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

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

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

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

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

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

The Foundation is unique among the Federal Government’s scientific research agencies in that it supports science and engineering across all disciplines. Each year the National Science Foundation supports an average of 200,000 scientists, engineers, educators and students at universities,
Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

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

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

The National Science Foundation has done so many good things since its inception, and as I said, it is one of the leaders in the world. It also provided awards from the Office of Management and Budget just within the past few years as the most efficiently run government agency. Now, that is indeed an important prize. I understand we are going to have a few amendments to increase the budget of the National Science Foundation, and I think it is absurd to punish the best-operated government agency while we are continuing to fund other agencies which do not do as well, and we are not reducing their budget.

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

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

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

Every sewer that has been laid in the United States, every piece of clothing that the people in this room are wearing has been cut out by laser light, not scissors, but lasers guided around, cutting out the patterns before they are sewn together. I could go on and on with many other examples, including medical examples, by the way.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Making both research and the education of our children a national priority is not simply an investment in these fields. Our global competitiveness is directly linked to the ability of our math, science and engineering professionals to develop innovative technologies, policies and scientific breakthroughs.

It is imperative that we continue to invest in the best science research institutions in the world, in order to ensure that the United States maintains its proud traditions of education in science, technology, engineering and math, the STEM fields.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege to serve with him and to offer this strong bill to the floor today.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege to serve with him and to offer this strong bill to the floor today.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

It also supports the construction of major research facilities that are shared within and across many disciplines of the scientific community.
Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to Mr. KIRK for a colloquy.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Accordingly, I will be happy to work with the gentleman from Illinois, and I look forward to the committee providing direction to the U.S. EPA in a letter to that effect.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.
The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 2? The Clerk will designate section 3. The text of section 3 is as follows:

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) Fiscal Year 2008—

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

(2) Specific allocations of the amount authorized under paragraph (1)—

(A) $5,080,000,000 shall be made available for research and related activities, of which $115,000,000 shall be made available for the Major Research Instrumentation program according to section 8(7) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n–1); and

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

(i) $94,000,000 shall be for the Mathematics and Science Education Partnerships established under section 9 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n–2); and

(ii) $70,000,000 shall be for the Robert Noyce Scholarship Program established under section 10 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n–1); (ii) $90,000,000 shall be for the Science, Mathematics, Engineering, and Technology Talent Expansion Program established under section 8(7) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–38); and

(ii) $59,000,000 shall be made available for the Advanced Technological Education program as established by section 3(a) of the Scientific and Advanced-Technology Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–476); (C) $280,000,000 shall be made available for major research equipment and facilities construction;

(B) $12,350,000 shall be made available for the Office of the National Science Board; and

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

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

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

(F) $12,150,000 shall be made available for the Office of Inspector General.

(b) Fiscal Year 2009—

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

(2) Specific allocations—Of the amount authorized under paragraph (1)—

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

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

(i) $100,600,000 shall be for Mathematics and Science Education Partnerships established under section 9 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n–1); (ii) $101,000,000 shall be for the Robert Noyce Scholarship Program established under section 10 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n–1); (iii) $133,000,000 shall be for the Robert Noyce Scholarship Program established under section 10 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n–1); (iv) $329,450,000 shall be made available for the Major Research Instrumentation program established under section 8(7) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–38); and

(ii) $55,000,000 shall be for the Advanced Technological Education program as established by section 3(a) of the Scientific and Advanced-Technology Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–476); (C) $245,000,000 shall be made available for major research equipment and facilities construction;

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

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

(F) $12,150,000 shall be made available for the Office of Inspector General.

(c) Fiscal Year 2010—

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

(2) Specific allocations—Of the amount authorized under paragraph (1)—

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

(B) $1,003,000,000 shall be made available for the Robotic Technology Program established under section 9 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n–1); and

(C) $200,000,000 shall be for the Science, Mathematics, Engineering, and Technology Talent Expansion Program established under section 8(7) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–38); and

(D) $309,760,000 shall be made available for the Mathematics, Engineering, and Technology Talent Expansion Program established under section 8(7) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–38); and

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

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

(d) Fiscal Year 2011—

(1) In General.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation $7,493,000,000 for fiscal year 2011.

(2) Specific allocations—Of the amount authorized under paragraph (1)—

(A) $5,863,200,000 shall be made available for research and related activities, of which $131,700,000 shall be made available for the Major Research Instrumentation program;
number of preproposals that may be submitted by an institution, the Director shall allow the subsequent submission of a full proposal based on each preproposal that is determined to have merit following the Foundation’s merit review process.

(2) REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT OF POLICIES.—The Board shall review and assess the effects on research of changes in the policies of the NV. The Board shall determine whether current policies are well justified and appropriate for the types of programs that limit the number of proposal submissions. Not later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Board shall summarize its findings and any recommendations regarding changes to the current policy on the restriction of proposal submissions in a report to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate.

(g) RESEARCH EXPERIENCES FOR UNDERGRADUATES.—The Director shall allow the submission of full proposals in proportion to the increase in the total amount appropriated to the Foundation for research and related activities in any year for which appropriations are authorized by this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HONDA

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. Honda:

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

(h) GLOBAL WARMING EDUCATION.—

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

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

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

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

Some of you may recall, Mr. why I need to know this? Hundreds of years ago, Galileo and Sir Isaac Newton made remarkable discoveries about gravity and the behavior of falling objects, but to this day, most people couldn’t explain the law of gravity or what determines the speed of a falling object if they had to. Most of the time people can go on with their lives, their everyday lives, without understanding scientific concepts. In order to debate global warming, you don’t need to understand gravity to keep from falling. You don’t need to understand your lungs in order to breathe. But global warming presents a new kind of a problem.
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The understanding of global warming will play a significant role in our ability to actually address the problem. And, we don’t have much time. Global warming will cause significant impacts, including shifting weather patterns, drought, rising sea levels, and disrupted wildlife migration patterns.

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

These threats are the most natural consequences of a worldwide overreliance on fossil fuels and destructive, wasteful uses. We have lived on the earth, but we have not yet learned to live with the earth. But we can’t just give in to the fear and the sense of helplessness. We can turn the tide of global warming if we have the knowledge. That is why we need to know this.

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

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

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SULLIVAN TO AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HONDA

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. Honda:

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

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

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

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

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

It is important to me that the science education they receive in school reflect the diversity of scientific viewpoints on this important issue. This is something my friends on the other side of the aisle have long advocated for and something my amendment achieves.
With 36.4 million elementary school-aged children and 16.8 million high school-aged children in our country, it is obvious that the science education they get today will dramatically affect their future tomorrow.

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

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

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

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

Mr. BAIRD. I continue to reserve.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the sense of what the gentleman is raising with his second order amendment. Having taught science myself, I believe it is absolutely important to share different sides of it. My concern is I think you are sort of micromanaging the education process, however, positive your intent may be. And the gentleman himself just acknowledged that students from K–12 need to have balanced information. I question whether we really want to mandate that a kindergarten teacher educate her or his students on the impact of greenhouse gases on U.S. energy security, global developing nations, et cetera.

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

I would, however, note that the International Panel on Climate Change, which we have had two hearings of in this committee, has clearly unani-
mously agreed on some general prin-
ciples: That the climate temperature is increasing; that humans are signifi-
cantly responsible for a large sub-
stantial portion of that increase; and, that it will have very important con-
sequences for the well-being of the world.

So one of the problems I have is the gentleman’s amendment would seem to suggest that there is an equal weight of evidence against that perspective as there is in favor of it. And I don’t re-
call if the gentleman attended those two hearings, but if he did, I think it was pretty clear that scientists from around the world do not consider that there is an equal weight among those who might refute the evidence of global warming and the human causes thereof.

It is absolutely legitimate that we look at the pros and cons of the various strategies to remedy that; but to micromanage it in this way, which is not what the gentleman from California’s amendment did. I think there is a mistake. I certainly wouldn’t want a kindergarten teacher who is trying to educate her or his students about the potential problems of global warming to say, “Oh, my goodness. I don’t have in my curriculum for these 5-year-olds a lesson on the impact of greenhouse gas on developing nations or United States energy security.” I think a kind-
garten teacher might be much more likely to say, “Hey, kids the world is getting bigger and you and I and your folks can have a role in trying to re-
duce that problem, and it is in all of our best interests to do so.” I would hate to see a kindergarten teacher micromanaged like this, however well-intentioned the gentleman’s amendment is. And I still reserve the point of order, but if we don’t succeed in that, I certainly urge opposition to this at this point.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

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

The amendment was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes ap-
curred to have it.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I de-
mend a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. WELDON OF FLORIDA

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chair-
man, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will desig-
nate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as fol-
loows:

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

In section 3(a)(1), strike “There” and in-
sert “Except as provided in paragraph (3), there”:

At the end of section 3(a), insert the fol-
lowing new paragraph:

(3) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding para-
graphs (1) and (2), the total amount author-
ized to be appropriated under this subsection shall not exceed the amount actually appro-
priated for the Foundation for fiscal year 2007 if—

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

(B) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administra-
tion Space Operations for fiscal year 2008 is less than $3,923,800,000; or

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

In section 3(b)(1), strike “There” and insert “Except as provided in paragraph (3), there”:

At the end of section 3(b), insert the fol-
lowing new paragraph:

(3) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding para-
graphs (1) and (2), the total amount author-
ized to be appropriated under this subsection shall not exceed the amount actually appro-
priated for the Foundation for fiscal year 2008 if—

(A) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administra-
tion for fiscal year 2009 is less than $18,026,300,000; or

(B) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administra-
tion Exploration Operations for fiscal year 2009 is less than $4,312,800,000; or

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

In section 3(c)(1), strike “There” and insert “Except as provided in paragraph (3), there”:

Notwithstanding para-

section 3(c), insert the fol-
lowing new paragraph:

Notwithstanding para-

section 3(c), insert the fol-
lowing new paragraph:

(3) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding para-
graphs (1) and (2), the total amount author-
ized to be appropriated under this subsection shall not exceed the amount actually appro-
priated for the Foundation for fiscal year 2009 if—

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

(B) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administra-
tion Exploration Operations for fiscal year 2010 is less than $17,309,400,000; or

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

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to reserve a point of order on this amend-
ment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

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

My concern before the committee today is that the National Science Foundation is in the same budget cat-

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

So my amendment is very simple and very straightforward. Basically what it says is that we are not going to cut NASA for the purpose of plussing up the National Science Foundation. I believe we need to fund both of these programs, and that is my goal and that is the purpose of my amendment. I think the point of order which the author of this bill keep talking about, which is very revealing and I think very important to the debate we are having right now, they talk about the importance of training kids in math and science, and that we are failing behind in our international competitiveness. But I can tell you, when I talk to teachers all across the country about what motivates our young people to study math and science, it is not the level of grants that are coming out of the National Science Foundation, it is actually our space program and an enthusiasm for the possibility or the chance that they might some day be able to participate in the space program, the manned space flight program in particular that motivates our kids.

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

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

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

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

There are many, many places in the Federal budget where we could find possible money to support the gentleman’s aims, many within, for example, the Commerce appropriations bill.

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

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

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

POINT OF ORDER

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

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

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

The underlying section of the bill being amended is specific to the National Science Foundation, while the amendment introduces another unrelated agency, NASA, so the subject matter of the amendment is different than the underlying bill. In addition, the amendment places an unrelated contingency on the authorization of NSF funds. On this point I would cite Deschler’s Precedents, Chapter 28, section 31.22.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just simply point out to my friends on the other side that this amendment was duly and appropriately presented to the Rules Committee. The Rules Committee has all of the availability of the parliamentarians and the appropriate expertise to be able to determine whether or not the amendment should be made in order. They determined, in their wisdom, that it should be made in order. And therefore, I would hope that the Chair would rule that, in fact, this amendment is appropriate, and that it does address an issue of importance to the gentleman from Florida and importance to this Nation; and I would hope that we’d move forward with the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is inappropriate to exercise a point of order on this amendment. It’s quite clear that the NASA budget and the National Science Foundation are within the same budget category, function 250, and that there’s a strong relationship between increasing the National Science Foundation that it can have a negative impact on NASA. Furthermore, as my friend from Georgia just indicated, we have moved several bills through this body. Just today we did one where multiple points of order were waived. And the bottom line here, in my opinion, is NASA a priority for the new majority in this Congress. I don’t believe it is. I don’t believe it’s a sufficient enough priority, and I ask that the point of order not be sustained.

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

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

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

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

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida is, therefore, not germane. The point of order is sustained.
Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the Chair.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

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

(1) archives of Andean Knotted-String Records;

(2) the accuracy in the cross-cultural understanding of others’ emotions;

(3) bison hunting on the late prehistoric Great Plains;

(4) team versus individual play;

(5) sexual politics of waste in Dakar, Senegal;

(6) social relationships and reproductive strategies of Phayre’s Leaf Monkeys; and

(7) cognitive model of superstitious belief.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Looking to these studies, some of which are $10,000, now absolutely we must make sure that we spend all the taxpayer dollars wisely. But let me just share with you what the American Association for Advancement of Science, probably the most prestigious scientific body in this country, has said. Prohibiting specific grants sets a dangerous precedent for scientific research that has progressed and advanced for decades through freedom of inquiry into a broad spectrum of subjects. While congressional oversight of Federal programs is, of course, important, second-guessing peer review in this way could compromise the fabric of our public research enterprise one thread at a time. Therefore, we urge you to oppose such amendments.

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

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

Now, my wager is the gentleman’s saying to himself right now, I have no idea what the chairman is speaking about, because I’ve been talking about another budget problem. When you look at a cursory examination of the title, or an abstract, you don’t have an idea. That’s why we have peer review.

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

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

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.
Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

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

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

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

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I thank very much the gentleman for yielding.

And I would just caution I don't think the research by the title. This was evident a few years ago when we went through exactly the same charade when discussing the National Science Foundation budget. Some of my colleagues came down to the floor to amend the NSF appropriations bill, and one offered an amendment to remove grants for the operation of ATM. Perhaps even in the National Science Foundation or the Department of Energy to study ATM. His argument was, let the banking industry do this. I recommend to the floor. What he didn't know is that the proposal was not on automatic teller machines but the proposal was on studying asynchronous transfer modes, which involves the way computers talk to each other. This proposed change in the speed at which computers were able to talk to each other.

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

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

So I urge defeat of this amendment.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I suggest candidly that it was a valiant attempt. But it was truly a valiant attempt, and I appreciate the attempt, to make a justification for bison hunting on the Late Prehistoric Great Plains. I would also suggest that the sexual politics of waste in Dakar, Senegal is a questionable study.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the political statement you want to make is whether or not these things have academic merit within a field of academics. It is a question of whether they are worthy of spending taxpayer money in that area. I think they are not.

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

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

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

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

Mr. BAIRD. Let me just share with the gentleman the dangerous path you are on. There was a study some time back dealing with the sex life of the screw worm, perhaps apropos not of the sex life of the screw worm, that would be pretty tempting to come to the floor and say, by God, we are making taxpayer dollars studying the sex life of the screw worm! The reason being that that research saved the cattle industry millions of dollars by eliminating a parasite that deposited eggs in the placenta of newborn cows.

We don't have the knowledge. We are indeed stewards of the taxpayers' money, which is why we created the National Science Foundation. We are very careful about designating how the peer-review process works, and, quite frankly, why we shouldn't mess with that peer-review process. If we truly want to be stewards of the taxpayers' money, which I believe all of us want to be, then our best approach is to delegate some of the decision making about where some of that money is spent to those who best know the realm in which the research is spent. It is precisely because I believe in the task of being a steward of the taxpayer dollars that I oppose the general purpose of the amendment.

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

And I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding.

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

Just a couple of points and then I will yield.

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

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

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

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

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

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

And I appreciate the comments of my good friend from Washington, who said, and I think it got down correctly, "We are neither trained nor have expertise in this area." And you are absolutely right. But consistency is a wonderful thing and inconsistency is a challenge.

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

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

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

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

Mr. EHLERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all, I'll make a deal with you. I won't make any judgments about medical research if you don't make judgments about NSF research. The point of this really is that you cannot predict what will result from the research; that is the idea behind basic research.

Years ago when I was a graduate student at Berkeley, we were spending tremendous amounts of money to examine the behavior of elementary particles, protons, neutrons, mesons, and so on. And no one, even in the scientific community, could ever imagine any practical use for that. But later on the results from doing that research led to the development of a CAT scanner and...
the MRI. Now, who would ever have thought that elementary particle physics would lead to major findings in medicine which every doctor relies upon today?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So this is a cut; this is a reduction. It does not deal with, as the gentleman from Washington mentioned, it does not specifically say what, it leaves that issue open. So, therefore, it does not interfere with the selection of those various proposals and research things that the gentleman from Washington just supported in the last amendment.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I would just say "aye".

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The following countries are increasing their investment in basic research faster than this legislation would authorize, and they've already put the money up front. Listen to these countries see what it is wise for our Nation to reduce its investment even further, and further fall behind: China, Taiwan, European Union, South Korea, Singapore and others. Do we seriously want to further reduce our investment in basic research if we want to keep our Nation competitive? I submit we don't, and I would urge defeat of this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

As I referenced before, when I go back to my constituents back at home in town hall meetings and the like, they are not seeing 7 percent increases in their wages and salaries. They are not seeing a doubling of their incomes and their family household incomes. They may be seeing that as far as their expenses are concerned. They are seeing all other sorts of increases in spending, such as gasoline prices and the like that they have to put up with, but, they are not seeing the increases in income and expenditures that we are seeing in this bill.

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

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

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

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment, because it is our duty simply as stewards of our constituents' money, the taxpayers' dollars, as we hope to maintain our prosperity today came from those investments that have come out of funding by the National Science Foundation.

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

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

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

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

I will tell you, I just spoke to a scientist in my district last week and he...
said to me, Congressman, the pipeline of U.S. scientists is drying up. You just really have to understand this. The pipeline of U.S.-based scientists is drying up, because the research funding is not adequate to meet the demand.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1867, the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2007. This bill is another important component of the new Democratic majority’s Innovation Agenda, which is designed to make our Nation more able to compete successfully in the global economy.

Mr. Chairman, to ensure that the United States will continue to have a workforce ready for global competition, it is essential that we make a sustained commitment to federal research and development. The National Science Foundation is crucial to these goals, providing vital support to our Nation’s science and engineering projects and researchers.

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

This bill reaffirms our commitment to scientific excellence by reauthorizing the National Science Foundation (NSF) for three years and providing nearly $21 billion in funding for fiscal years 2008–2010. This legislation appropriates specific funding for each of the NSF’s major accounts: research and related activities, education and human resources, major research equipment and facilities construction, agency operations and award management, the National Science Board and the Inspector General. A number of specific programs within the science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) educational categories are singled out as the recipients of funding. Additionally, specific funding is designated for Major Research Instrumentation (MRI) awards. By raising the cap for these awards, this bill allows the NSF to support a wider range of state-of-the-art research tools. This bill contains many other important provisions. It requires an evaluation of NSF’s role in conducting interdisciplinary research, and encourages university and industry partnerships. It encourages young investigators through a new grant program, and it requires a National Academy of Sciences report on barriers to and strategies for increasing the participation of underrepresented minorities in STEM fields.

The NSF ensures a continued national supply of scientific and engineering personnel, while promoting basic research and education across a wide array of scientific and technological disciplines. In the interest of both economic capability, the United States must continue producing a workforce knowledgeable to maintain technological competitiveness. If we are to do this,
this Congress must continue funding and strengthening science and mathematics education. Supporting this bill is an important step, and I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. EHlers. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

One huge element of cost in health care is cancer treatment. Today at lunch I met with the latest seven Nobel Prize winners of all of whom happen to be from America because we support this research.

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. EHlers. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Baird. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding, and I thank Mr. Ehlers for his comments.

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT. The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.
Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In the amendment before us right now, we look to see what is the underlying mission of the NSF. If we look at their mission statement, we see it is:

‘‘To promote the progress of science, and to secure the national defense.’’

To promote the progress of science, and to secure the national defense.‘‘

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

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

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

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

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

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

And for you or I to presume that we have the expertise to say that we don’t think this study will do that because we know so much about menopause, sir, and I count myself among those “sirs.” I think is vastly presumptuous.

Menopause is profoundly important to the women of this country. This study deals with menopause, and I am tremendously grateful to the gentleman for picking this study because in so doing, you have made the best possible case for not micromanaging this fine agency.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

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

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

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

Would that it be the case as a Congress and we as a House to have that same brilliance in our decisionmaking when we make decisions regarding health care. Again, as a physician, this Chamber makes incredible decisions that affect the very personal health care of individuals and one hopes that whatever it be, and takes the decision making authority from physicians and patients in an inappropriate way, I believe.
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We also this past week determined as a Chamber, the majority party has determined that they have greater knowledge about the specific military activities that ought to occur on the ground as it relates to our brave men and women fighting to defend our liberty and our freedom. However, the majority party apparently believes that it is appropriate for them to make specific decisions what our commanders ought to be doing on a day-to-day basis.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate section 4.

The text of section 4 is as follows:

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

(a) FUNDING FOR CENTERS.—The Director shall continue to carry out the program of Centers for Research on Learning and Education Improvement as established in section 11 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n–2).
should be funding, that we have extra money to actually fund people who did not get the grants to help them improve their proposals that they might get a grant next year?

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

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

I have heard from the other side, those defending the current budget and arguing against proposals to actually cut specific programs, that we have a peer review process and that these grants should only be given out that way. I am glad to hear that because my guess is when we come 3 months from now or 2 months from now to the appropriations process, in the S&SC budget, to the side of the aisle, from this side of the aisle, to fund specific research grants, some of whom were turned down during the peer review process. So this notion that you have got to have peer review and I doubt that have the money edge, I will confess that, but then why in the world are we earmarking like we are?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I am particularly pleased that this bill emphasizes our need to develop our human capital in the STEM fields. I would also like to thank my colleague and friend Congresswoman EDDIE BERENS JOHNSON for her work in including this amendment and the important role, and far from being marginalized, this is right about that. There is a lot of private industry research. Let me share with the gentleman some of the private industry bodies that endorse this bill, and the list is very impressive.

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

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

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

I am particularly pleased that this bill emphasizes our need to develop our human capital in the STEM fields. I would also like to thank my colleague and friend Congresswoman EDDIE BERENS JOHNSON for her work in including this amendment and the important role, and far from being marginalized, this is right about that. There is a lot of private industry research. Let me share with the gentleman some of the private industry bodies that endorse this bill, and the list is very impressive. I have got it. I would be happy to share. If it is so secret and needs to be dramatically modified, these are the organizations that support it:


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

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

As for the gentleman's amendment per se, I share with the gentleman that much of this legislation develops from research conducted by the National Academy of Sciences, The National Science Foundation, and of this amendment lying bill, H.R. 1867.

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

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

What it may well have said is it is a very good application. The competition and the constrained funding, in its current state, we will not choose it.
What this bill does is basically say to the young investigator, we will give you some help in advancing your career so you can make a second run at this. This is supported by the National Science Foundation. Folks who have done this research, and I have written applications for a few grants, I am sure Dr. Ehlers has, it takes you a while to learn how to do it.

Sometimes the young professors who are the very people who are teaching the undergraduate classes, trying to get through the Congress. We believe that only 25 percent of the gentleman makes the point, we are happy to help.

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

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

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

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

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

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

I would also suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman makes the point appropriately that only 25 percent of the grants are accepted. So why should we waste Federal dollars on teaching individuals who have other avenues to be able to determine how to fill out their grant application appropriately? Why should we waste precious Federal dollars that could go to, in fact, the kinds of cures that he is endeavoring to fund with the moneys that he is advocating? What I think are those Federal dollars in this kind of endeavor, which, I think, is frankly ill-founded and not needed.

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

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentleman, and I commend him for his amendment. I am pleased to yield to my good friend from Michigan.

Mr. EHLERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, let the gentleman from Arizona, I totally agree with your comments about earmarks. I have fought hard here to keep this body and the other body from providing earmarks for scientific research, because all grants should go through the peer review process.

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

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

So it’s a very good symbiotic relationship.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I object.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will designate section 7. The text of section 7 is as follows:

SEC. 7. BROADER IMPACTS MERIT REVIEW CRITERIA.

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

(b) PARTNERSHIPS WITH INDUSTRY.—The Director shall encourage research proposals from institutions of higher education that involve partnerships with businesses and organizations representing businesses in fields that have been identified as having high importance for future national economic competitiveness that include input on the research agenda from and cost-sharing by the industry partners.
(c) REPORT ON BROADER IMPACTS CRITERION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall transmit to Congress a report on the impact of the broader impacts criterion used by the Foundation. The report shall—

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

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

(3) provide any evaluations performed by the Foundation to assess the degree to which the broader impacts aspects of research proposals were carried out to meet the broader impacts criterion; and

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

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

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

The Clerk will designate section 8.

The text of section 8 is as follows:

SEC. 8. POSTDOCTORAL RESEARCH FELLOWS.

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

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

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

The Clerk will designate section 9.

The text of section 9 is as follows:

SEC. 9. RESPONSIBLE CONDUCT OF RESEARCH.

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

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

The Clerk will designate section 10.

The text of section 10 is as follows:

SEC. 10. REPORTING OF RESEARCH RESULTS.

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

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

The Clerk will designate section 11.

The text of section 11 is as follows:

SEC. 11. SHARING RESEARCH RESULTS.

An investigator supported under a Foundation award, whom the Director determines has failed to comply with the provisions of section 4 of the Policy Manual, shall be ineligible for a future award under any Foundation supported program or activity. The Director may determine that such an investigator is no longer eligible on the basis of the investigator’s subsequent compliance with the provisions of section 734 of the Foundation Grant Policy Manual and such terms and conditions as the Director may impose.

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

The Clerk will designate section 12.

The text of section 12 is as follows:

SEC. 12. FUNDING FOR SUCCESSFUL STEM EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

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

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

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

(b) CONTINUATION OF FUNDING.—For grants that are identified under subsection (a) and that are deemed by the Director to be successful in meeting the objectives of the initial grant solicitation, the Director may extend the duration of those grants for up to 3 additional years beyond their scheduled expiration date at the request of the investigator on the basis of the investigator’s policies for allocation of costs for, and oversight of, maintenance and operation of major research equipment and facilities, except that such grants shall not be extended for more than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit a report to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Science and Technology of the Senate a report cataloging all elementary and secondary school, two-year and four-year college, and under- graduate educational programs and activities supported through appropriations for Research and Related Activities. The report shall describe the programs and activities by directorate, along with estimated funding levels for the fiscal years 2006, 2007, and 2008, and shall provide a description of the goals of each program and activity. The report shall also describe how the programs and activities relate to or are coordinated with the programs supported by the Education and Human Resources Directorate.

(d) ANNUAL PLAN FOR ALLOCATION OF FUNDING TO UNDERGRADUATE INSTITUTIONS PROGRAM.—The Director shall transmit to Congress along with the fiscal year 2011 budget request a report listing the funding requirements and distribution of awards for the Research in Undergraduate Institutions program, by type of institution based on the highest academic degree conferred by the institution, for fiscal years 2008, 2009, and 2010.

(e) ANNUAL PLAN FOR ALLOCATION OF FUNDING TO HUMAN RESOURCES FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and each subsequent annual plan for the allocation of funding for the Foundation, the Director shall submit to the
Committee on Science and Technology and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the Committee on Education, Labor, and Pensions, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, a plan for the allocation of education and human resources funds authorized by the Act. The plan shall include: (1) the amounts to be prescribed by the Board in connection with the effective instruction of mathematics, science, engineering, and technology; and (2) the allocation of funds under that subsection. The Acting CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 16? The Clerk will designate section 16. The text of section 16 is as follows: SEC. 16. ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENTS. (a) FUNDING OF OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD.—Section 15(a) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862s-5) is amended— (1) by striking “an annual audit” and inserting “an audit every three years”; (2) in paragraph (4), by striking “each year” and inserting “every third year”; and (3) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph: “(5) MATERIALS RELATING TO CLOSED PORTIONS OF MEETINGS.—To facilitate the audit required under paragraph (3) of this subsection, the Office of the National Science Board shall maintain the General Counsel’s certificate, the presidential record, and any transcript or recording of any closed meeting, for at least 3 years after such meeting.”. (b) BUDGET FOR PERSONNEL FOR THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD.—Subsection (g) of section 4 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 1863(g)) is amended to read as follows: “(g) The Board may, with the concurrence of a majority of its members, permit the appointment of a staff consisting of not more than 5 professional staff members, technical and professional personnel on leave of absence from academic, industrial, or research institutions for a limited term and such operations and support staff members as may be necessary. Such staff shall be appointed by the Chairman and assigned at the direction of the Board. The professional members and limited term technical and professional personnel of such staff may be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and the provisions of chapter 31 of title 5 relating to classification, and shall be compensated at a rate not exceeding the maximum rate payable under section 5316 of such title, as may be necessary to provide fair compensation for such duties as may be prescribed by the Board in connection with the exercise of its powers and functions under this Act. Section 14(a)(3) shall apply to each limited term member of such staff. The Board may make such grants to the Director for the purpose of providing professional personnel under this subsection. Each appointment under this subsection shall be subject to the same security requirements as those required for personnel of the Foundation appointed under section 14(a).”.

(c) INCREASE IN NUMBER OF WATERMAN AWARD RECIPIENTS.—Paragraph (a) of section 14(j) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1975 (42 U.S.C. 1881a) is amended to read as follows: “(c) Up to three awards may be made under this section.”.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 16? The text of section 17 is as follows: SEC. 17. NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD REPORTS. (a) TRIANNUAL AUDIT OF THE OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD. Paragraph (a)(1) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1863(j)(1)) and (a)(2) are amended by striking “” for submission to “” and “for submission to”. The Acting CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 17? The text of section 18 is as follows: SEC. 18. NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCE REPORT ON DIVERSITY IN STEM FIELDS. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Foundation shall enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences to prepare a report, to be transmitted to the Congress not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, about barriers to increasing the number of underrepresented minorities in science, engineering, and mathematics fields and to identify strategies for bringing more underrepresented minorities into the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics workforce. (b) SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS.—The Director shall ensure that the study described in subsection (a) addresses— (1) social and institutional factors that shape the decisions of minority students to commit to education and careers in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields; (2) precipitating barriers preventing greater minority student participation in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields; (3) primary focus points for policy intervention to increase the recruitment and retention of underrepresented minorities in America’s future workforce; (4) programs already underway to increase diversity in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields, and their level of effectiveness; (5) factors that make such programs effective, and how to expand and improve upon existing programs; (6) the role of minority-serving institutions in the diversification of America’s workforce in these fields and how that role can be supported and strengthened; and (7) how the public and private sectors can better assist minority students in their efforts to join America’s workforce in these fields.

Amendment No. 8 Offered by Ms. Matsui
Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.
The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Ms. Matsui at the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 19. COMMUNICATIONS TRAINING FOR SCIENTISTS.

(a) GRANT SUPPLEMENTS FOR COMMUNICATIONS TRAINING.—The Director shall provide grant supplements, on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis, to institutions receiving awards under the Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship program. The grant supplements shall be used to train graduate students in the communication of the substance and importance of their research to nonscientist audiences, including policymakers.

A BILL TO AMEND THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT TO授權.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall transmit a report to the Committee on Science, Technology, and Transportation of the Senate, describing how the activities required under subsection (a) have been implemented. The report shall include data on the number of graduate students enrolled in the number and size of grant supplements awarded, and a description of the types of activities funded through the grant supplements. The Director shall designate this amendment to the NSF reauthorization is designed to improve the ability of scientists to communicate with non-scientific audiences such as businesses, the media, the general public and, of course, Members of Congress. Specifically, my amendment would add a provision to H.R. 1667 that authorizes a science communications initiative at the National Science Foundation.

I believe this proposal will encourage people are getting a much better role on the Federal Government’s investment in the National Science Foundation as possible. By implementing this program, it would diversify the education of our scientists and would ensure that policymakers and other nonscientists have better access to the technical expertize fostered by NSF and the Nation’s broader research enterprise, because if scientists can’t tell the rest of us what they have discovered, we are not fully recognizing the benefits of our investment in scientific research. Unfortunately, the ability to articulate the content and significance of scientific information is often overlooked by graduate training programs. My amendment addresses this unmet need and would create a pipeline of scientists who are increasingly engaged with nonscientists, including policymakers, business leaders and educators. Providing communications training to our scientists will ensure that we, the policymakers, can make the most informed decisions possible as we debate technical issues and craft policy.

This amendment creates a competitively reviewed supplement within the Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship, or IGERT program. Investigators at IGERT-awardee institutions will compete for resources to develop and implement communications training. The IGERT program will administer the competitive review process for this communications training initiative. I received strong support for this program from stakeholders in my district of Sacramento and from across the country. Policymakers, scientists, educators, business leaders and science writers all agree we need to better integrate scientific expertise into the public debate.

This amendment represents an important step toward that goal. That is...
why this amendment has received the endorsement of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and The Council of Graduate Schools.

This amendment is based on the Scientific Communication Act of 2007, H.R. 1469, if I am correct, with Chair-
man Gordon as an original cosponsor. I would like to thank Chairman Gordon, Mr. Hope, Mr. Allen, Mr. Inslee and Mr. Higgins for their cosponsorship of that legislation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I think most Members of this body have had people from the scientific community come and talk to us about why their research matters or how it is going to help society, and we have said to ourselves or to them, "Could you please put it in English so I know what you are talking about?" The challenge is that the esoteric realm that some of the scientists work in is really beyond some of our ken. And I think that is fine. But if we are going to make informed policy decisions, it is essential that we understand the research that we are making decisions about that may have been illustrated earlier tonight in some of the discussion.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Recently, the Department of Education has developed programs involving professional development for teachers in elementary and secondary schools to try to bring them up to speed on the latest developments in math and science and how to teach them. They ended up calling it the math-science partnership. This has resulted in a problem because some in the administration decided to cut science, and it was the National Science Foundation because they felt this was a duplication of programs. It is not.

The National Science Foundation concentrates on doing research. The Foundation’s model is designed for competitive grants to spur innovative programs that will peer reviewed and evaluated to enhance research on effective math and science education, whereas the Department of Education ensures that this knowledge is disseminated to districts as best as possible. Knowledge gained from the competitive foundation scholarships, in other words the National Science Foundation math-science partnerships, can be used and is used to prove and enhance State investments in programs developed by the Department of Education.

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

Another reason why we would like to thank Committee GORDON,
Ranking Member HALL, and my good friend Mr. BAIRD for bringing H.R. 1867, the National Science Foundation Reauthorization Act, to the floor. This is a very important bill that will benefit our young scientists for generations to come.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The NSF already supports similar programs for Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Tribal Colleges, and this amendment will allow Hispanic-serving institutions to better serve our future leaders and scientists.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

They are just a few of the colleges that will benefit from this amendment.

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

Mr. Chair, I rise today to support the McNerney-Giffords amendment. This amendment establishes a new competitive grants program specifically for Hispanic-Serving Institutions at the National Science Foundation.
I would like to thank Representatives McNerney and Representative Giffords for their leadership in offering this amendment, which will increase opportunities for so many undergraduate students.

This amendment will focus attention on the need for more Hispanic students in the science field by creating a specific program for Hispanic-Serving Institutions to receive infrastructure development funding.

I would also like to thank Chairman Gordon, Subcommittee Chairman Baird, and the staff of the Science and Technology Committee for their assistance in drafting this amendment, and for their commitment to increasing participation of minorities in the science and technology fields.

Hispanic-Serving Institutions serve the majority of the nearly two million Hispanic students enrolled in college today, and many of these institutions offer associate, undergraduate, and graduate programs and degrees in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields.

The Hispanic-Serving Institutions Undergraduate Program created by this amendment will allow these colleges and universities to access the funding they need to enhance their educational programs.

In my district alone, about 10,000 students attend Hispanic-Serving Institutions for undergraduate and graduate degree in science fields. Students at institutions throughout Queens and the Bronx, including Lehman College, Bronx Community College, Hostos Community College, LaGuardia Community College, Vaughn College of Aeronautics and Technology, and the College of St. Vincent, like those all across the country, will benefit from increased access to funding to improve these degree programs.

This amendment corrects a long-standing inequity at the National Science Foundation. Unlike their counterparts of Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Tribal Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-Serving Institutions have not benefited from a specific program to provide them with grants for research, curriculum, and infrastructure development.

Without access to targeted capacity-building grants, Hispanic-Serving Institutions have difficulty increasing the ranks of Hispanics in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields, where they have been historically underrepresented. Studies show that Hispanics earn less than 3 percent of doctorates in these areas, compared to more than 50 percent by non-Hispanic whites.

This amendment also goes to the heart of the Innovation Agenda spearheaded by Speaker Pelosi and Senate Majority Leader Reid. It strengthens the Hispanic-Serving Institutions in this process, we can reach out to and involve more of the Hispanic educational community.

The National Science Foundation, through its undergraduate and graduate programs, can assist Hispanic-Serving Institutions in developing programs to prepare current and future generations of Hispanics and other minority professionals in the sciences.

I applaud the establishment of a Hispanic-Serving Institutions Undergraduate Program to achieve these goals, and I urge passage of this excellent amendment by Representatives McNerney and Giffords.

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

The prior speakers have been very eloquent in support of this and the hour is late; so I won't go into any detail. I just want to commend them for their leadership on this and urge support of this outstanding amendment.

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

I want to commend my colleagues as well for bringing what would on its face value be seen as a remarkably new and innovative program. In fact, I think as the gentleman said, advancing the Democratic innovation agenda.

Well, it is curious, Mr. Chairman, because if you look and look specifically at the language that is in this amendment, and it is to be commended indeed, it bears striking resemblance to the language in current law. In fact, the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002, section 24 has language that is exactly the same as is in this amendment.

So I want to commend my colleagues for being inventive and being innovative indeed.

I also think it would be appropriate for them to cite, in fact, where the original language came from, and that was the prior Republican Congress. So I commend my colleagues for their innovation, indeed, in formulating an amendment that is already in place in current law.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. Price of Georgia.

Mr. Price of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting Chairman. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. Price of Georgia.

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

SEC. 19. REQUIREMENT OF OFFSETS.

(a) in the Generalization of appropriations made by this Act or other provisions of this Act that results in costs to the Federal Government shall be effective except to the extent that this Act provides for offsetting decreases in spending of the Federal Government, such that the net effect of this Act does not otherwise increase the Federal deficit or reduce the Federal surplus.

(b) Definitions. In this section, the terms "deficit" and "surplus" have the meanings given such terms in the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.).

Mr. Price of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I know the hour is late and we are drawing to a close on this, and I think this is an appropriate amendment upon which to end for this is the amendment that allows us as a Congress to say, yes, indeed, we believe that fiscal responsibility is important.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, this bill, the National Science Foundation Authorization Act, authorizes $20.973 billion, nearly $21 billion, over 3 years and creates five new Federal programs. The National Science Foundation Authorization Act establishes a pilot program of 1-year seed grants for new investigators to help improve funding rates for young investigators and to stimulate higher-risk research. It encourages the NSF to foster relationships between academia and industry in order to spawn U.S. competitiveness and furthers the Agency's traditions of education in science, technology, engineering, and math.

The NSF has a mission to achieve excellence in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education at all levels and all settings from kindergartens through postdoctoral training, from classrooms to science museums and online resources. Having done so for the last half century. And while what this bill does is extremely important, equally important is this amendment that will apply the principle of pay as you go to any new spending authorized by this legislation by requiring that any new spending have a specific offset.

The amendment provides that no authorization of appropriations made by this Act that results in costs to the Federal Government shall be effective unless there are decreases in spending elsewhere in the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, common sense dictates that is what we should do. Now we need to follow through on the promises by this new majority. An excerpt of "A New Direction for America," which was proposed by House Democrats in the 109th Congress as their plan for the majority, it reads: “Our New Direction is committed to pay-as-you-go budgeting, no more deficit spending. We are committed to auditing the books and subjecting every facet of Federal spending to tough budget discipline and accountability, forcing the Congress to choose a new direction and the right priorities for all Americans.”

Well, hear, hear, Mr. Chairman. I heartily agree. But on April 18, Majority Leader Hoyer was quoted in Roll Call as saying, "We want to get the budget deficit under control. We have said that fiscal responsibility was necessary, but we're not going to be hoisted on the torrent of fiscal irresponsibility."

Well, Mr. Chairman, Americans all across this Nation are being shaken down by a "torrent" of fiscal irresponsibility.
I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, the rules are not rules if you only follow them when you want to. The Democrats promised pay-as-you-go rules for everything. Instead, they are picking and choosing, picking and choosing when to do so. At home, we call that breaking a rule and breaking a promise.

So while what this bill does is extremely important, $20.973 billion is a considerable amount of money even here in Washington, and it is equally important that we are good stewards of the hard-earned money of the American people. We should not limit our talk about fiscal responsibility only when it is politically convenient.

So I urge the new majority to reevaluate itself to the principle of pay-as-you-go spending. Fiscal responsibility shouldn't be something that is just talked about only on the campaign trail.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this commonsense, fiscally responsible, pay-as-you-go amendment. Mr. EHlers, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

In the midst of all this serious debate about an extremely important bill, I would like to pause just a moment to have a lighter moment that we can all enjoy as we recognize that one of our leading Members in this Congress tomorrow reaches a major milestone. The ranking member of the Science Committee from Texas, Mr. RALPH HALL, tomorrow will begin the second half of his life. He reaches the age of 84 tomorrow. So we can all celebrate with him and appreciate the tremendous contributions he has made to this Congress and to this country.

And I think it is entirely appropriate that on the eve of this important occasion, he spends the entire evening in the midst of all this serious debate about an extremely important bill, I would like to pause just a moment to have a lighter moment that we can all enjoy as we recognize that one of our leading Members in this Congress tomorrow reaches a major milestone. The ranking member of the Science Committee from Texas, Mr. RALPH HALL, tomorrow will begin the second half of his life. He reaches the age of 84 tomorrow. So we can all celebrate with him and appreciate the tremendous contributions he has made to this Congress and to this country.

And I think it is entirely appropriate that on the eve of this important occasion, he spends the entire evening in the midst of all this serious debate about an extremely important bill, I would like to pause just a moment to have a lighter moment that we can all enjoy as we recognize that one of our leading Members in this Congress tomorrow reaches a major milestone. The ranking member of the Science Committee from Texas, Mr. RALPH HALL, tomorrow will begin the second half of his life. He reaches the age of 84 tomorrow. So we can all celebrate with him and appreciate the tremendous contributions he has made to this Congress and to this country.

And I think it is entirely appropriate that on the eve of this important occasion, he spends the entire evening in the midst of all this serious debate about an extremely important bill, I would like to pause just a moment to have a lighter moment that we can all enjoy as we recognize that one of our leading Members in this Congress tomorrow reaches a major milestone. The ranking member of the Science Committee from Texas, Mr. RALPH HALL, tomorrow will begin the second half of his life. He reaches the age of 84 tomorrow. So we can all celebrate with him and appreciate the tremendous contributions he has made to this Congress and to this country.

And I think it is entirely appropriate that on the eve of this important occasion, he spends the entire evening in the midst of all this serious debate about an extremely important bill, I would like to pause just a moment to have a lighter moment that we can all enjoy as we recognize that one of our leading Members in this Congress tomorrow reaches a major milestone. The ranking member of the Science Committee from Texas, Mr. RALPH HALL, tomorrow will begin the second half of his life. He reaches the age of 84 tomorrow. So we can all celebrate with him and appreciate the tremendous contributions he has made to this Congress and to this country.

And I think it is entirely appropriate that on the eve of this important occasion, he spends the entire evening in the midst of all this serious debate about an extremely important bill, I would like to pause just a moment to have a lighter moment that we can all enjoy as we recognize that one of our leading Members in this Congress tomorrow reaches a major milestone. The ranking member of the Science Committee from Texas, Mr. RALPH HALL, tomorrow will begin the second half of his life. He reaches the age of 84 tomorrow. So we can all celebrate with him and appreciate the tremendous contributions he has made to this Congress and to this country.
Messrs. JOHNSON of Illinois, DAVIS of Indiana, REYES and RUSH changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HONDA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote. A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 252, noes 165, not voting 20, as follows:

[A Roll No. 388]

AYES—252

[Names of members who voted "aye"]

NOES—165

[Names of members who voted "noe"]

NOTE—20

Not voting are the Members who were excused from voting. Members are advised to note the vote in the record.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised to note the vote in the record.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinishing business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by vote.
Mr. ROYBAL-ALLARD of California. The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment. The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded. A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 115, noes 20, not voting 21, as follows:

(Roll No. 290)

AYES—115

Mr. Chairman, during Rollcall vote No. 289 on the amendment, there were—a 2-minute vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be recorded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 115, noes 301, not voting 21, as follows:

(Roll No. 290)

AYES—115

Mr. Chairman, during Rollcall vote No. 289 on the amendment, there were—a 2-minute vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be recorded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—a yes 115, noes 301, not voting 21, as follows:

(Roll No. 290)

AYES—115

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 115, noes 20, not voting 21, as follows:

(Roll No. 290)

AYES—115

Mr. Chairman, during Rollcall vote No. 289 on the amendment, there were—a 2-minute vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be recorded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—a yes 115, noes 301, not voting 21, as follows:

(Roll No. 290)
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**AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. GARBETT OF NEW JERSEY**

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARBETT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

**RECORDED VOTE**

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote to be taken was electronic, and there were—ayes 126, noes 292, not voting 19, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roll No. 291</th>
<th>AYES—126</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Complete list of votes]
The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed on the yeas vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 232, noes 186, not voting 19, as follows:

AYES—232

(Amendment No. 293)

[Roll No. 293]

AYES—232

A recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Ms. MATSUI) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed on the yeas vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 232, noes 186, not voting 19, as follows:

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 232, noes 186, not voting 19, as follows:

AYES—232

(Amendment No. 293)
The Acting CHAIRMAN. The amendment was agreed to. The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 235, not voting 19, as follows:

AYES—183

Baker, Tom...

NOES—235

Baker, Tom...

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a re-
corded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN redesignates the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded. A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 235, not voting 19, as follows:

AYES—183

Baker, Tom...

NOES—235

Baker, Tom...
Amending the Rules of the House to Clarify Certain Matters Relating to Official Conduct

Resolved, that Clause 15 of rule XXIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"15. (a) Except as provided in paragraph (b) a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may not use personal funds, official funds, or campaign funds for a flight on an aircraft.

(b) Paragraph (a) does not apply if:

(1) the flight consists of the personal use of an aircraft owned by an entity that is not a commercial air carrier; or

(2) the flight is required to be conducted under air carrier safety rules, or, in the case of travel which is abroad, by an air carrier or commercial operator certified by the Federal Aviation Administration and the flight is required to be conducted under air carrier safety rules; or, in the case of travel which is abroad, by an air carrier or commercial operator certified by an appropriate foreign civil aviation authority and the flight is required to be conducted under air carrier safety rules; or, in the case of travel which is abroad, by an air carrier or commercial operator certified by an appropriate foreign civil aviation authority and the flight is required to be conducted under air carrier safety rules;

(3) the flight consists of the personal use of an aircraft owned by an entity that is not a public corporation in which the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner or her or his family member has an ownership interest, provided that such Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner does not use the aircraft any more than the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner (or her or his family members) proportionate share of ownership allows; and

(4) the flight consists of the personal use of an aircraft owned by an entity that is not a public corporation in which the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner or her or his family member has an ownership interest, provided that such Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner does not use the aircraft any more than the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner (or her or his family members) proportionate share of ownership allows; and

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced aloud as follows: "So the bill was passed."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

So the bill was passed.