

like. But those are programs that have formula within them that allow them just to continue to perpetuate year after year after year. And this area of the pie chart is what Representative CONAWAY talked about. That is the area that will consume 50 percent, 50 percent of the entire gross domestic product.

Currently, this is 20 percent of the budget. This, over the next 10 years, will grow to 62 percent. As you can see, this trend, in 1995, it was 49 percent; 2005, 54 percent; 2015, 62 percent. That trend is one that we cannot sustain as a Nation. It just cannot happen, unless you do what the other side talks about repeatedly, which is to raise taxes; and, as Congressman CONAWAY talked about, in fact, you cannot even grow your way out of it. You cannot even raise taxes enough to cover that and sustain our way of life as a Nation. So I think it is incredibly important that when we are talking here on the floor of the House that we talk about real facts, real facts, honest information for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I would just like to say what a pleasure it has been to come before the American people tonight and to gather a group of what we are calling the official truth squad of primarily the freshmen class. And, Mr. Speaker, as president of the freshman class, Representative JINDAL from Louisiana has been wonderfully supportive of these efforts to bring truth to the floor of the House. What a wonderful thing.

We live in an incredible and a great and a wonderful Nation. It is a Nation that has, through liberty and through freedom, benefited more citizens than ever known in the history of the world. We believe, on this Republican side of the aisle, that it is important that government does do some things, but we do not want government running every part of our life.

There are a couple of things the government should do well. It should defend us well. It should have a balanced budget and be able to keep the commitments that it makes. We have a clear and a positive plan to build a safer world and a more hopeful America. We believe that Washington spends too much money, too much of the taxpayers' hard-earned money, and we have a commitment to balance the budget through controlling the growth in spending.

The other side, as I mentioned, tends to be interested in doing one thing, and that is raising your taxes. There is a plan afoot right now that they have to increase and raise your taxes. It seems to be oftentimes the only solution that they have.

But, Mr. Speaker, we were sent to Washington to solve problems. Difficult problems, yes. But my colleagues and I and the official truth squad will be here many, many times over the coming months to bring reality to the discussions that we are having, to bring some truth to the discussions

that we are having, and to remember what Senator Moynihan said, and that is that you are welcome to your own opinions but you are not welcome to your own facts.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank the leadership once again so very much for the opportunity to present this hour.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 32. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide criminal penalties for trafficking in counterfeit marks.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1777. An act to provide relief for the victims of Hurricane Katrina.

□ 2030

#### DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS INNOVATIVE AGENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JINDAL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am claiming this time on behalf of myself and other colleagues who will be joining me shortly to talk about what really has made America such an economic power in the world and such a leader in both economics and in innovation, and that is in the 1960s when President Kennedy made the case to send a person to the Moon and to bring that person back safely, it was more than a moon shot. It was an expression of optimism about the talent in this country and about the resources in this country.

In the process of sending that individual to the Moon and back, we also built a great infrastructure. We built a great infrastructure that consisted of one of the great public-private partnerships in the history of the world, a partnership between our academic institutions, our research institutions, the private sector, and the U.S. Government. In putting that partnership together, we created both the physical resources to create the rocket ships and the infrastructure at NASA, and also the intellectual basis and foundation to make the discoveries necessary.

That is where America has been for the last 50 years. It has ridden out on the point of scientific discovery, of the discovery of knowledge, the acquisition of knowledge, and in the resulting innovation, in the resulting economic growth and the world leadership in those areas. It has served this country well. It has made it the richest country

in the world. It has made it the strongest country in the world because of that innovation, because of that scientific discovery.

Some of that was done through the National Science Foundations. Some of that was done through the National Institutes of Health, the National Institutes of Medicine, in conjunction with other research facilities and with the private sector.

It was very interesting as the Democrats started to consider the need for reinvestment in America's innovation infrastructure; and we thought about what would it mean at this time to push ahead for the next generation of innovation, the next generation of innovators, the next generation of manufacturing jobs in this country, the next generation of other jobs in this country and the economic growth that could continue to drive the American standard of living for America's families.

As we talked to those who had been so very successful in the world of technology and biotechnology and venture capitalists who have gone forth to try and fund these bright young people and their ideas, those people who today are the CEOs and the presidents and the founders of some of the most successful companies in the history of the world, American companies in the technology field and the biotech field, it is interesting that all of them fully understood that they were the inheritors, they were the inheritors of that public-private partnership, of that investment that was made in the scientific discovery, that investment that was made in new young mathematicians and scientists and engineers; the fact that this country decided that it was important enough for our national security, for our economic security, that we would fully pay people's way with fellowships so they could spend their full time in the quest of that new knowledge, those skills, those talents, and achieved their Ph.D.s and other advanced degrees in math, science, and engineering.

All of these people today recognize that when they were starting their companies in the garages of California, in the small business parks of New Jersey, in the small business parks and the university research labs across this country, they were the inheritors of that investment made by this Nation.

They also told us in these meetings that they felt in that public-private partnership the public side had been lagging, the public side had not been keeping up with the kind of investments that were going to be necessary if we in fact were going to have long-term, high-risk, high-reward research taking place in this country, the kind of research that does lead you to the next generation of innovation, to the next generation of jobs and economic growth and world leadership, that we need to reinvest in that.

They talked about how we doubled and this Congress made a decision on a

bipartisan basis to double the budget of NIH. But they also made it clear that the doubling of the budget wasn't simply a one-time target; it was the beginning of the process at the National Institutes of Health, at the National Institutes of Medicine.

They also noted when we decided to double the budgets at the National Institutes of Health, we did it at a cost to the physical sciences, that the physical sciences also had been lagging. It is interesting we see after now having achieved the bipartisan goal of doubling the budget of the National Institutes of Health, we see in the President's most recent submission a diminishment, a cutting of that budget of the National Institutes of Health while the President is talking about increasing the physical sciences, the budgets of the National Science Foundation and the other governmental research.

This cannot be a rob-Peter-to-pay-Paul effort. It cannot be that. This cannot be done by robbing the physical sciences to help the life sciences or robbing the life sciences to help the physical sciences. A great country must make advances in scientific discovery in all of these fields; and clearly, clearly, that needs to be done if we are going to attract private capital to partner up with the Federal dollars in the basic researches across the agencies of this country.

We also talked with them about what would be the driver of much of the new innovation, what would give them a task which would generate new scientific discovery and innovation; and many of them said we have got to deal with the energy problem in this country. The technology is a big part of America becoming more energy independent and trying to achieve a sense of energy independence over the next 10 years in alternative fuels, in alternative technologies, in alternative energy sources, rather than simply relying on the fossil fuel policy of the current administration and the current budget of this country. Those kinds of investments in energy.

They also thought we should try to recreate a long-term, high-risk, high-reward research facility within the Department of Energy so people could go out on the edge again of the kind of knowledge that had to be acquired if we are going to achieve the goal of energy independence. But, once again, you don't do it on a nickel-and-dime policy. You have to make a sustained major commitment.

When you double the budget of the National Institutes of Health and you are looking for the kind of research that is so critical to preventative medicine, to dealing with the new communicable diseases that are traveling around the world and the health care of this country, you have to make a sustained investment. If you are going to do it in the physical sciences, you have to make a sustained investment.

So that is what my colleagues and I would like to talk about, how America

turns to the next generation and provides them the promise and investment in their talents, their skills, and their future. We think we can do that by looking at what has led to this American model of success.

We will also talk about the fact that this model is under challenge from countries in Asia, from India, from China, from Korea, from Japan, from Taiwan; that the idea that America is number one, the position we hold in the world today, in innovation, in Nobel prizes, in patents issued and copyrights, that that is not a position that is ours by birthright. It came because of the investment and the hard work.

That is now being challenged from all across the world. People are now able to take the American model and leapfrog it because of the technologies, because of the scientific discovery that we have made.

I see one of my colleagues from New Jersey, Mr. RUSH HOLT, who participated in the drafting of the innovation agenda for the Democratic Caucus, an agenda that has received wide acclaim from the private sector in terms of our ability to go forward again on a new and higher level of sustained effort at scientific discovery and innovation and economic growth.

I am delighted to the yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

When we held our meetings around the country with entrepreneurs, with business leaders, with scientists, with researchers, we found much to be optimistic about. We are in many ways still the powerhouse for new ideas, for innovation; but the indications are all pointing in the wrong direction.

You do not have to look very far in my district, and I am sure in yours and just about every district in the country, to find people who are worried about outsourcing. Jobs, indeed, are going overseas, the kinds of jobs we would like to keep here.

You can go to almost any university, and you will find that what used to be the destination of choice for bright students around the world, they wanted to study in the United States, it is not so true any more. Yes, we have good universities, but the signs are pointing in the wrong direction.

What was known over the centuries as good old American know-how, where really every American, every shopkeeper, every farmer, every manufacturer was something of a scientist, they took their education seriously, well, the signs are pointing in the wrong direction now.

Our kids are not competing as well in international comparisons. The President stood in this Chamber a couple of weeks ago and said it is time to make a commitment to research and development, to science education. Then a few days later he presented the budget. In real terms, the Federal R&D portfolio, research and development spending,

will decline under the President's budget.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. If the gentleman will yield on that point, the gentleman was part of this and we traveled to North Carolina and to New Jersey and to Boston and to California and Seattle talking to people about this innovation agenda; and when we put the innovation agenda together, so many CEOs and venture capitalists and others said this is it, you are exactly on the right track, this is what America needs.

It was interesting to see the President come forward in the State of the Union as you mentioned and embrace the innovation agenda, many components of this effort. Then it was so disappointing to see the budget that was published afterwards, and even more disappointing when the Republican leadership slammed this innovation agenda as just simply more spending, when in fact the President mirrored what was in our agenda right down to switch fuels.

Mr. HOLT. That is right. The President embraced much of this. This need not be, should not be, a partisan matter. We are presenting tonight something we call the Democratic Innovative Agenda. It doesn't have to be the Democratic Innovative Agenda. We are presenting it because for 5 years it hasn't been presented. It is because these things need to be done. These entrepreneurs, these venture capitalists, these researchers that we have been meeting with said, please do it; it is not getting done.

So we are presenting it, and I guess I would even challenge the majority to take this issue away from us if they only would. But in fact we have the budget in front of us. The President's budget, as I say, not only reduces research and development spending in total, the NIH budget in real terms will decline for the third year in a row, and math-science partnerships at the National Science Foundation zeroed, zeroed out.

How in the world are we going to grow the kind of innovative economy that we want, that we need, that we used to have, if we are cutting the National Science Foundation?

Mr. DELAHUNT. If the gentleman will yield for a moment, I want to welcome Congressman MILLER and Congressman HOLT to the 30-Something Group. The two of you have created, of course, a new definition of the 30-Something Group, but we will let that pass for the moment.

□ 2045

I think it is important to frame the issue that we have, you or Congressman MILLER, detail for those of us here and those who are watching the international comparisons that you have expressed a concern about. Because I think we all hear terms like the global village and the global economy, and I think we recognize that that is the reality. But I know I hear figures, for example, where China is going to graduate a multiple of four or five times

what this country will do in terms of students that have majored in the sciences and math.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I just want to show you the graph that we have here. I would like to welcome all the gray hairs to the 30-Something group. And you, obviously, Mr. DELAHUNT, the gentleman from Massachusetts, has been here for a while, so your gray hair is—

Mr. DELAHUNT. Really dark.

Mr. HOLT. The rest of us have been here for a while.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. You brought up the issue of global standards, and this is a chart that illustrates what you were talking about.

This is the students who will graduate with engineering degrees this year. In China, 600,000; India, 350,000; and the U.S., 70,000; and a good portion of the U.S. graduates will be foreign born who will probably return to one of these countries but fits under the U.S. statistics.

How are we going to possibly try to jump start our economy if we are not going to address this issue? Under our innovation proposal we are saying we want to create 100,000 new engineers and scientists in the next 4 years. We are limited to what we can do because this President and the Republican House and the Republican Senate have run up such tremendous budget deficit that we have to pay down. When we get in charge we will have to pay down the debt for a while and reduce the deficit, but we are focused and we have a way to pay for this 100,000 new engineers and scientists in the next 4 years.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I think these are the points we have to stress is that the trends, as you allude to, are running in the wrong direction; and I guess if we do not jump start with this initiative and work with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, we are going to suffer. The future of the 30-something generation is at risk here.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Congressman HOLT, I just want to tell you real quick, you said that you hope the majority highjacks this issue which the President tried to do during his State of the Union, but his budget does not speak to that, Mr. MILLER. His budget does not speak to innovation. He is saying one thing, and he is going in another direction. Because for him to cut student aid to students to even start the whole innovation moment, education is the way Americans have bettered themselves. Individuals have gone to college for the first time. Communities are better because of it.

Now this President wants to come and he says the word "innovation" that means that we are heading in that direction. It does not necessarily mean that.

So I believe, unlike what they have done in other areas, we have talk about homeland security and international strategy. They highjacked it and said it was theirs. The President was against it for many weeks and months. He finally saw it our way because our way was the American people's way.

The same thing happened with the whole issue when it came down to the 9/11 Commission. We said there should be a comprehensive review on what happened during 9/11. They tried to put together these little partisan committees. The American people said they wanted it. Thank God for the survivors of 9/11 and the families that lost loved ones in 9/11. The President was against it. The majority side was against it. The Republicans, finally, they said, oh, we should have a 9/11 Commission. What a great idea.

But this issue as it relates to innovation and investing in America, I do not think they are going to come with us.

Mr. HOLT. If the gentleman would yield, I am sure he understands that when I invite the other side to seize this issue, I do not mean with just rhetoric. We as a country need an investment in education, an investment in research, an investment in innovation. And the irony is our colleagues were on the floor a few minutes ago talking about how the economy is going to grow.

I will tell you if the economy grows it will be because of productivity growth resulting from investment in a smart, well-trained workforce and in new ideas; and that means really putting something up more than rhetoric.

In math and science education, which are critical to this, the President with all of the rhetoric and the other side here with all of the rhetoric are now funding teacher professional development for math and science teaching at less in actual dollars, I do not mean in inflation adjusted dollars, less than it was funded when the President took office 5 years ago. We have lost ground in actual dollars, not even counting the purchase power.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I want to make a distinction here. This President finds the time and the energy and the commitment to put \$16 billion in corporate welfare into the energy bill, finds the time and the energy and the commitment to put billions upon billions of dollars in the Medicare prescription drug bill that is going to some of the most profitable industries in the country, including the pharmaceutical industry. So the fact of the matter is we have got a President who is committed as he could possibly be to corporate welfare for the most profitable industries in the country, but yet we just want to train math and science teachers. We just want to create 100,000 new engineers and scientists, Mr. President. That is all we want to do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And we want to fully fund, if the gentleman would yield, we want to fully fund the landmark legislation that was passed in a bipartisan way under the leadership of Mr. MILLER and others and Republicans that was described as the No Child Left Behind Act.

What has happened to that, Mr. MILLER?

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. What has happened to that is we made

a promise to the country. We put it out in the bill. We negotiated with the President of the United States. And now what we find is in this budget the President is about \$55 billion behind where he promised the country he would be on the funding of No Child Left Behind.

What is interesting is, while the President is creating those deficits in education funding, the private sector is telling us one of the key items in terms of economic growth in this country is to fully fund No Child Left Behind. They are not telling us, the Federal Government, to create 100,000 new scientists. They are saying we want to partner with you. We will employ these people in internships in summer jobs, in graduate jobs, full-time jobs. We want to work with you because it is so critical to the future growth of our companies.

These are some of the most successful companies in the history of the world. They are worried about whether or not America will be able to generate the workforce necessary so they can continue to do business in this country and we can have jobs in this country.

And what happens? The President says he wants to do it in the State of the Union. It is not in this budget, and the new majority leader slams the program as simply more spending. This was not our agenda. This was not partisan. We specifically laid this out as a challenge to this Congress, to 435 Members of Congress to take up what the private sector now has been telling them for years to do with the permanent extension of modernization of the R&D tax credits, the full funding of No Child Left Behind, the doubling of the National Science Foundation, maintaining the doubling of the National Institute of Health, to get broadband across this country so that economic growth can take place all over the country in the rural areas, people can start jobs, and education can be brought there.

And what do we find out? You just get a big partisan slam from the Republican side of the aisle. Most of the CEOs who helped us draft this program and consulted with us in Boston and in California and in Austin and in North Carolina are Republicans. But they can see the challenge of what China and India that Mr. RYAN just talked about. The trend line for American scientists and engineers is going down; in our most fierce competitors it is soaring up.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Can I suggest that what we will see with that trend line in terms of the increase of the number of scientists and mathematicians and computer personnel is those jobs, those well-paying jobs will also trend towards China and India and OPEC and all those countries that we are borrowing from today. And we discussed this last night, that we have borrowed from that, are funding those tax cuts that translate into 1 percent of Americans, the most affluent, receiving 40

percent of the benefits. We are putting ourselves on a trajectory that will put America permanently behind.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. And that is what this is about. We have lost a huge number of manufacturing jobs overseas. We have lost other jobs overseas. This is a fight and a struggle to make sure that there will be new jobs created in America. I think it is called the Advanced Manufacturing Association, many people out of the Midwest, in Mr. RYAN's area who are worried about the next generation of manufacturing in this country. That is going to come through scientific discovery and innovation, and that is what we are trying to promote here, and what you get from the Republicans is "we are not going there."

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. MILLER, the real issue here is that Mr. HOLT talks about the good old American spirit and being able to say that we want to conquer, we want to move forward with innovation.

You talk about the support, your support of No Child Left Behind; and, as you know, many States, Republican governors and Democratic governors have sued the U.S. government on the underfunding of No Child Left Behind.

I just want to make sure and our good friend, Mr. JAY INSLEE is here, and I am willing to give up the podium because he has been working on this issue. But for a very long time, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MILLER and others, you have been a part of putting together this innovation agenda that we have, printed well before the President's State of the Union as he comes up to say words of quote/unquote wisdom and encouragement, but at the same time put action behind it.

We have put action behind it. We as House Democrats have asked the majority to be a part of this experience of innovation. You are challenging the majority. But I am telling you, Mr. HOLT, I kind of know these folks right now. I kind of know they say one thing and they do another. And the issues that Mr. RYAN pointed out is the fact that it is not attractive to them for them to go out of their way to do what they need to do on behalf of their constituents and also on behalf of the American people.

And I urge the majority, I challenge the majority to go on the HouseDemocrats.gov, get a copy of our innovation agenda that talks about how we can put this country on the right track, not in a matter of 20 or 40 or something years but right now. We can start right now with that investment.

So I want to thank Mr. MILLER and yourself and others who spent a lot of time to put this together, not to just keep the printer in business but to make sure that we can do the things that we need to do on behalf of the American people.

Mr. HOLT. If the gentleman would yield, he is absolutely right to use the word "investment." That is where the

growth comes from, and it is probably worth taking a moment to talk about the difference between authorization and appropriation.

Authorization is what the Congress says we need to do for the coming years. Appropriations is whether you are going to put some meat behind it.

Rhetoric is cheap.

The National Science Foundation was supposed to be, according to the majority, on a doubling path. It is not. As I just told you, it is actually decreasing.

No Child Left Behind, as Mr. MILLER pointed out, is \$55 billion behind what was authorized, in other words, what was determined to be necessary to carry it out.

Now, let me put this in terms of a typical classroom has been short-changed about \$25,000. Now, ask a teacher what she or he could do over the last few years with an extra \$25,000 for teacher training, for special programs, for technology, for what it takes to have what we have demanded through No Child Left Behind.

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

### 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JINDAL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I accept the time, Mr. Speaker.

I wanted to, first of all, thank Mr. MILLER for his leadership. I am able to sit on the committee with him, on the Education Committee, and we go through these struggles all the time. But before we get to our friend, Mr. INSLEE from out west, who is very familiar with technology because of the mass amounts in his district, I want to put forth before I do that the 30-Something Group is pretty consistent. We do not want this to be about BILL DELAHUNT or RUSH HOLT or KENDRICK MEEK or GEORGE MILLER saying something.

□ 2100

We want to have a third-party validator, and so before we kick it over to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), I just want to say what some high-tech CEOs are talking about when they refer to our innovation agenda, the Democratic Innovation Agenda.

John Chambers, president and CEO of Cisco Systems, Incorporated: "The innovation agenda focuses on the right issues for building on our Nation's competitiveness, from investing in basic R&D, expanding science and math education and broadband infrastructure, to creating a globally competitive business environment . . . I look forward to working with both sides of the aisle to implement these

laudable goals." That is the CEO of Cisco Systems.

How about the Federal Government affairs managing director of Microsoft: "The policy agenda announced today by Democratic Leader PELOSI and her colleagues in the House Democratic Caucus to promote investment in education, research and development and innovation marks a positive step forward in the struggle to maintain our Nation's competitive edge in the global marketplace . . . At Microsoft, we are committed to changing the world through innovative technology and, in order to fulfill that commitment, we need a pool of well-educated, skilled workers. We ask Congress to give these issues serious consideration and support."

This is the CEO of Cisco Systems. This is the Federal Government affairs director at Microsoft. This is not TIM RYAN from Ohio who is toeing the line for the Democratic Party. This is the CEOs, many of them Republicans, saying this is the kind of investment we need to make. Go to our Web site and you can see the whole packetful of quotes that will be up there from CEOs from around the world.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. They are begging.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. They are begging for the leadership that we should be providing in this Chamber.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. They deserve it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), my good friend.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate you mentioning this little small business that has had a little success, it is called Microsoft, in my district that has been one area that has recognized the power of innovation. There are many others in my district.

I will just tell you, I want to mention a couple of my favorite constituents, about why they believe this Democratic Innovation Agenda makes sense, that we should seize the creative powers of Americans and put it in harness.

One of my favorite constituents, my mother, I talked to her today, and she was brimming with laughter. We had a great talk, and it was great to hear her laughing because she went through a tough patch with some health problems about 6 months ago, and it was a tough time for her.

Since then, she has got on a medical technology that was developed in Seattle by some brilliant doctors doing research in basic and applied research; and because of their work now done over a decade ago, my mother was laughing today and probably is alive today. The reason that she was laughing today is that someone had the wherewithal and the foresight to make an investment in basic research medical technology involving the blood system over 10 years ago.

We have rolled out this idea to increase and accelerate research in medical technology because we believe there