

His leadership reached far beyond America, as his peace-through-strength approach to rebuilding our military and supporting missile defense, among other things, helped bring an end to communism in the former Soviet Union, giving freedom to millions of people across Eastern Europe.

It is also very personal to my family. My 19-year-old special needs son, Livingston, has collected 45 Ronald Reagan books so far that he has in his office, in his room at home, and he is looking forward to coming to the June 3 ceremony. It is a special event for our family.

This statue will be a constant reminder of the hope he gave us as we continue to our "rendezvous with destiny."

□ 1145

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I will continue to reserve, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I'm honored to be here to pay tribute to a man known by many and whose influence can be seen throughout the world today.

During his life he was president of the Screen Actors Guild; he was a fan of FDR and his New Deal policies; he was a registered Democrat but became a registered Republican; and he was also a member of the media. Doesn't sound like a person I normally would pay tribute to.

However, he was also an Army officer, he served as 33rd Governor of the State of California; and almost single-handedly won the Cold War. He had the eternal sense of optimism. He summarized it best in this quote: "It's morning in America."

And today we consider the measure which would authorize a statue of Ronald Reagan to be displayed here in this Capitol. It's a fitting tribute. Ronald Reagan arguably is one of the most influential persons in the 20th century. And there's no doubt that the world is a better place because Ronald Reagan was here. You can just ask the millions of people in Eastern Europe that are free today and have freedom because that wall, as he demanded, came down.

Ronald Reagan ushered in a new era, "Reagan Revolution," as it came to be called, and swept across every aspect of America, from the executive branch to the legislative branch and the judicial branch.

Ronald Reagan pursued policies that reflected his personal belief in the worth of the individual. He stood up for the little guy. He advocated small Federal government and more power to the people to make decisions for themselves and their communities. He believed in the sanctity of the Constitution, federalism, a balanced budget and a strong military. He established policies consistent with all of those beliefs.

Ronald Reagan once said, "Each generation goes further than the genera-

tion preceding it because it stands on the shoulders of that generation." That statement is true, and I believe our children and our children's grandchildren are better off because they're standing on the shoulders of this great American statesman.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. May I inquire of the gentleman if he has any speakers?

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. No, I don't.

Mr. CALVERT. I'll give the closing remarks, Mr. Speaker.

In closing, June 3 will be a great day here in the United States Capitol, a great day for our State of California, and certainly, I believe, a great day for America and for the world who appreciated Ronald Reagan's leadership. This was truly a remarkable American. So we look forward to gathering together with the former First Lady and with other people who will come from throughout the United States and throughout the world to pay tribute to this great man.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in memory of Ronald Reagan and his accomplishments as our nation's 40th president. He was a legendary president, skilled actor, and loving husband and father to his family.

Today, we pay tribute to a great American, a man who deeply loved this country. In the midst of darkness, Reagan showed no fear—staring down the face of communism and ultimately leading us to victory in the Cold War. He exhibited unprecedented leadership during a period in our history when our economy seemed bleak, our enemies surrounded us, and the fight against Soviet Communism pushed against our ideals of freedom and democracy. Even after an assassination attempt in 1981, Reagan quickly returned to duty with tremendous grace and ease, giving us a mere glimpse of his strength and determination to better our country. Known as the "Great Communicator," Reagan had an amazing gift of connecting with the public, instilling us with a sense of pride as Americans. President Reagan once stated, "There is no limit to what a man can do or where he can go if he doesn't mind who gets the credit." Certainly, these words ring loud and true today in the halls of Congress, reminding us that we are merely servants of the American public.

I wholeheartedly support today's resolution for the acceptance of a statue of President Reagan to be placed in the U.S. Capitol. Mr. Speaker, I ask my esteemed colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution and in expressing our heartfelt gratitude for Ronald Reagan's service to our great Nation.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my support to H. Con. Res. 101 that would forever honor America's 40th President, Ronald Reagan. Both as Governor of California and as our nation's Chief Executive, Reagan faced domestic and international struggles with optimism and decorum that assured us all, "It's morning again in America." President Reagan captured the hearts and minds of Americans by following in the footsteps of our Founding Fathers in advocating less government, private enterprise and a managed budgetary approach.

At a time when we are unsure of our economic future and deal precariously with the nations of the world, a figure of Reagan would serve as a simple reminder that confidence in our country's potential is necessary to our success today. President Reagan once told us, "I know in my heart that man is good. That what is right will always eventually triumph. And there's purpose and worth to each and every life."

Mr. Speaker, I rise to show my support for honoring President Reagan in this way. It is a gesture appropriate to the legacy he left us as a leader and as an American.

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

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 101.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTRONIC DEVICE RECYCLING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1580) to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to award grants for electronic waste reduction research, development, and demonstration projects, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1580

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Electronic Device Recycling Research and Development Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The volume of electronic devices in the United States is substantial and will continue to grow. The Environmental Protection Agency estimates that over 2 billion computers, televisions, wireless devices, printers, gaming systems, and other devices have been sold since 1980, generating 2 million tons of unwanted electronic devices in 2005 alone.

(2) Electronic devices can be recycled or refurbished to recover and conserve valuable materials, such as gold, copper, and platinum. However, according to the Environmental Protection Agency, only 15 to 20 percent of electronic devices discarded from households reach recyclers.

(3) The electronic device recycling industry in the United States is growing; however, challenges remain for the recycling of electronic devices by households and other small generators. Collection of such electronic devices is expensive, and separation and proper recycling of some of the materials recovered, like lead from cathode-ray tube televisions, is costly.

(4) The export of unwanted electronic devices to developing countries also presents a serious challenge. The crude methods of many of the recycling operations in these countries can expose workers to harmful chemicals, jeopardizing their health and polluting the environment.

(5) Some of the challenges to increasing the recyclability of electronic devices can be addressed by improving the logistics and technology of the collection and recycling process, designing electronic devices to avoid the use of hazardous materials and to be more easily recycled, and encouraging the use of recycled materials in more applications.

(6) The public currently does not take full advantage of existing electronic device recycling opportunities. Studying factors that influence behavior and educating consumers about responsible electronic device recycling could help communities and private industry develop recycling programs that draw more participation.

(7) The development of tools and technologies to increase the lifespan of electronic devices and to promote their safe reuse would decrease the impact of the production of electronic devices on the environment and likely increase the recyclability of such devices.

(8) Accurately assessing the environmental impacts of the production of electronic devices and the recycling of such devices is a complex task. Data, tools, and methods to better quantify these impacts would help policymakers and others determine the best end-of-life management options for electronic devices.

SEC. 3. ELECTRONIC DEVICE ENGINEERING RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall award multiyear grants to consortia to conduct research to create innovative and practical approaches to manage the environmental impacts of electronic devices and, through the conduct of this research, to contribute to the professional development of scientists, engineers, and technicians in the fields of electronic device manufacturing, design, refurbishing, and recycling. The grants awarded under this section shall support research to—

(1) increase the efficiency of and improve electronic device collection and recycling;

(2) expand the uses and applications for materials recovered from electronic devices;

(3) develop and demonstrate environmentally friendly alternatives to the use of hazardous and potentially hazardous materials in electronic devices and the production of such devices;

(4) develop methods to identify, separate, and remove hazardous and potentially hazardous materials from electronic devices and to reuse, recycle, or dispose of such materials in a safe manner;

(5) reconsider product design and assembly to facilitate and improve refurbishment, reuse, and recycling of electronic devices, including an emphasis on design for recycling;

(6) conduct lifecycle analyses of electronic devices, including developing tools and methods to assess the environmental impacts of the production, use, and end-of-life management of electronic devices and electronic device components;

(7) develop product design, tools, and techniques to extend the lifecycle of electronic devices, including methods to promote their upgrade and safe reuse; and

(8) identify the social, behavioral, and economic barriers to recycling and reuse for electronic devices and develop strategies to increase awareness, consumer acceptance, and the practice of responsible recycling and reuse for such devices.

(b) MERIT REVIEW; COMPETITION.—Grants shall be awarded under this section on a merit-reviewed, competitive basis.

(c) APPLICATIONS.—A consortium shall submit an application for a grant under this section to the Administrator at such time, in such manner, and containing such information and assurances as the Administrator may require. The application shall include a description of—

(1) the research project that will be undertaken by the consortium and the contributions of each of the participating entities, including the for-profit entity;

(2) the applicability of the project to reduce impediments to electronic device recycling in the electronic device design, manufacturing, refurbishing, or recycling industries;

(3) the potential for and feasibility of incorporating the research results into industry practice; and

(4) how the project will promote collaboration among scientists and engineers from different disciplines, such as electrical engineering, materials science, and social science.

(d) DISSEMINATION OF RESEARCH RESULTS.—Research results shall be made publicly available through—

(1) development of best practices or training materials for use in the electronic device manufacturing, design, refurbishing, or recycling industries;

(2) dissemination at conferences affiliated with such industries;

(3) publication on the Environmental Protection Agency's Web site;

(4) demonstration projects; or

(5) educational materials for the public produced in conjunction with State governments, local governments, or nonprofit organizations on problems and solutions related to electronic device recycling and reuse.

(e) FUNDING CONTRIBUTION FROM FOR-PROFIT MEMBER OF CONSORTIUM.—The for-profit entity participating in the consortium shall contribute at least 10 percent of the total research project cost, either directly or with in-kind contributions.

(f) PROTECTION OF PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.—The Administrator—

(1) shall not disclose any proprietary information or trade secrets provided by any person or entity pursuant to this section;

(2) shall ensure that, as a condition of receipt of a grant under this section, each member of the consortium has in place proper protections to maintain proprietary information or trade secrets contributed by other members of the consortium; and

(3) if any member of the consortium breaches the conditions under paragraph (2) or discloses proprietary information or trade secrets, may require the return of any funds received under this section by such member.

(g) BIENNIAL REPORT.—Within 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Administrator shall transmit a report to Congress that provides—

(1) a list of the grants awarded under this section;

(2) the entities participating in each consortium receiving a grant;

(3) a description of the research projects carried out in whole or in part with funds made available under such a grant;

(4) the results of such research projects; and

(5) a description of the rate and success of the adoption or integration of such research results into the manufacturing processes, management practices, and products of the electronics industry.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator to carry out this section:

(1) \$18,000,000 for fiscal year 2010.

(2) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2011.

(3) \$22,000,000 for fiscal year 2012.

SEC. 4. NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES REPORT ON ELECTRONIC DEVICE RECYCLING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to better recognize gaps and opportunities in the research and training programs established in this Act, the Administrator shall enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences for a report, to be transmitted to Congress not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, on—

(1) opportunities for and barriers to—

(A) increasing the recyclability of electronic devices, specifically addressing—

(i) recycling or safe disposal of electronic devices and low value materials recovered from such devices;

(ii) designing electronic devices to facilitate reuse and recycling; and

(iii) the reuse of electronic devices; and

(B) making electronic devices safer and more environmentally friendly, specifically addressing reducing the use of hazardous materials and potentially hazardous materials in electronic devices;

(2) the environmental and human health risks posed by the storage, transport, recycling, and disposal of unwanted electronic devices;

(3) the current status of research and training programs to promote the environmental design of electronic devices to increase the recyclability of such devices; and

(4) any regulatory or statutory barriers that may prevent the adoption or implementation of best management practices or technological innovations that may arise from the research and training programs established in this Act.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The report under subsection (a) shall identify gaps in the current research and training programs in addressing the opportunities, barriers, and risks relating to electronic device recycling, and the report shall recommend areas where additional research and development resources are needed to reduce the impact of unwanted electronic devices on the environment.

SEC. 5. ENGINEERING CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT GRANTS.

(a) GRANT PROGRAM.—The Administrator, in consultation with the Director of the National Science Foundation, shall award grants to institutions of higher education to develop curricula that incorporate the principles of environmental design into the development of electronic devices—

(1) for the training of electrical, mechanical, industrial, manufacturing, materials, and software engineers and other students at the undergraduate and graduate level; and

(2) to support the continuing education of professionals in the electronic device manufacturing, design, refurbishing, or recycling industries.

(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—The term "institution of higher education", as such term is used with respect to eligibility to receive a grant under subsection (a)(2), includes any institution of higher education under section 101(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(b)).

(c) OUTREACH TO MINORITY SERVING INSTITUTIONS.—The Administrator shall conduct outreach to minority serving institutions for the purposes of providing information on the grants available under this section and how to apply for such grants.

(d) MERIT REVIEW; COMPETITION.—Grants shall be awarded under this section on a merit-reviewed, competitive basis.

(e) USE OF FUNDS.—Grants awarded under this section shall be used for activities that enhance the ability of an institution of higher education to broaden the undergraduate

and graduate-level engineering curriculum or professional continuing education curriculum to include environmental engineering design principles and consideration of product lifecycles related to electronic devices and increasing the recyclability of such devices. Activities may include—

(1) developing and revising curriculum to include multidisciplinary elements;

(2) creating research and internship opportunities for students through partnerships with industry, nonprofit organizations, or government agencies;

(3) creating and establishing certificate programs; and

(4) developing curricula for short courses and continuing education for professionals in the environmental design of electronic devices to increase the recyclability of such devices.

(f) APPLICATION.—An institution of higher education seeking a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Administrator at such time, in such manner, and with such information and assurances as the Administrator may require.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator to carry out this section:

(1) \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2010.

(2) \$5,150,000 for fiscal year 2011.

(3) \$5,304,000 for fiscal year 2012.

SEC. 6. ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY ALTERNATIVE MATERIALS PHYSICAL PROPERTY DATABASE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall establish an initiative to develop a comprehensive physical property database for environmentally friendly alternative materials for use in electronic devices.

(b) PRIORITIES.—The Director, working with the electronic device design, manufacturing, or recycling industries, shall develop a strategic plan to establish priorities and the physical property characterization requirements for the database described in subsection (a).

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator to carry out this section:

(1) \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 2010.

(2) \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 2011.

(3) \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 2012.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) CONSORTIUM.—The term “consortium” means a grant applicant or recipient under section 3(a) that includes—

(A) at least one institution of higher education, nonprofit research institution, or government laboratory; and

(B) at least one for-profit entity, including a manufacturer, designer, refurbisher, or recycler of electronic devices or the components of such devices.

(3) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

(4) ELECTRONIC DEVICE.—The term “electronic device” may include computers, computer monitors, televisions, laptops, printers, wireless devices, copiers, fax machines, stereos, video gaming systems, and the components of such devices.

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

(6) MINORITY SERVING INSTITUTION.—The term “minority serving institution” means an institution that is an eligible institution under section 371(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1067q(a)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) each will control 20 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 and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1580, the bill now under consideration.

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 myself such time as I may consume.

Today I rise in support of H.R. 1580, the Electronic Device Recycling, Research and Development Act. This bill represents the first step forward on a large and growing problem. Every year Americans send millions of old cell phones, televisions, computers, laptops and other electronic devices to landfills. Millions more are stored in desk drawers and attics by consumers unsure of how to get rid of the old computer.

These devices are often termed as electronic waste, but waste is hardly an appropriate name for these sophisticated products. Many can still be used. All can be recycled to recover their constituent materials. And as the Science and Technology Committee learned through a series of hearings, electronics also can contain hazardous materials like lead and cadmium, which do not belong in landfills.

The Environmental Protection Agency reported that nearly 2 billion electronic products were sold between 1980 and 2004. Unfortunately, of the hundreds of millions of now unwanted products, only about 15 percent are recycled. There are many hurdles to increasing this percentage, such as the cost of collecting and processing materials and the low value or the hazardous nature of many of the recoverable materials.

The purpose of H.R. 1580 is to meet these challenges through research and development. The areas the bill addresses were identified through two Science and Technology Committee hearings held this Congress and last, and reflects the considerable input from the electronics producers, manufacturers, recyclers, refurbishers and the environmental interest community.

It's supported by a broad number of stakeholders, including the Consumer Electronics Retailers Coalition, the Consumer Electronics Association, the Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries, The Wireless Association, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Electronics Take Back Coalition, Best Buy, AT&T, the Center for Environmental Health, Lower East Side Ecology Center, the Product Steward-

ship Institute, and the National Center for Electronics Recycling.

I'm also pleased that this bill is the product of a bipartisan collaboration and contains the input of both Democratic and Republican members of our committee.

H.R. 1580 directs the Environmental Protection Agency to fund the R&D that will enable efficient and affordable electronic device recycling and find other means of reducing the impact of electronic devices on our environment. Research can foster innovation to enable more efficient recycling, the selection of more environmentally friendly materials, better ways to educate consumers about electronics recycling, and methods to design products for easier disassembly and recycling.

The research supported by H.R. 1580 will also assess the environmental impact of electronic products over their entire lifecycle. This information will allow electronic producers, policymakers and consumers to make wise environmental decisions.

Specifically, the research grants authorized by this bill require university or government-led laboratories to work with electronics producers, recyclers or related for-profit entities. The goal of H.R. 1580 is to ensure research that can be applied to this challenge as soon as possible.

H.R. 1580 also authorizes the EPA, in consultation with the National Science Foundation, to fund grants that will give engineering students the tools and knowledge to incorporate environmental considerations into their future environmental endeavors.

Electronic devices have become indispensable tools for modern living, but they, unfortunately, are a modern environmental problem, too. Research, development and innovation are a key component to addressing this environmental challenge. And I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1508.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1580. I am pleased that this bill has been introduced and happy that our country will continue to be on the forefront of technology policy. The goals, frankly, of this bill are commendable as we struggle to limit the pollution and amount of waste that is being sent to our landfills.

Obviously, there are a lot of issues to consider when we address disposal, recycling and the reuse of electronic equipment. First, we must consider what technologies are appropriate for reuse and recycling. Obviously, another consideration is the proper disposal of hazardous waste that accompanies electronics. And, finally, we must balance the costs and the benefits of the regulatory issues when you're dealing with export economies.

Now, with each technological advance and each model replacement, we face the question of disposal of those

older products. This is a very complex situation which creates a vast array of opinions on possible solutions to the problems.

Now, dealing with this problem is not insurmountable. With the right type of research and development, we can institute new ways of tracking, of sorting, recycling and reusing electronics, and by making them less hazardous from the design stage, from the beginning, before they're even being built, allow them to do less harm when we dispose of them later on in life. So I think this legislation is a move in the right direction to address these concerns.

Through the committee process, Mr. Speaker, we've learned that there are a number of companies, many of them actually, that seek new uses for these products which obviously then reduces the number of them that end up in landfills. And I'm grateful to the chairman for introducing this legislation and also for holding hearings on this subject matter.

So, again, lots of times we hear that legislation gets to the floor without going through the normal order, regular order. In this case, not only has that taken place, but the chairman has had hearings on it, and I think it's important.

Now, again, I endorse the concept behind this bill, and I believe Congress should be encouraging better designs for electronic devices, to increase their life span and, obviously, to make them easier to recycle.

But there are a few aspects of this bill that still I have some concerns with. One such concern comes from an amendment offered in committee requiring that the EPA publish the results of research and development projects authorized by this bill on its Web site. And of course that sounds like something we should all support, and we should.

But here's the concern, that the copyright protections of the research published on the Web site may not be preserved. We should ensure that this is addressed prior to the bill finally being enacted into law. And I look forward to continuing to work with the chairman.

Additionally, it was unclear from the bill's language whether, if there's more than one for-profit entity included in a consortium whether the total contribution from all for-profit entities is to be at least 10 percent, or if each for-profit member is to contribute at least 10 percent. It's not clear. So I appreciate the efforts of the chairman to clarify this in report language, and I hope that he would be willing to modify the legislative language itself, if necessary, to ensure that these issues are addressed. And, again, the chairman, I know, also has the same concerns because he's addressed it. But I think we need to address it a little bit further.

I believe this bill takes steps towards addressing a very important issue. And I hope that this bill, as it moves for-

ward, will continue to be tweaked a little bit to make sure that it's even better.

So, again, I hope that we can get the best possible bill, the best possible legislation out of this. I commend the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remaining part of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank my friend from Florida for his constructive advice. I think most of his concerns have been addressed in report language. But this is a continuing product. We want to get the best that we can. And we want to work with you and your compatriots as we go through the whole process. This is an important bill and a good bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my friend from California (Mr. THOMPSON). Mr. THOMPSON is the cochair of the Working Group on Electronic Waste, but more importantly, really is the leader in Congress on this issue. He has been a longtime advocate and we welcome his time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your kind words and for recognizing me on this bill.

Mr. Speaker and Members, I'm here today to speak in strong support of this measure, H.R. 1580. As the chairman noted, I've been involved in this subject of electronic waste or e-waste since I first came to Congress. And I want to applaud the chairman and the Science Committee's work and their interest on this very, very important issue. Chairman GORDON has been a strong leader on e-waste issues and has helped to move this issue forward.

□ 1200

Electronic product technology is moving at a very, very fast pace, but at the same time, it's creating an ever-growing environmental and waste disposal problem. That's because it's often cheaper or sometimes cooler to buy a new PC or a new cell phone than to upgrade an old one. Today, the average life span of a computer is only 2 years, and Americans are disposing of 3,000 tons of computers every day. These discarded items, more often than not, wind up in landfills in developing countries where the waste is a terrible environmental problem.

A recent GAO study found that most e-waste exported from the U.S. is dismantled under unsafe conditions, often by children, using methods like open-air incineration and acid baths to extract component metals. This puts people at risk and makes e-waste a moral issue, a moral hazard as well.

The bill we are considering today will achieve two important and necessary goals. First, it will establish grant programs to fund studies to evaluate how to make electronic equipment easier to recycle on the front end. Second, it will train our Nation's engineering students in "green design." This important leg-

islation will lay an important piece of the foundation for comprehensive e-waste legislation in the future. Truly, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. If obsolete computers and other such items can be diverted from the waste stream at the outset, half of our battle will already have been won.

Again, I thank the chairman and the committee for their good work. I urge swift passage of this measure.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. If I may inquire, Mr. Speaker, of the chairman if he has further speakers.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. We have no further speakers.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. At this time then, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Let me just conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying this is a good bipartisan bill, and I thank Mr. THOMPSON for his support. As I say, he has been a leader on this issue.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1580.

Many of us, whether at home or in our offices, have leftover electronics that eventually find their way to a dark closet corner or basement.

If I took a poll of Members here, everyone would raise a hand to having an old computer, several old cell phones, and at least one old television. For those of us with children and grandchildren, that list probably grows to include first generation Nintendos, Gameboys, and Mp3 players.

Those of us that keep old electronics probably plan to give them away. Or, we buy the latest, most updated gadget without thinking of what to do with the old. We want to dump or donate the old PC, but we worry about what personal information may still be on its hard drive.

H.R. 1580 takes the first step to address all of those issues, and study the prospects and concerns for abandoned electronics and their components stream.

As we heard at our February 11th hearing, coordinated research and education efforts are needed to address disposal, product design, and in general, raise awareness of what opportunities consumers have to recycle un-used or what they consider "obsolete" equipment.

A witness at that hearing, and constituent of mine, is one of the first certified Microsoft refurbishers in the country. Thanks to his hard work, forty thousand computers have been refurbished and distributed to schools, non-profits, and homes of at-risk children throughout the Chicago area.

With the right research and development, and more business models like my constituent's, electronics recycling and refurbishment can be an integral part of our communities, decrease waste in our landfills, and offer budget-friendly alternatives for consumers. It is important to note that every dollar spent on refurbishment stays in the U.S.; every dollar spent on new products may not.

I would like to thank Chairman GORDON for working with the members of the committee to improve H.R. 1580. Thanks to his cooperation, we were able to include an important change

from the term “waste” to “device” in the underlying text. Doing so sets a tone of reuse instead of disposal and lessens the opportunity for regulatory or legal hurdles to stall the refurbishing and recycling process that we are trying to promote.

If we can institute new ways of tracking, sorting, recycling, and reusing electronics and make them less hazardous from the design stage, we can allow them to do less harm in the disposal stage. I think this legislation is a move in the right direction to address these concerns.

Although I endorse the concept behind H.R. 1580 and believe Congress should be encouraging better designs for electronic devices to increase their life-span and make them easier to recycle, there are aspects of this bill that concern me.

One such concern comes from an amendment offered in Committee requiring the Environmental Protection Agency to publish the results of research and development projects authorized by this bill on its website. The concern here is that the copyright protections of the research published on the website may not be preserved. We should ensure this is addressed prior to this bill being enacted into law.

Additionally, it is unclear from the bill language whether if there is more than one for-profit entity included in a consortium whether the total contribution from all for-profit entities is to be at least ten (10) percent, or if each for-profit member is to contribute at least ten (10) percent. I appreciate the efforts of the Chairman to clarify this in report language and hope that he would be willing to modify the legislative language, if necessary, to ensure this issue is addressed.

I believe this bill takes steps toward addressing a very important issue and I hope that moving forward we will continue to work together to ensure we produce the best law possible.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PASITOR of Arizona). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1580, as amended.

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

The title was amended so as to read: “A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to award grants for electronic device recycling research, development, and demonstration projects, and for other purposes.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GREEN ENERGY EDUCATION ACT OF 2009

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 957) to authorize higher education curriculum development and graduate training in advanced energy and green building technologies.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 957

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Green Energy Education Act of 2009”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION.

For the purposes of this Act:

(1) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of the National Science Foundation.

(2) HIGH PERFORMANCE BUILDING.—The term “high performance building” has the meaning given that term in section 914(a) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16194(a)).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Energy.

SEC. 3. GRADUATE TRAINING IN ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) FUNDING.—In carrying out research, development, demonstration, and commercial application activities authorized for the Department of Energy, the Secretary may contribute funds to the National Science Foundation for the Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship program to support projects that enable graduate education related to such activities.

(b) CONSULTATION.—The Director shall consult with the Secretary when preparing solicitations and awarding grants for projects described in subsection (a).

SEC. 4. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT FOR HIGH PERFORMANCE BUILDING DESIGN.

(a) FUNDING.—In carrying out advanced energy technology research, development, demonstration, and commercial application activities authorized for the Department of Energy related to high performance buildings, the Secretary may contribute funds to curriculum development activities at the National Science Foundation for the purpose of improving undergraduate or graduate interdisciplinary engineering and architecture education related to the design and construction of high performance buildings, including development of curricula, of laboratory activities, of training practicums, or of design projects. A primary goal of curriculum development activities supported under this section shall be to improve the ability of engineers, architects, landscape architects, and planners to work together on the incorporation of advanced energy technologies during the design and construction of high performance buildings.

(b) CONSULTATION.—The Director shall consult with the Secretary when preparing solicitations and awarding grants for projects described in subsection (a).

(c) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants with respect to which the Secretary has contributed funds under this section, the Director shall give priority to applications from departments, programs, or centers of a school of engineering that are partnered with schools, departments, or programs of design, architecture, landscape architecture, and city, regional, or urban planning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

rial on H.R. 957, the bill now under consideration.

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 myself such time as I may consume.

Today, I rise in support of H.R. 957, the Green Energy Education Act of 2009. First, I would like to thank Mr. MCCAUL for his leadership on this legislation. This bill authorizes the Department of Energy to contribute funds to the National Science Foundation’s successful Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship program, known as IGERT. IGERT awards prepare doctoral students by integrating research and education in innovative ways that are tailored to the unique requirements of newly emerging interdisciplinary fields and new career options.

This bill also authorizes the Department of Energy’s high-performance building technology programs to contribute to the National Science Foundation’s ongoing curriculum development activities with the goal of improving the ability of engineers and architects to design and construct high-performance buildings.

In summary, this bill addresses a critical need to provide resources to universities to update their curricula and research efforts in alternative energy and high-performance buildings, and it improves the coordination between the Department of Energy and the National Science Foundation in achieving this goal.

I am pleased to support H.R. 957, the Green Energy Education Act of 2009. Once again, I want to commend Mr. MCCAUL for this important legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 957, and I yield myself as much time as I might consume.

I also urge my colleagues to support this bill, H.R. 957, the Green Energy Education Act of 2009, introduced by my distinguished colleague, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

This is a good piece of legislation that, by the way, passed in the 110th Congress, but the Senate did not take it up before adjournment. Simply put, this measure encourages the Department of Energy to work with the National Science Foundation to help develop the next generation of engineers and architects to work effectively together to produce buildings that incorporate the latest in energy-efficient technologies.

Oftentimes, energy-efficient buildings are not being constructed, not because building professionals don’t want to do it or think it’s a bad idea, but primarily because they just don’t even know or are not aware of all of the technology that’s available, so this measure is intended to close that gap.