the population under the age of 18 is a racial or ethnic minority. That percentage is on a path to pass 50 percent by the year 2050, Yet, in 2000, only 4.4 percent of the science and engineering jobs were held by African Americans and only 3.4 percent by Hispanics. Women constitute over half of the postsecondary students in the nation, but represent a little more than one-quarter of our science and engineering workforce.

The America COMPETES Act tackles these disparities head on. Throughout the legislation, there is an emphasis on increasing the numbers of minorities and women in the STEM fields and on expanding the minority-serving institutions' participation in education, research and development.

The America COMPETES Act makes strategic investments in improving the STEM pipeline through education.

This legislation invests in 25,000 new teachers through professional development, summer training institutes, graduate education assistance, and scholarships through NSF's Noyce Teacher Scholarship Program and Math and Science Partnerships Program. In exchange for their scholarship, these teachers go to our highest need schools.

The America COMPETES Act includes provisions modeled after the successful U-Teach program at the University of Texas where students earn degrees in the STEM fields and teaching certificates at the same time. These newly minted teachers are placed, mentored, and supported in the schools where they are needed the most.

This legislation expands access to Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate programs. It also establishes P–16 councils to coordinate education and workforce goals with industry and community leaders, and to identify the challenges of recruiting and retaining students in innovative fields.

I am especially pleased that this legislation addresses a quiet crisis in our high need high schools—the lack of quality laboratory science opportunities.

The National Research Council's report on America's High School Labs found that experience in high school labs was poor for most students and practically non-existent for students in low-income or minority communities. We will never produce enough STEM professionals if we do not address this issue.

I am very pleased that the legislation before us today includes the provisions of my bill, H.R. 524 Partnerships for Access to Laboratory Science Act. This legislation will establish a pilot program that will partner high need school districts with colleges and universities, and the private sector to improve high school laboratories. Through these pilots, we will be able to develop models and test effective practices for improving laboratory science in high need schools. We will leverage resources from the local community and the private sector, and build on our base of knowledge of what works in teaching science.

The America COMPETES Act is about our vision for the future of this country. It is about our belief in this nation's unlimited potential and our willingness to invest in it.

I would like to commend Chairman GORDON, Chairman MILLER and all of the members of the conference committee for their excellent work.

I urge my colleague to unanimously pass this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. SHIMKUS

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. SHIMKUS. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Shimkus moves to recommit the conference report on the bill, H.R. 2272, with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to:

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

(2) 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.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 199, nays 227, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 801]

YEAS—199

Aderholt	Cubin	Hill
Akin	Culberson	Hobson
Alexander	Davis (KY)	Hoekstra
Altmire	Davis, David	Holden
Bachmann	Davis, Tom	Hulshof
Bachus	Deal (GA)	Hunter
Baker	Dent	Inglis (SC)
Barrett (SC)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Issa
Barrow	Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson (IL)
Bartlett (MD)	Donnelly	Jones (NC)
Barton (TX)	Doolittle	Jordan
Biggert	Drake	Keller
Bilbray	Dreier	King (IA)
Bilirakis	Duncan	King (NY)
Bishop (UT)	Ehlers	Kingston
Blackburn	Ellsworth	Kirk
Blunt	Emerson	Kline (MN)
Boehner	English (PA)	Knollenberg
Bonner	Everett	Kuhl (NY)
Bono	Fallin	LaHood
Boozman	Feeney	Lamborn
Boustany	Flake	Latham
Brady (TX)	Forbes	LaTourette
Broun (GA)	Fortenberry	Lewis (CA)
Brown (SC)	Fossella	Lewis (KY)
Brown-Waite, Ginny	Foxx	Linder
	Franks (AZ)	Lucas
Buchanan	Frelinghuysen	Lungren, Daniel E.
Burgess	Gallegly	
Burton (IN)	Garrett (NJ)	Mack
Buyer	Gerlach	Manzullo
Calvert	Gillmor	Marchant
Camp (MI)	Gingrey	Marshall
Campbell (CA)	Gohmert	McCarthy (CA)
Cannon	Goode	McCaul (TX)
Cantor	Goodlatte	McCotter
Capito	Granger	McCrery
Carney	Graves	McHenry
Carter	Hall (TX)	McHugh
Castle	Hastert	McKeon
Chabot	Hastings (WA)	McMorris Rodgers
Coble	Hayes	
Cole (OK)	Heller	Mica
Conaway	Hensarling	Miller (FL)
Costello	Herger	Miller (MI)

Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Space
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)

NAYS—227

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
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
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Ramstad
Rangel
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Clarke
Crenshaw
Davis, Jo Ann
Dicks
Johnson, Sam
Schakowsky

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1812

Mr. HALL of New York, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas and Mr. LANGEVIN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. MCKEON and Mr. SPACE changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 367, noes 57, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 802]

AYES—367

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Donnelly
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—57

Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Blunt
Boehner
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Buyer
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Conaway
Cubin
Deal (GA)
Doolittle
Duncan
Feeney
Flake
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Granger
Hensarling
Herger
Issa
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Kucinich
Lamborn
Linder
Mack
Manzullo
McHenry
Miller (FL)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pence
Poe
Putnam
Radanovich
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shimkus
Sullivan
Tancredo
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)

NOT VOTING—9

Boyd (FL)	Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson, Sam
Clarke	Dicks	Reyes
Crenshaw	Doggett	Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER (during the vote). Members are advised 1 minute remains in the vote.

Mr. ROYCE changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

□ 1818

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 581 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3161.

□ 1821

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3161), as amended, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with Mr. SNYDER (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CLEAVER) having assumed the chair, Mr. SNYDER, 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. 3161) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO REDUCE TIME FOR ELECTRONIC VOTING DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3161

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, during further consideration of H.R. 3161 pursuant to House Resolution 581 and House Resolution 599, 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 gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 581 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3161.

□ 1823

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3161), as amended, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with Mr. SNYDER (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, July 31, 2007, the bill had been read through page 2, line 12, and pending was the amendment by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) to amendment No. 3 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Pursuant to House Resolution 599, the amendments printed in part A of House Report 110–290 are adopted and the bill is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of the remainder of the bill is as follows:

EXECUTIVE OPERATIONS

CHIEF ECONOMIST

For necessary expenses of the Chief Economist, including economic analysis, risk assessment, cost-benefit analysis, energy and new uses, and the functions of the World Agricultural Outlook Board, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1622g), $10,847,000.

NATIONAL APPEALS DIVISION

For necessary expenses of the National Appeals Division, $15,056,000.

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Budget and Program Analysis, $8,622,000.

HOMELAND SECURITY STAFF

For necessary expenses of the Homeland Security Staff, $2,252,000.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Information Officer, $16,723,000.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, $6,076,000: *Provided,* That no funds made available by this appropriation may be obligated for FAIR Act or Circular A–76 activities until the Secretary has submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives a report on the Department's contracting out policies, including agency budgets for contracting out.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, $897,000.

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Civil Rights, $23,147,000.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration, $709,000.

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For payment of space rental and related costs pursuant to Public Law 92–313, including authorities pursuant to the 1984 delegation of authority from the Administrator of General Services to the Department of Agriculture under 40 U.S.C. 486, for programs and activities of the Department which are included in this Act, and for alterations and other actions needed for the Department and its agencies to consolidate unneeded space into configurations suitable for release to the Administrator of General Services, and for the operation, maintenance, improvement, and repair of Agriculture buildings and facilities, and for related costs, $196,616,000, to remain available until expended, of which $156,590,000 shall be for payments to the General Services Administration for rent and the Department of Homeland Security for building security: *Provided,* That amounts which are made available for space rental and related costs for the Department of Agriculture in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations to cover the costs of additional, new, or replacement space 15 days after notice thereof is transmitted to the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Department of Agriculture, to comply with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.), $12,200,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That appropriations and funds available herein to the Department for Hazardous Materials Management may be transferred to any agency of the Department for its use in meeting all requirements pursuant to the above Acts on Federal and non-Federal lands.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For Departmental Administration, $23,913,000, to provide for necessary expenses for management support services to offices of the Department and for general administration, security, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations in this Act for travel expenses incident to the holding of hearings as required by 5 U.S.C. 551–558.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations to carry out the programs funded by this Act, including programs involving intergovernmental affairs