



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 20, 2015

No. 78

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
May 20, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable EARL L. CARTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

### WOMEN ON 20s CAMPAIGN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, the voting was going on for months spearheaded by the Women on 20s campaign. A nominee was announced last week. Women on 20s is a campaign that has been agitating to have a woman's portrait, the portrait of a great American woman, placed on the \$20 bill by at least 2020, the 100th anniversary of the U.S. recognizing a woman's right to vote.

The Women on 20s campaign narrowed down their nominees for this

honor to four women: Wilma Mankiller, a trailblazer and first woman chief of the Cherokees; Rosa Parks, credited with starting the Montgomery bus boycott by not relinquishing her seat and sparking the modern civil rights movement in 1955; Harriet Tubman, an abolitionist born a slave who became one of the most noted conductors on the Underground Railroad; and Eleanor Roosevelt, who redefined the role of First Lady while being a noted civil rights and human rights activist in her own right.

More than 600,000 votes were cast in an online poll, and the winner announced with great fanfare last week is Harriet Tubman. I am overjoyed that this great American leader was selected.

As the author of Put a Woman On the Twenty Act of 2015, H.R. 1910, I think matching a specific person with a specific biography will sharpen the focus of this remarkable grassroots effort to put a woman's face on our currency. My legislation does not limit the idea of putting a woman on our money to Harriet Tubman or any particular nominee. It instructs the Secretary of the Treasury to convene the citizen panel that will make recommendations and get it done.

From my perspective, as we see women breaking barriers at every level of our society and as we see people of color breaking barriers at every level of our society, our money ought to more accurately reflect who we are as a nation in the 21st century.

I am not saying that Andrew Jackson or any of the men we honor on our money are not worthy. Many of our Founding Fathers made important contributions to this country which we continue to enjoy today in the United States and throughout the world by the spread of democracy.

It is also true that part of our history includes the practices and decisions we certainly are not proud of as a nation.

Let's be straight: President Jackson was, for many, a war hero, a great defender of the young American Republic and, really, the first President and founder of the Democratic Party. He oversaw our Nation as it expanded west. It is the expansion of this Nation, the manifest destiny that pushed settlers west, that pushed the institution of slavery west, and that pushed the extermination and forced migration of Native peoples west.

That is precisely the nexus of Andrew Jackson and Harriet Tubman and illustrates why putting a new face on our money makes so much sense. The forced removal of Native peoples from their lands so that we could expand the practice of slavery is at the heart of Andrew Jackson's legacy. The landgrab and the Trail of Tears of the Cherokee people is key to contextualizing President Jackson.

It was when Harriet Tubman was about 6 years old that Jackson became President. She was born a slave in Maryland and eventually walked to freedom in Pennsylvania. She went back again and again, at least 19 times, telling more than 300 former slaves how to follow the Big Dipper constellation that pointed to the North Star and the way to freedom to the north.

She was an agitator. She was a subversive. She used the tools of social change to improve America. She fought for the little guy against the strong guy. She was willing to put herself at great risk to ensure justice for others. She was a woman, and she was Black. In other words, she is an ideal American.

The other women honored as nominees by the Women on 20s campaign were also great Americans. They were also subversive troublemakers, agitators, and, therefore, exactly the kind of people I think we need on our currency. But Harriet Tubman, because she is a woman, because she is a woman of color, because she fought for

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3393

freedom and for a better America in the face of this Nation's greatest and, for many like me, still unresolved sin of slavery and racism, because she turned the tide of history for the better, she is very, very worthy of this great honor.

In a few years, maybe in a few months, we will all wonder why it took so long to put an American woman on our \$20 bill. Well, it shouldn't take so long. Members of this body, Mr. Speaker, have the ability to do something about it and speed this process along.

Cosponsor the Put a Woman on the Twenty Act of 2015. It is H.R. 1910. Join me in calling on the Secretary of the Treasury to do this, whether it is Harriet Tubman or anyone else that a fair and open process arrives at. Let us stand as a Congress to put a great American woman on our money.

#### HOUSTON POLICE OFFICER— RICHARD MARTIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the early morning hours of Monday, while most of the city was asleep, the diligent Houston Police Department responded to a robbery call at an Exxon service station.

The lawmen approach the scene, and they see a suspect speed off in what turned out to be a stolen U-Haul truck. The police follow the truck, and the high-speed chase is on.

The outlaw abandons the truck, carjacks a woman, pushes her out of the minivan, and continues his flight. The outlaw fires shots at the police and keeps fleeing in the darkness of the morning hours.

Houston Police Officer Richard Martin, aware of the chase and ahead of it, jumps out of his patrol car and starts placing spike strips on the road to stop the approaching vehicle. The criminal sees Officer Martin and intentionally runs over him and kills him. Then the criminal continues on a 20-mile run from the law in the city of Houston.

He is later cornered by the police in a standoff, and then he shoots himself and is taken to the hospital. As he lingered in the hospital, the district attorney, Devon Anderson, prepared capital murder charges against him, but the killer died, thus avoiding the hangman.

The outlaw had a long criminal history.

Officer Richard Martin was a Houston police officer. He was 47 years of age. He had only been a peace officer for 4 years, and he worked at the Westside patrol division.

Prior to being a police officer, he had been in private industry for 20 years. Officer Martin was also a veteran. He spent 4 years on Active Duty in the United States Air Force, then spent 8 years as a reservist in the United States Air Force.

Being a police officer was his ultimate goal, so in his early forties, he be-

came a Houston police officer. In just 4 short years, Officer Martin became a field officer. His captain said that he crammed 20 years of policing in the 4 years that he served as a Houston police officer. This speaks volume about his character as a lawman.

He was the father of two, a 22-year-old daughter and an 11-year-old son; and he loved being actively involved in his children's lives, including his son's baseball team.

Mr. Speaker, just last week, our Nation celebrated National Police Week, honoring the daily sacrifices of peace officers like Officer Martin.

Just across the way here, on the west side of the Capitol, last Friday, the families of those who had lost peace officers were here, surrounded by thousands and thousands of other police officers and the public to show their respect for those who are killed in the line of duty; and how quickly we are reminded, again, of their sacrifices.

Officer Martin's life was callously and coldly robbed and stolen from us and his family, and the Houston community is now in mourning.

Our first responders are a special breed, those like Officer Richard Martin. They work selflessly to maintain and restore order in communities and neighborhoods across America. While we sleep, those that wear the badge are vigilantly and always on patrol, protecting us from the evil ones.

For these remarkable men and women, their safety is never guaranteed. While the badge and the uniform represents safety for citizens, it is a target for the unlawful.

We do take comfort in the fact that as long as criminals walk and wander our streets looking to do mischief, refusing to follow the law, peace officers will always be there on patrol, officers like Richard Martin.

Officer Martin was one of those officers. He was one of Houston's finest. Friday, the city of Houston will lay to rest Officer Richard Martin. Peace officers will wear the black cloth ribbon of sacrifice across their badges as they stand in silent mourning for one of their brothers in blue.

The bagpipes will play "Amazing Grace," and the flags will be lowered, as yet one more of our best is laid to rest for sacrificing his life for the rest of us. Peace officers wear the badge over their heart as a symbol of their willingness to put themselves between us and the lawless.

Officer Martin was a noble citizen who represented everything that is good and right about our society. With heavy hearts, we send prayers and thoughts to his family and those of the thin blue line in the Houston Police Department.

We thank Officer Martin for giving his life for our town.

And that is just the way it is.

#### THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, on April 24, the 100th anniversary of the Armenian genocide, runners and cyclists set out from Los Angeles on the Race for Recognition. I had the great pleasure of riding the first 28 miles of their journey with them. On May 7, they completed their 3,000-mile ride across the United States.

They undertook their ride to raise awareness of the Armenian genocide and genocides all around the world and to commemorate and remember the victims. It is my honor to read a portion of the petition that they carried with them across the Nation and to enter the entirety into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It provides:

On this 100th anniversary of the Armenian genocide, LA2DC organizing committee members wish to recognize and honor the contributions of the following people and organization:

The American people, for setting the standard in the world for philanthropy, social activism, human rights and prevention of crimes against humanity—in their first nationwide relief campaign from 1915 to 1930, Americans donated the equivalent of \$2.7 billion to help save over 1 million Christian Armenians, Greeks, Assyrians, and other minorities during the first mass atrocity of the 20th century, when these minorities were targeted for extermination and deportation by the Ottoman Empire;

Ambassador Henry Morgenthau, who, as the United States Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, alerted the United States Government and the rest of the world to the "destruction of the Armenian race";

The Near East Foundation, for providing relief to 1 million refugees and 132,000 orphan survivors of the atrocities perpetrated by the Ottoman Empire;

The American Red Cross, for providing relief to survivors of genocides and mass atrocities for the past 100 years, starting with its first international assistance program in 1915 that provided relief to survivors of the Armenian genocide;

The Museum of Tolerance, for educating and enlightening more than 250,000 visitors per year since 1993 and challenging them to understand the Holocaust and genocides in both historic and contemporary contexts;

Raphael Lemkin, for inventing the term "genocide" to describe atrocities that target groups for annihilation, and for working tirelessly to gain approval of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide by the United Nations in 1948;

USC's Shoah Foundation and its founder, Mr. Steven Spielberg, for collecting nearly 52,000 eyewitness testimonies of the Holocaust, the Armenian genocide, and other genocide survivors;

Facing History and Ourselves, for educating over 10,000 teachers and, through them, hundreds of thousands of students on the history of prejudice and racism and the role they play in the events that lead to genocide;

The International Committee of the Red Cross and the United Nations's Children's Fund, for starting a vast relief operation in 1979 for the people of Cambodia, threatened by famine and disease in the aftermath of

the Cambodian genocide, which claimed millions of lives;

United States Army Europe and United States Air Force Europe, for delivering humanitarian aid in 1995 and 1996 to the survivors of the Bosnian genocide, during which an estimate 100,000 Bosniaks were systematically targeted and killed;

Senator William Proxmire, for delivering a speech every day the U.S. Senate was in session in support of the ratification of Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. After 20 years and 3,211 speeches, the United States Senate ratified the convention on February 11, 1986;

President Ronald Reagan, for signing the Genocide Convention Implementation Act of 1987 into law;

The International Rescue Committee, for providing relief to Rwandan genocide survivors, when an estimated 800,000 mostly Tutsi minorities were massacred;

Not On Our Watch and George Clooney, for using his public profile to raise awareness of the genocide in Darfur, where 300,000 civilians were targeted and murdered and 2 million displaced;

U.N. Ambassador Samantha Power, for her groundbreaking book published in 2003, "A Problem from Hell," which recounts the history of genocide and offers a framework for policymakers that can help detect and prevent genocides;

The Armenian National Committee of America, for advocating for the recognition of the Armenian genocide and raising awareness of genocides as crimes against humanity.

□ 1015

Mr. Speaker, these riders carried this important message of truth and gratitude with them across our great Nation. It is an honor to do my small part to make sure they are heard.

Mr. Speaker, on April 24th, the 100th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide, runners and cyclists set out from Los Angeles on a "Race for Recognition." I had the great pleasure of riding the first 28 miles of their journey with them. And on May 7th, they completed their 3,000 mile ride across the United States. They undertook their ride to raise awareness of the Armenian Genocide, and Genocides around the world, and to commemorate and remember the victims. It is my honor to read a portion of the petition that they carried with them across the nation, and to enter the entirety into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

On this 100th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide, LA2DC organizing committee members wish to recognize and honor the contributions of the following people and organizations:

In the past 100 years, over 100 millions lives have been lost in genocides and mass atrocities;

During the same period, heroic American citizens, politicians, diplomats, faith based organizations, and non-government organizations have made it a part of their mission to raise awareness of genocides, help prevent genocides, and provide relief to survivors of genocides;

Some of these citizens, relief organizations, diplomats, and politicians put their lives and treasure at risk by working in conflict zones to alert the world of impending genocides and genocides in progress, rescue genocide survivors, and provide relief.

On this 100th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide, and through this petition, LA2DC

organizing committee members wish to recognize and honor the contributions of the following people and organizations for their work in raising awareness of genocides, providing relief to genocide survivors, and working to prevent genocides;

The American People—for setting the standard in the world for philanthropy, social activism, human rights, justice, and prevention of crimes against humanity. In their first act of large scale, nationwide, organization and execution of a relief campaign, from 1915 to 1930, Americans donated more than \$117 million—the equivalent of \$2.7 billion in 2015 dollars—to relief organizations that saved over 1 million Christian Armenians, Greeks, Assyrians, and other minorities during the first mass atrocity of the 20th century, when these minorities were targeted for extermination and deportation by the Ottoman Empire. Over the past 100 years, Americans continue to be in the front lines of helping to prevent genocides, and providing relief and hope to survivors of atrocities.

Ambassador Henry Morgenthau—who as United States Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, alerted the United States government of "Destruction of the Armenian Race . . ." and called on Americans to get organized to help the survivors.

The Near East Foundation (formerly known as Near East Relief or NER)—for providing relief to 1 million refugees and 132,000 orphan survivors of the atrocities perpetrated by the Ottoman Empire from 1915–1923. During this period, NER raised the equivalent of \$2.7 billion in 2015 dollars, and mobilized over 1,000 volunteers to help build 400 orphanages, food and clothing distribution centers, clinics and hospitals, and vocational training schools for the survivors.

The American Red Cross—for providing relief to survivors of genocides and mass atrocities for the past 100 years, starting with its first international assistance program in 1915 that provided relief to the survivors of the Armenian Genocide.

The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum—for leading national and international efforts to promote human dignity, confront hatred, and prevent the next genocide.

The Museum of Tolerance—for educating and enlightening more than 250,000 visitors per year since 1993, and challenging them to understand the Holocaust and genocides in both historic and contemporary contexts and confront all forms of prejudice and discrimination in our world today.

Raphael Lemkin—for inventing the term "genocide" to describe the atrocities that target groups for annihilation, and for working tirelessly to gain approval of Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide by United Nations in 1948.

University of Southern California's Shoah Foundation and its founder, Mr. Steven Spielberg—for painstakingly collecting nearly 52,000 eyewitness testimonies of the Holocaust, the Armenian Genocide, and other genocide survivors, and using their first hand accounts to teach the world about the horrors of genocides and the importance of preventing them.

Facing History and Ourselves—for educating over ten thousand teachers in the United States and worldwide, and through them, hundreds of thousands of students, on the history of prejudice and racism, and the

role they play in the events that lead to genocide. Since 1976, Facing History has been engaged in genocide prevention work by promoting global citizenship and heightened awareness of genocides.

The International Committee of The Red Cross and United Nations Children's Fund for starting a vast relief operation in 1979 for the people of Cambodia threatened by famine and disease in the aftermath of the Cambodian Genocide, which claimed millions of lives.

United State Army Europe and United States Air Force Europe—for delivering humanitarian aid in 1995 and 1996 to the survivors of the Bosnian Genocide, during which an estimated 100,000 Bosniaks were systematically targeted and killed.

Senator William Proxmire—for following through his commitment to deliver a speech every day the United States Senate was in session in support of the ratification of United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. After 20 years and 3,211 speeches, the United States Senate ratified the convention on February 11, 1986.

President Ronald Reagan—for signing the Genocide Implementation Act of 1987 into law, making genocide a Federal offense, and declaring, "This legislation still represents a strong and clear statement by the United States that it will punish acts of genocide with the force of law and the righteousness of justice."

The International Rescue Committee—for providing emergency supplies and restoring infrastructure following the 1994 genocide in Rwanda, where an estimated 800,000 mostly Tutsi minorities were massacred.

Not On Our Watch, and Messrs. George Clooney, Don Cheadle, Matt Damon, Brad Pitt, David Pressman, and Jerry Weintraub for using their public profiles to bring attention to atrocities around the world, and raising awareness of the genocide in Darfur, where 300,000 civilians were targeted and murdered, and 2 million displaced.

United States Institute of Peace Genocide Prevention Task Force, and Co-Chairs Honorable Madeleine K. Albright and Honorable William S. Cohen—for developing a genocide prevention blueprint entitled, "Preventing Genocide: A Blueprint for U.S. Policymakers", which affirmed that genocides are preventable, and issued 34 specific actionable recommendations that United States can implement to help detect and prevent genocides.

Ambassador Samantha Power, the United States Ambassador to the United Nations—for her groundbreaking research documented in her book published in 2003, "A Problem from Hell", which recounts the history of genocide and offers a framework for policy makers that can help detect and prevent genocides.

Congressman ADAM SCHIFF—for being the leading voice in the United States Congress advocating for recognition of past genocides as an important step towards detecting and preventing future genocides and atrocities.

The Armenian National Committee of America—for advocating for the recognition of the Armenian Genocides and raising awareness of genocides as crimes against humanity.

Countless other Americans and organizations who have made it their mission to help prevent the next genocide and promote peaceful resolution of conflicts.

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE  
TOWN OF CLINTON, NEW JERSEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the incorporation of the town of Clinton in Hunterdon County, New Jersey. Established as a separate municipality in 1865, Clinton has a rich history and is known for its natural beauty and sense of community.

The 2010 Census counted the town's population at 2,719.

As the recently deceased Clinton town historian and longtime mayor, Allie McGaheran, has written, the area was settled on the convergence of two rivers, the Spruce Run and the south branch of the Raritan, surrounded by excellent farmland, attracting English and German settlers. One of those settlers, David McKenny, built two mills directly across the river from each other.

These treasured mills—the first dating to 1810—now the Red Mill Museum Village and the Hunterdon Museum of Art, were owned by Daniel Hunt, the namesake of the town's first moniker, Hunt's Mill. These mills have been the center of Clinton's economic and cultural life for two centuries.

Later, mill owners John Taylor and John Bray championed renaming the town after DeWitt Clinton, the builder of the Erie Canal and Governor of New York.

A limestone quarry, located immediately behind the Red Mill, brought another wave of settlers, including Irish immigrants crossing the ocean to establish a better life for themselves and their families in the new world.

The present municipal building, a handsome Victorian structure, was the residence of John Leigh, a brick maker and farmer who served as the town's second mayor. The Lehigh Valley Railroad provided passenger and freight access, contributing greatly to the growth and wealth of the town in the 19th century.

Clinton has a large historic district that is on the State and national historic registers. There are five historic sites: the two mills; the music hall that entertained generations of residents; the original Grandin Library, named for artist and philanthropist Elizabeth Grandin in the last century; and the quarry.

The 150th anniversary of Clinton is being celebrated with parades, farmers' markets, art displays, performances, and other community events.

I thank and congratulate Megan Jones-Holt for her work as chair of the 150th anniversary committee. She and her husband, former mayor and current Hunterdon County Freeholder Matt Holt, do so very much for the town civically.

Clinton is governed by the town form of government, with a mayor and six council members. Mayor Janice Kovach and the governing body of the

town are greatly involved in the year-long festivities. Clinton is served by a dedicated volunteer fire company and rescue squad. Its beautiful and historic churches are an integral part of the community.

The Clinton-Glen Gardner School District educates children through the eighth grade. High school students attend North Hunterdon High School in neighboring Clinton Township, one of our State's strongest public elementary and secondary schools. My twin brother, Jim, and I are proud graduates of the high school.

My own family has been involved in the history of Clinton for many generations. My great uncle was president of the local bank, and my father practiced law in the town for 70 years.

In his essay, "The Inspiration of Clinton," Stephen Shoeman notes: "Everybody in Clinton smiles. Everybody is friendly. America is beautiful because of Clinton, New Jersey, and the other towns and villages just like it."

This year's celebration comes 1 year after the tricentennial of Hunterdon County, a yearlong retelling of Hunterdon County's storied founding and its 300-year journey in advancement from the English colonies in North America to its present-day status as one of America's premier places to live and work.

Clinton's history is ingrained in the fabric of Hunterdon County. We have also just celebrated New Jersey's 350th anniversary.

Public-spirited residents have worked to keep Clinton beautiful and the epitome of small-town American life. Their efforts maintain a charming and vibrant merchant district, excellent public schools, meaningful cultural events, and significant engagement in public affairs.

The town of Clinton thrives on neighborly camaraderie. I am deeply honored to represent the town here in the House of Representatives. And all who love Clinton congratulate the town on its landmark celebration.

#### TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the near hysteria over trade promotion authority and the pending Trans-Pacific Partnership, the so-called TPP, is unfortunate because it is so misguided. The stakes are too high to get it wrong, and the negative arguments are unfortunate because they are so wrong.

Being against TPP, which has yet to be finished, is premature, at best. Being against the TPA is misguided because those provisions guarantee people will actually know the details and have stronger tools to evaluate whether it is worthy of support.

The trade agenda and the role of America in the global economy has

been front and center in Congress over the last few weeks, and well it should be. The United States has an opportunity to make further inroads in 95 percent of the markets that are outside our borders and to be able to gain that access under more favorable terms.

Businesses large and small that want to sell their products overseas run into much more difficult barriers, procedures, and costs than people who sell their goods to America, which has one of the most open markets in the world.

In Oregon, there are two competing narratives: those who are opposed to further competition for American goods in American markets, fearing a loss of business and jobs; and those who see significant opportunity selling goods and services abroad, creating more family-wage jobs at home.

The people I talk to in Oregon who are in business overwhelmingly support that access. They feel they have far more to gain than they have to lose, selling more wine, bicycles, agricultural products, and small tools. They think they can compete overseas, creating family-wage jobs at home, if that playing field is level.

There are others who are deeply concerned that this perceived leveling of the playing field will not be achieved. They are concerned about a lack of labor and environmental standards overseas.

Having spent time with the people who are negotiating the agreements, having reviewed documents myself, and working to reflect Oregon values and interests, these agreements, I am confident, hold promise for Oregon. But it is too soon to tell for sure because the agreement is still being negotiated, and people like me are still trying to influence it to make it stronger still. For instance, I have provisions I am working on in both the House and the Senate to provide an enforcement mechanism.

As the agreement potentially enters its final stages, where there are some of the more difficult concessions with decisions yet to be made, the United States and other countries are reluctant to show their full hand while things are in flux.

That is why the trade promotion authority that is working its way through the Senate—and may be in front of the House early in June—is so important.

This trade promotion authority is a significant enhancement over any similar provision in the past. It guarantees that the entire country—not just Congress—will be able to examine all of the provisions 2 months before the President even signs the agreement and for months after that, before Congress votes. The authority also sets out provisions that speak to the concerns I have heard about for years about the weaknesses in NAFTA, not having enforceable, strong provisions for environment and labor.

That is why I thought it was important to vote to establish these rules

which were significantly strengthened and made more transparent as a result of the tremendous efforts on behalf of my friend and colleague from Oregon, Senator RON WYDEN, in the Senate.

If an agreement is reached under these new rules, we will have the strongest standards ever to evaluate a trade agreement, and everyone in America will be able to evaluate for themselves, not conjure up some sort of speculation. They will have months to do what I am going to do: see if this agreement is in the best interest of the people in Oregon who I represent. If it is, then they, like I, will support it. If it is not, then I will do, as I have sometimes done in the past, and vote “no” on things I don’t think measure up.

The time to draw the lines in the sand “yes” or “no” is after an agreement is reached, not before. And thanks to the new trade promotion authority, everyone will have an opportunity to make that judgment for themselves well in advance of any decision that Congress makes.

#### SYRIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I remember a few years ago visiting Israel, standing in the Golan Heights and looking to the border of Syria. At this time, our guide began talking about the peaceful protests in Syria, the beginning of an era of discontent.

As I looked into the seemingly peaceful area, I never imagined the carnage that was to come: children who on that day attended school, filled with hope for the future and with dreams of becoming a businessman, a policeman, an architect, or any of the host of things building in the minds of such a young person at that age; children and parents who did not know that in a few short years, their lives would be cut down by a ruthless dictator, bent on keeping power at all cost.

As the peaceful protests built in strength, Bashar al-Assad responded in violence. And so began what history will likely judge to be the start of among the most brutal times in Middle East modern history.

Bashar-al Assad began using barrel bombs indiscriminately against innocent people and infamously gassed thousands who struggled to get that last breath of life, only to choke to death, completely aware that that breath would be their last.

As family members died, others joined a group later dubbed the Free Syrian Army, a group the President referred to as a bunch of pharmacists, lawyers, and businessmen, all standing up to reclaim what was theirs rightfully, which was a free Syria. And they fight bravely for a free Syria today.

Through the carnage of this terrible war, a more nefarious group began to assemble, a group not concerned with

human carnage but inspired by it; a group not fighting to protect life but fighting to cut it down; and a group not inspired by freedom of religion but inspired by a hollow and a shallow world view. The group today is now known as ISIS.

□ 1030

Mr. Speaker, before the world paid any attention, this group occupied not just parts of Syria, but also Fallujah, an area fought with American blood and treasure to bring peace and stability to the people of Iraq. The border of Syria and Iraq was torn down, and the world continued to sleep.

I called for America to lead airstrikes against this fledgling group at that time numbering in the low four figures. The reaction I received was not unexpected: people angry that I was interested in starting “Iraq War III.” Yet as this cancer continued to grow, the carnage became worse, and today we find ourselves engaged in limited action against a group growing in numbers faster than they are being dispatched by our airplanes.

Americans feel saddened that the areas that our brave military members fought so hard to win was being thrown away to political expedience, and I am one of those people. I spent a little bit of time in Iraq, on behalf of the United States Air Force, flying airplanes, and I just saw a week ago or a few days ago that Ramadi, the capital of Anbar province, where we saw so much success in the Sunni awakening, has fallen to ISIS.

Now, by the way, Anbar and Ramadi serve as a transportation center for getting goods from Jordan and Syria into Baghdad and are resupply routes for ISIS. So we are seeing not overmuch success in Iraq. But lest we think this fight is limited to just Iraq, all we have to do is look all over the world and all over the Middle East and see ISIS’ influence, from folks arrested near my district in the United States attempting to join and support ISIS, to the problems we see in Lebanon and in Saudi Arabia, and as we see ISIS grow and develop in Libya. This is something that, Mr. Speaker, the President has got to get a control on and reassert American leadership.

We also see that these terrorist groups, these jihadist groups, are coming under the umbrella of ISIS, whether it is al Shabaab, Boko Haram, or al Qaeda in Yemen, or we see the Taliban beginning to join under this supposedly successful group.

What is it we need to do to push them back? In Iraq, I believe we need to use the number of troops and the amount of military force necessary to destroy ISIS and not just necessary to follow the President’s promise of no troops on the ground. I don’t think we need another 200,000 troops in Iraq, and I haven’t heard a single person actually ever suggest that, but we need to use what is necessary to push this back.

By the way, the American military is fierce and desperate to do what needs

to be done, and they are ready to do what the American people and the President calls on.

Lastly, ISIS must be destroyed in Syria; and you can not destroy ISIS in Syria without destroying the incubator of ISIS, who is the evil dictator, Bashar al Assad. There are negotiations in progress now, but until the Syrian people know that the American people stand behind them through a no-fly zone and other means, ISIS will not be destroyed in Syria until that point.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the President to stand up.

#### REESTABLISH THE GOLDEN FLEECE AWARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our Nation is currently over \$18 trillion in debt, we must carefully scrutinize our government programs to ensure that we are funding essential programs, policies, and projects while eliminating frivolous and wasteful spending.

Every day in the news, Americans hear of government waste, fraud, abuse, and regulations that are hindering our small businesses and costing American taxpayers billions of dollars that could be better spent in creating jobs and boosting our economy.

Today, I rise to establish the Golden Fleece Award to once again uncover and bring public attention to the wasteful spending across our Federal Government. The Golden Fleece Award will highlight some of the most egregious examples of government waste of hard-working taxpayers’ dollars and will shed new light on some of the rampant, unnecessary spending by our Federal agencies.

The inspiration behind the Golden Fleece Award was pioneered by the Democratic U.S. Senator from Wisconsin, Bill Proxmire, in March 1975. For the next 13 years, Senator Proxmire went on to issue bulletins announcing a monthly Golden Fleece Award. The Golden Fleece Award became a staple in the U.S. Senate during this time. Senator Robert Byrd once stated that the awards were “as much a part of the Senate as quorum calls and filibusters.”

Mr. Speaker, the Golden Fleece Award will once again serve as an important reminder that taxpayers need to watch, control, and provide the necessary reforms, through this Congress, about Federal spending and regulations.

I will utilize social media and the Internet to provide a unique platform for my constituents to share with me examples that they spot, that they see, of waste of our Federal Government resources by using, #goldenfleeceoversight on Twitter, or emailing me at goldenfleece@mail.house.gov. I have

also established a Web site that allows users to submit their recommendations for future Golden Fleece Awards at [hill.house.gov/goldenfleece](http://hill.house.gov/goldenfleece).

Americans are crying out for accountability from our leaders, and I look forward to working with them and my colleagues to spot waste and find ways to effectively eliminate that kind of spending and regulatory overreach in Washington.

---

**DO UNTO OTHERS AS WE WOULD  
HAVE THEM DO UNTO US**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the great Mahalia Jackson was a gospel singer. The great singer and civil rights activist Mahalia Jackson, once proclaimed by Harry Belafonte to be the most powerful woman in America, the great Mahalia Jackson gave us some words to live by, some words that can add meaning to life. She, in one of her songs, indicated that, and I shall paraphrase, if I can help somebody as I travel along, then my living shall not be in vain. Live not in vain; help somebody—that is the essence of the message that she presented.

I am here today to speak of persons who are in harm's way and who are suffering. The people of Nepal have had two earthquakes visited upon them: one a 7.8 magnitude, the other a 7.3 magnitude. These two earthquakes have done great damage. More than 8,000 people are dead. I am looking at the statistical information: more than 16,000 injured, 8 million persons affected, nearly 500,000 homes destroyed, another 200,000-plus damaged. They are still in harm's way, but there is something we can do. We can do unto others as we would have them do to us if we had suffered a similar tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great opportunity for us to do something to help without actually expending a lot of American dollars, although we have spent quite a bit. I am proud to say that the United States has accorded approximately \$40 million to this effort—\$40 million. It will take a lot more, but the United States is involved in doing its part. We have had our rescue teams there; and one of our rescue teams, unfortunately, suffered some tragedy. One of our military helicopters went down. We have lost lives there. People have been there living not in vain, trying to do what they can to be of assistance, doing unto others as we would have them do for us under similar circumstances.

One of the things that we can do is sign on to a bill that will allow those persons who are in this country from Nepal, who are here lawfully, to stay in this country for an extended period of time while their country is recovering. H.R. 2033 affords Nepalese who are in the United States of America to stay for a while longer. They will not have their status in the country change.

They won't become persons on a pathway to citizenship. They will simply have more time here. We will not send them back in harm's way. We will do unto them what we would have them do unto us if we were in a similar circumstance.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has many persons who are supporting it. More than 50 persons have supported this piece of legislation. I am proud to say that some of the persons who have supported it are persons who have great Nepalese communities, and there are others who do not. They just want to be of help.

I want to mention a few whose names I did not mention when I mentioned names previously, or I did not state them correctly. This is a chance for me to correct the RECORD: Congressman MIKE CAPUANO, Congressman TONY CÁRDENAS, Congressman JOE CROWLEY, Congressman MARK DESAULNIER, Congressman RAÚL GRIJALVA, Congressman LUIS GUTIÉRREZ, Congressman JARED POLIS, Congressman CHARLES RANGEL, Congressman CEDRIC RICHMOND, Congresswoman LORETTA SANCHEZ, and Congresswoman LINDA SÁNCHEZ—all persons who are supportive, along with many others, nearly 50.

I am proud to say that the community in Houston, the Nepalese community has come together, and they have a goal of raising \$100,000. They have exceeded that goal, under the leadership of Mr. Ghimirey and Mr. Nepal. They have exceeded the goal of \$100,000, and they are still raising additional funds.

I believe that H.R. 2033 affords all of us to live not in vain. I think this is a great opportunity to do unto others as we would have them do unto us. I ask that we support H.R. 2033 and live not in vain. Help somebody as we travel along our way.

---

**RECESS**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 41 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

---

□ 1200

**AFTER RECESS**

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

---

**PRAYER**

Minister Michael Greene, Lehman Avenue Church of Christ, Bowling Green, Kentucky, offered the following prayer:

Dear God, Our Creator and the One from whom we receive our unalienable rights, we give You our thanks for this day and for all the bountiful blessings You have poured out upon this great

land, this country, and these peoples. We pray these blessings will continue through Your grace.

We are thankful for the opportunity to serve wherein is found greatness. We pray for those assembled here today as they deliberate in this august body. We pray Your guiding hand be upon them.

Bless them with wisdom. Bless them with courage to do the right as You have revealed the right.

Help them to remember that what is being done in this place is not just an exercise in debate but will affect millions of people.

Help us, Father, to preserve our heritage of freedom for future generations.

This we pray on this 20th day of May in the year of our Lord.

Amen.

---

**THE JOURNAL**

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

---

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. KUSTER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

---

**WELCOMING MINISTER MICHAEL  
GREENE**

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome Mr. Michael Greene to Washington. Mike is serving today as guest chaplain in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Speaking just moments ago, Mike prayed for all of us serving this great institution and the work we do each and every day. I have been fortunate to know Mike as my minister in Bowling Green, Kentucky, and have always appreciated his prayers.

Throughout his 44 years as a minister, Mike has served Churches of Christ in Kentucky, Tennessee, and Georgia. He also serves on the board of directors of Foundation Christian Academy in Bowling Green.

I always enjoy having a little bit of Kentucky here in Washington. Today, I am proud to welcome you, Mike, to the U.S. Capitol. Thank you for your prayers and for taking the time to be with us in our Nation's Capitol today.

---

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). The Chair will

entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### VA ACCOUNTABILITY

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHNER. My colleagues, next week marks the 1-year anniversary since General Eric Shinseki resigned as the Secretary of the Veterans Affairs Department.

At the time, the President promised reform. He said: "The number one priority is making sure that problems get fixed."

Instead of a new day at the VA, the American people are still seeing more of the same. Last year, Congress gave the VA Secretary new authority to fire employees. While some 110 VA facilities kept secret lists to hide their wait times, just one person has been fired—one.

What the hell happened to the rest of them? Some got to retire with their benefits, some got transfers, some got paid leave, some got a slap on the wrist. All of them went on collecting checks from taxpayers. If only the Veterans Administration did half as good a job of taking care of our veterans as they do the bureaucrats, we would be in a lot better shape.

Congress also gave the VA more than \$16 billion to improve care and to shorten waiting times, yet the number of patients facing long waits is about the same. The number of patients waiting more than 90 days has doubled. At this point, the VA can't even build a hospital. Just about every project ends up years behind schedule and hundreds of millions, if not billions, over cost.

Last week, the public learned that the VA is spending \$6 billion a year illegally. An internal report exposed examples of overspending on conferences, improper gifts, inappropriate purchases, and promotional items—again, if only VA bureaucrats did as good a job taking care of our veterans as they do themselves.

The author of the report at the VA wrote, "doors are swung wide open for fraud, waste, and abuse," and that these actions "may potentially result in serious harm or death to America's veterans."

That is their own expert saying this.

This isn't run-of-the-mill incompetence. It is arrogance; and it is arrogance that allows our veterans to be lied to, ignored, and, frankly, left to die.

My colleagues, it is almost Memorial Day. This is when we slow down and reflect on the debt of gratitude that we owe to our heroes.

I commend Chairman MILLER and all of the members of the Veterans Affairs' Committee for striving every day to fulfill this obligation. Congress will continue to pass legislation to hold the VA accountable, but only the adminis-

tration can change the culture from within.

The President owes the American people a real, long-term plan to fix the VA—not a promise, not a pledge, not rearranging the chairs on a deck—a real plan to clean up this mess.

I will keep coming back to this podium until the administration produces such a plan.

#### VOLVO OCEAN RACE

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the city of Newport, Rhode Island, in my district, on hosting, this month, the Volvo Ocean Race, the world's premier sailing race around the world.

This 12-day event brought 125,000 visitors to Rhode Island, far exceeding even the most optimistic projections, as well as millions of dollars in economic activity that supported Rhode Island's tourism industry and our small-business community. Most importantly, the success of this event offered an opportunity to tell our story about the great things that are happening in Rhode Island today.

I want to thank everyone who helped make the only North American stop-over for this year's Volvo Ocean Race such an incredible success, including Sail Newport, Rhode Island's Public Sailing Center, Discover Newport, the Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management, the Newport Chamber of Commerce, Senate President Teresa Paiva-Weed, Speaker Mattiello, members of the general assembly, and Governor Gina Raimondo.

I want to especially acknowledge Senator WHITEHOUSE for all of his work to bring this race to Rhode Island and his ongoing efforts to enhance our State's position in the maritime industry.

Congratulations to everyone who made this such a success.

#### TRIBUTE TO STAFF SERGEANT ROBERT H. DIETZ

(Mr. GIBSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Staff Sergeant Robert H. Dietz who was awarded the Medal of Honor for his courageous actions during World War II. Sergeant Dietz hailed from Kingston, New York, a proud and historical city in New York's 19th Congressional District.

In March 1945, Sergeant Dietz led his squad on an attack of a heavily fortified German position. Under heavy machine gun fire, Sergeant Dietz advanced forward, clearing enemy obstacles, providing a path for the men of his squad and platoon. This selfless act enabled the success of this attack; but in the process, Sergeant Dietz lost his life.

With strong local support, we submitted a bill to rename the post office in Kingston for Sergeant Dietz. Yesterday that bill passed in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. I thank Chairman CHAFFETZ, his committee, and the entire New York delegation for their strong support; and I look forward to its passage in the full House soon.

Mr. Speaker, as we approach Memorial Day weekend, we pause to remember Sergeant Dietz and all those men and women who lost their lives in defense of our freedoms.

#### BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I, along with many of my colleagues—both women and men, Republicans and Democrats—wear red to pressure Nigerian President-elect Muhammadu Buhari into taking aggressive action against Boko Haram.

Next week, as Nigeria welcomes the new President and celebrates Democracy Day, we here in Congress want to put a spotlight on the immense threat Boko Haram poses to Nigeria's democracy and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, we want President-elect Buhari to know we will hold him accountable, just as we held his predecessor accountable. We urge this new administration to bring with it a swift and lasting change in attitude on this issue. We hope the new President will have a sense of urgency in finding the Chibok schoolgirls and defeating Boko Haram.

Mr. Speaker, we expect the new President to find the girls, whether they have been married off against their will or not, are alive or in a mass grave. Wherever they are, we want to know.

Until they are found, we will continue to tweet, tweet, tweet #bringbackourgirls; tweet, tweet, tweet #joinrepwilson.

#### 21ST CENTURY CURES ACT

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the 21st Century Cures Act. This is legislation that we, at the Energy and Commerce Committee, are working on in a bipartisan basis, and we look forward to moving it to the House floor and seeing this passed and signed into law. Why are we doing it? Because we want to put the focus on cures, real cures that will enable people to live better lives.

Let's take just one disease, Alzheimer's. There are 5 million Americans that currently have Alzheimer's. The cost to the Nation is \$215 billion a year. When you look out several decades to 2050, the cost is estimated to be

\$1 trillion a year for one disease. Yes, we need to focus on finding cures.

And there are other disorders and diseases that need that attention. Take autism, diabetes, ALS, cancer, the list moves on.

It is time for us to encourage and support young scientists, to put the focus on our most challenging health conditions, and we want the regulatory agencies to be there to encourage this effort, and I encourage support for the 21st Century Cures Act.

#### RECOGNIZING NHTI, CONCORD, NEW HAMPSHIRE'S COMMUNITY COLLEGE

(Ms. KUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to underscore the importance of increasing access to higher education, including crucial workforce development programs that help our students gain the high-tech skills they need to succeed in our 21st century economy.

In New Hampshire, we are blessed to have some of the very best community colleges in the country, and I am proud to have visited every single community college in my district.

Today I would like to recognize one institution, the New Hampshire Technical Institute, the community college in our capital of Concord, which was just ranked number one in the country for value added by the Brookings Institution. That means that NHTI students are meeting and surpassing expected outcomes after graduation, and many of them are going on to extremely successful careers.

Every student should have access to this type of opportunity, and I am pushing for a number of initiatives that will help business partners join with community colleges to provide specific job training. Let's all join together to make sure that students across the country can access the kind of value-added programs offered at NHTI. And together, we can move forward so that every American can realize the American Dream.

□ 1215

#### VETERAN HEALTH CARE, FIGHTER ACES

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of my top priorities is standing up for our servicemen and -women. That is why I am proud to reintroduce the Help Veterans Save for Health Care Act, because right now the IRS makes a veteran choose between receiving VA care or continuing to fund their health savings account. That is wrong. My bill fixes that.

In addition to this bill, today Congress will recognize America's fighter

aces with its highest honor—the Congressional Gold Medal. Last year, Congress passed this resolution honoring these patriots who are simply the best of the best.

We are the land of the free because of all our troops and veterans who have put their lives on the line for us, and I salute them today as we remember their sacrifices on this Memorial Day.

#### DAVID LETTERMAN

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this occasion to thank David Letterman for 33 years of late-night television and giving his genius to America. I want to thank him on behalf of my friend Warren Zevon for being the best friend his music ever had, and for helping so many other musicians get an opportunity to play for America; as a Memphian who attended the Andy Kaufman-Jerry Lawler match, for Dave giving Andy Kaufman the opportunity to give his zany sense of humor to America, and so many other comedians that he gave a forum to.

Dave was in the Ed Sullivan Theater, but he should have been in the Steve Allen Theater, Ed's rival, because he was more like Steve Allen, the first late-night host. The "Man on the Street" interview with Steve Allen was like "Stupid Pet Tricks."

Dave Letterman was a genius. Tonight I will be watching his last show—we all will—the 6,028th. We will all watch it.

Dave, don't stay away. Come back. We thank you for all you have given us.

#### HONORING MONTANA VETERANS

(Mr. ZINKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of Montana veterans and all the men and women who have fallen in defense of our great Nation.

I would like to recognize one in particular, Private 1st Class Nicholas Cook, from Hungry Horse, Montana, who was killed in action in Afghanistan. He bravely sacrificed himself to save his fellow paratroopers by exposing his position, providing suppressive fire. His valor earned him the Silver Star.

Mr. Speaker, no veteran should ever be forgotten. Today I would like to also recognize the following Montana veterans for their service to our Nation:

James Dighans, Carl Nordberg, Kenneth and Christopher Bogner, George Lacher, Charles Pickard, Michael Kallas, James and Gary Jacobson, Benjamin Balducke, Nicholas Cook, Williard Purkett, James and John Hantz, Robert Emrick, Dennis Morkert, and Edward Kinney.

God bless the United States, and God bless the troops that defend her.

#### CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HEAD START

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Head Start program.

Head Start is near and dear to my heart. I began my career as a Head Start teacher in the Chicago public schools. I have never forgotten how the program made a monumental difference for its students, and this Congress should not forget those kids either.

Since its inception, Head Start has served 32 million children in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. territories. Last year, in my home State of Illinois, there were 130 early Head Start and Head Start providers providing quality teachers.

And there is an economic impact. Head Start accounted for more than 7,950 jobs in Illinois last year. Yet sequestration cuts have done serious damage to the programs in Illinois and around the Nation. In my State alone, more than \$16.5 million in funding has been cut, 1,900 children went unserved, and 549 jobs were lost.

Certainly none of us was elected to keep young children in need from getting an education. We should celebrate the 50th anniversary by fully funding Head Start and eliminating the sequester because every child in our country deserves a quality education and a good start.

#### VETERANS DESERVE ACCOUNTABILITY

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this week, an internal report from the Department of Veterans Affairs revealed that the Department annually spends \$6 billion on illegal contracts and out-of-control spending. This fraud is unacceptable, an insult to the men and women who have risked their lives in service to our country. Unfortunately, this lack of accountability at the Department of Veterans Affairs is all too common under President Obama's failed leadership.

Our veterans deserve the best care, and I will continue working to give our veterans the treatment they have earned as promoted by Veterans' Affairs Chairman JEFF MILLER of Florida. Congress has worked to promote change at the VA. For example, this week, we passed the Ensuring VA Accountability Act, sponsored by Congressman RYAN COSTELLO. This bipartisan effort clearly demonstrates meaningful reforms for our veterans and military families.

I hope President Obama can live up to his commitment to end delays and denial of services to our veterans.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President by his actions never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

**CELEBRATING THE 50TH  
ANNIVERSARY OF HEAD START**

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that this week marks the 50-year anniversary of the Head Start program, a momentous achievement in our Nation's fight to break the cycle of poverty and open the windows of opportunity for low-income families and children.

Now, I don't want to date myself, actually, but I was in the first class of Head Start, and today I bring with me my original certificate of completion from that program. I am proud to say that, if it were not for Head Start, I wouldn't be here today. You see, as the daughter of poor immigrants from Mexico, not many people would think I would graduate from high school, let alone college, or get my MBA and eventually make my way to the House of Representatives.

Head Start has served over 32 million children, and, more importantly, it has helped families know how to navigate the school system. My hat is off to the teachers, to the community volunteers, to the healthcare coordinators, and to so many who helped to implement Head Start programs in their communities. Your work is transforming our Nation. It is giving that head start to our children because they are the future of this Nation.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say today, "Happy birthday, Head Start."

**REMEMBERING CAPTAIN DUSTIN  
LUKASIEWICZ OF ALMA, NE-  
BRASKA**

(Mr. SMITH of Nebraska asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Third District constituent Captain Dustin Lukasiewicz of Alma, Nebraska. He and five fellow marines were killed in a helicopter crash last week while providing humanitarian aid to earthquake victims in Nepal.

Captain Lukasiewicz made the ultimate sacrifice while trying to assist victims no one else could reach. His service reflects the goodness of America, accepting the call to help those who need it most.

When I spoke with the captain's mother yesterday, she told me how her son called to wish her a happy Mother's Day just days before the crash. His attention to loved ones is a reflection of his life of service and devoting himself to the care of others.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in praying for the captain's mother, father, wife, daughter, unborn child, and all others who lost loved ones in this terrible tragedy. As Memorial Day approaches, we must make it our priority to honor and remember our military heroes, and Captain Lukasiewicz is certainly one of our heroes.

**CELEBRATING THE 50TH  
ANNIVERSARY OF HEAD START**

(Mr. NOLAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, as Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY and Congresswoman SANCHEZ just pointed out their involvement in Head Start, I want you to know I directed a 19-unit Head Start program up in north central Minnesota in my youth, and so I am proud to join them in celebrating this 50th anniversary that served over 32 million children, because I was able to see firsthand how this impacted children's lives. And what a testimonial it is to see one of the first participants go on to become a Member of the United States Congress and running for the United States Senate.

Clearly, Head Start is so critical to our national commitment to every child, regardless of their circumstances at birth, to have an opportunity to succeed in life, developing that wonderful spark for learning that sets kids up for success.

So once again, hats off to the educators, to the directors, to the faculty, and to the parents, all those who have made this program such a wonderful, great success for children all across America.

**NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH**

(Mr. ROTHFUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize May as National Foster Care Month.

Today I would like to applaud the thousands of families who open their homes to foster children. It takes a special kind of caregiver to foster a child, someone who can drop everything on a moment's notice and, without hesitation, bring a child into their home.

In Pennsylvania alone, there are 15,000 children in foster care. That means we have thousands of amazing families with hearts big enough to provide love and care for children who need a place to call home.

Mr. Speaker, foster children become an irreplaceable part of the family. Indeed, the most telling statistic is that in Pennsylvania 65 percent of families end up adopting their foster children. We need families willing to open their hearts and homes unconditionally to

children who have been abused and removed from their homes. This is what so many dedicated foster families are able to provide.

Mr. Speaker, during National Foster Care Month, I would like to celebrate the resiliency of foster children who overcome great obstacles at such a young age and recognize the dedicated foster families who support them.

**NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH**

(Mrs. LAWRENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, today I stand here to recognize May as National Foster Care Month. More than 40,000 of our Nation's youth are currently living in the child welfare system. More than 23,000 youth age out of the foster care system when they turn 18, putting them at risk for homelessness, criminal exposure, and mental illness. These statistics paint a grim picture.

Today I stand here to recognize a young woman who aged out of the foster care system, Kamille Tynes, a success story. Kamille spent 5 years in the Michigan foster care system. Her experience fostered a tireless advocacy for foster care and resources that our children need. She has been given awards and recognized for her amazing leadership, such as the foster care Outstanding Young Leaders Award. She is now creating her own consulting firm to address those needs. She is a graduate of the University of Michigan.

Ladies and gentlemen, I ask my colleagues to please continue to understand the importance of recognizing and funding our foster care program.

**NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH**

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate May as National Foster Care Month and welcome many of the foster care youth who are visiting the House of Representatives today.

This year's theme is "Get to Know the Many Faces of Foster Care." The goal of this special month is to celebrate the experiences of the more than 400,000 youth in the child welfare system and raise awareness about their needs.

Mr. Speaker, the foster care system has and always will hold a special place in my heart. When I was 11 years old, my family welcomed a foster care child, Bob, into our home. Bob, throughout the years, has taught me so much and will be my brother for life.

Today I have the honor of being shadowed for the day by Nyeelah Innis of Newnan, Georgia. Nyeelah has been in foster care for 8 years, with her first foster care setting starting when she was 10 years old. Mr. Speaker, in just

these few hours, Nyeelah has impressed me with her positive attitude and eagerness to learn about the legislative branch of our Federal Government. I know for certain that this young lady has a very bright future ahead, like so many other youth whom we will see through the Halls of Congress today.

□ 1230

#### CONGRESSIONAL FOSTER YOUTH SHADOW DAY

(Ms. BASS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in celebration of 63 foster youth and 63 bipartisan Members of Congress who are participating in the fourth annual Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth Shadow Day experience.

The goal of this event is to give foster youth the opportunity to share their unique experience with Members of Congress, as well as gain intimate insight into the legislative process.

Far too often, we legislate from a glass tower, far removed from the people and places that our laws affect. Shadow Day was created to address this very issue, empowering foster youth from across the country to come to our Nation's Capital and share their stories, while giving Members of Congress the opportunity to learn from the very young people whose lives we genuinely want to improve.

Shadowing me today is Briana, a beautiful young woman from my hometown of Los Angeles. Briana became an open case of the department of child and family services at the age of 15 due to abuse by her father. Multiple placements, neglect, and instability defined her foster care experience.

As she pursues her bachelor's degree in accounting at Dillard University in New Orleans, Briana strives to voice the real concerns of foster youth and give strength to her foster peers by moving towards change. Briana's ultimate goal is to become a foster care advocate, encouraging other youth like her to stand up for themselves in the child welfare system.

I look forward to hearing more about Briana's experience and listening to her legislative recommendations. Thank you, Briana, for your resiliency and your commitment to reforming the child welfare system.

In honor of Briana and the other 62 foster youth here on the Hill, I invite my colleagues to join the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth.

#### NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH

(Mr. MARINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize May as National Foster Care Month.

On September 30, 2012, there was an estimated 400,000 children in foster

care. Sixty-five percent of foster children experience at least seven school changes while in care. Fifty percent of former foster and probation youth become homeless within the first 18 months of emancipation.

My foster shadow today is Damara. She is from Pennsylvania, and we are exchanging some great ideas about foster care.

All children deserve a safe, loving, and permanent home. Please become a foster care parent. My wife and I are foster care parents and associated with working with children throughout my life. We have provided so much for them, but equally important, they have provided so much for us.

#### GREEN SCHOOLS

(Mr. ASHFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud several Nebraska schools for their nationally recognized roles in protecting the environment.

Two Omaha schools—the Edward “Babe” Gomez Heritage Elementary School and the Wilson Focus School—along with the Lincoln School District, have been named 2015 Green Ribbon Schools by the U.S. Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan.

These schools have been honored for their promising efforts to reduce negative environmental impact, ensure environmental education, promote better health, and cut utility costs.

As Secretary Duncan has noted, these schools are “an inspiration and deserve the spotlight for embodying strong examples of innovative learning and civic engagement.”

It is clear that the honorees are powerful examples of the ways in which schools can help students cut school costs, provide healthy learning environments, and prepare for the real world ahead.

I also want to take this opportunity to honor my good and late friend, Senator Ron Raikes from Ashland, Nebraska, who with me developed the legislation for the focus schools in Nebraska. He has been and is sorely missed.

#### FIX OUR MENTAL HEALTH SYSTEM

(Mr. GUINTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to advocate on behalf of a cause near and dear to my heart, fixing our mental health system.

As some of you may know, I have a family member with a mental illness. This has allowed me to witness firsthand where our system fails those with a mental illness and to see where the opportunities are for improvement.

As part of my effort to bring about change to New Hampshire's mental

health system, I joined my colleague, Representative KUSTER, last week in hosting a mental health summit with local advocates, healthcare providers, and New Hampshire lawmakers.

These experts are essential in the fight to reform and strengthen our mental health system. It is with their feedback, perspective, and opinion that myself, Representative KUSTER, and my colleagues in Congress can devise bipartisan solutions to fix this very important issue.

Together, we can bring about real bipartisan change for individuals and families affected by mental illness. We need to change this to a patient-centered and metrics-driven environment to ensure that Granite State patients and their families are provided with the necessary care, support, and resources they deserve.

#### ASIAN AMERICAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDERS HERITAGE MONTH

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, Asian American and Pacific Islanders' achievements in art, technology, business, and education serve as a reminder that our Nation's success is built upon the foundation of diversity.

This is particularly evident in my district, which is home to the largest AAPI community in Nevada. The Las Vegas Asian Chamber of Commerce facilitated the reinvigoration of our economy after the 2008 crash.

Chinatown Plaza on Spring Mountain Road is home to one of the country's most popular Chinese New Year celebrations. There is a thriving Filipino district along Maryland Parkway. Dozens of Thai, Japanese, Korean, and Vietnamese shops, restaurants, markets, and festivals enrich our society and strengthen our economy.

As we celebrate AAPI Heritage Month, let us acknowledge the value immigrants bring to our lives and recognize how much we all stand to gain from enacting comprehensive immigration reform that honors our country's legacy as the land of opportunity.

We don't simply benefit from the myriad contributions of immigrants; we thrive and flourish because of them.

#### RECOGNIZING COLONEL ARTHUR JEFFREY

(Mr. NEWHOUSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, today, we present a Congressional Gold Medal, the highest civilian honor bestowed by Congress, to recognize the distinguished service of the American Fighter Aces.

One of the Fighter Aces being honored is Colonel Arthur Jeffrey, who was credited with shooting down 14 enemy aircraft during World War II. Colonel

Jeffrey flew air cover missions during D-day. In December 1944, he was awarded the Silver Star for his "courage, combat skills, and gallant leadership" while thwarting an enemy mission.

Colonel Jeffrey ended his tour as commander of the 434th Fighter Squadron. His service was recognized at the time with the Distinguished Flying Cross, with one oakleaf cluster, and the Air Medal, with 16 oakleaf clusters.

Colonel Jeffrey passed away this April in Yakima, Washington, at the age of 95, regrettably before this honor was bestowed.

Please join me in honoring the memory of Colonel Arthur Jeffrey, a remarkable American, for his outstanding service defending our Nation.

#### HEAD START 50TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. CLYBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 50th anniversary of Head Start, a wonderful success story that empowered 32 million children in America.

Unfortunately, the future of Head Start today stands in grave peril due to the misplaced priorities of the Republican budget which cuts \$759 billion from nondefense discretionary funds and will result in 35,000 fewer children participating in Head Start.

House Democrats want to embrace the future by investing in early childhood education and enacting universal prekindergarten. Democrats strongly support President Obama's initiative to fully fund Head Start and expand the Early Head Start-Childcare Partnerships. Research shows that high-quality early education is a great investment in a child's life and our Nation's future.

Mr. Speaker, our children are our future. As Head Starters across the country plant rose bushes this week to commemorate President Johnson's Rose Garden launching of Head Start, this Congress must reject the misplaced priorities of the Republican budget and embrace a brighter future for our children.

#### HONORING WARRIORS WEEKEND

(Mr. FARENTHOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to pay tribute to our veterans and to the men and women of our Armed Forces who wake up every day, put on our Nation's uniform, and don't know if they are going to be home that evening safely with their families.

Last weekend, volunteers came together in Port O'Connor, Texas, to honor more than 900 veterans and current members of the Armed Forces for the ninth annual Warriors Weekend.

Warriors Weekend brings together military members who have been wounded during combat in the global war on terror—and not just those who are wounded physically, but also those with invisible scars, like PTSD and depression.

Mr. Speaker, many of these current and former military members are still in recovery and physical rehabilitation, but the weekend event gives them the chance to build a support network and have a great time enjoying the Texas outdoors.

Warriors Weekend was created in part by veterans who served during Vietnam. They knew all too well how it felt to return home from war and be looked down on. They wanted to make sure every member of the military is welcomed home properly, and they knew that our wounded veterans oftentimes have needs that are overlooked.

I urge Members to support Warriors Weekend again next year.

#### PASS A LONG-TERM PLAN TO FIX OUR NATION'S TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the House voted yesterday to approve a 2-month extension of the highway trust fund. I am pleased we were able to pass a short-term fix, but it is time to stop kicking the can down the road.

I urge my colleagues to use the next 60 days to come up with a long-term plan to invest in our Nation's transportation infrastructure, a plan that will create jobs, strengthen American competitiveness, and lay the groundwork for future economic growth.

I asked the Joint Economic Committee staff to analyze the costs of U.S. underinvestment in infrastructure, and this map tells an important part of the story.

Across the country, one in four bridges are structurally deficient or functionally obsolete. That is scary, and it is a matter of public safety. Americans are taking tens of millions of trips every day over bridges that are in need of repair.

As you can see on the map, in some States, over one-third of the bridges are failing. Here in the Nation's Capital, 70 percent of our bridges are failing. We should fix our crumbling infrastructure as a matter of public safety and as a matter of national pride.

To see how your State is doing, you can download the map and the raw data behind it from the JEC, [jec.senate.gov](http://jec.senate.gov).

I urge my colleagues to support infrastructure. It is time to move beyond a 2-month extension and, instead, work on a long-term solution to this critical and important and economic development challenge.

#### NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate National Foster Care Month, first recognized by President Ronald Reagan in 1988, I would like to thank the dedicated foster families, social workers, and service providers for their commitment to help children.

May is also a time to shed light on the plight of nearly 400,000 children and youth who are currently in our country's foster care system, and we call for safe and nurturing environments for these vulnerable members of our society.

In an effort to give qualified adoptive and foster parents an opportunity to make a lasting difference in the lives of these children, I will be introducing bipartisan, bicameral legislation that would help ensure that more children have the opportunity to be raised in a loving and supportive home that they can call their own.

The Every Child Deserves a Family Act would ensure that prejudices plays no part in adoption and foster care placements. A parent's ability to care for a child should not be determined by any parent's sexual orientation or gender identity, but by their love.

□ 1245

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2262, SPURRING PRIVATE AEROSPACE COMPETITIVENESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 880, AMERICAN RESEARCH AND COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MAY 22, 2015, THROUGH MAY 29, 2015

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 273 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 273

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2262) to facilitate a pro-growth environment for the developing commercial space industry by encouraging private sector investment and creating more stable and predictable regulatory conditions, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered

for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-17. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 880) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify and make permanent the research credit. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of May 21, 2015, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

SEC. 4. The Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Wednesday, May 27, 2015, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016.

SEC. 5. On any legislative day during the period from May 22, 2015, through May 29, 2015—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, arti-

cle I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 6. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 5 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for two bills—H.R. 2262, the SPACE Act of 2015, and H.R. 880, the American Research and Competitiveness Act of 2015. House Resolution 273 provides for a structured rule for the consideration of H.R. 2262 and a closed rule for the consideration of H.R. 880.

The resolution provides for 1 hour of debate, equally divided between the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for H.R. 2262, and 1 hour of debate, equally divided between the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, for H.R. 880.

The resolution also provides for the consideration of seven amendments to H.R. 2262, and it provides for a motion to recommit for each bill. In addition, the rule provides for the normal recess authorities to allow the chair to manage pro forma sessions; it provides for the Committee on Appropriations to have the opportunity to file reports during the district work period; and it provides for suspension authority for Thursday to provide flexibility on the last day prior to the district work period.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution and the underlying legislation.

Both of these bills represent critical investments in science and technological innovation. On the floor this week, we have debated and passed several pieces of legislation to encourage the research and development of new technologies and ideas, moving our economy and our country forward and cementing our place in the world as the leader in scientific discovery.

These discoveries and the research they require will promote and create high-tech, high-paying jobs that can have untold benefits to our economy, benefiting all Americans. The rule and

the underlying legislation we have under consideration today continues that objective, and I look forward to discussing these critical issues with our colleagues here in the House.

H.R. 2262, the SPACE Act of 2015, is a package of four bills that will update the Commercial Space Launch Act. H.R. 2262, the SPACE Act, as introduced by the majority leader, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), will facilitate a progrowth environment for the commercial space industry by encouraging private sector investment and by creating a more stable and predictable regulatory environment.

H.R. 1508, the Space Resource Exploration and Utilization Act, introduced by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY), will promote the development of a United States commercial space resource exploration and utilization industry, and it will increase the exploration and utilization of resources in outer space.

H.R. 2261, the Commercial Remote Sensing Act, introduced by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE), will facilitate the continued development of the commercial remote sensing industry and protect our national security.

Finally, H.R. 2263, the Office of Space Commerce Act, proposed by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), will rename the Office of Space Commercialization to the Office of Space Commerce, and it will seek to foster the conditions for the economic and technological growth of the United States space commerce industry.

This package of bills will ensure American leadership in space by fostering a strong and vibrant commercial space industry. Without this legislation, the commercial space industry may face a myriad of regulatory hurdles that would threaten America's continued exceptionalism in space exploration.

The other underlying bill in this rule, H.R. 880, addresses the research and development tax credit. In 1981, President Reagan signed into law a critical research and development tax credit, but Washington has let it expire and then has renewed it over a dozen times since then.

As we discussed last month as to our tax credits, Mr. Speaker, the R&D tax credit was included in the package of retroactive bills and extenders that was signed by the President on December 19 of last year, providing just 7 business days of certainty for businesses seeking to utilize this provision of our Tax Code. It, along with all of the others that expired again on December 31 of last year, currently remain expired. The temporary nature of the now expired research credit limits its effectiveness, which prevents some businesses from having certainty on long-term investments in U.S.-based research and development.

More research and development means more innovation, greater economic growth, and more American

jobs. In 2012, American companies invested \$302 billion in research and development. As of 2011, 1.47 million Americans worked directly in research and development. Increased certainty, combined with the simplification of our Tax Code, would lead to more research and more American jobs.

Investment in research and development is the key to America remaining the world's leader in innovation. The percentage of patents awarded by the U.S. Patent Office has increased each year, but the share awarded to U.S. innovators has declined. In the year 2000, 54 percent of the patents awarded were of American origin. By 2014, the number fell to 48 percent. From 2001 to 2011, America's share of global research and development declined from 37 percent to just 30 percent.

By making the research credit permanent, researchers can stop worrying about whether Congress is going to extend the tax credit and can, instead, focus on new discoveries that will help fuel our economy and grow jobs.

I look forward to debating these bills with our House colleagues, and I urge support for the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying bills.

Before I proceed, I did not speak during the 1 minutes, and I want to also take cognizance of this being the 50th anniversary of Head Start and, additionally, this month of May as being Foster Care Month. Like many Members, I have a young person who has a more than compelling story about foster care—Ke'Onda Johnson from Royal Palm, Florida—who is shadowing me today, and I am delighted that she and other youngsters have this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 880, the American Research and Competitiveness Act of 2015, and H.R. 2262, the SPACE Act of 2015—two separate bills, wholly unrelated in content and purpose.

As a first order of business, I believe it is critical that I take a moment to highlight the manner in which we are debating this rule today. The deliberation of multiple, unrelated bills under a single rule is a disturbing trend that has ballooned under Republican leadership and is one that threatens the very foundation of the democratic process. Forcing several pieces of legislation into a single rule not only prevents Members of this Chamber from making informed judgments about the proper floor procedure for each measure, but it also leads to disjointed and often perplexing debates about an assortment of unconnected issues.

□ 1300

Votes on the House floor should reflect where Members stand on the specific questions at issue, not on a set of complex and unrelated procedures, some of which they support and others which they oppose.

Indeed, just yesterday, the House considered H. Res. 271, a rule providing for consideration of three measures: the Highway and Transportation Funding Act, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, and the America COMPETES Reauthorization bill.

The debate on that rule vacillated from surface transportation projects, to funding for the legislative branch, to the prioritization of science research development. Such debate erodes the integrity of House proceedings by creating confusing alternations in subject matter that eliminate the ability to reinforce a line of reasoning or respond to opposing arguments.

The grab-bag approach has skyrocketed since Republicans assumed control of the House in 2011, with a record 49 grab-bag rules reported out during the 113th Congress. Even more disheartening, we are on schedule to shatter this record during the 114th Congress, having already approved an unconscionable 14 of these rules in less than 5 months.

In fairness, the chairman of the Committee on Rules did say, in response to one of my colleagues and myself the day before, that this practice is not likely to continue at its present pace, and I await the opportunity for him to fulfill his view with reference to that matter.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today for consideration of yet another grab-bag rule governing two bills of significant importance that, as a result of this rule, will undoubtedly escape the due consideration each deserves.

H.R. 880, the American Research and Competitiveness Act of 2015, would make permanent a tax credit for qualified research expenses that expired at the end of last year. It is my strong belief that Democrats and Republicans, alike, support a tax credit that will help facilitate innovation and foster advancements in research, enabling American companies to grow and prosper. Technological innovation stemming from research and development serves as an important engine to our Nation's economic growth.

My opposition to this piece of legislation, therefore, comes in first part from my Republican colleagues' decision to make this tax credit permanent in what I view as a fiscally irresponsible way.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican friends have long touted themselves as the party of fiscal responsibility. For this reason, I find it a bit insincere that they now seek to implement a tax credit with no offsets for lost revenue. As a result, the Joint Committee on Taxation estimates that this bill would add almost \$182 billion to the deficit over the next 10 years. I have stated

time and time again that we cannot continue to provide tax cuts and credits without a mechanism to pay for them. It is comical to me that my Republican friends claim to be the party of fiscal responsibility while they, in the same breath, advocate a measure that would add nearly \$200 billion to the Federal deficit.

In addition to this legislation's reckless budgetary impact, I disagree with the piecemeal approach the majority has taken in making these tax credits permanent. More than 50 tax provisions expired at the end of last year, many of them critical to the middle and working class and, yes, poor families. And yet, instead of addressing the issues facing our Tax Code in a comprehensive, bipartisan way, the majority has decided to leave certain tax credits—ones that would directly improve the lives of hard-working American families, such as the work opportunity tax credit, the new markets tax credit, and renewable energy tax credit—to an uncertain fate.

The American people expect, and I am sure that they deserve, a Tax Code that supports our shared priorities. Cherry-picking tax credits to extend, and then allowing those credits to dramatically increase the deficit, is, in my view, a step in the wrong direction. It is an unacceptable step away from bipartisan, comprehensive tax reform.

I agree, as most of my colleagues likely do as well, that the research tax credit is critical for American innovation. That is why I am truly disappointed, although not surprised, that my Republican friends have again chosen to place partisan politicking above the needs of our constituents.

This rule also provides for consideration of the SPACE Act of 2015, another piece of once bipartisan legislation that has been distorted into an unrecognizable measure that panders to industry giants without regard for the safety of the American public or of spaceflight passengers.

While the enticement of space travel hovers over the objectives of this legislation, we must address the reality of what this bill seeks to accomplish. First, this bill reads like a laundry list of commercial space launch industry requests, exempting it from needed safety regulations and providing essentially complete immunity for civil lawsuits by removing claims related to commercial space launches from State court and mandating that they be heard in Federal Court, where few appropriate legal remedies exist. In practice, this measure will immunize commercial space companies from legal liability, even in cases of recklessness or intentional misconduct.

Also troubling, this bill provides tremendous subsidies for insurance coverage—and that is kind of interesting—to protect wealthy recreational spacecraft passengers. Why on earth, and there is no pun intended here, are we spending taxpayer dollars on individuals wealthy enough to travel into space for sport?

While it is uncontested that the issues these bills seek to address are important, the partisan way in which they have been presented prevents a robust deliberation, and I therefore oppose both the rule and the underlying bills.

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

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to some of the comments of the gentleman from Florida and remind him that each bill will be separately debated and that, obviously, this combined rule is a floor time management technique that the chairman of the Committee on Rules yesterday said was an aberration. I take him at his word; and I think it is important to note that, during Democratic majorities, this was certainly not an unheard-of practice, either.

I do want to make sure that I reiterate that every bill will be separately debated; and I would remind the gentleman that, during the time we have to debate the rule, if we actually stick to the topics related to the bills and the rules, it will help us manage our floor time even better.

With that, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY).

Mr. POSEY. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

Despite some of the comments we have heard from across the aisle this morning, I remember my first 2 years, my first term here, and not one time was I allowed to even file a single amendment to a single bill here. All the rules were closed, and it was run like a king would run a kingdom, not a democratic republic. Here, today, I think the other side has already filed seven amendments on one of these bills. That is seven times more than I ever got to dream about filing when you ran this place.

Another great thing about this bill, you actually get to read it before we pass it. We have done all our bills like that since we have taken control. You actually get to read the bills before they are passed. When you all were in the majority, we had to pass them before you read them. I think you remember the famous quote.

You refer to this as a grab bag. The only grab bag I see here is the litany of totally unrelated subjects rattled off, as if they somehow related to this bill. I mean, that doesn't pass the straight face test.

Now to the bill. I would like to thank the majority leader, KEVIN MCCARTHY, and Chairman LAMAR SMITH for their hard work on the SPACE Act. The SPACE Act will help ensure American leadership in space, facilitating the growth and stability of the commercial space industry. This is an important, historic, and exciting piece of legislation.

This legislation includes many important provisions to update our laws

and the oversight of the commercial space industry, including title 2 of the Space Resource Exploration and Utilization Act—historic, bipartisan, bicameral legislation introduced with my colleague from the State of Washington, DEREK KILMER.

I appreciate the support H.R. 1508, incorporated herein, has received from many members of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the thorough work and research of Senators PATTY MURRAY and MARCO RUBIO, who introduced identical legislation in the United States Senate.

The SPACE Act also includes a provision which would streamline regulations and encourage cooperation between government agencies' commercial space activities to eliminate red tape and bureaucracy that are impeding development of America's commercial space industry.

The Federal Aviation Administration, the Department of Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and other agencies are all involved in overseeing many commercial space launches, and sometimes there are duplicative measures that could be streamlined, cutting costs to both the Federal Government and commercial companies and making the United States companies more competitive in the global marketplace.

Let me add that this bill includes a provision requiring the FAA to provide direction for space support vehicles, also known as experimental aircraft. Unfortunately, for too long, the FAA has held off providing direction by means of a regulatory framework for these endeavors to safely support the United States commercial space endeavors. In Florida, there is such an entity, approved by NASA and operating out of the Kennedy Space Center, which the FAA grounded because they use experimental aircraft. This is a testament that FAA needs serious reform and needs to be brought into the 21st century.

In short, the SPACE Act is a critical piece of legislation to the future of our commercial space industry, and it is important to our space exploration efforts as well.

I thank my colleagues again for their work on the SPACE Act and urge all Members to support the rule today and passage of this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members in the second person.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), who is the ranking member on the Committee on Ways and Means and a good friend of mine.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I thank Mr. HASTINGS for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this debate is not about support for the R&D credit. Democrats

have a long track record of supporting the R&D tax credit. Indeed, I have often been the author of legislation to strengthen it.

This debate, purely and simply, is about fiscal responsibility, about taking one tax provision and making it permanent without paying one dime for it.

When former Chairman Camp unveiled a tax reform proposal last year, he undertook a comprehensive consideration of the more than 50 tax provisions that expired at the end of last year, but in a fiscally responsible manner.

□ 1315

This bill does just the opposite. It continues a helter-skelter approach toward tax extenders, without any regard whatsoever for paying the hundreds of billions of dollars they cost to make them permanent.

Last year, Ways and Means Republicans passed 14 permanent extensions at a cost of \$825 billion. They went nowhere because the President has made clear his opposition to this approach.

With this bill, this year's price tag has reached \$586.3 billion. It is particularly glaring that the majority is passing unpaid-for tax cuts the very same week that they once again put off a long-term extension of highway funding because they are unable to find a revenue stream.

There is no lack of support for the R&D credit among us Democrats. It is the approach Republicans are taking that we oppose and strongly so. It is fiscally irresponsible indeed, and it would leave behind vital provisions that help hard-working American families, like the expansion of the earned income tax credit, the child tax credit, and the American opportunity tax credit.

We stand ready to work with the majority on tax reform and on a long-term extension of highway funding. Today's R&D bill is tax reform in reverse. It makes talk of fiscal responsibility hypocrisy and creates another big financial pothole standing in the way of long-term highway funding.

Vote "no" on this rule, and vote "no" on the bill relating to R&D tax credits.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I stand steadfastly against not only the way in which we have been conducting business with regard to the way we report out rules, but also to both underlying bills for their partisan posturing and failure to address the important issues facing the middle class in this country.

We cannot continue to provide tax credits without establishing a revenue offset, enact tax policies that favor a partisan agenda and push us further away from needed comprehensive tax reform, or offer legislative gifts to industry giants at the expense of the American public.

Mr. Speaker, Memorial Day is next Monday. If we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative BROWNLEY's Help Hire Our Heroes Act, H.R. 607.

H.R. 607 would reauthorize the Veterans Retraining Assistance Program, which expired in March 2014. That program paid for veterans to get training for high-demand occupations, and during its 3 years in existence, it helped more than 76,000 veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question; vote "no" on the underlying bills.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Florida, but I would like to respond to a few of the comments.

The R&D tax credit has been overwhelmingly supported for the last 16 extensions, the last time garnering 378 votes. Only 46 Members voted against the R&D tax credit.

The R&D tax credit will be passed again. In fact, the gentleman from Michigan admitted, Mr. Speaker, that the vast majority of Democrats will vote to extend the R&D tax credit. In fact, they will do it every year for the next 10 years, like they have the last few years. When it is done every year, they don't insist it is paid for.

If you will do it for 10 years in a row without paying for it—the entire budget window—why don't we just all create some certainty for our businesses so we can invest in high-tech jobs and growing our economy, Mr. Speaker?

Let's create certainty for the American people. Let's pass the bill. Let's pass the rule. Let's pass the previous question.

I think, unfortunately, the arguments from the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Speaker, really encourage cliff politics—high-stakes, expiring legislation that the American people don't want. The American people want us to create certainty. They want us to support jobs. They want us to support our technological innovation in this country, Mr. Speaker.

I would urge my colleagues to support the rule and support the underlying bills, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I support the Rule on H.R. 2262, the Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act of 2015 (the SPACE Act of 2015). And I thank Majority Leader McCARTHY for sponsoring this important legislation. The space community is well served having Leader McCARTHY as a champion.

This bill is the product of over three years of work. Congress solicited input from nearly

every stakeholder group. That is reflected in the broad support that this bill has received.

From industry, to education groups, to grassroots citizen advocacy groups, this bill has been praised by virtually every interested party.

The process to getting here was inclusive and exhaustive. The Science, Space, and Technology Committee held numerous hearings on the topic over the last three years.

On November 19, 2013, the Committee held a hearing on the commercial space industry. On February 14, 2014, the Committee held a hearing on updates to the Commercial Space Launch Act. On April 29, 2014, the Committee held a hearing on the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) space traffic management proposal and orbital debris. On February 27, 2015, the Committee held a hearing on the Commercial Crew program.

Last October, staff formally submitted a draft to the minority. Within the last two months, the majority and minority have worked to write many of the provisions in the underlying bill.

For instance, Section 101, which deals with Consensus Standards, is the result of bipartisan negotiations. The same can be said for Section 102, which calls for an update to the maximum probable loss calculation under indemnification.

Section 103, which pertains to Launch Vehicle Flexibility, is identical to the bipartisan provision sponsored by Senators HEINRICH and RUBIO that easily passed the Senate Commerce Committee last year by voice vote.

Section 104 clarifies the role of Government Astronauts and is almost identical to the provision requested by the FAA and NASA.

The minority also played a role in writing Section 108 on Orbital Traffic Management. Section 109 on State Commercial Spaceports also addressed bipartisan requests.

Section 111 on the Streamlining of Commercial Space Launch Activities is similar to language already in the Senate's bill, and Section 112 was the result of an amendment in Committee that earned bipartisan support.

Title 2 of the bill focuses on Space Resource Exploration and Utilization. As a stand-alone bill, it was the subject of a hearing last September and it is cosponsored by both Republicans and Democrats. It even has a Democratic champion on the Senate side, Senator MURRAY.

Title 3 of the bill addresses Commercial Remote Sensing and also benefits from bipartisan co-sponsorship. When it was marked up in Committee last week, it enjoyed unanimous support. The same can be said of Title 4 of the bill that pertains to the Office of Space Commerce.

At the Committee's recent markup, eight amendments to the provisions we are considering today were adopted—three of which were amendments offered by Democrats.

The Rule before us today allows for consideration of five Democratic amendments and two Republican amendments. The majority has gone out of its way to include the minority in this process.

In fact, the Administration said in a statement that it, "does not oppose House passage of the bill"—a rarity for bills considered under a Rule.

This bill facilitates a pro-growth environment for the developing commercial space industry by encouraging private sector investment, creating more stable and predictable regulatory conditions, and improving safety.

The Act ensures American leadership in space and fosters the development of advanced technologies. I urge my colleagues to support this Rule as well as the underlying bill, and I thank the Majority Leader once again for his initiative on this legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the rule for H.R. 2262, the SPACE Act of 2015.

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution states that "The Congress shall have Power to promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries . . ."

It does not say that the Congress shall have the right to ignore.

The United States space program has existed for over half a century and my commitment to providing NASA with the resources to carry the agency forward with its ambitious agenda of research, exploration, and discovery is unwavering.

NASA continues to push the boundaries of what is possible, keeping our Nation on the forefront of innovation and exploration.

It is the responsibility of this Congress to ensure that the future of space exploration remains a part of our national destiny.

It inspires our children to look to the stars and dream of what they too, one day, may achieve.

The Jackson Lee Amendments made in order by the Rules Committee are intended to improve the Space Act.

My amendments are simple and will improve the bill.

1. Jackson Lee Amendments to H.R. 2262

This Jackson Lee Amendment Number 8, would facilitate the participation of HBCU, Hispanic Serving Institutions, National Indian institutions, in fellowships, work-study and employment opportunities in the emerging commercial space industry.

My amendment would increase awareness among underrepresented groups in STEM employment and education opportunities in the commercial space industry.

One of the most enduring difficulties faced by underrepresented populations in the STEM field is a lack of awareness and understanding of the connection between STEM and employment opportunities.

In 2012, a survey found that despite the nation's growing demand for more workers in science, technology, engineering, and math, the skills gap among the largest ethnic and racial minorities groups remains stubbornly wide.

Blacks and Latinos account for only 7 percent, of the STEM workforce despite representing 28 percent of the U.S. population.

2. Jackson Lee Amendment on Minority and Women Owned Businesses

The Jackson Lee Amendment requires that provisions of the bill that address future legislation also lay the foundation for the commercial space industry include work on how to effectively conduct outreach to small business concerns owned and controlled by women and minorities.

I have worked hard to help small business owners to fully realize their potential.

That is why I support entrepreneurial development programs, including the Small Business Development Center and Women's Business Center programs.

These initiatives provide counseling in a variety of critical areas, including business plan development, finance, and marketing.

Outreach is key to developing healthy and diverse small businesses.

There are approximately 6 million minority owned businesses in the United States, representing a significant aspect of our economy.

According to the most recent available Census data, minority owned businesses employ nearly 6 million Americans and generate \$1 trillion dollars in economic output.

Women owned businesses have increased 20% between 2002 and 2007, and currently total close to 8 million.

My home city of Houston, Texas, the home of the Johnson Space Center, is also home to more than 60,000 women owned businesses, and more than 60,000 African American owned businesses.

Final Jackson Lee Amendment Seeks Funding To Continue Space Exploration R&D

The taxpayer has invested in space exploration for decades.

This investment is reaping benefits for the commercial space industry today.

3. The Jackson Lee Amendment not included in the Rule would have provided revenue for research and development work to continue on challenges that hinder manned and unmanned space flight.

Many of the startup companies entering the space industry have few resources to dedicate to basic research.

There are still critical areas of research that must be done to make space flight as safe as commercial transportation systems are today.

Although commercial transportation is not 100 percent without risk, it is much safer than it would have been without dedicated and focused basic and applied research to address safety issues.

While the government supports the aspirations of companies large and small to become part of the commercial space industry, it should still be the responsibility of NASA to pursue research that can save lives and improve space travel.

If the future we envision is one where thousands of businesses will benefit from commercial and government space exploration and investment efforts then investing today in tomorrow's economy makes good sense.

Although I believe the Jackson Lee Amendments will improve the Bill, there exist troubling aspects of the bill:

First, it is regrettable that the SPACE Act will restrict the "learning period" of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulation of spacecraft.

This learning period should be extended for a shorter period than the ten-year extension through 2025 included in the bill.

Second, a voluntary industry consensus standard would provide a strategy that improves the overall safety of the industry as opposed to performance-based regulations.

Finally, I have concerns about the ability of U.S. companies to move forward with innovative space initiatives without authority to ensure continuing supervision of these initiatives as delineated in the Outer Space Treaty.

Thus, I hope we can all work together in addressing these troubling aspects of the bill.

I ask my colleagues to vote for the Jackson Lee Amendments.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 273 OFFERED BY  
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 7. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 607) to amend the VOW to Hire Heroes Act of 2011 to extend the Veterans Retraining Assistant Program, and for other purposes. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 8. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 607.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the pre-

vious question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 183, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 250]

YEAS—241

Abraham	Cole	Garrett
Aderholt	Collins (GA)	Gibbs
Allen	Collins (NY)	Gibson
Amash	Comstock	Gohmert
Amodei	Conaway	Goodlatte
Babin	Cook	Gosar
Barletta	Costello (PA)	Gowdy
Barr	Cramer	Granger
Barton	Crawford	Graves (GA)
Benishek	Crenshaw	Graves (LA)
Billirakis	Culberson	Graves (MO)
Bishop (MI)	Davis, Rodney	Griffith
Bishop (UT)	Denham	Grothman
Black	Dent	Guinta
Blackburn	DeSantis	Guthrie
Blum	DesJarlais	Hanna
Bost	Diaz-Balart	Hardy
Boustany	Dold	Harper
Brady (TX)	Duffy	Harris
Brat	Duncan (SC)	Hartzler
Bridenstine	Duncan (TN)	Heck (NV)
Brooks (AL)	Ellmers (NC)	Hensarling
Brooks (IN)	Emmer (MN)	Herrera Beutler
Buchanan	Farenthold	Hice, Jody B.
Buck	Fincher	Hill
Bucshon	Fitzpatrick	Holding
Burgess	Fleischmann	Hudson
Byrne	Fleming	Huelskamp
Calvert	Flores	Hultgren (MI)
Carter (GA)	Forbes	Hultgren
Carter (TX)	Fortenberry	Hunter
Chabot	Fox	Hurd (TX)
Clawson (FL)	Franks (AZ)	Hurt (VA)
Coffman	Frelinghuysen	Issa

Jenkins (KS) Mullin  
 Jenkins (WV) Mulvaney  
 Johnson (OH) Murphy (PA)  
 Johnson, Sam Neugebauer  
 Jolly Newhouse  
 Jones Noem  
 Jordan Nugent  
 Joyce Nunes  
 Katko Olson  
 Kelly (PA) Palazzo  
 King (IA) Palmer  
 King (NY) Paulsen  
 Kinzinger (IL) Pearce  
 Kline Perry  
 Knight Pittenger  
 Labrador Pitts  
 LaMalfa Poe (TX)  
 Lamborn Poliquin  
 Lance Pompeo  
 Latta Posey  
 LoBiondo Price, Tom  
 Long Ratcliffe  
 Loudermilk Reed  
 Love Reichert  
 Lucas Renacci  
 Luetkemeyer Ribble  
 Lummis Rice (SC)  
 MacArthur Rigell  
 Marchant Roby  
 Marino Roe (TN)  
 Massie Rogers (AL)  
 McCarthy Rogers (KY)  
 McCaul Rohrabacher  
 McClintock Rokita  
 McHenry Rooney (FL)  
 McKinley Ros-Lehtinen  
 McMorris Roskam  
 Rodgers Ross  
 McSally Rothfus  
 Meadows Rouzer  
 Meehan Royce  
 Messer Russell  
 Mica Ryan (WI)  
 Miller (FL) Salmon  
 Miller (MI) Sanford  
 Moolenaar Scalise  
 Mooney (WV) Schweikert

NAYS—183

Adams Dingell  
 Aguilar Doggett  
 Ashford Doyle, Michael  
 Bass F.  
 Beatty Duckworth  
 Becerra Edwards  
 Bera Ellison  
 Beyer Engel  
 Bishop (GA) Eshoo  
 Blumenauer Esty  
 Bonamici Farr  
 Boyle, Brendan Fattah  
 F. Foster  
 Brady (PA) Fudge  
 Brown (FL) Gabbard  
 Brownley (CA) Gallego  
 Bustos Garamendi  
 Butterfield Graham  
 Capuano Grayson  
 Cárdenas Green, Al  
 Carney Green, Gene  
 Carson (IN) Grijalva  
 Cartwright Gutiérrez  
 Castor (FL) Hahn  
 Castro (TX) Hastings  
 Chu, Judy Heck (WA)  
 Cicilline Higgins  
 Clark (MA) Himes  
 Clarke (NY) Hinojosa  
 Clay Honda  
 Cleaver Hoyer  
 Clyburn Huffman  
 Cohen Israel  
 Connolly Jackson Lee  
 Conyers Jeffries  
 Cooper Johnson (GA)  
 Costa Johnson, E. B.  
 Courtney Kaptur  
 Crowley Keating  
 Cuellar Kelly (IL)  
 Cummings Kennedy  
 Davis (CA) Kildee  
 Davis, Danny Kilmer  
 DeFazio Kind  
 DeGette Kirkpatrick  
 Delaney Kuster  
 DeLauro Langevin  
 DelBene Larson (CT)  
 DeSaulnier Lawrence  
 Deutch Lee

Scott, Austin  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Sessions  
 Shimkus  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Smith (MO)  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Stefanik  
 Stewart  
 Stivers  
 Stutzman  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiberi  
 Tipton  
 Trott  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Valadao  
 Wagner  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walker  
 Walorski  
 Walters, Mimi  
 Weber (TX)  
 Webster (FL)  
 Wenstrup  
 Westerman  
 Westmoreland  
 Whitfield  
 Williams  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Yoder  
 Yoho  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (IA)  
 Young (IN)  
 Zeldin  
 Zinke

Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sanchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schrader  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, David  
 Serrano  
 Sewell (AL)

NOT VOTING—8

Capps  
 Chaffetz  
 Curbelo (FL)  
 Donovan  
 Frankel (FL)  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Sherman  
 Sinema  
 Sires  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (WA)  
 Speier  
 Swalwell (CA)  
 Takai  
 Takano  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Titus  
 Tonko  
 Torres  
 Van Hollen  
 Vargas  
 Veasey  
 Vela  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walz  
 Waters, Maxine  
 Watson Coleman  
 Welch  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Yarmuth

□ 1349

Messrs. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, TAKAI, and RUSH changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Noted against:

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 250, I was not present because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR THOSE LOST IN THE PHILADELPHIA TRAIN DERAILMENT

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 12, we had a horrific train derailment crash in the city of Philadelphia. So first off, our thoughts and prayers are with the eight men and women who lost their lives and the over 200 who were injured.

I have never been more proud of the men and women who live and work in the city of Philadelphia, the city of brotherly love and sisterly affection. We had this major catastrophe at 9:15 at night. Within 4 minutes, our first responders—our police, our fire, Police Commissioner Ramsey, Fire Commissioner Sawyer—were on the scene.

The scene was in total darkness, and we had volunteers from the neighborhood who even joined in. Imagine, total darkness. The only light was flashlights flashing back and forth.

I stand here as proud as I could be of the mayor of the city of Philadelphia, Michael Nutter, who, from Tuesday until Sunday, was on that scene constantly, orchestrating the administration people, moving them around, consoling families, making sure that all were accounted for, and even making sure that their belongings were given back to them.

I can't be more proud of our hospitals and our universities. Universities opened their doors for loved ones to come. And our hospitals, the doctors, nurses, all the men and women who worked there—there were doctors who worked 30 hours and went back home and couldn't sleep and came back to work another 12 hours.

But most importantly, two things really struck me. Temple University Hospital in the city of Philadelphia had a lot of the injured people admitted to their hospital. The students who go to Temple University heard about it,

jumped on their bicycles, and rode down to assist all those in the hospital, whether it be by pushing a gurney or whether it would be consoling a family member or putting a family member with a loved one.

And the neighbors, the neighbors ran out—again, in total darkness. There were 200 people-plus injured. Neighbors ran through, helping out through all the soot, picking them up, pulling them out of the trains, bringing them into their house, bringing out water, going to a local store and buying water, bringing towels, wiping them down.

One person said:

I am sorry I am in your home. I am full of soot, and I am dirtying your rug and your couch.

And in response, the lady said:

That is okay. We can buy more couches, and we can buy more things, more whatever we need to buy. But you can't buy your health back. So we want to be here to be able to help you in the best way we can.

I am honored to be standing here with my colleagues from Pennsylvania and some others from throughout the country. Some lost a loved one.

I am extremely proud to recognize Chairman JEFF DENHAM and Ranking Member MIKE CAPUANO, who assisted me and toured the site with me. I appreciate their concern, and I appreciate them being there.

So, Mr. Speaker, the best way we can honor these men and women is to make sure this accident never again happens in the United States of America.

With that, I ask for a moment of silence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 185, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 251]

AYES—240

Abraham	Bridenstine	Cook
Aderholt	Brooks (AL)	Costello (PA)
Allen	Brooks (IN)	Cramer
Amodei	Buchanan	Crawford
Babin	Buck	Crenshaw
Barletta	Bucshon	Culberson
Barr	Burgess	Curbelo (FL)
Barton	Byrne	Davis, Rodney
Benishek	Calvert	Denham
Bilirakis	Carter (GA)	Dent
Bishop (MI)	Carter (TX)	DeSantis
Bishop (UT)	Chabot	DesJarlais
Black	Clawson (FL)	Diaz-Balart
Blackburn	Coffman	Dold
Blum	Cole	Duffy
Bost	Collins (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Boustany	Collins (NY)	Duncan (TN)
Brady (TX)	Comstock	Ellmers (NC)
Brat	Conaway	Emmer (MN)

Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hanna  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jolly  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Katko  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Knight  
Kuster  
Labrador  
LaMalfa

Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Marino  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratchliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita

Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lujan Grisham (NM)  
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)  
Lynch  
Maloney, Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Massie  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Rourke

NOT VOTING—7  
Capps  
Chaffetz  
Deutch  
Donovan  
Hastings  
Tsongas  
Wasserman  
Schultz

Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takai  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

ceeds 50 percent of the average basic research payments for the 3 taxable years preceding the taxable year for which the credit is being determined, plus

“(3) 20 percent of the amounts paid or incurred by the taxpayer in carrying on any trade or business of the taxpayer during the taxable year (including as contributions) to an energy research consortium for energy research.”

(b) REPEAL OF TERMINATION.—Section 41 of such Code is amended by striking subsection (h).

(c) CREDIT ALLOWED AGAINST ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX IN CASE OF ELIGIBLE SMALL BUSINESS.—Section 38(c)(4)(B) of such Code is amended by redesignating clauses (ii) through (ix) as clauses (iii) through (x), respectively, and by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

“(ii) the credit determined under section 41 for the taxable year with respect to an eligible small business (as defined in paragraph (5)(C), after application of rules similar to the rules of paragraph (5)(D)).”

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 41(c) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(c) DETERMINATION OF AVERAGE RESEARCH EXPENSES FOR PRIOR YEARS.—

“(1) SPECIAL RULE IN CASE OF NO QUALIFIED RESEARCH EXPENDITURES IN ANY OF 3 PRECEDING TAXABLE YEARS.—In any case in which the taxpayer has no qualified research expenses in any one of the 3 taxable years preceding the taxable year for which the credit is being determined, the amount determined under subsection (a)(1) for such taxable year shall be equal to 10 percent of the qualified research expenses for the taxable year.

“(2) CONSISTENT TREATMENT OF EXPENSES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding whether the period for filing a claim for credit or refund has expired for any taxable year taken into account in determining the average qualified research expenses, or average basic research payments, taken into account under subsection (a), the qualified research expenses and basic research payments taken into account in determining such averages shall be determined on a basis consistent with the determination of qualified research expenses and basic research payments, respectively, for the credit year.

“(B) PREVENTION OF DISTORTIONS.—The Secretary may prescribe regulations to prevent distortions in calculating a taxpayer's qualified research expenses or basic research payments caused by a change in accounting methods used by such taxpayer between the current year and a year taken into account in determining the average qualified research expenses or average basic research payments taken into account under subsection (a).”

(2) Section 41(e) of such Code is amended—  
(A) by striking all that precedes paragraph (6) and inserting the following:

“(e) BASIC RESEARCH PAYMENTS.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘basic research payment’ means, with respect to any taxable year, any amount paid in cash during such taxable year by a corporation to any qualified organization for basic research but only if—

“(A) such payment is pursuant to a written agreement between such corporation and such qualified organization, and

“(B) such basic research is to be performed by such qualified organization.

“(2) EXCEPTION TO REQUIREMENT THAT RESEARCH BE PERFORMED BY THE ORGANIZATION.—In the case of a qualified organization described in subparagraph (C) or (D) of paragraph (3), subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) shall not apply.”

□ 1402

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AMERICAN RESEARCH AND COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2015

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 273, I call up the bill (H.R. 880) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify and make permanent the research credit, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). Pursuant to House Resolution 273, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, modified by the amendment printed in part B of House Report 114-127, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 880

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “American Research and Competitiveness Act of 2015”.

#### SEC. 2. RESEARCH CREDIT SIMPLIFIED AND MADE PERMANENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 41(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 38, the research credit determined under this section for the taxable year shall be an amount equal to the sum of—

“(1) 20 percent of so much of the qualified research expenses for the taxable year as exceeds 50 percent of the average qualified research expenses for the 3 taxable years preceding the taxable year for which the credit is being determined,

“(2) 20 percent of so much of the basic research payments for the taxable year as ex-

#### NOES—185

Adams  
Aguilar  
Amash  
Ashford  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly

Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
DeSaulnier  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael F.  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fattah  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Graham  
Grayson

Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively, and

(C) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated, by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C) and by redesignating subparagraphs (D) and (E) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively.

(3) Section 41(f)(3) of such Code is amended—

(A)(i) by striking “, and the gross receipts” in subparagraph (A)(i) and all that follows through “determined under clause (iii)”;

(ii) by striking clause (iii) of subparagraph (A) and redesignating clauses (iv), (v), and (vi), thereof, as clauses (iii), (iv), and (v), respectively;

(iii) by striking “and (iv)” each place it appears in subparagraph (A)(iv) (as so redesignated) and inserting “and (iii)”;

(iv) by striking subclause (IV) of subparagraph (A)(iv) (as so redesignated), by striking “, and” at the end of subparagraph (A)(iv)(III) (as so redesignated) and inserting a period, and by adding “and” at the end of subparagraph (A)(iv)(II) (as so redesignated);

(v) by striking “(A)(vi)” in subparagraph (B) and inserting “(A)(v)”;

(vi) by striking “(A)(iv)(II)” in subparagraph (B)(i)(II) and inserting “(A)(iii)(II)”;

(B) by striking “, and the gross receipts of the predecessor,” in subparagraph (A)(iv)(II) (as so redesignated);

(C) by striking “, and the gross receipts of,” in subparagraph (B);

(D) by striking “, or gross receipts of,” in subparagraph (B)(i)(I), and

(E) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

“(C) ADJUSTMENTS FOR BASIC RESEARCH PAYMENTS.—In the case of basic research payments, rules similar to the rules of subparagraph (A) and (B) shall apply.”

(4) Section 41(f)(4) of such Code is amended by striking “and gross receipts” and inserting “and basic research payments”.

(5) Section 45C(b)(1) of such Code is amended by striking subparagraph (D).

(6) Section 45C(c)(2) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “base period research expenses” and inserting “average qualified research expenses”, and

(B) by striking “BASE PERIOD RESEARCH EXPENSES” in the heading and inserting “AVERAGE QUALIFIED RESEARCH EXPENSES”.

(7) Section 280C(c) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “basic research expenses (as defined in section 41(e)(2))” in paragraph (1) and inserting “basic research payments (as defined in section 41(e)(1))”, and

(B) by striking “basic research expenses” in paragraph (2)(B) and inserting “basic research payments”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

(2) SUBSECTION (b).—The amendment made by subsection (b) shall apply to amounts paid or incurred after December 31, 2014.

### SEC. 3 BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-

bers may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 880, the American Research and Competitiveness Act of 2015.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is really simple. We have had the research and development tax credit in law since 1981. It has periodic expirations in it. Every time the law expires, we renew the law. Why? Because we think this is a good policy, and on a bipartisan basis our votes have always reflected that.

We believe that since we renew this specifically 1 year at a time, it does not do very well in giving businesses the time to plan and the ability to consider long-term investments. They need certainty. One of the problems plaguing this economy is the lack of certainty. So what this bill does is it makes it permanent. This is something that we think ought to be a permanent feature of our Tax Code.

Mr. Speaker, one of the arguments you are going to hear is, well, this has to be paid for. I want people to understand what that means when people say that. They are saying that to keep taxes where they are, we need to go raise them on other people. To put it another way, the minority is telling us they want a permanent extension of tax credits from the stimulus bill which was temporary, but they are saying if we make permanent provisions that have bipartisan support that are extended on an annual basis, if we make them permanent, all of a sudden we have to go raise taxes on some other hard-working Americans just to keep these taxes in place.

I think that is incorrect. We don't think it jibes with reality. More importantly, we think it is very important, to help unleash job creation, to keep research and development jobs in America, that we make the research and development tax credit permanent.

#### PERMISSION TO POSTPONE PROCEEDINGS ON MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the question of adopting a motion to recommit on H.R. 880 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the author of H.R. 880 and a Ways and Means Committee member, manage and control the remaining time for the majority.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to start by clarifying one thing. My friend from Wisconsin talked about what it means when you say “paid for.” What it means when you say “paid for” is you pay for the bill. There is a certain cost associated with any legislation that we do, and if we don't pay for it, then it is added on to our deficits. So when we raise concerns about whether or not this tax bill or any other bill that comes to the floor for debate is paid for, the concerns that we are raising are in direct correlation to the fact that it needs to be paid for, not it needs to be added to the deficit or it needs to be added to our national debt.

There is no debate on the issue of the merits of the R&D credit. A majority of my Democratic colleagues and I, too, believe in and support the R&D credit. It has proven to facilitate advancements in new technologies, sparked new innovations, and creates good-paying jobs for hard-working Americans, and it benefits hard-working American families. And it is critical to helping U.S. companies innovate and compete in a global marketplace.

However, what we do object to is the approach by which this is being done. As I said, it is unpaid for, and it is outside of tax reform.

Last year, the previous chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Chairman Camp, unveiled a tax reform proposal that made the R&D credit permanent; but the cost of the provision was paid for. He did it responsibly. It was responsibly offset. This bill, like all the other individual tax bills we have considered thus far this year, does not pay for any of them; it does just the opposite. It continues a helter-skelter approach toward tax extenders without any regard for paying the hundreds of billions of dollars it costs to make them permanent. Moreover, it poisons the bipartisan process that is going to be critical if we are, in fact, going to get tax reform done.

This political exercise that we are doing today shows the misplaced priorities of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Not only did they recently vote to raise taxes and cut programs for millions of hardworking American families in their budget resolution, they are also leaving behind important provisions to help them, like the expansion of the earned income tax credit, the child tax credit, and the American opportunity tax credit.

When it comes to corporations and the wealthy, cost doesn't seem to be a problem. Yet programs vital to the well-being of hard-working families and communities are significantly cut or done away with.

What is particularly glaring is that we can't even pass a long-term transportation bill, which is, by far, more important to our national security, our economic growth, and our competitiveness. The reason we can't pass it is because the majority is unable to find a way to pay for it.

Yet here we are taking up a bill that costs \$181 billion. Add that to the other unpaid-for tax cut bills that this body has already passed this year, and we will have added \$586 billion to the deficit. That is almost half a trillion dollars. That is over half a trillion dollars.

And what do we have to show for it? The President has already said that he is going to veto this bill, so what is the point? Why are we wasting the time and expense of debating this? It is going to be vetoed anyway.

What we should be doing is working together to pass legislation that is vital to every congressional district's long-term transportation bill and comprehensive tax reform.

Mr. Speaker, we stand ready to work with the majority on these important things. Today's bill just takes us further away from that goal. Therefore, I ask that we vote "no" on this bill and make sure we vote for America.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

When it comes to research and development initiatives, America is rapidly falling behind our global competitors. Unless the U.S. remains the world's leading innovator, our economy will suffer while middle class families and talented college graduates will see jobs and opportunities lost to foreign countries. Making permanent the tax incentive for companies to invest in research and development right here in the United States will ensure lifesaving technologies, state-of-the-art computer systems, and breakthroughs in manufacturing products.

While America once led the world in R&D incentives, the U.S. has now dropped to—get this—27th among our global competitors. America's share of global research and development, while it is still big, has dropped from 39 percent, before the turn of this new century, to 31 percent.

So look at China. By contrast, China's R&D spending has increased fourfold. It is poised to surpass that of America by 2022.

Permanency provides certainty to U.S. innovators. It makes the Federal budget scorekeeping far more honest, and it removes the asterisk from this temporary provision so that progrowth tax reform can advance.

This year, we have added a new provision that will allow eligible small businesses to count the credit against the AMT, the alternative minimum tax. This is an important provision to enable America's newest innovators to develop even more cutting-edge, market-dominating technologies.

I am proud to have worked on this important tax incentive with my friend

JOHN LARSON, a Democrat from Connecticut. The House passed this provision with a strong bipartisan vote last year.

While the economy is improving, there are millions of Americans still looking for full-time work and millions more middle class families whose paychecks have been stagnant for years. If we want a permanently strong economy, we need a permanent research and development tax credit.

The time for excuses is over. Stand with innovation in America or stand with China and other countries with the R&D being shipped to the rest of the world. I say we stand with America, our innovators, our college graduates, and our businesses.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), former chair of the committee and a strong proponent of responsible tax policy.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I was listening to the eloquent words of my friend from Texas about the importance of research and development, and I can't think of any member on our committee that could not agree with him more.

□ 1415

While he was eloquently speaking about how important it was to our great Nation, I was even thinking about our trade bill if this is packaged in such a way that we would have our workforce with the backup of research and development, a trade bill that would include in it educational possibilities for the workforce, that would have infrastructure there and would have America knowing that we just weren't talking about success of the corporations, but for success of America.

Also, the part that he mentioned—continuity—so that our businesspeople would know exactly what they could depend on. I just can't, for the life of me, see how they will know which part of the Tax Code or which week that we intend to bring up knowing it is going to be vetoed, if really in our hearts what we want is continuity. There is only one way to get continuity, and that is to review the Tax Code, to reform the Tax Code.

If you take out all of the gems just to get a "no" vote against it politically, you are really harming bipartisanship. That is what we need; that is what the Tax Code needs; that is what our country needs, a Tax Code that eliminates all of the loopholes, and concentrate on those things our country needs.

Of course, if politics is more important than policy, if all we are trying to do is play "I gotcha," if all we want to say is we love research and development, but we know darn well politically it is not going to pass, if we are going to say that we all want reform, but now that we have both Houses Republican—House and the Senate—but

we dare not talk about tax reform, well, I don't think we want to play this political game.

What we do want to do—and I want to agree with the majority—research and development is what keeps America competitive. It should not be played with. It should not be politicalized. It should be a part of the tax reform bill.

If you can't do it when you have control of the Finance Committee in the Senate and refuse to do it when you are in charge of the Ways and Means Committee and have a President that is calling out for overall comprehensive fairness and equity and tax reform, it is painful to see how the eloquence of love for this country can be distorted by having votes on legislation that we know is never to become law.

I say, as I take my seat, I am not giving up on tax reform. I hope that the Republicans come together and have a meaningful bill not for our committee, but for our conscience.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

The President has threatened to veto this bill. The question is clear: Why is the President standing for those who would ship jobs overseas? Why isn't he standing with Republicans and Democrats in Congress in this House to keep those jobs in research here in America?

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING), a new member of the Ways and Means Committee, who understands research and development in the Triangle of North Carolina.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman BRADY for offering this important piece of legislation.

The research and development credit plays a crucial role in the continued economic growth of our Nation, spurring innovation and supporting high-skilled, high-paying jobs.

Innovation has been a huge driver of growth in my district. Because of the breakthrough technologies coming out of Research Triangle Park, North Carolina has become a leader in American innovation.

In and around my district, I have seen how important the R&D credit has been to our Nation's innovative companies, like Biogen, Cisco, GSK, SAS, UTC, and Siemens, amongst a host of others. I urge my colleagues to support such companies and their employees and the families of those employees by making this important credit permanent.

Right now, Mr. Speaker, a growing number of foreign countries are increasing innovation and advancing manufacturing by providing generous and permanent R&D tax credits along with lower corporate tax rates.

In fact, according to an OECD study, the U.S. ranks 22nd in research incentives among industrialized countries. We owe our innovators better, and in order to remain a leader in the increasingly global economy, we must continue to support and incentivize research and innovation here in the United States.

Passage of this bill will provide companies and researchers with the certainty and support they need to keep America and my district and North Carolina in the forefront of global innovation and send a strong message that we stand behind the groundbreaking research being conducted by our Nation's innovators.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to point out that the President is standing with those of us who support the R&D credit, but he wants it done responsibly. He wants it paid for, and he wants it part of tax reform. Just like all of us, we support the R&D credit. We want it paid for, and we want it part of tax reform.

To suggest that voting against this is standing with China, I find somewhat an ironic statement made by my friend from Texas, given the fact that China already holds so much of the U.S. debt. All this does is empower them more, give them more of our debt.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, there is one type of innovation in which these Republicans are truly unexcelled—there is no competition. And that is the innovation in names, in naming these bills.

They salute climate deniers and The Flat Earth Society by slashing funding for earth science that is strongly opposed by geophysicists and one academic after another. What do they call it? The "America COMPETES Act."

On this measure, its companion, they borrow almost \$200 billion from anyone who will lend it to us to give mostly to the largest corporations, largely for doing research that they would be doing, even if they weren't rewarded. And they call that the "American Research and Competitiveness Act." Now, that is true innovation. They don't need a credit; they ought to get a prize for being contortionists when it comes to labeling these measures.

This particular bill just digs us deeper and deeper into debt, while adding very little to our research capability. That is truly unfortunate, since America's future competitiveness is in jeopardy. And that is outlined this very day in "Innovation Lies on Weak Foundation," a New York Times economic column.

As Eduardo Porter notes, "Investment in research and development has flatlined over the last several years as a share of the economy . . . other countries are now leaving the United States behind . . . government budgets for basic research, the biggest source of financing for scientific inquiry . . . fell in 2013 to substantially below its level 10 years earlier."

Indeed, the Republican budget makes significant cuts to research, including hundreds fewer research grants that the President sought at both the Na-

tional Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation. I think we need more than another Ice Bucket Challenge to fund research for cures for cancer and diabetes, ALS, AIDS, and the like. We need the resources to tackle problems that are touching every family in this country.

Unfortunately, this R&D credit that is being made permanent without reform has required American taxpayers to subsidize the development of electronic cigarettes and other products to addict our children to nicotine, instead of using those dollars to fight those dreaded diseases to which nicotine contributes.

Corporate research generally is focused more and more on the next quarter's reports to Wall Street to which excessive corporate compensation is tied, instead of focusing on basic research. Porter concludes in the same article that this particular bill is "unlikely to help much." And he notes the conclusion of the Congressional Research Service, an objective source, that this regularly renewed credit "delivered, at most, a modest stimulus to domestic business R&D investment from 2000-2010."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DOGGETT. I support a permanent research and development credit to incentivize more research. The question is: How do we pay for it, and how do we ensure that it actually encourages more jobs, leads to more research and more economic development, instead of just giving a reward to those who are already doing something in this area to advance their product?

Nothing, of course, prevents multinationals from taking the credit and then putting the patent or the copyright in some foreign tax haven and avoiding paying their American taxes, another reform that is necessary.

We should reject this proposal in favor of a strong research credit that actually incentivizes necessary research here in America and which is paid for, in part, by comprehensive reform of this very credit. Surely, we don't need any more research today to know that today's bills are the wrong way to go for America.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), one of our leaders of the Ways and Means Committee, who understands you can't keep making excuses about bringing R&D to America; you have to act.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this legislation and on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. Speaker and Members, America has long been a place where an idea that is thought up in a garage or in the backyard can become the next revolution in manufacturing or the next life-saving technology.

We need a Tax Code that promotes innovation, that promotes entrepreneurship, that promotes growth. We need a Tax Code that allows the inventors and the dreamers with a good idea to be able to go out there and succeed.

This is critical legislation that comes at a very critical time. Modernizing and making the research and development tax credit permanent will ensure that the United States remains competitive in the global marketplace.

It has been around since 1981; it has been renewed 16 times, but when you renew a credit for 1 year, for 2 years, or you make it retroactive, that doesn't work very well for some companies that are allocating their capital for 5 or 10 years on the horizon that want to invest in research and development.

In Minnesota, we are the home to 400 medical device companies. Research and development is their lifeblood, and these manufacturers use research and development to invent new devices, new techniques, new procedures. These companies are also a very essential component to our economy in Minnesota and also around the United States.

We should be making America the number one destination to create and grow a business. Making the research and development credit permanent will provide our Nation's innovators that incentive and that certainty that they need to develop the next big idea and help America win the future.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a distinguished member of our Ways and Means Committee, from a district filled with innovators, all of whom would benefit from doing this policy the right way.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

I was listening to my dear friend, the gentleman from Texas, who is managing the bill for our Republican friends, and I was struck for a moment when he talked about the disadvantage vis-a-vis China, how—in a few years—we are going to slip behind China in R&D development.

He talked about the hundreds of thousands of jobs that could be made available if we were able to redouble our efforts in research and development and the concerns about the overall slippage of the United States into the middle of the pack when it comes to research.

I was struck by those words. For a moment, I thought he was talking about the United States infrastructure because we don't have to wait for 3 or 4 or 5 years to slip behind China; we are already being overshadowed by their efforts. We are investing less than 2 percent of our gross domestic product in infrastructure; the Chinese are investing 8 percent or more.

The United States once had the finest infrastructure in the world—not anymore. Those international ratings that my good friend from Texas talked

about are very much the case for our infrastructure. We have dropped from 1st to 5th to 16th to 27th.

I want to know where the alarm for my Republican friends is about our falling behind while America falls apart.

□ 1430

We are going to pass before the year is out the research and development credit. I hope we do it the right way, but we will do it.

What we haven't done in the 55 months since the Republicans took control of the House of Representatives is we have not had a single hearing on how we are going to finance our crumbling infrastructure—not one. In the meantime, we are told that this is off the table, that the gas tax is off the table. We are going to do some smoke and mirrors or something. We just passed the 33rd short-term extension of the surface transportation bill.

What country became great in having built its infrastructure 9 months at a time?

While my Republican friends refuse to even consider the gas tax that Ronald Reagan championed—in fact, urged and Congress more than doubled under his watch—in the last 6 months, we have had Georgia, Utah, South Dakota, Nebraska, Idaho, and Iowa all raise their gas taxes, hoping that the Federal Government will meet its obligations and be a partner in rebuilding and in renewing America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Where is the sense of urgency for the cost to families who are having \$300 a year or more in damage to their cars? The fact that we are not being able to move product because we are stuck in traffic? Then our ports, our airports, our roads, our rail—we just had an example of its instability—where is the urgency?

I would, respectfully, suggest that we reject this wrongheaded approach and deal with real tax reform and the R&D tax credit. But in the meantime, maybe the Ways and Means Committee could find a week that we could spend working together to rebuild and renew America.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD), a new member of the Ways and Means Committee who comes from a research-driven State.

Mr. DOLD. I want to thank my good friend from Texas for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just address my good friend from Oregon to say, as someone on this side of the aisle, I, too, sense an urgency on transportation and infrastructure. I know that we need to step up and do something about it so that we can have a robust economy, so that we can be moving our goods and services around. I do look forward to

our working on tax reform, but, today, we are talking about research and development.

As we talk about certainty, certainly we need certainty with regard to our transportation and infrastructure system, but we need certainty when it comes to research and development. Businesses all across our country, as they are looking to try to create that next new product, as they are looking to innovate, as they are looking to create that next new thing in order to improve the lives of individuals and to enhance our Nation, they need to have that certainty to be able to look around the corner.

We are moving forward on research and development a step at a time. We are reauthorizing it a year at a time. Sometimes we are doing it retroactively, which means that those businesses don't have the ability to plan and oftentimes don't. They are happy to take the tax relief, but they are not really willing to plan and invest in it, oftentimes having, year after year, programs in which they are investing billions of dollars, creating thousands of jobs.

Innovation, Mr. Speaker, is something that we should all be united behind. We want to innovate here in the United States. We want to create things here in the United States. We do not want to have a research and development situation which really fosters innovation outside of the United States. Yes, we have slipped behind, and Republicans and Democrats alike want to make sure that the United States is leading the charge. We need to be globally competitive. We are not in a domestic economy—we are in a global economy. If we want to be globally competitive, we cannot be ranked 22nd when it comes to research incentives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I come from a northern district in Illinois. We are the fourth-largest manufacturing district in the Nation. Yes, we rely on that infrastructure because we need to know how our raw materials come in, how our finished product goes out, and how we move people around. We also realize that those manufacturers rely on that research and development tax credit in order to innovate, in order to create that next new thing, that next new innovation. If we don't do it in the United States, they will be doing it elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I just got back from Israel. One of the things that struck me as I swung by one of their companies is that they had a sign out front that read: "Where Innovation Never Stops."

We either choose to innovate here, or they will do it elsewhere. This is a bipartisan initiative, and I ask my colleagues to support this initiative.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to point out that my friend who just spoke said that he, too, believes in transportation, that we should be working on transportation and tax reform, but that, today, we are talking about the R&D credit.

Mr. Speaker, the majority party sets the agenda. The reason we are not talking about transportation or tax reform is that they don't want to talk about it. They set the agenda. They are the ones who decided that today we were going to do this irresponsible tax bill rather than look at comprehensive tax reform or look at transportation funding for our crumbling infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), my colleague and friend and the chair of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let's make sure we get something straight. I don't think there is a Member here on the floor who doesn't agree that we want to invest in research and development so that we keep that innovation here at home and create jobs that pay well here at home. We all want to incentivize that job creation. We all want to make sure that the economy grows in the future. That is not what is at issue here. What is at issue is that this bill sends exactly the wrong message about our commitment to invest not just in our future but in our children and in what we call the middle class and the American Dream.

See, there is a cost involved in doing research and development tax credits. That is a tax break. We are willing to give companies a tax break that the families who are up in this gallery won't get. When they file their taxes, they won't get to write off some of their costs for doing certain things because they are not companies, and they are not doing research and development.

We, as a community, as a country, are saying it is valuable to give a country a tax break to do that research that gives us the next invention. Great, but there is a cost. How much? \$180 billion. It ain't free. We have got to pay for it. So it is not an issue of not supporting research and development; it is wanting to be responsible and wanting to be honest with the American people in saying let's pay for it. Democrats are saying we can pay for it. Let's close those tax breaks that are essentially tax loopholes that everyone in America would agree are not fair. Use the money you save from closing tax loopholes to pay for something we all want, which is research and development tax credits.

Now, this isn't free. If we don't pay for it, what happens? Guess what? You don't want to pay for it? You know this is going to cost three times more than what we spend on our veterans. So we

are going to say, Veterans, you shouldn't get any services because we had to do this research and development tax credit, and we didn't pay for it.

Perhaps you want to tell that to all of those folks who are looking for the cure for cancer or for the cure for diabetes. Guess what? We are spending about three times as much with this research and development tax credit—unpaid for—than what we pay for all of that medical research we do through the National Institutes of Health. This is not free.

Student loans. How many folks have to worry about paying for their student loans for their kids to go to college? Guess what? The cost of this bill is about what it would cost to continue the programs that we have in place for our kids who go on to college so we can keep the cost of student loans low. You want to eliminate that so people have to pay a lot more—market rate interest rates—for those student loans? Guess what? That is what we would have to do.

There are consequences. If we are going to get away from deficit spending, you have got to pay for things. If you think it is a priority, then let's pay for it, but don't act like you can do these things for free. They cost money. All we are saying is let's pay for what we all agree is important—a research and development tax credit for companies that will do that research here in America. Let's not try to hoodwink the American public. This is not free. It is the right thing to do. Just about every American family would say, Guess what? Maybe I have to pay a few more dollars in taxes, but I am keeping that American company here, investing in innovation here, creating jobs in America.

Priorities. Let's make the tough choices. Let's vote against this and vote for a bill that actually pays for the cost of something we want to do with the research and development tax credit.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader of the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to take a moment to thank the gentleman from Texas for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to a lot of speakers on this floor. What is the cost not to invest in the future? There are 4 out of 10 graduates out of college today who can't find a job. How do you pay for that?

You look towards the future. I will tell you many in this country have followed the innovators in our history. Mr. Speaker, one happened to be Steven Jobs. Steven Jobs said that innovation distinguishes between a leader and a follower.

That is true with people, and it is also true with countries. America leads

because we take the principles of our past, and we apply them to a changing future. We are the pioneers who always look to the next frontier, ready to challenge what others believe is impossible. Innovation is key to our leadership and is essential to our economic prosperity in an increasingly competitive 21st century. What Washington needs to understand is that the greatest innovations don't come from Washington—they come from the people.

It reminds me of what was going on in the early 1900s in this country. Washington wanted to figure out the invention of flight, so the wisdom of government said, "Let's just pay Samuel Langley to discover how to fly," but we all knew what came true. We watched two brothers who owned a bicycle store take to the skies from a small field in Kitty Hawk, transforming what we know of today.

The R&D tax credit harnesses that American spirit. It makes space for the American people to lead us into the future. When Ronald Reagan first signed the R&D tax credit into law, he knew it would grow our economy and make America strong because it put our faith in the country's greatest assets—its people and the future.

Mr. Speaker, today, we are voting to make this tax credit permanent. I think that is very good policy. I also think it shows what our values are. It shows that it is everyday heroes who can lead us into the future of tomorrow. So I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill, and I urge my colleagues to give the American people the tools to move America forward.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank Mr. THOMPSON and the ranking member, Mr. LEVIN, and members of the committee for bringing clarity to this debate today.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats have always believed that innovation is what keeps America number one. I think that that is a view that is shared by all of us in the Congress. Our commitment on our side of the aisle, I know, is to science and to research and development, which create jobs, launch entire new industries, and give the miraculous power to cure.

For Americans to continue to lead in the 21st century, for us to meet the challenges of our time, for us to secure a strong and sustainable future for America's families and the next generation, we must commit to fueling the engines of innovation.

When President Kennedy challenged Americans to reach for the Moon, he reminded us that America must lead in innovation:

The vows of this Nation can only be fulfilled if we are first, and, therefore, we intend to be first. Our leadership in science and in industry, our hopes for peace and security, our obligations to ourselves as well as to others, all require us to make this effort.

However, according to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, these days, the United States has dropped to 10th place in national R&D investment as a percentage of the GDP.

As their report makes clear:

Unless basic research becomes a higher government priority than it has been in recent decades, the potential for fundamental scientific breakthroughs and future technological advances will be severely constrained.

Instead of meeting this urgent need and challenge, Republicans are coming to the floor of this House today with not one but two bills that do violence to that aspiration.

□ 1445

First of all, we have the so-called Republican R&D bill, a completely unpaid-for, permanent, and deficit-exploding tax extension. Democrats support the R&D tax credit, and we will be offering a motion to recommit for a 2-year extension to give Congress—Democrats and Republicans—time to work together to pass comprehensive tax reform that closes loopholes and pays for making this tax credit permanent.

With this bill alone, Republicans will explode the deficit by \$182 billion. This is just a part of a larger package of permanent, completely unpaid-for Republican tax measures this year that will add almost \$600 billion to the deficit—over half a trillion dollars added to the deficit—including this bill, their bill to hand \$269 billion to the 5,400 richest families in America, 5,400 families, and their estate tax bill would be getting the benefit of \$269 billion paid for by the middle class in our country, depriving us of investments in our children's future.

The fact is that House Republicans have spent this entire Congress blowing up the deficit with unpaid-for tax giveaways overwhelmingly tilted toward wealthy special interests. My colleagues, hear this: it is worth noting that this bill on the floor has nothing to do with enterprising startups that are unable to claim the R&D tax credit. Some of you have said to me: Well, we have all these startups in my district. By and large, they cannot benefit from this bill the way it is written.

We would like to have written our motion to recommit to go further, to do that, but the Parliamentarians say, because you prevent it in your base bill, we can't go further.

This is what is really stunning in the look of it all. On the same day as you are saying we are going to do a gotcha bill on R&D and challenge you all who support R&D not to vote for our approach, on the very same day—lest anybody think that this is an overwhelming interest in R&D on the Republican side of the aisle—Republicans are bringing to the floor a COMPETES Act that completely undermines everything to do with science and innovation in our country. It completely upsets our Innovation Agenda.

In the 110th Congress we put forth the Innovation Agenda, a bill developed in a totally nonpartisan way. ANNA ESHOO, ZOE LOFGREN, and George Miller took the lead going across the country, getting input, nonpartisan input, academic input, venture capital input, technological input, into an Innovation Agenda. That Innovation Agenda really calls for making permanent and modernizing the R&D tax credit. We see the relationship between science, technology, innovation, and progress to keep America number one with R&D tax credits, but not done this way as we do here.

This is a trap in order to keep us from investing in Innovation Agenda, and that was something that Bart Gordon, as chair of the Science and Technology Committee, fought for and achieved. ARPA-E, you know that, to name one thing. But instead, today, Republicans are bringing a bill that totally does violence to all this. I hope Members will listen to and support the alternative presented by Congresswoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, our ranking member on the committee.

But, anyway, the original COMPETES Act by the Democratic Congress was supported by an overwhelming number of Republicans. A majority of the Republicans defied their leadership and voted for the COMPETES Act in the 110th Congress, and that original bill passed in a bipartisan way. We laid the foundation for new industries that provide jobs for our workers, that open new markets for American products, that ensure that we continue to “rise above the gathering storm.” Norm Augustine and others led the way to show what the gathering storm was unless we made those investments in science and technology. As I said, we created ARPA-E, so important.

This Republican bill betrays everything that the COMPETES Act did. The Republican bill betrays everything that the COMPETES Act did. It is an assault on science and a plan to surrender American leadership on innovation. Instead of investing in research and development, their bill slashes funding for essential initiatives at the National Science Foundation, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the Office of Science and Technology Policy, the Department of Energy research.

It cuts energy efficiency and renewable energy R&D by \$496 million. It is huge, half-a-billion-dollar cut, nearly 30 percent below what was appropriated last year. It cuts ARPA-E by \$140 million, 50 percent below the level in the Energy and Water Appropriations bill passed last week.

Most insidiously, Republicans are attacking science they don't even want to hear. Just because you don't want to hear it doesn't mean it isn't true. In this COMPETES bill that they are presenting, they are trying to silence the climate, environmental, and social science they have consistently tried to

ignore. The Republican bill goes so far as to forbid Federal agencies such as EPA and FERC from using any research funded or developed by DOE, a brazen attempt to divorce their decisions from scientific inquiry.

So again, the very idea that, on this floor today, they come out with this masquerade of R&D tax credits, \$182 billion added to the deficit, with the impression that they care about R&D. R&D into what? R&D into nothing that is about innovation to keep America number one. These Republican bills represent a perfect manifestation of Republican trickle-down economics.

The choice that our country has to make in the economy as we go forward is trickle-down economics versus middle class economics. Trickle-down theories have not worked. They are what got us in trouble in 2008, and it is exactly what the Republicans are trying to take us back to. Today is one manifestation of that.

Republicans are seeking to ransack our Nation's investments in the future, our commitment to science, our commitment to our children's education, our commitment to bigger paychecks, and our commitment to better infrastructure for every American family.

We need to come together in a bipartisan way, and that is very possible. We did it with the COMPETES Act before. To pay for R&D tax credit extension, we need to reject this Republican assault on science that will happen later today. We need to invest in the future of innovation of our country, of hard-working American families. We need to reject failed trickle-down economic theories and accept that the success of our Nation depends on bigger paychecks for America's working families. R&D tax credits made permanent and modernized are a significant part of that, but they are not a part of it if they take us deeper into debt, preventing us from making the investments in the future.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this fiscally irresponsible R&D bill, “no” on their destructive COMPETES Act, and “yes” on the proposal made by Congresswoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, who I thank for her great leadership for keeping America number one.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. I thank Mr. BRADY for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleagues on the other side that, under the leadership of the former presenter, almost a trillion dollars was spent on a stimulus package with nothing to show for it.

I was in the business world then, and I have been in the business world 37 years. The reason I ran for Congress was to bring real-world experience to this body. That is why I rise today in support of H.R. 880. The reason for that is because, when you invest and you invest properly, there is a return. Those

families find jobs, and that is what this bill is about.

H.R. 880 is to simplify and make permanent the research and development tax credit. Despite the fact that the research tax credit has been extended 16 times since its enactment, it remains a temporary measure. It is very difficult to plan based on temporary measures. Clearly, it is high time that we provide certainty for innovators in Georgia and across the Nation by making this tax credit permanent.

Innovation is the lifeblood of the small-business community, which employs over 70 percent of the workforce. Innovation in the private sector is essential to driving our economy forward and in fostering growth and creating jobs for Americans now and in the future. It is our duty in Congress to incentivize businesses so that innovators and entrepreneurs can do what they do best and fill the ever growing demand for jobs across our great Nation.

We have so many capable men and women willing to work, so let's get out of the way of the entrepreneurial American spirit and pass H.R. 880.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out that small businesses and the startups are disadvantaged if this bill passes. They can't take advantage of this real-world experience and business-world experience. I am here to tell you, as a small-business person, if you don't pay your bills, you go out of business. The leader had mentioned that this bill is going to cost \$181 billion, but, Mr. Speaker and Members, if you add that \$181 billion to everything else that the majority has passed in regard to unpaid-for tax cuts, that number jumps to \$586.3 billion of unpaid-for tax policy.

Now it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), a distinguished member of our Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California for yielding me time. I also want to thank Representative BRADY for his characterization of my State, the State of Illinois, as being research driven, and indeed it is. I am also proud to know that, from the time I have been here, I have always been number one or number two in our delegation of supporting research, so I am research oriented.

It amazes me how much doubletalk we engage in. We talk a great deal about deficit reduction and reducing spending, and yet, at the same time, we are passing a bill that is not paid for while we cut greatly needed programs and activities that could give balance to individuals all over the country who are just simply trying to survive and to make it, activities like Medicaid and SNAP.

In my communities and in many others throughout America, we are struggling right now with the idea of how do you develop summer work opportunities for young adults so that we could

have a real attack on some of the rash of violence and activity that we see approaching and being engaged in throughout urban America.

I have always been in favor of research and development, and I have always been in favor of using tax incentives as a way of spurring economic development and stimulating the economy. But, you know, I am also interested in passing credits. I am interested in credits for businesses. We have talked about businesses. Well, let's pass some credits so that businesses can hire hard-to-employ individuals, so that they can hire these young people looking for summer jobs, for something to do.

So I am in favor of credits, but I am not in favor of a bill that is not paid for, a bill that will not be comprehensive across the board, and a bill that will put more wealth in the pockets of the 1 percent and do nothing to aid the overall economy.

□ 1500

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY).

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, President Ronald Reagan once observed that the government's view of the economy is pretty simple: "If it moves, tax it."

Well, today, more than ever, President Reagan's words ring true. Taxes are prohibitively high. We can take a step in a new direction by passing H.R. 880, the American Research and Competitiveness Act of 2015. This legislation is simple; it will make the R&D tax credit permanent. By doing so, we reduce the amount of taxes that America's innovators pay by providing a 20 percent credit on research expenses.

According to a recent study, this policy will increase overall investment in research by \$33 billion and result in 300,000 research-related jobs. In practical terms, this means that a small business in the beautiful State of West Virginia—which I represent—or where you live that spends \$5 million a year on research could be eligible for a \$500,000 tax credit.

That is enough money to hire 10 new employees at \$50,000 a year. We are talking about 10 new, hard-working American taxpayers. We are talking about men and women who are given the dignity of work. They will pay taxes rather than possibly take government assistance.

When I ran for office, I promised West Virginians that I would fight for policies that create jobs and bring economic freedom back to America. This bill takes us a step in that direction. I encourage my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support, as I said earlier, of the R&D tax credit. My colleagues on this side of the aisle support the R&D tax credit. As we have been saying here today on the floor, it is an important credit that is vital to our global competitiveness, job and economic growth, and maintaining our position as the world's leader in innovation.

As I have also stated—and I will say it again—this bill isn't paid for. The majority is adding \$181 billion to the deficit with just this one bill. This is fiscally irresponsible.

What I haven't been able to understand—and I am having trouble today trying to figure it out—is how we can pass bills that help corporations and the wealthy, adding the cost of that to the deficit, but then turn around and try to balance the budget and close the deficit on the backs of hard-working American families.

They are trying to do this by cutting the programs we need to grow our economy, like education and infrastructure. We have an infrastructure bill that we are still waiting for a hearing on, which we are still waiting to see scheduled.

It is a double standard; it is hypocritical, and it is harmful to the people that all of us represent. We are ready and willing to work with the majority to strengthen the economy, including progrowth reforms that benefit businesses and comprehensive tax reform that will benefit all of America, but this is the wrong approach, and we should not be party to this political gamesmanship that is taking place on the floor today.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I think one of the big problems with Washington is that everyone finds excuses not to do the right thing. The truth is we need research and development here in America, not overseas. We need the jobs that come with that here in America, not overseas. We need, frankly, the future of America here, rather than overseas. Republicans and Democrats both agree on that; both sincerely agree on that. Today, we heard excuses, and we will hear excuses.

We are told this doesn't fund infrastructure. It doesn't. This is about funding the infrastructure of research and development and innovation, but not through the government. This is through our entrepreneurs, like Apple and Microsoft, and all the new research and groundbreaking drugs and medical breakthroughs. That is how we are funding the infrastructure of our future. Roads and bridges, we will tackle in another bill.

We are told this isn't comprehensive tax reform. No, it is not. It is a critical

step forward in that by taking a provision that has been temporary far too long and making it a permanent part of our Tax Code so that we can invest in R&D with certainty, so we can have honest scorekeeping in our budget, and so we can take that first step toward real, comprehensive progrowth tax reform.

We are told today, as we have heard in the past, that it is not paid for, but in fact, to the extensions since 1981, these provisions haven't been paid for. Our Democrat friends passed these bills and supported them. They weren't paid for. We have done the same. It was 1 year or 2 years at a time. To say this is fiscally irresponsible, when they voted so many times to do the same thing, seems to me to be another excuse.

The cost of doing this permanently is no more than the cost of doing it 1 or 2 years at a time. To think otherwise is sort of in the line of saying: You know, that dessert doesn't have calories if I eat it standing up.

Well, the cost of R&D is the same, but the cost of not making it permanent is very much not the same. We know the impact will be fewer jobs here in America, more R&D in China, and we will lose our lead in the world as the world's innovator.

No more excuses—what we are looking for today is a bipartisan effort to make sure those jobs are here in America, that our companies have a chance to invest more and more and more each year. That is what we want them to do.

We want to give college graduates hope. As the majority leader from California noted, 4 out of 10 college graduates either can't find jobs, or they are working behind a cash register. Well, it is wrong. We ought to give them an opportunity. We ought to give them some jobs and some hope. Those college graduates are skilled and talented, and they deserve to be part of America's innovative society. That is what they deserve. That is what we are going to deliver to them.

While I am thrilled my Democrat friends are talking about the deficit, I wish they would have acted upon it earlier. The first year they took control of this House under the former Speaker, they doubled the deficit. The second year, they tripled the deficit. The third year, they took it over a trillion dollars and a trillion dollars again, until the American public said enough.

What we got for all that spending was the worst economic recovery in half a century. We are missing 6 million jobs from the American economy. We have fewer people working the workforce than we did before the recovery actually began. In some ways, we are going backwards, especially for our young people.

Today, with this bill, this is research and development both parties support. The only reason we are hearing the excuses is that it is a Republican bill this time. That is the only reason.

Research and development is not a Republican proposal, it is not a Democrat proposal. It is an American proposal we all support. We think our economy ought to grow not in Washington, but back home, and that innovation matters. The way we do that is to recapture America's leadership in R&D.

For all those reasons—and for the support of entrepreneurs, manufacturers, and technology companies back home all across America—I urge that we stop the excuses, we join together as Republicans and Democrats, we take back America's leadership in innovation and create the jobs that our young people deserve.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the bipartisan bill H.R. 880 the American Research and Competitiveness Act of 2015 to make permanent and simplify an important tax credit, which promotes job creation and economic growth.

Unfortunately, Congress did not address this issue last year, so I applaud Mr. BRADY for continuing to work on this important measure to bring certainty to an important sector of the U.S. economy.

By simply enhancing and making permanent the now expired research tax credit, H.R. 880 increases the ability of businesses to compete in an increasingly globalized marketplace by rewarding investments in innovation technologies and manufacturing. These new technologies provide the basis of new consumer products, increased scientific discovery, and technological improvements across numerous fields and disciplines.

The common sense American Research and Competitiveness Act of 2015 lowers the cost of innovation, creates high wage jobs, and lays the foundation for a strong economy in the 21st century. The U.S. is facing increasing competition around the globe from countries with more advantageous tax structures, so it is critical that Congress extend this credit to remain competitive in the future.

As a cosponsor of the bipartisan H.R. 880, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in support of this common sense legislation to provide the tools necessary to create jobs, promote economic growth, and create the innovations of tomorrow—right here in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 273, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. NEAL. I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Neal moves to recommit the bill H.R. 880 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike section 2 and insert the following:

#### SEC. 2. NO INCREASE IN DEFICIT OR DELAY OF COMPREHENSIVE TAX REFORM.

Nothing in this Act shall result in—

- (1) an increase in the deficit, or
- (2) a delay or weakening of efforts to adopt a permanent extension of the research credit in a fiscally responsible manner.

#### SEC. 3. TWO-YEAR EXTENSION OF RESEARCH CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 41(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2016”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred after December 31, 2014.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill in its current form, and I want to remind my colleagues that this will not kill the bill, nor will it send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will proceed immediately to final passage as amended.

Well, we are 6 months into the new Congress; and what do we hear from the majority? It is more of the same, more of the same assurances: Trust us on tax reform; it is on the way.

First, it was: Do not introduce tax bills. Trust us, tax reform is on the way.

Then it was: If we make some extenders permanent, trust us, tax reform is just around the corner.

The new refrain is: If we want to fix the highway trust fund, let's do tax reform at the same time.

Mind you, we have just voted to extend the highway trust fund for the 33rd time, and in December, we will most likely vote to extend the R&D tax credit on another short-term basis. Let's stop playing these games.

By the way, when my friend from Texas talked about Democrats extending the deficits, did he forget that Bill Clinton left us with four straight balanced budgets, and in 8 years, they wrecked the trajectory of those balanced budget with \$2.3 trillion of tax cuts? That is the reality. When I heard him say the Democrats ran up the deficits, I guess they forgot there was a President George W. Bush in between.

What do we do here? We do the estate tax repeal. That takes care of 5,400 families in America. How universal is that? If we weren't doing the estate tax bill—repealing it, by the way—then what we could have done was perhaps extend and agree upon a robust R&D tax credit, which you all know I support. How about, for 6, 7, 8, 9, or 10 years, put it in line and let private investment build around it?

If you are from Massachusetts, obviously, you are for a more robust R&D tax credit. Who in Massachusetts could be against that? World class universities, hospitals, businesses, incuba-

tors—we produce some of the highest and best tech advancements in the world. Kendall Square in Cambridge has the highest concentration of R&D in the whole world.

We know this credit is vital to keeping America at the innovation forefront, and we know that the start-and-stop nature of this credit has put a damper on the willingness of firms to invest because they don't know if the credit is going to be gone tomorrow.

Now, a chance to point something out that I think bears noting, as a percent of gross domestic product, research and development now is the lowest it has been in decades. Why is that? Because of the rejection of science on my Republican friend's side, private sector R&D is way down.

The encouragement in the Tax Code is simply to buy smaller companies, merge, and take advantage of the innovation they have done. There is the opportunity here to build something around the R&D that we should be taking advantage of here today, but we are not doing that because of the notion of having rejected this science.

The fickle nature of Congress toward this credit is attributable to one fact: we have not reformed the Tax Code since 1986. Now, Congressman BRADY wasn't even born the last time that we did tax reform 30-some odd years ago. He was but a wish in a couple's eye. That is how dated this argument is.

He said: Why can't we agree on some things here?

There are some things we can agree upon: Barack Obama was not born in Kenya; secondly, and just importantly, there is no imminent invasion of Texas that is being planned; And third, very simply, the tax cuts don't pay for themselves. They have to score some place.

□ 1515

We are taking up the time today debating this extender—or extenders—when we should be talking about tax reform that works for the middle class, a tax reform that does not reward investment; instead, we are doing this hodgepodge effort on tax extenders that really make no sense. Guess what, come December, we are going to be right back here on this floor tackling the R&D credit for another year or two.

Now, before they say to me, Mr. NEAL, you are wrong, I certainly have been right in the last two cycles about what happened as to where we ended up with tax extenders. The President has already said he would veto a permanent R&D at this point, and I understand the whole nature of why we need to do talking points.

I would submit this to my friend, Mr. BRADY, and he is my friend, and we work together on many pieces of legislation. Why don't we commit ourselves to building an R&D tax credit for 10 years, so it can be built into the investment code of the American entrepreneur, so they know precisely what

is going to be out there, instead of taking this tactic today that is never going to see the light of day as we go forward?

This Congress could have been spending its time today talking about income disparity, downward pressure on wages, robotics, and what is putting the American worker behind the curve of opportunity; but, no, we can't do that. We spend our time instead on these sorts of arguments.

I hope that we can send this back to committee and come up with something that we can all live with.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this Democrat proposal does violence to America's research infrastructure. It does violence to America's economy, and it does violence to the future of our economy and to the hope of young people.

We will not stand for this. Vote "no" on this motion to recommit.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### AMERICA COMPETES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 1806.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 271 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1806.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1519

##### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the

consideration of the bill (H.R. 1806) to provide for technological innovation through the prioritization of Federal investment in basic research, fundamental scientific discovery, and development to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes, with Mr. YODER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to sponsor H.R. 1806, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015, a pro-science, fiscally responsible bill that sets America on a path to remain the world's leader in innovation.

This bill reauthorizes civilian research programs at the National Science Foundation, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the Department of Energy, and the Office of Science and Technology Policy. H.R. 1806 prioritizes basic research and development, while staying within the caps set by the Budget Control Act.

America's businesses rely on government support for basic research to produce the scientific breakthroughs that spur technological innovation, jump-start new industries, and spur economic growth. Title I of the bill reauthorizes the National Science Foundation for 2 years and provides a 4.3 percent increase for research and related activities.

The bill prioritizes funding for the Directorates of Biological Sciences, Computer and Information Science and Engineering, Engineering, and Mathematics and Physical Sciences and recognizes the need to make strategic investments in basic R&D for the U.S. to remain the global leader in science and innovation. The bill reprioritizes research spending at NSF by cutting funding for the Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences and the Directorate for Geosciences.

Federal budget restraints require all taxpayers' dollars to be spent on high-value science in the national interest. Unfortunately, NSF has funded a number of projects that do not meet the highest standards of scientific merit, from climate change musicals, to evaluating animal photographs in National Geographic, to studying human-set fires in New Zealand in the 1800s. There are dozens of other examples.

The bill ensures accountability by restoring the original intent of the 1950 NSF Act and requiring that all grants serve the "national interest." The NSF has endorsed this goal.

Title II represents the Science, Space, and Technology Committee's commitment to enhancing STEM education programs. A healthy and viable

STEM workforce is critical to American industries and ensures our future economic prosperity.

The definition of STEM is expanded to include computer science, which connects all STEM subjects. The bill also creates an advisory panel on STEM education to ensure outside stakeholders have a role in assessing the Federal STEM education portfolio.

Title III includes three bipartisan bills the Science, Space, and Technology Committee approved in March. Those bills, H.R. 1119, the Research and Development Efficiency Act; H.R. 1156, the International Science and Technology Cooperation Act of 2015; and H.R. 1162, the Science Prize Competitions Act, passed the committee by voice vote. Two of these were sponsored by the Democrats.

Title IV supports the important measurement, standards, and technology work taking place at the National Institute of Standards and Technology laboratories, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program, and the recently authorized Network for Manufacturing Innovation.

Measurement science conducted at NIST contributes to industrial competitiveness by supporting the technical infrastructure and advancements for nanotechnology, global positioning systems, material sciences, cybersecurity, health information technology, and a variety of other fields.

Title V reauthorizes the Department of Energy Office of Science for 2 years, at a 5.4 percent increase over fiscal year 2015. It prioritizes basic research that enables researchers in all 50 States to have access to world-class user facilities, including supercomputers and high-intensity light sources.

This bill also prevents duplication and requires DOE to certify that its climate science work is unique and not being undertaken by another Federal agency.

Title VI reauthorizes the DOE applied research and development programs and activities for fiscal year 2016 and 2017. They include the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, the Office of Nuclear Energy, the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, the Office of Fossil Energy, and the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy.

H.R. 1806 refocuses some spending on late-stage commercialization efforts within the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy to research and development efforts.

The bill requires DOE to provide a regular strategic analysis of science and technology activities within the Department, identifying key areas for collaboration across science and applied research programs.

Title VII proposes to cut red tape and bureaucracy in the DOE technology transfer process. It allows contractor operators at DOE national laboratories to work with the private sector more efficiently by delegating signature authority to the directors of the labs

themselves, rather than to DOE contracting officers, for cooperative agreements valued at less than \$1 million.

This title also requires DOE to assess its capability to authorize, host, and oversee privately funded fusion research and the next generation fission reactor prototypes. Currently, the private sector has little incentive to build reactor prototypes due to regulatory uncertainty from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1806 sets the right priorities for Federal civilian research, which enhances innovation and U.S. competitiveness without adding to the Federal deficit and debt.

I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, I must unfortunately rise in opposition to the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act. It is unfortunate because I was a strong supporter of both the original COMPETES Act, as well as the 2010 reauthorization.

Both of those bills passed with bipartisan support, and both bills reflected the recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences' groundbreaking 2005 report, "Rising Above the Gathering Storm."

It is worth reflecting on what the National Academy's panel found and why they made the recommendations they did.

First, the panel that wrote the report was composed of a distinguished group of individuals from industry, academia, and science; and it was headed by the former Lockheed CEO Norm Augustine.

The panel noted that much of America's economic growth and success in the decades following World War II was the direct result of our Nation's sustained investment in research and development. However, they noted that a gathering storm was approaching. America's economic and military competitors around the world had begun to catch up with our Nation's technological lead.

Moreover, research and development budgets in the United States were stagnating. The panel determined that America was sorely in need of a recommitment to research and development in order to maintain our competitive edge.

The Augustine panel gave specific recommendations that we increase R&D spending, revitalize STEM education across the country, and also create and support a new ARPA-E for breakthrough energy research modeled on the renowned DARPA program at the Department of Defense.

The original COMPETES Act implemented these recommendations across the board. Supporting this bill was one of the highlights of my two decades of service here in Congress.

I have highlighted this history because it is important to understand

what we are doing here today and why these issues are so important. Since 2010, when we passed the last COMPETES reauthorization, R&D spending in America has begun to stagnate again and, by some measures, even declined.

In the meantime, our economic competitors have doubled down on their investments in research and development. Over the past decade, China has averaged a 23 percent increase in R&D spending each year. Perhaps, not surprisingly, in 2014, China overtook the United States to become the world's largest economic power.

The crisis that the Augustine committee warned us about in 2005 has now arrived.

□ 1530

What is the response of our majority to this crisis? Absolutely nothing. That is what is in H.R. 1806: absolutely nothing.

H.R. 1806 completely abandons the recommendations of the Augustine committee and the original COMPETES Act. It abandons the legacy of COMPETES by flat-funding R&D investments. It abandons the legacy by slashing funding for the very ARPA-E program envisioned by this committee, the Augustine committee. It abandons that legacy by politicizing the scientific grant-making process and pitting different research disciplines against each other.

I want to be clear about what it is that this majority is abandoning. They are abandoning our future.

America is the greatest nation on Earth, but our greatness is not guaranteed. We have to work for it. We have to do the things that are necessary to ensure a bright future for our country. That means making the same kinds of investments in science and technology that previous generations made. Our predecessors understood what was at stake. They made a commitment to invest in research and development and science education, and we still benefit from those past investments today.

The world is not standing still. If we do not recommit to our investments in science education, research, and development, we will be surpassed.

The bill before us fails to secure our Nation's future, and for that reason, I must strenuously oppose it.

I am not alone in my opposition. We have received more than 40 letters or statements of concern or outright opposition from over 70 different groups, including the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Association of American Universities, the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities, the Business Council for Sustainable Energy, the Coalition for National Science Funding, the STEM Education Coalition, the Truman National Security Project, and many, many others. I will put the full list of these organizations in the RECORD at this time.

75 ORGANIZATIONS IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 1806, THE AMERICA COMPETES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

1. Alliance to Save Energy
2. American Academy of Political and Social Science
3. American Anthropological Association
4. American Association for the Advancement of Science
5. American Association of Petroleum Geologists
6. American Association of Physics Teachers
7. American Educational Research Association
8. American Geophysical Union
9. American Geosciences Institute
10. American Institute of Biological Sciences
11. American Institute of Physics
12. American Meteorological Society
13. American Physical Society
14. American Political Science Association
15. American Psychological Association
16. American Society for Microbiology
17. American Sociological Association
18. Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies
19. Association for the Sciences of Limnology and Oceanography
20. Association of American Universities
21. Association of Population Centers
22. Association of Public and Land-grant Universities
23. AVS: Science & Technology of Materials, Interfaces, and Processing
24. Biophysical Society
25. Business Council for Sustainable Energy
26. Center for Small Business and the Environment
27. Clay Minerals Society
28. Coalition for National Science Funding
29. Computing Research Association
30. Consortium for Ocean Leadership
31. Consortium of Social Science Associations
32. Council of Undergraduate Research
33. Department of Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz
34. Earth Day Network
35. Ecological Society of America
36. Energy Sciences Coalition
37. Environment America
38. Environment and Energy Study Institute
39. Environmental Defense Fund
40. Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology
41. Federation of Associations in Behavioral and Brain Sciences
42. Geological Society of America
43. Incorporated Institutions for Seismology
44. Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc.
45. Law and Society Association
46. League of Conservation Voters
47. Learning and Education Academic Research Network
48. Michigan State University
49. National Association of Geoscience Teachers
50. National Association of Marine Laboratories
51. National Cave and Karst Research Institute
52. National Ground Water Association
53. Natural Resources Defense Council
54. Nobel Laureates
55. Ohio State University
56. Paleontological Research Institution
57. Pew
58. Population Association of America
59. Princeton University
60. Research!America
61. Seismological Society of America

- 62. Sierra Club
- 63. Society for Mining, Metallurgy, and Exploration, Inc.
- 64. Society of Independent Professional Earth Scientists
- 65. Soil Science Society of America
- 66. STEM Education Coalition
- 67. Taskforce on American Innovation
- 68. The Optical Society
- 69. Truman National Security Project—Operation Free
- 70. Union of Concerned Scientists
- 71. United States Permafrost Association
- 72. University Corporation for Atmospheric Research
- 73. University of Colorado at Boulder
- 74. University of Michigan
- 75. Wayne State University.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Again, I strongly, strongly oppose this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER), who is the chairman of the Energy Subcommittee of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I thank Chairman SMITH for yielding me time to speak on this important legislation that is on the floor today.

Mr. Chair, H.R. 1806, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015, authorizes the science and energy research programs at the Department of Energy, providing funding for research and development conducted in our universities and national labs across the country.

DOE is the largest Federal supporter of basic research in the physical sciences and provides user facilities for over 31,000 scientific researchers each year.

The America COMPETES Act prioritizes funding for the Office of Science, which conducts critical research in high energy physics, advanced scientific computing, biological and environmental research, nuclear physics, fusion energy sciences, and basic energy sciences.

This basic R&D has broad applications for our economy and for our national security, providing tools and user facilities for researchers in all energy fields.

The America COMPETES Act also reauthorizes the Department's applied energy programs in nuclear energy, fossil energy, energy efficiency and renewable energy, and electricity research and development.

By prioritizing research and development in these programs, we can maximize Federal dollars and leave commercialization and deployment to the private sector, Mr. Chairman, which has the most incentive to bring new, cost-effective, and efficient technologies to market.

This legislation is fiscally responsible and cuts funding to lower-priority and duplicative programs like EERE, which has grown by almost 60 percent in the last decade. With our national debt of \$18 trillion and rising, Congress must prioritize fundamental research to lay the foundation for the next technological breakthrough.

We simply cannot afford to spend limited Federal dollars on promoting today's technology. This is so yesterday when we do that. Instead of duplicating work that could be done in the private sector, the America COMPETES Act prioritizes basic research and development with broad application to all forms of energy and energy efficiencies.

Mr. Chairman, over the past 5 months, the Science Committee has held hearings on the Department of Energy research and development for advanced nuclear reactors, high-performance computing, energy efficiency and renewable energy, energy storage, and the Department of Energy budget proposal. With limited time, this Science Committee in this Congress has conducted five hearings in support of this legislation, prioritizing oversight of the DOE programs authorized in this bill.

By supporting the America COMPETES Act, Congress can promote fundamental research, build a foundation for the private sector to bring innovative new technologies to market, and grow the American economy.

I urge my colleagues to support the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, it is actually quite disappointing that we are here at this point today. And I join the ranking member and our colleagues on this side of the aisle in opposing this harmful antiscience bill, H.R. 1806.

When I first came into Congress, I was excited because we were actually working on reauthorizing the COMPETES Act. We were making investments in important research and development and technologies for the 21st century. And we were doing that in a bipartisan fashion based on bipartisan scientific and research-based recommendations. But that is not where we are today.

H.R. 1806 contains severe funding cuts to the Department of Energy, including cutting close to one-third of the budget of the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy and half the budget of ARPA-E. In fact, you could argue that this is not an investment in the 21st century at all: it is a throwback bill to the 20th century.

These cuts are going to cripple our Nation's research into high-impact technologies to generate, store, and use energy and will harm our ability to compete successfully with other countries.

The bill also contains many harmful provisions restricting the Department of Energy, such as a provision preventing the results of any Department of Energy-supported fossil fuel energy research and development from being "used for regulatory assessments or determinations by Federal regulatory authorities." That would essentially bar

the EPA or the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission from using the most current research results when they set rules to protect our air, our land, and our water.

How unfortunate that this antiscience bill also includes a misguided attempt to impose a level of political review on the National Science Foundation's gold-standard merit review system.

This is the National Science Foundation, not a political organization.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. EDWARDS. This is a dangerous proposal that would stifle the kind of high-risk, outside-the-box thinking that has put the United States on the cutting edge of scientific research.

If this bill were to become law, it would eliminate valuable and scientifically sound research on climate change within the Department of Energy under the guise of a cost-cutting measure.

After all, Mr. Chairman, isn't that what this is about? It is about the other side just not believing in climate change, despite the science.

In addition to all of the dangerous and harmful things that this bill does do, it lacks any substantively helpful provisions in a number of areas.

I actually proposed an amendment that would simply look at our 21st century workforce by supporting research at minority-serving institutions, growing STEM fields for young people who we know have to go into the 21st century workforce. It flat-funds the education directorate at the National Science Foundation.

I can't think of anything more harmful than doing a COMPETES legislation that is, at its core, the most anti-competitive legislation that could be put on this floor. It is a danger to the 21st century.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), who is the majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank my colleague, the chairman from Texas, for yielding and for his leadership in bringing the America COMPETES Act to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the America COMPETES Act. If you look at what we are trying to do here, we want America to maintain our competitive edge, to create good-paying jobs here at home. But to do that, we need to invest wisely and responsibly in basic scientific research.

After years of overspending and the administration expanding programs way beyond the core missions of the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy, the COMPETES Act prioritizes taxpayer dollars to support basic research in biology, chemistry, math, engineering, and computer science. American taxpayers' dollars are being spent on programs that do

not meet the national interest or help invest in our future.

I want to point out some of the wasteful spending that is being eliminated by this legislation, the America COMPETES Act.

Mr. Chairman, \$340,000 of taxpayer money is being spent to study human-set fires in New Zealand in the 1800s—taxpayer dollars here in America are being spent on that; \$50,000 to study civil lawsuits in Peru from 1600 to 1700; \$487,000 to study textiles and gender in Iceland from 874–1800, during the Viking era; \$697,000 for “The Great Immensity,” a musical about climate change.

This is what taxpayer dollars are being spent on, Mr. Chairman, at a time when Americans are tightening their belts and are looking to Washington to do what they are doing in being fiscally responsible.

This refocuses what we are supposed to be trying to do to promote science, to promote computer science, as a computer scientist, the things that are going to help American workers be successful—not all of this foolishness that is wasting taxpayer money. It is a great bill that actually prioritizes the taxpayer dollars of this country. I urge my colleagues to pass it.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the COMPETES Reauthorization Act, which is an attempt to disinvest, in my view, in research, innovation, and education at a time when we ought to be investing in those areas even more greatly.

This bill places our competitiveness at a serious risk over the long term. The public must be awfully confused, I understand, by both sides claiming that they are enhancing research. Many interest groups, however, disagree with our Republican friends.

I had hoped that this year's COMPETES legislation would have been written so that we could continue the tradition of the strong bipartisan support that it received in 2007 and 2010. Overwhelmingly, Republicans voted for these bills initially and the reauthorization.

Unfortunately, the severe cuts and partisan policy changes it makes preclude that from happening. The Republicans who wrote this legislation have decided that they know better than America's scientists and innovators. They arbitrarily pick and choose research programs they like at the expense of those they ideologically oppose—in other words, not peer review but political review. And they cut key areas of research far below the levels appropriated for fiscal year 2015, including the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program and R&D for renewable energy technologies.

How ironic that we have an R&D bill on the floor and they are cutting R&D technology here.

Furthermore, this bill would slash our investments in the cutting edge ARPA-E program by 50 percent, which funds high-risk and high-reward research in energy technologies that might not otherwise be pursued.

Now, of course, if global warming is not an issue, who cares.

This bill, though called the America COMPETES Act, really ought to be titled the Everyone Else Competes Act because it will cause us to fall farther and farther behind our overseas competitors, who are already far outpacing us in how much they invest in science and technology research.

Alongside this bill today, the House also is considering a bill that tries to do something many of us agree ought to be done but it does it in a fiscally irresponsible way. I am opposing and urge my colleagues to oppose making the R&D tax credit permanent because we ought to pay for it, Mr. Chairman—not make our children and grandchildren pay for it.

Over and over and over again, the Republicans claim that the tax cuts that they are passing will pay for themselves. I came here in 1981. That was the claim. Under President Reagan, we increased the debt 189 percent.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 1 minute.

□ 1545

Mr. HOYER. Now, Bush did better after 2001 and 2003. He only increased the deficit 87 percent, or almost three times that increased under President Clinton; and none of the tax cuts ended up paying for themselves, and Greenspan said so.

Since the beginning of this Congress, Republicans have brought to the floor and passed nine tax cuts. It is so easy to vote for tax cuts. It is so hard to pay for what we are buying. And that is why we have a deficit, because we do not pay for what we buy.

Today the House is being asked to vote on another unpaid-for tax extender that, on its own, would increase the deficit by \$182 billion. That is a total of \$586 billion—over half a trillion dollars—that Republicans are proposing to add to the deficit this year.

We have heard Republicans argue that making the R&D tax credit permanent would benefit the economy.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. They are right about that, and I support the R&D being made permanent—if we pay for it. That is a principle the American public expects us to pursue. Many Democrats agree as well.

However, what will be an even greater benefit to the economy is for Congress to set aside the misguided mantra that tax cuts pay for them-

selves and, instead, put America's fiscal house in order. Let's start a real conversation about fixing our broken Tax Code in a fiscally sustainable way. Passing this R&D tax credit will undermine that effort.

I am urging my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who care deeply about fiscal sustainability, about tax reform, and about economic competitiveness to oppose these bills.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT), an active member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the America COMPETES Act, and I would like to thank the chair for his leadership in this field.

Mr. Chairman, today the Federal Government spends about \$3 billion across STEM education efforts. This bill creates a new STEM education advisory panel to provide feedback and advise the President and Federal agencies with STEM programs to better inform plans and budgets. The bill directs that STEM education efforts are to be coordinated across the Federal Government to limit duplication. Industry also recognizes the benefits of STEM. This is evidenced by its support of various STEM programs with equipment, facilities, and volunteers.

In my district alone, aerospace thrives with high-technical, high-paying jobs. Without STEM, without reaching out with STEM education, we don't get those folks to jump in there. We have to talk about other things like visas and bringing people in for these types of jobs instead of working with our kids to get them educated and moving toward a good career.

This bill provides for grants for research on STEM programming that engages underrepresented students. Again, in my district, we have the Lancaster Robotics Team. It started more than 10 years ago. When it started, it was about 2 percent women, or 2 percent girls; today it is over 40 percent. Forty percent of the Lancaster Robotics Team is girls working towards a STEM degree, working towards an engineering degree, a mathematics degree, and a computer science degree. Again, aerospace brings many of the highest paying and most technical jobs not just to my district, but to this country.

Mr. Chairman, STEM education is not just a buzzword; it is something that actually works. STEM education is the lifeblood for what we do in a high technical society. If we don't do it, someone else will. We should do it right here in America. I ask for an “aye” vote.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

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

Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1806, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act. The original

COMPETES Act was visionary in its commitment to increased R&D funding, and I strongly believe we should continue to increase funding for worthwhile investments in our Nation's future. However, I have serious concerns with this bill that the majority has offered.

In 2010, as a member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, I had the opportunity to work on a truly bipartisan reauthorization of COMPETES. We worked together and chose to make certain that we innovate and we made certain that we would compete.

This year I returned to the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, excited to again work on a smart and targeted COMPETES reauthorization. Unfortunately, there was no bipartisan process, and the result is a bill that does not live up to the original COMPETES vision. It would be more appropriately named the "America Concedes" bill. Why? Because at a time when the rest of the world is taking extraordinary steps to innovate, this bill would have America do the opposite. Its efforts are misguided, at the least. Major areas of research are not adequately funded, and the policy changes would take us in the wrong direction.

Mr. Chair, I am concerned by the majority's fixation on allocating funding for NSF by directorate. This creates a dangerous precedent in denying NSF adequate flexibility and instead places political whims ahead of the need to independently foster true innovative research. I am also concerned by the effort to impose political review on NSF's gold-standard merit review system. The scientific community in our Nation and around the world agrees that NSF's review system works, and works very well. So why would we make it more difficult to encourage high risk, high rewards research?

Instead, we should be increasing research funding, providing NSF the appropriate flexibility to fund innovative research, and we should be investing in a sustained commitment to STEM education. My district needs and deserves STEM as an education process. It doesn't want simple buzzwords. It wants a real STEM education effort.

As a nation, we are woefully under-producing scientists and engineers. In order to remain a competitive global economic power in the 21st century, we must place a strong focus on STEM education. Instead, this bill provides flat funding for STEM education along with increased administrative burdens. That is not a commitment to STEM education. In practical terms, it is a decrease in funding.

I am also concerned by the cuts in funding for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program and by the strike in funding for the National Network for Manufacturing Innovation, or NNMI. These initiatives are smart investments and opportunities for our Nation to truly collaborate, to compete, and to be truly cutting-edge. This bill denies our American pioneer spirit.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. TONKO. This bill also makes huge cuts to funding for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy research and development as well as the funding for ARPA-E. These cuts ignore the reality that a modern society needs energy, and the only way we are going to meet our energy challenge is through smart investments in research and development.

Energy is essential to our economy, and if we pull back resources and do not invest, we will put our economic and national security at risk. We will also not meet the energy challenge if we blindly ignore existing research and refuse to access the most up-to-date information.

We also cannot solve our budget deficit with these types of cuts. In fact, they are more likely to make the problem worse. The best way to reduce our budget deficit is by fostering new businesses and industries that generate economic wealth, revenue, and jobs, and the fuel for that task is research and development. We are missing a golden opportunity with this measure. For these reasons I urge a "no" vote on this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this bill does not touch merit review.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN), who is a valuable member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1806, the America COMPETES Act.

Mr. Chairman, when the American people pay their taxes, they expect their tax dollars to be spent effectively and efficiently. Too often that has not been the case across government, and there is nothing worse than seeing taxes taken out of their paychecks and wasted. Not only is that fiscally irresponsible, it is insulting to the taxpayers.

The bill before us is fiscally responsible and takes important steps to cut wasteful spending. Traditionally, when the National Science Foundation was mentioned, Americans thought of hard sciences—basic research, advanced technologies in biology, engineering, mathematics, and the physical sciences. It is investments in these fields that advance American technology and help the United States maintain its competitive edge.

Unfortunately, some recent National Science Foundation expenditures have brought widespread criticism to the NSF and its priorities. There was the expenditure, for example, of \$856,000 on a grant to teach three captive mountain lions how to use a treadmill. NSF spent another \$387,000 on a mechanical device that simulates Swedish massages for rabbits. This is unquestionably a waste of taxpayer money, par-

ticularly when we are over \$18 trillion in debt.

Our bill cuts spending on lower priority government social and behavioral programs at the National Science Foundation by 45 percent, saving taxpayer dollars and setting a higher priority on the harder sciences. The American people want Washington to be responsible with their money, and when Federal agencies get out of hand, they need to be reined in, and our bill does just that.

I want to thank Chairman SMITH and his staff for their hard work and leadership on this bill, and I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for yielding.

Bentley University is a renowned business school in my district, and when a class from Bentley visited me just a few weeks ago, they were advocating for a critical underpinning of our economy. These students came to discuss the importance of funding the geosciences in the NSF. Why? Because it is good business.

These students and the business community understand the critical role that geoscience has in disaster resilience, helping us to address drought, looking at solar storms that can cripple our electric grid, impacts on fisheries and ocean health, and in maintaining agriculture and in healthy soil.

Business leaders know that extreme weather like hurricanes, droughts, tornadoes, and landslides result in billions of dollars in damage, and by using what we learn from geoscience, we can identify ways to mitigate these costs and save us money. Business leaders understand this connection, so why doesn't Congress?

Rather than support investment in geoscience research, this legislation specifically targets it for drastic cuts in funding. Climate change is real. Human activity contributes to it, and it is bad for the bottom line. It is irresponsible for us to cut funding for research that helps us understand what is happening and how to address it.

Adequately funding geoscience research is critical to protecting and growing our economy and to the security of the American people. Let's vote for our economy, let's vote for our security, and let's reject this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, as set forth in the report that accompanied the Science, Space, and Technology Committee approval of the America COMPETES Act, NSF will maintain full funding for research in the hard science areas of geoscience like deep-ocean drilling and geological research to find new energy resources. What our bill does do is reduce funds that have been used by NSF to fund low priorities like a survey of

Norwegian tourism, teaching TV meteorologists about climate change, and creating climate change video games.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL), my colleague and the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee.

□ 1600

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of reauthorization of the America COMPETES Act. In this tough budget environment, I applaud Chairman SMITH and the Science, Space, and Technology Committee for crafting a bill that provides for much-needed investments in scientific research in a fiscally responsible manner. By setting priorities and eliminating duplicative activities, we are actually able to increase funding for new and promising research while keeping overall spending constant.

This bill is designed to secure America's premier status in scientific and technological advancement in several ways. First, it improves our STEM education programs by adding computer sciences to the definition of STEM education, which will allow these programs to be used to train the next generation of high-tech workers and cybersecurity professionals. As our high-tech sector continues to expand in places like my hometown of Austin, it is important to make sure that we are producing enough qualified workers to fill these jobs.

Second, this bill also helps researchers at our national labs commercialize their discoveries by removing bureaucratic obstacles. This will bring innovative new products to market faster, encouraging job creation and private sector investment.

Most importantly, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act provides a substantial increase in funding for research activities at the National Science Foundation, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and the Department of Energy. This will allow the scientists at our universities, such as the University of Texas, to advance our understanding of the physical world and provide the foundation for future innovations by business and new entrepreneurs.

I urge strong support of this bill.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU).

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose the America COMPETES Act in part because it cuts over \$62 million of funding to the hard science of studying the effects of climate change.

The effects of climate change are not a partisan issue. We know that our sea levels have risen by over 6.7 inches in the last century, and they have accelerated in the last decade. Rising sea levels affect not just Democratic districts; it also affects Republican districts.

We can measure with precision that we have had, over 20 years, the hottest

records in terms of temperatures in recorded history having occurred since 1980. We know that, in 2012, over 19 States broke the hottest records in their States. More extreme weather events and more weather uncertainty affect not just red States and blue States and purple States, it affects all of America. And that is why, last month, former Reagan Secretary of State George Shultz wrote an op-ed in *The Washington Post* saying: Climate change is happening. We need to take action on it, and we need to ensure our future against climate change. He called it the Reagan way. He said that is what President Reagan would have done.

As you know, this America COMPETES Act, the funding for the hard science of the effects of climate change, was put in place under President Bush in 2007. Just today, our President announced what the U.S. military is saying about climate change.

I served on Active Duty in the United States Air Force. I am now 19 years in with the Reserves. One of the amazing strengths of America is that our military is nonpartisan, nonideological; and our military takes the world as it is, not as they hope it to be. Our military does not live in a fantasy world, and they understand that climate change is happening. They know it is a national security threat. They are telling the American public we need to act on climate change now because we can't have flooding of our bases; we can't have droughts and more severe weather events that cause conflicts in all the parts of the world.

So I ask the American public to trust former Reagan Secretary of State George Shultz, trust President Bush, trust our United States military who are saying climate change is a problem. Keep in mind, our military relies on hard science and technology and all that makes this world possible. So trust our military, and trust everyone who has looked at it. Please reject the America COMPETES Act because we need to deal with climate change. We need to deal with it now.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR), who is a member of the Science Committee and also a vice chairman of the Research and Technology Subcommittee.

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Chairman, the America COMPETES Act is good legislation that will help build a better future for our country. The COMPETES Act expands the definition of STEM education to include computer science.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for every computer science graduate between 2013 and 2023, there will be two jobs available. That is why programs in my district like Go IT, offered free of charge to middle and high school students, are so important to creating career awareness in computer science and other STEM fields.

This legislation increases government accountability. It requires the National Science Foundation grants meet a national interest standard and to publicly justify why they should receive taxpayer dollars. Requiring government agencies to prioritize the national interest is common sense. It enhances accountability to the American people.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of the America COMPETES Act, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chair, I have no other speakers at this time as well, so I will reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON. Mr. Chair, I have no further requests for speaking.

I just urge everyone to vote "no" on this bill, and I yield back the balance of time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle today would have you believe that the only way you can be pro-science is to spend more taxpayer money than the Budget Control Act allows. That is irresponsible.

If everything is a priority, then nothing is. Real priorities require making real choices.

If synthetic biology research at NSF is a priority, we should stop using the American people's tax dollars to fund reviews of animal photographs in *National Geographic* magazine. If robotics and batteries are priorities, we should not continue to spend taxpayer dollars on climate change musicals.

H.R. 1806 proves that we can set priorities, make tough choices, and still invest more in breakthrough research and innovation.

I thank the members of the Science Committee who provided valuable input into H.R. 1806, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015; and that includes the cosponsors of the bill: Committee Vice Chairman FRANK LUCAS; all of our subcommittee chairs, BARBARA COMSTOCK, RANDY WEBER, BARRY LOUDERMILK, and JIM BRIDENSTINE; as well as Representatives STEVE PALAZZO, RANDY HULTGREN, STEVE KNIGHT, BRIAN BABIN, and JOHN MOOLENAAR.

I urge the adoption of this pro-science, fiscally responsible bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into the RECORD an exchange of letters between the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Oversight and Government Reform, and Energy and Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

Washington, DC, May 4, 2015.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,  
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect

to H.R. 1806, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015. Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Education and the Workforce with regard to H.R. 1806 on those matters within the Committee's jurisdiction.

In the interest of expediting the House's consideration of H.R. 1806, the Committee on Education and the Workforce will forgo further consideration of this bill. However, I do so only with the understanding this procedural route will not be construed to prejudice my Committee's jurisdictional interest and prerogatives on this bill or any other similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my Committee in the future.

I respectfully request your support for the appointment of outside conferees from the Committee on Education and the Workforce should this bill or a similar bill be considered in a conference with the Senate. I also request you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the Committee Report on H.R. 1806 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

JOHN KLINE,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,

Washington, DC, May 4, 2015.

Hon. JOHN KLINE,

Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee on Education and the Workforce's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 1806, the "America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015," and your willingness to forego consideration of H.R. 1806 by your committee.

I agree that the Committee on Education and the Workforce has a valid jurisdictional interest in certain provisions of H.R. 1806, and that the Committee's jurisdiction will not be adversely affected by your decision to forego consideration of H.R. 1806. As you have requested, I will support your request for an appropriate appointment of outside conferees from your Committee in the event of a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation should such a conference be convened.

Finally, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,

Washington, DC, May 4, 2015.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,

Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Rayburn HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write concerning H.R. 1806, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015. As you know, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology received an original referral and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform a secondary referral when the bill was introduced on April 15, 2015. I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House of Representatives in an expeditious manner, and accordingly,

the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform will forego action on the bill.

The Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1806 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. Further, I request your support for the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform during any House-Senate conference convened on this or related legislation.

Finally, I would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the bill report filed by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Sincerely,

JASON CHAFFETZ,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,

Washington, DC, May 4, 2015.

Hon. JASON CHAFFETZ,

Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 1806, the "America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015," and your willingness to forego consideration of H.R. 1806 by your committee.

I agree that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform has a valid jurisdictional interest in certain provisions of H.R. 1806, and that the Committee's jurisdiction will not be adversely affected by your decision to forego consideration of H.R. 1806. As you have requested, I will support your request for an appropriate appointment of outside conferees from your Committee in the event of a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation should such a conference be convened.

Finally, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,

Washington, DC, May 12, 2015.

Hon. FRED UPTON,

Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee on Energy and Commerce's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 1806, the "America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015," and your willingness to forego consideration of H.R. 1806 by your committee.

I agree that the Committee on Energy and Commerce has a valid jurisdictional interest in certain provisions of H.R. 1806, and that the Committee's jurisdiction will not be adversely affected by your decision to forego consideration of H.R. 1806. As you have requested, I will support your request for an appropriate appointment of outside conferees from your Committee in the event of a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation should such a conference be convened.

Finally, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Committee Report

and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,

Washington, DC, May 11, 2015.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,

Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: I write in regard to H.R. 1806, America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015. As you are aware, the bill was referred to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, but the Committee on Energy and Commerce has a jurisdictional interest in the bill. I wanted to notify you that the Committee on Energy and Commerce will forgo requesting a sequential referral on the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

This is done with the understanding that the Committee on Energy and Commerce's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered. In addition, the Committee reserves the right to seek conferees on H.R. 1806 and requests your support when such a request is made.

I would appreciate your response confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1806 and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,  
Chairman.

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chair, I would like to submit for the RECORD my strong opposition to H.R. 1806, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015.

This harmful bill undermines key investments in science and innovation, as well as our nation's commitment to world class research, including the research that is taking place in my congressional district on the Central Coast of California.

Specifically, this bill cuts several important programs at NSF, including research and development related to climate science, natural hazards, and renewable energy.

Furthermore, H.R. 1806 cripples support for international research collaborations—an instrumental tool at UC Santa Barbara, which has led to groundbreaking research and produced multiple Nobel Prize winners.

As we move to affirm our nation's leadership in science and technology, we should be working in a bipartisan manner to strengthen our investments in scientific research—not weaken them.

This bill is sadly a step backward for American innovation, and I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1806.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, printed in the bill, it shall

be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-15. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1806

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

**TITLE I—NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION**

Sec. 101. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 102. Findings.

Sec. 103. Policy objectives.

Sec. 104. Definitions.

Sec. 105. Accountability and transparency.

Sec. 106. Greater accountability in Federal funding for research.

Sec. 107. Obligation of major research equipment and facilities construction funds.

Sec. 108. Management and oversight of large facilities.

Sec. 109. Whistleblower education.

Sec. 110. Graduate student support.

Sec. 111. Permissible support.

Sec. 112. Expanding STEM opportunities.

Sec. 113. Review of education programs.

Sec. 114. Recompensation of awards.

Sec. 115. Sense of the Congress regarding industry investment in STEM education.

Sec. 116. Misrepresentation of research results.

Sec. 117. Research reproducibility and replication.

Sec. 118. Research grant conditions.

Sec. 119. Computing resources study.

Sec. 120. Scientific breakthrough prizes.

Sec. 121. Rotating personnel.

Sec. 122. Sense of Congress regarding Innovation Corps.

Sec. 123. Brain Research through Advancing Innovative Neurotechnologies Initiative.

Sec. 124. Noyce scholarship program amendments.

Sec. 125. Informal STEM education.

Sec. 126. Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research.

**TITLE II—SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ENGINEERING, AND MATHEMATICS**

Sec. 201. Findings; sense of Congress.

Sec. 202. STEM Education Advisory Panel.

Sec. 203. Committee on STEM Education.

Sec. 204. STEM Education Coordinating Office.

**TITLE III—OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY**

Sec. 301. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 302. Regulatory efficiency.

Sec. 303. Coordination of international science and technology partnerships.

Sec. 304. Alternative research funding models.

Sec. 305. Amendments to prize competitions.

Sec. 306. United States Chief Technology Officer.

Sec. 307. National Research Council study on technology for emergency notifications on university campuses.

**TITLE IV—NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY**

Sec. 401. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 402. Standards and conformity assessment.

Sec. 403. Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology.

Sec. 404. Police and security authority.

Sec. 405. Education and outreach.

Sec. 406. Programmatic planning report.

Sec. 407. Assessments by the National Research Council.

Sec. 408. Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership.

Sec. 409. Elimination of obsolete reports.

Sec. 410. Modifications to grants and cooperative agreements.

Sec. 411. Information systems standards consultation.

Sec. 412. United States-Israeli cooperation.

**TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY SCIENCE**

Sec. 501. Mission.

Sec. 502. Basic energy sciences.

Sec. 503. Advanced scientific computing research.

Sec. 504. High energy physics.

Sec. 505. Biological and environmental research.

Sec. 506. Fusion energy.

Sec. 507. Nuclear physics.

Sec. 508. Science laboratories infrastructure program.

Sec. 509. Domestic manufacturing.

Sec. 510. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 511. Definitions.

**TITLE VI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY APPLIED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT**

**Subtitle A—Crosscutting Research and Development**

Sec. 601. Crosscutting research and development.

Sec. 602. Strategic research portfolio analysis and coordination plan.

Sec. 603. Strategy for facilities and infrastructure.

**Subtitle B—Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability Research and Development**

Sec. 611. Distributed energy and electric energy systems.

Sec. 612. Electric transmission and distribution research and development.

**Subtitle C—Nuclear Energy Research and Development**

Sec. 621. Objectives.

Sec. 622. Program objectives study.

Sec. 623. Nuclear energy research and development programs.

Sec. 624. Small modular reactor program.

Sec. 625. Fuel cycle research and development.

Sec. 626. Nuclear energy enabling technologies program.

Sec. 627. Technical standards collaboration.

Sec. 628. Available facilities database.

Sec. 629. Nuclear waste disposal.

**Subtitle D—Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Research and Development**

Sec. 641. Energy efficiency.

Sec. 642. Next Generation Lighting Initiative.

Sec. 643. Building standards.

Sec. 644. Secondary electric vehicle battery use program.

Sec. 645. Network for Manufacturing Innovation Program.

Sec. 646. Advanced Energy Technology Transfer Centers.

Sec. 647. Renewable energy.

Sec. 648. Bioenergy program.

Sec. 649. Concentrating solar power research program.

Sec. 650. Renewable energy in public buildings.

**Subtitle E—Fossil Energy Research and Development**

Sec. 661. Fossil energy.

Sec. 662. Coal research, development, demonstration, and commercial application programs.

Sec. 663. High efficiency gas turbines research and development.

**Subtitle F—Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy**

Sec. 671. ARPA-E amendments.

**Subtitle G—Authorization of Appropriations**

Sec. 681. Authorization of appropriations.

**Subtitle H—Definitions**

Sec. 691. Definitions.

**TITLE VII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER**

**Subtitle A—In General**

Sec. 701. Definitions.

Sec. 702. Savings clause.

**Subtitle B—Innovation Management at Department of Energy**

Sec. 711. Under Secretary for Science and Energy.

Sec. 712. Technology transfer and transitions assessment.

Sec. 713. Sense of Congress.

Sec. 714. Nuclear energy innovation.

**Subtitle C—Cross-Sector Partnerships and Grant Competitiveness**

Sec. 721. Agreements for Commercializing Technology pilot program.

Sec. 722. Public-private partnerships for commercialization.

Sec. 723. Inclusion of early-stage technology demonstration in authorized technology transfer activities.

Sec. 724. Funding competitiveness for institutions of higher education and other nonprofit institutions.

Sec. 725. Participation in the Innovation Corps program.

**Subtitle D—Assessment of Impact**

Sec. 731. Report by Government Accountability Office.

**TITLE VIII—SENSE OF CONGRESS**

Sec. 801. Sense of Congress.

**SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.**

In this Act—

(1) the term “STEM” means the subjects of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics;

(2) the term “STEM education” means education in the subjects of STEM, including computer science; and

(3) the term “Committee on STEM Education” means the Committee on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics Education established under section 101 of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 6621).

**TITLE I—NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION**

**SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

(a) **FISCAL YEAR 2016.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation \$7,597,140,000 for fiscal year 2016.

(2) **SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS.**—Of the amount authorized by paragraph (1)—

(A) \$6,186,300,000 shall be made available to carry out research and related activities, including—

(i) \$834,800,000 for the Biological Science Directorate;

(ii) \$1,050,000,000 for the Computer and Information Science and Engineering Directorate;

(iii) \$1,034,000,000 for the Engineering Directorate;

(iv) \$1,200,000,000 for the Geosciences Directorate;

(v) \$1,500,000,000 for the Mathematical and Physical Science Directorate;

(vi) \$150,000,000 for the Social, Behavioral, and Economics Directorate, of which \$50,000,000 shall be for the National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics;

(vii) \$38,520,000 for the Office of International Science and Engineering;

(viii) \$377,500,000 for Integrative Activities; and

(ix) \$1,480,000 for the United States Arctic Commission;

(B) \$866,000,000 shall be made available for education and human resources;

(C) \$200,310,000 shall be made available for major research equipment and facilities construction;

(D) \$325,000,000 shall be made available for agency operations and award management;

(E) \$4,370,000 shall be made available for the Office of the National Science Board; and

(F) \$15,160,000 shall be made available for the Office of Inspector General.

(b) FISCAL YEAR 2017.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation \$7,597,140,000 for fiscal year 2017.

(2) SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS.—Of the amount authorized by paragraph (1)—

(A) \$6,186,300,000 shall be made available to carry out research and related activities, including—

(i) \$834,800,000 for the Biological Science Directorate;

(ii) \$1,050,000,000 for the Computer and Information Science and Engineering Directorate;

(iii) \$1,034,000,000 for the Engineering Directorate;

(iv) \$1,200,000,000 for the Geosciences Directorate;

(v) \$1,500,000,000 for the Mathematical and Physical Science Directorate;

(vi) \$150,000,000 for the Social, Behavioral, and Economics Directorate, of which \$50,000,000 shall be for the National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics;

(vii) \$38,520,000 for the Office of International Science and Engineering;

(viii) \$377,500,000 for Integrative Activities; and

(ix) \$1,480,000 for the United States Arctic Commission;

(B) \$866,000,000 shall be made available for education and human resources;

(C) \$200,310,000 shall be made available for major research equipment and facilities construction;

(D) \$325,000,000 shall be made available for agency operations and award management;

(E) \$4,370,000 shall be made available for the Office of the National Science Board; and

(F) \$15,160,000 shall be made available for the Office of Inspector General.

#### SEC. 102. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Taxpayer-supported research investments administered by the Foundation should serve the national interest.

(2) The Foundation has made major contributions for more than 60 years to strengthen and sustain the Nation's academic research enterprise.

(3) The economic strength and national security of the United States, and the quality of life of all Americans, are grounded in the Nation's scientific and technological capabilities.

(4) Providing support for basic research is an investment in our Nation's future security and economic prosperity.

(5) Congress applauds the Foundation's recognition that wise stewardship of taxpayer dollars is necessary to maintain and ensure the public's trust for funding of fundamental scientific and engineering research.

(6) Other nations are increasing their public investments in basic research in the physical sciences in order to boost long-term economic growth.

(7) Longstanding United States leadership in supercomputing, genomics, nanoscience, photonics, quantum physics, and other key technological areas is jeopardized if United States investments in basic research in the natural sciences do not keep pace.

(8) Redundant regulations and reporting requirements imposed by Federal agencies on research institutions and researchers increase costs by tens of millions of dollars annually.

(9) The Foundation carries out important functions by supporting basic research in all science and engineering disciplines and in supporting STEM education at all levels.

(10) The research and education activities of the Foundation promote the discovery, integration, dissemination, and application of new knowledge in service to society and prepare future generations of scientists, mathematicians, and engineers who will be necessary to ensure America's leadership in the global marketplace.

(11) Many of the complex problems and challenges facing the Nation increasingly require the collaboration of multiple scientific disciplines. The Foundation should continue to emphasize cross-directorate research collaboration and activities to address these issues and encourage interdisciplinary research.

(12) The Foundation should meet the highest standards of efficiency, transparency, and accountability in its stewardship of public funds.

(13) The Foundation is charged with the responsibilities—

(A) to develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences;

(B) to initiate, support, and conduct basic scientific research and to appraise the impact of research on industrial development and the general welfare;

(C) to initiate, support, and conduct scientific research activities in connection with matters relating to the national defense, at the request of the Secretary of Defense;

(D) to award scholarships and graduate fellowships in the sciences;

(E) to foster the interchange of scientific information among scientists and across scientific disciplines;

(F) to evaluate scientific research programs undertaken by agencies of the Federal Government, and to correlate the Foundation's scientific research with that undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups;

(G) to communicate effectively to American citizens the relevance of public investments in scientific discovery and technological innovation to the Nation's security, prosperity, and welfare; and

(H) to establish such special commissions as the Board considers necessary.

(14) The emerging global economic, scientific, and technical environment challenges long standing assumptions about domestic and international policy, requiring the Foundation to play a more proactive role in sustaining the competitive advantage of the United States through superior research capabilities.

#### SEC. 103. POLICY OBJECTIVES.

In allocating resources made available under this title, the Foundation shall have the following policy objectives:

(1) To renew and maintain the Nation's international leadership in science and technology by—

(A) increasing the national investment in basic scientific research and increasing interdisciplinary investment in strategic areas vital to the national interest;

(B) balancing the Nation's research portfolio among the life sciences, mathematics, the physical sciences, computer and information science, geosciences, engineering, and social, behavioral, and economic sciences, all of which are important for the continued development of enabling technologies necessary for sustained economic competitiveness;

(C) encouraging investments in potentially transformative scientific research to benefit our Nation and its citizens;

(D) expanding the pool of scientists and engineers in the United States, including among segments of the population that have been historically underrepresented in STEM fields; and

(E) modernizing the Nation's research infrastructure and establishing and maintaining co-

operative international relationships with premier research institutions.

(2) To increase overall workforce skills by—

(A) improving the quality of STEM education and tools provided both inside and outside of the classroom, including in kindergarten through grade 12; and

(B) expanding STEM training opportunities at institutions of higher education.

(3) To strengthen innovation by expanding the focus of competitiveness and innovation at the regional and local level.

#### SEC. 104. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) BOARD.—The term "Board" means the National Science Board.

(2) DIRECTOR.—The term "Director" means the Director of the Foundation.

(3) FOUNDATION.—The term "Foundation" means the National Science Foundation established under section 2 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1861).

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

(5) STATE.—The term "State" means one of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, or any other territory or possession of the United States.

(6) UNITED STATES.—The term "United States" means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

#### SEC. 105. ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) sustained, predictable Federal funding is essential to United States leadership in science and technology;

(2) building understanding of and confidence in investments in basic research are essential to public support for sustained, predictable Federal funding; and

(3) the Foundation should commit itself fully to transparency and accountability and to clear, consistent public communication regarding the national interest for each Foundation-awarded grant and cooperative agreement.

#### SEC. 106. GREATER ACCOUNTABILITY IN FEDERAL FUNDING FOR RESEARCH.

(a) STANDARD FOR AWARD OF GRANTS.—The Foundation shall award Federal funding for basic research and education in the sciences through a new research grant or cooperative agreement only if an affirmative determination is made by the Foundation under subsection (b) and written justification relating thereto is published under subsection (c).

(b) DETERMINATION.—A determination referred to in subsection (a) is a justification by the responsible Foundation official as to how the research grant or cooperative agreement promotes the progress of science in the United States, consistent with the Foundation mission as established in the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.), and further—

(1) is worthy of Federal funding; and

(2) is in the national interest, as indicated by having the potential to achieve—

(A) increased economic competitiveness in the United States;

(B) advancement of the health and welfare of the American public;

(C) development of an American STEM workforce that is globally competitive;

(D) increased public scientific literacy and public engagement with science and technology in the United States;

(E) increased partnerships between academia and industry in the United States;

(F) support for the national defense of the United States; or

(G) promotion of the progress of science in the United States.

(c) **WRITTEN JUSTIFICATION.**—Public announcement of each award of Federal funding described in subsection (a) shall include a written justification from the responsible Foundation official as to how a grant or cooperative agreement meets the requirements of subsection (b).

(d) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—A determination under subsection (b) shall be made after a research grant or cooperative agreement proposal has satisfied the Foundation's reviews for Merit and Broader Impacts. Nothing in this section shall be construed as altering the Foundation's intellectual merit or broader impacts criteria for evaluating grant applications.

**SEC. 107. OBLIGATION OF MAJOR RESEARCH EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION FUNDS.**

No funds may be obligated for a fiscal year for a construction project for the Foundation that has not commenced before the date of enactment of this Act until 30 days after the report required with respect to each such fiscal year under section 14(a)(2) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n-4(a)(2)) is transmitted to the Congress.

**SEC. 108. MANAGEMENT AND OVERSIGHT OF LARGE FACILITIES.**

(a) **LARGE FACILITIES OFFICE.**—The Director shall maintain a Large Facilities Office within the Office of the Director. The functions of the Large Facilities Office shall be to support the research directorates in the development, implementation, and assessment of major multi-user research facilities, including by—

(1) serving as the Foundation's primary resource for all policy or process issues related to the development and implementation of major multi-user research facilities;

(2) serving as a Foundation-wide resource on project management, including providing expert assistance on nonscientific and nontechnical aspects of project planning, budgeting, implementation, management, and oversight;

(3) coordinating and collaborating with research directorates to share best management practices and lessons learned from prior projects; and

(4) assessing projects during preconstruction and construction phases for cost and schedule risk.

(b) **OVERSIGHT OF LARGE FACILITIES.**—The Director shall appoint a senior agency official within the Office of the Director whose primary responsibility is oversight of major multi-user research facilities. The duties of this official shall include—

(1) oversight of the development, construction, and operation of major multi-user research facilities across the Foundation;

(2) in collaboration with the directors of the research directorates and other senior agency officials as appropriate, ensuring that the requirements of section 14(a) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 are satisfied;

(3) serving as a liaison to the National Science Board for approval and oversight of major multi-user research facilities; and

(4) periodically reviewing and updating as necessary Foundation policies and guidelines for the development and construction of major multi-user research facilities.

(c) **POLICIES FOR LARGE FACILITY COSTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall ensure that the Foundation's policies for developing and managing major multi-user research facility construction costs are consistent with the best practices described in the March 2009 Government Accountability Office Report GAO-09-3SP, or any successor report thereto.

(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit to Congress the results of a study

and a report reforming the Foundation's policies on financial management of major multi-user research facilities, including a description of any aspects of the policies that diverge from the best practices recommended in Government Accountability Office Report GAO-09-3SP and the Uniform Guidance in 2 C.F.R. Part 200.

(3) **MANAGEMENT FEES.**—

(A) **DEFINITION.**—In this paragraph, the term "management fee" means a portion of an award made by the Foundation for the purpose of covering ordinary and necessary business expenses necessary to maintain operational stability which are not otherwise allowable under Cost Principles Uniform Guidance in 2 C.F.R. part 200, Subpart E, , or any successor regulation thereto.

(B) **LIMITATION.**—The Foundation may provide management fees under an award only if the awardee has demonstrated that it has limited or no other financial resources for covering the expenses for which the management fees are sought.

(C) **FINANCIAL INFORMATION.**—The Foundation shall require award applicants to provide income and financial information covering a period of no less than three prior years (or in the case of an entity established less than three years prior to the entity's application date, the period beginning on the date of establishment and ending on the application date), including cash on hand and net asset information, in support of a request for management fees. The Foundation shall also require awardees to report to the Foundation, within 30 days of receipt, any sources of non-Federal funds received in excess of \$50,000 during the award period.

(D) **EXPENSE REPORTING.**—The Foundation shall require awardees to track and report to the Foundation annually all expenses reimbursed or otherwise paid for with management fee funds, in accordance with Federal accounting practices as established in Government Accountability Office Report GAO-12-331G, or any successor report thereto.

(E) **AUDITS.**—The Inspector General of the Foundation may audit any Foundation award for compliance with this paragraph.

(F) **PROHIBITED USES.**—An awardee may not use management fees for—

(i) costs allowable under Cost Principles Uniform Guidance in 2 C.F.R. part 200, Subpart E, or any successor regulation thereto;

(ii) alcoholic beverages;

(iii) tickets to concerts, or sporting and other entertainment events;

(iv) vacation or other travel for nonbusiness purposes;

(v) charitable contributions;

(vi) social or sporting club memberships;

(vii) meals for nonbusiness purposes;

(viii) luxury or personal items;

(ix) lobbying, as described in the Uniform Guidance at 2 C.F.R. 200.450; or

(x) any other purpose the Foundation determines is inappropriate.

(G) **REVIEW.**—The Foundation shall review management fee usage under each Foundation award on at least an annual basis for compliance with this paragraph and the Foundation's Large Facilities Manual.

(4) **REPORT.**—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit to Congress a report describing the Foundation's policies for developing and managing major multi-user research facility construction costs, including a description of any aspects of the policies that diverge from the best practices recommended in Government Accountability Office Report GAO-09-3SP, or any successor report thereto, and the Uniform Guidance in 2 C.F.R. part 200.

**SEC. 109. WHISTLEBLOWER EDUCATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Foundation shall be subject to section 4712 of title 41, United States Code.

(b) **EDUCATION AND TRAINING.**—The Foundation shall provide education and training for

Foundation managers and staff on the requirements of such section 4712, and provide information on the law to all grantees, contractors, and employees of such grantees and contractors.

**SEC. 110. GRADUATE STUDENT SUPPORT.**

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the essential elements of the NSF Research Traineeship Program, formerly the Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship program, (or any successor thereto) should be maintained, including—

(1) collaborative research that transcends traditional disciplinary boundaries to solve large and complex research problems of significant scientific and societal importance; and

(2) providing students the opportunity to become leaders in the science and engineering of the future.

(b) **MODELS FOR SUPPORT.**—The Director shall enter into an agreement with the National Research Council to convene a workshop or roundtable to examine models of Federal support for STEM graduate students, including the Foundation's Graduate Research Fellowship program and comparable fellowship programs at other agencies, traineeship programs, and the research assistant model.

(c) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of the workshop or roundtable shall be to compare and evaluate the extent to which each of these models helps to prepare graduate students for diverse careers utilizing STEM degrees, including at diverse types of institutions of higher education, in industry, and at government agencies and research laboratories, and to make recommendations regarding—

(1) how current Federal programs and models, including programs and models at the Foundation, can be improved;

(2) the appropriateness of the current distribution of funding among the different models at the Foundation and across the agencies; and

(3) the appropriateness of creating a new education and training program for graduate students distinct from programs that provide direct financial support, including the grants authorized in section 527 of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 1862p-15).

(d) **CRITERIA.**—At a minimum, in comparing programs and models, the workshop or roundtable participants shall consider the capacity of such programs or models to provide students with knowledge and skills—

(1) to become independent, creative, successful researchers;

(2) to participate in large interdisciplinary research projects, including in an international context;

(3) to adhere to the highest standards for research ethics;

(4) to become high-quality teachers utilizing the most currently available evidence-based pedagogy;

(5) in oral and written communication, to both technical and nontechnical audiences;

(6) in innovation, entrepreneurship, and business ethics; and

(7) in program management.

(e) **GRADUATE STUDENT INPUT.**—The participants in the workshop or roundtable shall include current or recent STEM graduate students.

(f) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the National Research Council shall submit to Congress a summary report of the findings and recommendations of the workshop or roundtable convened under this section.

**SEC. 111. PERMISSIBLE SUPPORT.**

A grant made by the Education and Human Resources Directorate to support informal education may be used—

(1) to support the participation of underrepresented students in nonprofit competitions, out-of-school activities, and field experiences related to STEM subjects (such as robotics, science research, invention, mathematics, and technology competitions), including—

(A) the purchase of parts and supplies needed to participate in such competitions; and

(B) incentives and stipends for teachers and instructional leaders who are involved in assisting students and preparing students for such competitions, if such activities fall outside the regular duties and responsibilities of such teachers and instructional leaders; and

(2) to broaden underrepresented secondary school students' access to, and interest in, careers that require academic preparation in STEM subjects.

#### SEC. 112. EXPANDING STEM OPPORTUNITIES.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Within the Directorate for Education and Human Resources (or any successor thereto), under existing programs targeting broadening participation, the Director shall provide grants on a merit-reviewed, competitive basis for research on programming that engages underrepresented students in grades kindergarten through 8 in STEM.

##### (b) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Grants awarded under this section shall be used for research to advance the engagement of underrepresented students in grades kindergarten through 8 in STEM through the development and implementation of innovative before-school, after-school, out-of-school, or summer activities, including programs (if applicable to the target population) provided in a single-gender environment, that are designed to encourage interest, engagement, and skills development of underrepresented students in STEM. Such research shall be conducted in learning environments that actively provide programming to underrepresented students in grades kindergarten through 8 in STEM.

(2) *PERMITTED ACTIVITIES.*—Such activities may include—

(A) the development and implementation of programming described in subsection (a) for the purpose of research;

(B) the use of a variety of engagement methods, including cooperative and hands-on learning;

(C) exposure of underrepresented youth to role models in the fields of STEM, including researchers in the National Laboratories, and nearpeer mentors;

(D) training of informal learning educators and youth-serving professionals using evidence-based methods consistent with the target student population being served;

(E) education of students on the relevance and significance of STEM careers, provision of academic advice and assistance, and activities designed to help students make real-world connections to STEM content activities;

(F) the attendance of underrepresented youth at events, competitions, and academic programs to provide content expertise and encourage career exposure in STEM;

(G) activities designed to engage parents of underrepresented youth;

(H) innovative strategies to engage underrepresented youth, such as using leadership skill outcome measures to encourage youth with the confidence to pursue STEM coursework and academic study;

(I) coordination with STEM-rich environments, including other nonprofit, nongovernmental organizations, classroom and out-of-classroom settings, institutions of higher education, vocational facilities, corporations, museums, National Laboratories, or science centers; and

(J) the acquisition of instructional materials or technology-based tools to conduct applicable grant activity.

(c) *APPLICATION.*—An applicant seeking funding under the section shall submit an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as may be required. The application shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) A description of the target audience to be served by the program.

(2) A description of the process for recruitment and selection of students, as appropriate.

(3) A description of how such research activity may inform programming that engages underrepresented students in grades kindergarten through 8 in STEM.

(4) A description of how such research activity may inform programming that promotes student academic achievement in STEM.

(5) An evaluation plan that includes, at a minimum, the use of outcome-oriented measures to determine the impact and efficacy of activities being researched.

(d) *AWARDS.*—In awarding grants under this section, the Director shall give priority to applicants which, for the purpose of grant activity, include or partner with a nonprofit, nongovernmental organization that has extensive experience and expertise in increasing the participation of underrepresented students in STEM.

##### (e) ACCOUNTABILITY AND DISSEMINATION.—

(1) *EVALUATION REQUIRED.*—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall evaluate the grants provided under this section. In addition to evaluating the effectiveness of the grant activities, such evaluation shall—

(A) use a common set of benchmarks and assessment tools to identify best practices and materials developed or demonstrated by the research; and

(B) to the extent practicable, combine the research resulting from the grant activity with the current research on serving underrepresented students in grades kindergarten through 8.

(2) *REPORT ON EVALUATIONS.*—Not later than 180 days after the completion of the evaluation under paragraph (1), the Director shall submit to Congress and make widely available to the public a report that includes—

(A) the results of the evaluation; and

(B) any recommendations for administrative and legislative action that could optimize the effectiveness of the program.

(f) *COORDINATION.*—In carrying out this section, the Director shall consult, cooperate, and coordinate, to enhance program effectiveness and to avoid duplication, with the programs and policies of other relevant Federal agencies.

#### SEC. 113. REVIEW OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Director shall review the education programs of the Foundation that are in operation as of the date of enactment of this Act to determine—

(1) whether any of such programs duplicate target groups, services provided, fields of focus, or objectives; and

(2) how those programs are being evaluated and assessed for outcome-oriented effectiveness.

(b) *REPORT.*—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter as part of the annual budget submission to Congress, the Director shall complete a report on the review carried out under this section and shall submit the report to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and shall make the report widely available to the public.

#### SEC. 114. RECOMPETITION OF AWARDS.

(a) *FINDINGS.*—The Congress finds that—

(1) the merit-reviewed competition of grant and award proposals is a hallmark of the Foundation grant and award making process;

(2) the majority of Foundation-funded multi-user research facilities have transitioned to five-year cooperative agreements, and every five years the program officer responsible for the facility makes a recommendation to the National Science Board as to the renewal, recompetition, or termination of support for the facility; and

(3) requiring the recompetition of expiring awards is based on the conviction that competi-

tion is most likely to ensure the effective stewardship of Foundation funds for supporting research and education.

(b) *RECOMPETITION.*—The Director shall ensure that the system for recompetition of Maintenance and Operations of facilities, equipment and instrumentation is fair, consistent, and transparent and is applied in a manner that renews grants and awards in a timely manner. The Director shall periodically evaluate whether the criteria of the system are being applied in a manner that is transparent, reliable, and valid.

#### SEC. 115. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING INDUSTRY INVESTMENT IN STEM EDUCATION.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) in order to bolster the STEM workforce pipeline, many industry sectors are becoming involved in K-12 initiatives and supporting undergraduate and graduate work in STEM subject areas and fields;

(2) partnerships with education providers, STEM focused competitions, and other opportunities have become important aspects of private sector efforts to strengthen the STEM workforce;

(3) understanding the work that private sector organizations are undertaking in STEM fields should inform the Federal Government's role in STEM education; and

(4) successful private sector STEM initiatives, as reflected by measurements of relevant outcomes, should be encouraged and supported by the Foundation.

#### SEC. 116. MISREPRESENTATION OF RESEARCH RESULTS.

(a) *PROHIBITION.*—The findings and conclusions of any article authored by a principal investigator receiving a research grant from the Foundation, using the results of the research conducted under the grant, that is published in a peer-reviewed publication, otherwise made publicly available, or incorporated in an application for a research grant or grant extension from the Foundation may not contain any falsification, fabrication, or plagiarism, as established in the Foundation's Research Misconduct regulation (45 C.F.R. 689).

(b) *PUBLICATION.*—The Director shall make publicly available any finding that research misconduct (as defined in 45 C.F.R. 689) has been committed, including the name of the principal investigator, within 30 days of the final administration action of the Foundation.

#### SEC. 117. RESEARCH REPRODUCIBILITY AND REPLICATION.

(a) *SENSE OF CONGRESS.*—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the gold standard of good science is the ability of a researcher or research lab to reproduce a published method and finding;

(2) there is growing concern that some published research findings cannot be reproduced or replicated, which can negatively affect the public's trust in science;

(3) there are a complex set of factors affecting reproducibility and replication; and

(4) the increasing interdisciplinary nature and complexity of scientific research may be a contributing factor to issues with research reproducibility and replication.

(b) *REPORT.*—The Director shall—

(1) not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act, enter into an agreement with the National Research Council to provide, within 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, a report to assess research and data reproducibility and replicability issues in interdisciplinary research and to make recommendations on how to improve rigor and transparency in scientific research; and

(2) not later than 60 days after receiving the results of the assessment under paragraph (1), submit a report to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on

the findings of the assessment, together with the agreement or disagreement of the Director and Board with each of its findings and recommendations.

#### SEC. 118. RESEARCH GRANT CONDITIONS.

The Foundation shall establish procedures to ensure that—

(1) a research grant awarded by the Foundation to a principal investigator supports a scope of work not otherwise being directly funded by grants provided by other Federal agencies;

(2) a principal investigator includes in any application for a research grant awarded by the Foundation a list of all Federal research funding received by the principal investigator, as well as any funding that is being requested as of that time;

(3) unpublished research results used to support a grant proposal made to the Foundation do not include any knowing misrepresentations of data;

(4) principal investigators who receive Foundation research grant funding under more than one grant at the same time have sufficient resources to conduct the proposed research under each of those grants appropriately under the terms of the grant; and

(5) barriers to early career and new investigator applicants are addressed, including taking into account the broader accomplishments and potential of the individual investigator in addition to the potential impact of the project.

#### SEC. 119. COMPUTING RESOURCES STUDY.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall transmit to the Congress a report detailing the results of a study on the use of scientific computing resources funded by the Foundation at institutions of higher education. Such study shall assess—

(1) efficiencies that can be achieved by using shared scientific computing resources for projects that have similar scientific computing requirements or projects where specialized software solutions could be shared with other practitioners in the scientific community;

(2) efficiencies that can be achieved by using shared hardware that can be cost effectively procured from cloud computing services;

(3) efficiencies that can be achieved by using shared software from an open source repository or platform; and

(4) cost savings that could be achieved by potential sharing of scientific computing resources across all Foundation grants.

#### SEC. 120. SCIENTIFIC BREAKTHROUGH PRIZES.

The Director shall place a high priority on designing and administering pilot programs for scientific breakthrough prizes, in conjunction with private entities, that are consistent with Office of Science and Technology Policy guidelines. Breakthrough prizes shall center around technological breakthroughs that are of strategic importance to the Nation, and have the capacity to spur new economic growth.

#### SEC. 121. ROTATING PERSONNEL.

In order to control the costs to the Foundation of individuals employed pursuant to the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 4701 note)—

(1) the Foundation shall provide to Congress a written justification and waiver by the Deputy Director in instances in which such an individual is to be paid at a rate that exceeds the maximum rate of pay for the Senior Executive Service, including, if applicable, adjustment for the certified Senior Executive Service Performance Appraisal System;

(2) the Foundation shall provide to Congress a written justification and waiver by the Director in instances in which such an individual is to be paid at a rate that exceeds the annual salary rate of the Vice President of the United States; and

(3) the Foundation shall provide an annual report to Congress on the costs to the Foundation of employing such individuals, including—

(A) the timeliness and completeness of Foundation actions in response to recommendations and findings from the Office of Inspector General related to the employment of such individuals;

(B) actions taken by the Foundation to reduce the cost to the Foundation of the employment of such individuals at pay levels that exceed the threshold described in paragraph (1);

(C) the value to the Foundation of employing individuals pursuant to the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 4701 note) whose pay is set below the threshold described in paragraph (1); and

(D) the value to the Foundation of employing individuals who are not permanent employees whose pay requires a justification and waiver under paragraph (1) or (2).

#### SEC. 122. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING INNOVATION CORPS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Foundation's Innovation Corps (I-Corps) was established to foster a national innovation ecosystem by encouraging institutions, scientists, engineers, and entrepreneurs to identify and explore the innovation and commercial potential of Foundation-funded research well beyond the laboratory;

(2) the Foundation's I-Corps includes investment in entrepreneurship and commercialization education, training, and mentoring, ultimately leading to the practical deployment of technologies, products, processes, and services that improve the Nation's competitiveness, promote economic growth, and benefit society; and

(3) by building networks of entrepreneurs, educators, mentors, institutions, and collaborations, and supporting specialized education and training, I-Corps is at the leading edge of a strong, lasting foundation for an American innovation ecosystem.

#### SEC. 123. BRAIN RESEARCH THROUGH ADVANCING INNOVATIVE NEUROTECHNOLOGIES INITIATIVE.

The Foundation shall support research activities related to the Brain Research through Advancing Innovative Neurotechnologies Initiative. The Foundation is encouraged to work in conjunction with the Interagency Working Group on Neuroscience (IWGN) to determine how to use the data infrastructure of the Foundation and other applicable agencies to help neuroscientists collect, standardize, manage, and analyze the large amounts of data that will result from research attempting to understand how the brain functions.

#### SEC. 124. NOYCE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM AMENDMENTS.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Section 10A of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n–1a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)(B), by inserting “or bachelor’s” after “master’s”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (2)(B);

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by inserting “for teachers with master’s degrees in their field” after “Teaching Fellowships”;

(ii) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting “; and”;

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) in the case of National Science Foundation Master Teaching Fellowships for teachers with bachelor’s degrees in their field and working toward a master’s degree—

“(A) offering academic courses leading to a master’s degree and leadership training to prepare individuals to become master teachers in elementary and secondary schools; and

“(B) offering programs both during and after matriculation in the program for which the fellowship is received to enable fellows to become highly effective mathematics and science teachers, including mentoring, training, induction,

and professional development activities, to fulfill the service requirements of this section, including the requirements of subsection (e), and to exchange ideas with others in their fields.”;

(3) in subsection (e), by striking “subsection (g)” and inserting “subsection (h)”;

(4) by redesignating subsections (g) through (i) as subsections (h) through (j), respectively; and

(5) by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

“(g) SUPPORT FOR MASTER TEACHING FELLOWS WHILE ENROLLED IN A MASTER’S DEGREE PROGRAM.—A National Science Foundation Master Teacher Fellow may receive a maximum of 1 year of fellowship support while enrolled in a master’s degree program as described in subsection (c)(4)(A), except that if such fellow is enrolled in a part-time program, such amount shall be prorated according to the length of the program.”.

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 10(i)(5) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n–1(i)(5)) is amended by inserting “computer science,” after “means a science.”.

#### SEC. 125. INFORMAL STEM EDUCATION.

(a) GRANTS.—The Director, through the Directorate for Education and Human Resources, shall continue to award competitive, merit-reviewed grants to support—

(1) research and development of innovative out-of-school STEM learning and emerging STEM learning environments in order to improve STEM learning outcomes and engagement in STEM; and

(2) research that advances the field of informal STEM education.

(b) USES OF FUNDS.—Activities supported by grants under this section may encompass a single STEM discipline, multiple STEM disciplines, or integrative STEM initiatives and shall include—

(1) research and development that improves our understanding of learning and engagement in informal environments, including the role of informal environments in broadening participation in STEM; and

(2) design and testing of innovative STEM learning models, programs, and other resources for informal learning environments to improve STEM learning outcomes and increase engagement for K–12 students, K–12 teachers, and the general public, including design and testing of the scalability of models, programs, and other resources.

#### SEC. 126. EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM TO STIMULATE COMPETITIVE RESEARCH.

The Foundation shall continue to operate a robust Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR). The EPSCoR program helps ensure that academic research institutions in more than half the States develop a strong research infrastructure and participate fully in federally funded research activities. The program should be a high priority for the Foundation.

### TITLE II—SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ENGINEERING, AND MATHEMATICS

#### SEC. 201. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) According to the National Science Board’s Science and Engineering Indicators, the science and engineering workforce has shown sustained growth for more than half a century, and workers with science and engineering degrees tend to earn more than comparable workers in other fields.

(2) According to the Program for International Student Assessment 2012 results, America lags behind many other nations in STEM education. American students rank 21st in science and 26th in mathematics.

(3) Junior Achievement USA and ING found a decrease of 25 percent in the percentage of teenage students interested in STEM careers.

(4) According to a 2007 report from the Department of Labor, industries and firms dependent on a strong science and mathematics workforce have launched a variety of programs that target K-12 students and undergraduate and graduate students in STEM fields.

(5) The Federal Government spends nearly \$3 billion annually on STEM education related program and activities, but encouraging STEM education activities beyond the scope of the Federal Government, including privately sponsored competitions and programs in our schools, is crucial to the future technical and economic competitiveness of the United States.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) more effective coordination and adoption of performance measurement based on objective outcomes for federally supported STEM programs is needed;

(2) leveraging private and nonprofit investments in STEM education will be essential to strengthening the Federal STEM portfolio;

(3) strengthening the Federal STEM portfolio may require program consolidations and terminations, but such changes should be based on evidence with stakeholder input;

(4) coordinating STEM programs and activities across the Federal Government in order to limit duplication and engage stakeholders in STEM programs and related activities for which objective outcomes can be measured will bolster results of Federal STEM education programs, improve the return on taxpayers' investments in STEM education programs, and in turn strengthen the United States economy; and

(5) as the Committee on STEM Education implements the 5-year Strategic Plan for Federal STEM education required under section 101(b)(5) of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 6621(b)(5)), STEM education stakeholders must be engaged and outcome-based evaluation metrics should be considered in the coordination and consolidation efforts for the Federal STEM portfolio.

#### SEC. 202. STEM EDUCATION ADVISORY PANEL.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The President shall establish or designate a STEM Education Advisory Panel that incorporates key stakeholders from the education and industry sectors. The co-chairs shall be members of the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology.

(b) QUALIFICATIONS.—The Advisory Panel established or designated by the President under subsection (a) shall consist primarily of members from academic institutions, nonprofit organizations, and industry and shall include in-school, out-of-school, and informal educational practitioners. Members of the Advisory Panel shall be qualified to provide advice and information on STEM education research, development, training, implementation, interventions, professional development, or workforce needs or concerns. In selecting or designating an Advisory Panel, the President may also seek and give consideration to recommendations from the Congress, industry, the scientific community (including the National Academy of Sciences, scientific professional societies, and academia), State and local governments, and other appropriate organizations.

(c) DUTIES.—The Advisory Panel shall advise the President, the Committee on STEM Education, and the STEM Education Coordinating Office established under section 204 on matters relating to STEM education, and shall each year provide general guidance to every Federal agency with STEM education programs or activities, including in the preparation of requests for appropriations for activities related to STEM education. The Advisory Panel shall also assess and develop recommendations for—

(1) progress made in implementing the STEM education Strategic Plan required under section 101 of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 6621), and any needs or opportunities to update the strategic plan;

(2) the management, coordination, and implementation of STEM education programs and activities across the Federal Government;

(3) the appropriateness of criteria used by Federal agencies to evaluate the effectiveness of Federal STEM education programs and activities;

(4) ways to leverage private and nonprofit STEM investments and encourage public-private partnerships to strengthen STEM education and help build the STEM workforce pipeline;

(5) ways to incorporate workforce needs into Federal STEM education programs, particularly for specific fields of national interest and areas experiencing high unemployment rates;

(6) ways to better vertically and horizontally integrate Federal STEM programs and activities from pre-K through graduate study and the workforce, and from in-school to out-of-school in order to improve transitions for students moving through the STEM pipeline;

(7) whether societal and workforce concerns are adequately addressed by current Federal STEM education programs and activities;

(8) the extent to which Federal STEM education programs and activities are contributing to recruitment and retention of women and underrepresented students in the STEM education and workforce pipeline; and

(9) ways to encourage geographic diversity in STEM education and the workforce pipeline.

(d) REPORTS.—The Advisory Panel shall report, not less frequently than once every 3 fiscal years, to the President and Congress on its assessments under subsection (c) and its recommendations for ways to improve Federal STEM education programs. The first report under this subsection shall be submitted within 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) TRAVEL EXPENSES OF NON-FEDERAL MEMBERS.—Non-Federal members of the Advisory Panel, while attending meetings of the Advisory Panel or while otherwise serving at the request of the head of the Advisory Panel away from their homes or regular places of business, may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for individuals in the Government serving without pay. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prohibit members of the Advisory Panel who are officers or employees of the United States from being allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with existing law.

#### SEC. 203. COMMITTEE ON STEM EDUCATION.

Section 101 of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 6621) is amended—

(1) in the first subsection (b)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (6) as paragraphs (5) through (8), respectively;

(B) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraphs:

“(3) collaborate with the STEM Education Advisory Panel established under section 202 of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015 and other outside stakeholders to ensure the engagement of the STEM education community;”

“(4) review evaluation measures used for Federal STEM education programs;”;

(C) in paragraph (8), as so redesignated by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, by striking “, periodically update;”;

(2) in the second subsection (b) and in subsection (c), by striking “subsection (b)(5)” and inserting “subsection (b)(7)”.

#### SEC. 204. STEM EDUCATION COORDINATING OFFICE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall establish within the Directorate for Education and Human Resources a STEM Education Coordinating Office, which shall have a Director and staff that shall include career employees detailed from Federal agencies that fund STEM education programs and activities.

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The STEM Education Coordinating Office shall—

(1) provide technical and administrative support to—

(A) the Committee on STEM Education, especially in its coordination of Federal STEM programs and strategic planning responsibilities;

(B) the Advisory Panel established under section 202; and

(C) Federal agencies with STEM education programs;

(2) periodically update and maintain the inventory of federally sponsored STEM education programs and activities established under section 101(b)(8) of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 6621); and

(3) provide for dissemination of information on Federal STEM education programs and activities, as appropriate, to stakeholders in academia, industry, nonprofit organizations with expertise in STEM education, State and local educational agencies, and other STEM stakeholders.

(c) REPORT.—The Director of the STEM Education Coordinating Office shall transmit a report annually to Congress not later than 60 days after the submission of the President's budget request. The annual report shall include—

(1) any updates to the inventory required under subsection (b)(2);

(2) a description of all consolidations and terminations of Federal STEM education programs implemented in the previous fiscal year, including an explanation of the reasons for consolidations and terminations;

(3) recommendations for consolidations and terminations of STEM education programs or activities in the upcoming fiscal year;

(4) a description of any significant new STEM Education public-private partnerships; and

(5) description of the progress made in carrying out the strategic plan required under section 101 of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 6621), including a description of the outcome of any program assessments completed in the previous year.

(d) RESPONSIBILITIES OF NSF.—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall encourage and monitor the efforts of the STEM Education Coordinating Office to ensure that the Coordinating Office is carrying out its responsibilities under subsection (b) appropriately.

### TITLE III—OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

#### SEC. 301. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated for the Office of Science and Technology Policy—

(1) \$4,550,000 for fiscal year 2016; and

(2) \$4,550,000 for fiscal year 2017.

#### SEC. 302. REGULATORY EFFICIENCY.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) high and increasing administrative burdens and costs in Federal research administration, particularly in the higher education sector where most federally sponsored research is performed, are eroding funds available to carry out basic scientific research;

(2) progress has been made over the last decade in streamlining the pre-award grant application process through Grants.gov, the Federal Government's website portal;

(3) post-award administrative costs have grown as Federal research agencies have continued to impose agency-unique compliance and reporting requirements on researchers and research institutions;

(4) facilities and administration costs at research universities can exceed 50 percent of the total value of Federal research grants, and it is estimated that nearly 30 percent of the funds invested annually in federally funded research is consumed by paperwork and other administrative processes required by Federal agencies; and

(5) it is a matter of critical importance to American competitiveness that administrative

costs of federally funded research be streamlined so that a higher proportion of taxpayer dollars flow into direct research activities.

(b) *IN GENERAL.*—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall establish a working group under the authority of the National Science and Technology Council, to include the Office of Management and Budget. The working group shall be responsible for reviewing Federal regulations affecting research and research universities and making recommendations on how to—

(1) harmonize, streamline, and eliminate duplicative Federal regulations and reporting requirements;

(2) minimize the regulatory burden on United States institutions of higher education performing federally funded research while maintaining accountability for Federal tax dollars; and

(3) identify and update specific regulations to refocus on performance-based goals rather than on process while still meeting the desired outcome.

(c) *STAKEHOLDER INPUT.*—In carrying out the responsibilities under subsection (b), the working group shall take into account input and recommendations from non-Federal stakeholders, including federally funded and nonfederally funded researchers, institutions of higher education, scientific disciplinary societies and associations, nonprofit research institutions, industry, including small businesses, federally funded research and development centers, and others with a stake in ensuring effectiveness, efficiency, and accountability in the performance of scientific research.

(d) *REPORT.*—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for 3 years, the Director shall report to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on what steps have been taken to carry out the recommendations of the working group established under subsection (b).

**SEC. 303. COORDINATION OF INTERNATIONAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PARTNERSHIPS.**

(a) *ESTABLISHMENT.*—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall establish a body under the National Science and Technology Council with the responsibility to identify and coordinate international science and technology cooperation that can strengthen the United States science and technology enterprise, improve economic and national security, and support United States foreign policy goals.

(b) *NSTC BODY LEADERSHIP.*—The body established under subsection (a) shall be co-chaired by senior level officials from the Office of Science and Technology Policy and the Department of State.

(c) *RESPONSIBILITIES.*—The body established under subsection (a) shall—

(1) plan and coordinate interagency international science and technology cooperative research and training activities and partnerships supported or managed by Federal agencies and work with other National Science and Technology Council committees to help plan and coordinate the international component of national science and technology priorities;

(2) establish Federal priorities and policies for aligning, as appropriate, international science and technology cooperative research and training activities and partnerships supported or managed by Federal agencies with the foreign policy goals of the United States;

(3) identify opportunities for new international science and technology cooperative research and training partnerships that advance both the science and technology and the foreign policy priorities of the United States;

(4) in carrying out paragraph (3), solicit input and recommendations from non-Federal science and technology stakeholders, including universities, scientific and professional societies, in-

dustry, and relevant organizations and institutions; and

(5) identify broad issues that influence the ability of United States scientists and engineers to collaborate with foreign counterparts, including barriers to collaboration and access to scientific information.

(d) *REPORT TO CONGRESS.*—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall transmit a report, to be updated every 2 years, to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. The report shall also be made available to the public on the reporting agency's website. The report shall contain a description of—

(1) the priorities and policies established under subsection (c)(2);

(2) the ongoing and new partnerships established since the last update to the report;

(3) the means by which stakeholder input was received, as well as summary views of stakeholder input; and

(4) the issues influencing the ability of United States scientists and engineers to collaborate with foreign counterparts.

(e) *ADDITIONAL REPORTS TO CONGRESS.*—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall transmit, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, a report that lists and describes all foreign travel by Office of Science and Technology Policy staff and detailees. Each report shall specify the dates of each trip, the purpose of the trip, Office of Science and Technology Policy participants on the trip, total Office of Science and Technology Policy costs associated with the trip, and details of all international meetings, including meeting participants and topics addressed.

**SEC. 304. ALTERNATIVE RESEARCH FUNDING MODELS.**

(a) *PILOT PROGRAM AUTHORITY.*—The heads of Federal science agencies, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, shall conduct appropriate pilot programs to validate alternative research funding models, including—

(1) scientific breakthrough prize programs that are of strategic importance to the Nation and have the capacity to spur new economic growth; and

(2) novel mechanisms of funding including obtaining non-Federal funds through crowd source funding.

(b) *NON-FEDERAL PARTNERS.*—A pilot program may be conducted under this section through an agreement, grant, or contractual relationship with a non-Federal entity regarding the design, administration, and funding of the program.

(c) *PRIZE COMPETITION JUDGES.*—

(1) *REQUIREMENTS.*—Judges for a prize competition carried out under this section shall not be required to be Federal employees. An individual who serves as a judge for a prize competition carried out under this section who is not a Federal employee shall be required to sign an agreement, developed by the Office of Science and Technology Policy, with respect to non-disclosure, conflict of interest, and judging code of conduct requirements.

(2) *DISCLOSURE OF PERSONAL FINANCIAL INTERESTS.*—A judge for a prize competition with a total purse of \$10,000 or more, or for an aggregate of prize competitions with a total purse of \$50,000 or more, shall be required to disclose all personal financial interests.

(3) *REPORT TO CONGRESS.*—Not later than 30 days after the Office of Science and Technology Policy completes development of an agreement

under paragraph (1), it shall transmit a report to Congress describing the requirements of such agreement.

(d) *PUBLIC NOTICE.*—The heads of Federal science agencies shall widely advertise prize competitions to be conducted under this section to ensure maximum participation.

(e) *DEFINITION.*—For purposes of this section, the term “Federal science agency” means—

(1) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

(2) the National Science Foundation;

(3) the National Institute of Standards and Technology; and

(4) the National Weather Service.

(f) *REPORT TO CONGRESS.*—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter as part of the annual budget submission to Congress, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall transmit to the Congress a report on programs identified and conducted under subsection (a).

**SEC. 305. AMENDMENTS TO PRIZE COMPETITIONS.**

Section 24 of the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3719) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) by inserting “competition” after “section, a prize”;

(B) by inserting “types” after “following”; and

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking “prizes” and inserting “prize competitions”;

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking “in the Federal Register” and inserting “on a publicly accessible Government website, such as [www.challenge.gov](http://www.challenge.gov),”; and

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking “prize” and inserting “cash prize purse”;

(3) in subsection (g), by striking “prize” and inserting “cash prize purse”;

(4) in subsection (h), by inserting “prize” before “competition” both places it appears;

(5) in subsection (i)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting “prize” before “competition”;

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by inserting “prize” before “competition” both places it appears;

(C) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(3) *WAIVER.*—An agency may waive the requirement under paragraph (2). The annual report under subsection (p) shall include a list of such waivers granted during the preceding fiscal year, along with a detailed explanation of the reasons for granting the waivers.”;

(6) in subsection (k)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(A), by inserting “prize” before “competition”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting “prize” before “competitions” both places it appears;

(7) in subsection (l), by striking all after “may enter into” and inserting “a grant, contract, cooperative agreement, or other agreement with a private sector for-profit or nonprofit entity to administer the prize competition, subject to the provisions of this section.”;

(8) in subsection (m)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Support for a prize competition under this section, including financial support for the design and administration of a prize competition or funds for a cash prize purse, may consist of Federal appropriated funds and funds provided by private sector for-profit and nonprofit entities. The head of an agency may accept funds from other Federal agencies, private sector for-profit entities, and nonprofit entities to support such prize competitions. The head of an agency may not give any special consideration to any private sector for-profit or nonprofit entity in return for a donation.”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “prize awards” and inserting “cash prize purses”;

(C) in paragraph (3)(A)—  
(i) by striking “No prize” and inserting “No cash prize”; and  
(ii) by striking “the prize” and inserting “the cash prize”;

(D) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking “a prize” and inserting “a cash prize”;

(E) in paragraph (3)(B)(i), by inserting “competition” after “prize”;

(F) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking “a prize” and inserting “a cash prize”;

(G) in paragraph (4)(B), by striking “cash prizes” and inserting “cash prize purses”;

(9) in subsection (n), by inserting “for both for-profit and nonprofit entities,” after “contract vehicle”;

(10) in subsection (o)(1), by striking “or providing a prize” and insert “a prize competition or providing a cash prize”;

(11) in subsection (p)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking “cash prizes” both places it occurs and inserting “cash prize purses”;

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(G) PLAN.—A description of crosscutting topical areas and agency-specific mission needs that may be the strongest opportunities for prize competitions during the upcoming 2 fiscal years.”

#### SEC. 306. UNITED STATES CHIEF TECHNOLOGY OFFICER.

Title II of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6611 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“UNITED STATES CHIEF TECHNOLOGY OFFICER

“SEC. 210. (a) APPOINTMENT.—The President may appoint a United States Chief Technology Officer. Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015, such officer shall be one of the Associate Directors of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

“(b) DUTIES.—The duties of the United States Chief Technology Officer should include—

“(1) advising the President and the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy on Federal information systems, technology, data, and innovation policies and initiatives;

“(2) promoting an improved exchange of information among the Federal Government, the public, and Congress;

“(3) promoting the use of innovative technological approaches across the Federal Government to ensure a modern information technology infrastructure;

“(4) working with the Chief Technology Officers and Chief Information Officers of all Federal agencies to ensure the use of best technologies and security practices for information systems;

“(5) establishing a working group with such Officers to exchange best practices about information systems;

“(6) promoting transparency and accountability across the Federal Government for all technological implementation by working with agencies to ensure that each arm of the Federal Government, including the executive branch, makes its records open and accessible;

“(7) promoting security and privacy protection policies for all Federal information technology systems that are consistent with Federal law, regulations, and current best practices;

“(8) promoting technological interoperability of key Government functions;

“(9) in consultation with the Office of Management and Budget, providing an annual report to the President, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, and Congress on the current state of information systems of all Federal agencies, including—

“(A) the status of information systems, including potential technology and security concerns about these information systems in all Federal agencies;

“(B) a review of all Federal websites with third-party embedded tools that—

“(i) identifies each embedded tool, who it belongs to, and the data it collects; and

“(ii) addresses effects on cybersecurity and consumer privacy, including whether each website provides prominent notice to consumers about the presence of the tool and whether the consumer may opt-out of the tool;

“(C) the amount of money being spent on various technologies; and

“(D) technology recommendations and best practices; and

“(10) such other functions and activities as the President and Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy may assign.

“(c) REPORT.—In the absence of a United States Chief Technology Officer, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall be responsible for providing the report required under subsection (b)(9).”

#### SEC. 307. NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL STUDY ON TECHNOLOGY FOR EMERGENCY NOTIFICATIONS ON UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall enter into an arrangement with the National Research Council to conduct and complete a study to identify and review technologies employed at institutions of higher education to provide notifications to students, faculty, and other personnel during emergency situations in accordance with the requirements of existing law. The study shall address—

(1) the timeliness of notifications during emergency situations provided by various technologies;

(2) the durability of such technologies in delivering such notifications to students, faculty, and other personnel; and

(3) the limitations exhibited by such technologies to successfully deliver notifications not more than 30 seconds after the institution of higher education transmits such notifications.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the National Research Council enters into the arrangement required by subsection (a), the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under such subsection.

#### TITLE IV—NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY

##### SEC. 401. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2016.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce \$933,700,000 for the National Institute of Standards and Technology for fiscal year 2016.

(2) SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS.—Of the amount authorized by paragraph (1)—

(A) \$744,700,000 shall be for scientific and technical research and services laboratory activities;

(B) \$59,000,000 shall be for the construction and maintenance of facilities; and

(C) \$130,000,000 shall be for industrial technology services activities, of which \$125,000,000 shall be for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program under sections 25 and 26 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k and 278l) and \$5,000,000 shall be for the Network for Manufacturing Innovation Program under section 34 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278s).

(b) FISCAL YEAR 2017.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce \$933,700,000 for the National Institute of Standards and Technology for fiscal year 2017.

(2) SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS.—Of the amount authorized by paragraph (1)—

(A) \$744,700,000 shall be for scientific and technical research and services laboratory activities;

(B) \$59,000,000 shall be for the construction and maintenance of facilities; and

(C) \$130,000,000 shall be for industrial technology services activities, of which \$125,000,000 shall be for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program under sections 25 and 26 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k and 278l) and \$5,000,000 shall be for the Network for Manufacturing Innovation Program under section 34 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278s).

##### SEC. 402. STANDARDS AND CONFORMITY ASSESSMENT.

Section 2 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 272) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “authorized to take” and inserting “authorized to serve as the President’s principal adviser on standards policy pertaining to the Nation’s technological competitiveness and innovation ability and to take”;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “compare standards” and all that follows through “Federal Government” and inserting “facilitate standards-related information sharing and cooperation between Federal agencies”; and

(C) in paragraph (13), by striking “Federal, State, and local” and all that follows through “private sector” and inserting “technical standards activities and conformity assessment activities of Federal, State, and local governments with private sector”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (22), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (23) as paragraph (25); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (22) the following:

“(23) participate in and support scientific and technical conferences;

“(24) perform pre-competitive measurement science and technology research in partnership with institutions of higher education and industry to promote United States industrial competitiveness; and”

##### SEC. 403. VISITING COMMITTEE ON ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.

Section 10 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “15 members” and inserting “not fewer than 11 members”;

(B) by striking “at least 10” and inserting “at least two-thirds”;

(C) by adding at the end the following: “The Committee may consult with the National Research Council in making recommendations regarding general policy for the Institute.”; and

(2) in subsection (h)(1), by striking “, including the Program established under section 28.”.

##### SEC. 404. POLICE AND SECURITY AUTHORITY.

Section 15 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278e) is amended—

(1) by striking “of the Government; and” and inserting “of the Government;”;

(2) by striking “United States Code.” and inserting “United States Code; and (i) the protection of Institute buildings and other plant facilities, equipment, and property, and of employees, associates, visitors, or other persons located therein or associated therewith, notwithstanding any other provision of law.”.

##### SEC. 405. EDUCATION AND OUTREACH.

The National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 271 et seq.) is amended by striking sections 18, 19, and 19A and inserting the following:

##### “SEC. 18. EDUCATION AND OUTREACH.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director may support, promote, and coordinate activities and efforts to enhance public awareness and understanding of

measurement sciences, standards, and technology by the general public, industry, and academia in support of the Institute's mission.

“(b) RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director may award research fellowships and other forms of financial and logistical assistance, including direct stipend awards, to—

“(A) students at institutions of higher education within the United States who show promise as present or future contributors to the mission of the Institute; and

“(B) United States citizens for research and technical activities of the Institute.

“(2) SELECTION.—The Director shall select persons to receive such fellowships and assistance on the basis of ability and of the relevance of the proposed work to the mission and programs of the Institute.

“(3) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this subsection, financial and logistical assistance includes, notwithstanding section 1345 of title 31, United States Code, or any contrary provision of law, temporary housing and local transportation to and from the Institute facilities.

“(c) POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.—The Director shall establish and conduct a post-doctoral fellowship program, subject to the availability of appropriations, that shall include not fewer than 20 fellows per fiscal year. In evaluating applications for fellowships under this subsection, the Director shall give consideration to the goal of promoting the participation of underrepresented students in research areas supported by the Institute.”

**SEC. 406. PROGRAMMATIC PLANNING REPORT.**

Section 23(d) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278i(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “The 3-year programmatic planning document shall also describe how the Director is addressing recommendations from the Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology established under section 10.”

**SEC. 407. ASSESSMENTS BY THE NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL.**

(a) NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES REVIEW.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall enter into a contract with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a single, comprehensive review of the Institute's laboratory programs. The review shall—

(1) assess the technical merits and scientific caliber of the research conducted at the laboratories;

(2) examine the strengths and weaknesses of the 2010 laboratory reorganization on the Institute's ability to fulfill its mission;

(3) evaluate how cross-cutting research and development activities are planned, coordinated, and executed across the laboratories; and

(4) assess how the laboratories are engaging industry, including the incorporation of industry need, into the research goals and objectives of the Institute.

(b) ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENTS.—Section 24 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278j) is amended to read as follows:

**“SEC. 24. ASSESSMENTS BY THE NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Institute shall contract with the National Research Council to perform and report on assessments of the technical quality and impact of the work conducted at Institute laboratories.

“(b) SCHEDULE.—Two laboratories shall be assessed under subsection (a) each year, and each laboratory shall be assessed at least once every 3 years.

“(c) SUMMARY REPORT.—Beginning in the year after the first assessment is conducted under subsection (a), and once every two years thereafter, the Institute shall contract with the National Research Council to prepare a report

that summarizes the findings common across the individual assessment reports.

“(d) ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENTS.—The Institute, at the discretion of the Director, also may contract with the National Research Council to conduct additional assessments of Institute programs and projects that involve collaboration across the Institute laboratories and centers and assessments of selected scientific and technical topics.

“(e) CONSULTATION WITH VISITING COMMITTEE ON ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.—The National Research Council may consult with the Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology established under section 10 in performing the assessments under this section.

“(f) REPORTS.—Not later than 30 days after the completion of each assessment, the Institute shall transmit the report on such assessment to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.”

**SEC. 408. HOLLINGS MANUFACTURING EXTENSION PARTNERSHIP.**

Section 25 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k) is amended to read as follows:

**“SEC. 25. HOLLINGS MANUFACTURING EXTENSION PARTNERSHIP.**

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, through the Director and, if appropriate, through other officials, shall provide assistance for the creation and support of manufacturing extension centers, to be known as the ‘Hollings Manufacturing Extension Centers’, for the transfer of manufacturing technology and best business practices (in this Act referred to as the ‘Centers’). The program under this section shall be known as the ‘Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership’.

“(2) AFFILIATIONS.—Such Centers shall be affiliated with any United States-based public or nonprofit institution or organization, or group thereof, that applies for and is awarded financial assistance under this section.

“(3) OBJECTIVE.—The objective of the Centers is to enhance competitiveness, productivity, and technological performance in United States manufacturing through—

“(A) the transfer of manufacturing technology and techniques developed at the Institute to Centers and, through them, to manufacturing companies throughout the United States;

“(B) the participation of individuals from industry, institutions of higher education, State governments, other Federal agencies, and, when appropriate, the Institute in cooperative technology transfer activities;

“(C) efforts to make new manufacturing technology and processes usable by United States-based small and medium-sized companies;

“(D) the active dissemination of scientific, engineering, technical, and management information about manufacturing to industrial firms, including small and medium-sized manufacturing companies;

“(E) the utilization, when appropriate, of the expertise and capability that exists in Federal laboratories other than the Institute;

“(F) the provision to community colleges and area career and technical education schools of information about the job skills needed in small and medium-sized manufacturing businesses in the regions they serve; and

“(G) promoting and expanding certification systems offered through industry, associations, and local colleges, when appropriate.

“(b) ACTIVITIES.—The activities of the Centers shall include—

“(1) the establishment of automated manufacturing systems and other advanced production technologies, based on Institute-supported research, for the purpose of demonstrations and technology transfer;

“(2) the active transfer and dissemination of research findings and Center expertise to a wide

range of companies and enterprises, particularly small and medium-sized manufacturers; and

“(3) the facilitation of collaborations and partnerships between small and medium-sized manufacturing companies and community colleges and area career and technical education schools to help such colleges and schools better understand the specific needs of manufacturers and to help manufacturers better understand the skill sets that students learn in the programs offered by such colleges and schools.

“(c) OPERATIONS.—

“(1) FINANCIAL SUPPORT.—The Secretary may provide financial support to any Center created under subsection (a). The Secretary may not provide to a Center more than 50 percent of the capital and annual operating and maintenance funds required to create and maintain such Center.

“(2) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall implement, review, and update the sections of the Code of Federal Regulations related to this section at least once every 3 years.

“(3) APPLICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Any nonprofit institution, or consortium thereof, or State or local government, may submit to the Secretary an application for financial support under this section, in accordance with the procedures established by the Secretary.

“(B) COST SHARING.—In order to receive assistance under this section, an applicant for financial assistance under subparagraph (A) shall provide adequate assurances that non-Federal assets obtained from the applicant and the applicant's partnering organizations will be used as a funding source to meet not less than 50 percent of the costs incurred. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the costs incurred means the costs incurred in connection with the activities undertaken to improve the competitiveness, management, productivity, and technological performance of small and medium-sized manufacturing companies.

“(C) AGREEMENTS WITH OTHER ENTITIES.—In meeting the 50 percent requirement, it is anticipated that a Center will enter into agreements with other entities such as private industry, institutions of higher education, and State governments to accomplish programmatic objectives and access new and existing resources that will further the impact of the Federal investment made on behalf of small and medium-sized manufacturing companies.

“(D) LEGAL RIGHTS.—Each applicant under subparagraph (A) shall also submit a proposal for the allocation of the legal rights associated with any invention which may result from the proposed Center's activities.

“(4) MERIT REVIEW.—The Secretary shall subject each such application to merit review. In making a decision whether to approve such application and provide financial support under this section, the Secretary shall consider, at a minimum, the following:

“(A) The merits of the application, particularly those portions of the application regarding technology transfer, training and education, and adaptation of manufacturing technologies to the needs of particular industrial sectors.

“(B) The quality of service to be provided.

“(C) Geographical diversity and extent of service area.

“(D) The percentage of funding and amount of in-kind commitment from other sources.

“(5) EVALUATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each Center that receives financial assistance under this section shall be evaluated during its third year of operation by an evaluation panel appointed by the Secretary.

“(B) COMPOSITION.—Each such evaluation panel shall be composed of private experts, none of whom shall be connected with the involved Center, and Federal officials.

“(C) CHAIR.—An official of the Institute shall chair the panel.

“(D) PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT.—Each evaluation panel shall measure the involved

Center's performance against the objectives specified in this section.

“(E) POSITIVE EVALUATION.—If the evaluation is positive, the Secretary may provide continued funding through the sixth year.

“(F) PROBATION.—The Secretary shall not provide funding unless the Center has received a positive evaluation. A Center that has not received a positive evaluation by the evaluation panel shall be notified by the panel of the deficiencies in its performance and shall be placed on probation for one year, after which time the panel shall reevaluate the Center. If the Center has not addressed the deficiencies identified by the panel, or shown a significant improvement in its performance, the Director shall conduct a new competition to select an operator for the Center or may close the Center.

“(G) ADDITIONAL FINANCIAL SUPPORT.—After the sixth year, a Center may receive additional financial support under this section if it has received a positive evaluation through an independent review, under procedures established by the Institute.

“(H) EIGHT-YEAR REVIEW.—A Center shall undergo an independent review in the 8th year of operation. Each evaluation panel shall measure the Center's performance against the objectives specified in this section. A Center that has not received a positive evaluation as a result of an independent review shall be notified by the Program of the deficiencies in its performance and shall be placed on probation for one year, after which time the Program shall reevaluate the Center. If the Center has not addressed the deficiencies identified by the review, or shown a significant improvement in its performance, the Director shall conduct a new competition to select an operator for the Center or may close the Center.

“(I) RECOMPETITION.—If a recipient of a Center award has received financial assistance for 10 consecutive years, the Director shall conduct a new competition to select an operator for the Center consistent with the plan required in this Act. Incumbent Center operators in good standing shall be eligible to compete for the new award.

“(J) REPORTS.—

“(i) PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Director shall transmit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a plan as to how the Institute will conduct reviews, assessments, and reapplication competitions under this paragraph.

“(ii) INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.—The Director shall contract with an independent organization to perform an assessment of the implementation of the reapplication competition process under this paragraph within 3 years after the transmittal of the report under clause (i). The organization conducting the assessment under this clause may consult with the MEP Advisory Board.

“(iii) COMPARISON OF CENTERS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Director shall transmit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report providing information on the first and second years of operations for centers operating from new competitions or recompetition as compared to longstanding centers. The report shall provide detail on the engagement in services provided by Centers and the characteristics of services provided, including volume and type of services, so that the Committees can evaluate whether the cost-sharing ratio has an effect on the services provided at Centers.

“(6) PATENT RIGHTS.—The provisions of chapter 18 of title 35, United States Code, shall apply, to the extent not inconsistent with this

section, to the promotion of technology from research by Centers under this section except for contracts for such specific technology extension or transfer services as may be specified by statute or by the Director.

“(7) PROTECTION OF CENTER CLIENT CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.—Section 552 of title 5, United States Code, shall apply to the following information obtained by the Federal Government on a confidential basis in connection with the activities of any participant involved in the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership:

“(A) Information on the business operation of any participant in a Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership program or of a client of a Center.

“(B) Trade secrets possessed by any client of a Center.

“(8) ADVISORY BOARDS.—Each Center's advisory boards shall institute a conflict of interest policy, approved by the Director, that ensures the Board represents local small and medium-sized manufacturers in the Center's region. Board Members may not serve as a vendor or provide services to the Center, nor may they serve on more than one Center's oversight board simultaneously.

“(d) ACCEPTANCE OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to such sums as may be appropriated to the Secretary and Director to operate the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership, the Secretary and Director also may accept funds from other Federal departments and agencies and, under section 2(c)(7), from the private sector for the purpose of strengthening United States manufacturing.

“(2) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—

“(A) FUNDS ACCEPTED FROM OTHER FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS OR AGENCIES.—The Director shall determine whether funds accepted from other Federal departments or agencies shall be counted in the calculation of the Federal share of capital and annual operating and maintenance costs under subsection (c).

“(B) FUNDS ACCEPTED FROM THE PRIVATE SECTOR.—Funds accepted from the private sector under section 2(c)(7), if allocated to a Center, may not be considered in the calculation of the Federal share under subsection (c) of this section.

“(e) MEP ADVISORY BOARD.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Institute a Manufacturing Extension Partnership Advisory Board (in this subsection referred to as the ‘MEP Advisory Board’).

“(2) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The MEP Advisory Board shall consist of not fewer than 10 members broadly representative of stakeholders, to be appointed by the Director. At least 2 members shall be employed by or on an advisory board for the Centers, at least 1 member shall represent a community college, and at least 5 other members shall be from United States small businesses in the manufacturing sector. No member shall be an employee of the Federal Government.

“(B) TERM.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C) or (D), the term of office of each member of the MEP Advisory Board shall be 3 years.

“(C) VACANCIES.—Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

“(D) SERVING CONSECUTIVE TERMS.—Any person who has completed two consecutive full terms of service on the MEP Advisory Board shall thereafter be ineligible for appointment during the one-year period following the expiration of the second such term.

“(3) MEETINGS.—The MEP Advisory Board shall meet not less than 2 times annually and shall provide to the Director—

“(A) advice on Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership programs, plans, and policies;

“(B) assessments of the soundness of Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership plans and strategies; and

“(C) assessments of current performance against Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership program plans.

“(4) FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT APPLICABILITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In discharging its duties under this subsection, the MEP Advisory Board shall function solely in an advisory capacity, in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act shall not apply to the MEP Advisory Board.

“(5) REPORT.—The MEP Advisory Board shall transmit an annual report to the Secretary for transmittal to Congress within 30 days after the submission to Congress of the President's annual budget request in each year. Such report shall address the status of the program established pursuant to this section and comment on the relevant sections of the programmatic planning document and updates thereto transmitted to Congress by the Director under subsections (c) and (d) of section 23.

“(f) COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director shall establish, within the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership, under this section and section 26, a program of competitive awards among participants described in paragraph (2) for the purposes described in paragraph (3).

“(2) PARTICIPANTS.—Participants receiving awards under this subsection shall be the Centers, or a consortium of such Centers.

“(3) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the program under this subsection is to add capabilities to the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership, including the development of projects to solve new or emerging manufacturing problems as determined by the Director, in consultation with the Director of the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership program, the MEP Advisory Board, and small and medium-sized manufacturers. One or more themes for the competition may be identified, which may vary from year to year, depending on the needs of manufacturers and the success of previous competitions. Centers may be reimbursed for costs incurred under the program.

“(4) APPLICATIONS.—Applications for awards under this subsection shall be submitted in such manner, at such time, and containing such information as the Director shall require, in consultation with the MEP Advisory Board.

“(5) SELECTION.—Awards under this subsection shall be peer reviewed and competitively awarded. The Director shall endeavor to have broad geographic diversity among selected proposals. The Director shall select proposals to receive awards that will—

“(A) improve the competitiveness of industries in the region in which the Center or Centers are located;

“(B) create jobs or train newly hired employees; and

“(C) promote the transfer and commercialization of research and technology from institutions of higher education, national laboratories, and nonprofit research institutes.

“(6) PROGRAM CONTRIBUTION.—Recipients of awards under this subsection shall not be required to provide a matching contribution.

“(7) GLOBAL MARKETPLACE PROJECTS.—In making awards under this subsection, the Director, in consultation with the MEP Advisory Board and the Secretary, may take into consideration whether an application has significant potential for enhancing the competitiveness of small and medium-sized United States manufacturers in the global marketplace.

“(8) DURATION.—Awards under this subsection shall last no longer than 3 years.

“(g) EVALUATION OF OBSTACLES UNIQUE TO SMALL MANUFACTURERS.—The Director shall—

“(1) evaluate obstacles that are unique to small manufacturers that prevent such manufacturers from effectively competing in the global market;

“(2) implement a comprehensive plan to train the Centers to address such obstacles; and

“(3) facilitate improved communication between the Centers to assist such manufacturers in implementing appropriate, targeted solutions to such obstacles.

“(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘area career and technical education school’ has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2302); and

“(2) the term ‘community college’ means an institution of higher education (as defined under section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a))) at which the highest degree that is predominantly awarded to students is an associate’s degree.”

#### SEC. 409. ELIMINATION OF OBSOLETE REPORTS.

Section 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (g); and

(2) in subsection (k)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by inserting “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(B) in paragraph (4)(B), by striking “; and” at the end and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking paragraph (5).

#### SEC. 410. MODIFICATIONS TO GRANTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.

Section 8(a) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3706(a)) is amended by striking “The total amount of any such grant or cooperative agreement may not exceed 75 percent of the total cost of the program.”

#### SEC. 411. INFORMATION SYSTEMS STANDARDS CONSULTATION.

Section 20(c)(1) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g—3(c)(1)) is amended by striking “the National Security Agency.”

#### SEC. 412. UNITED STATES-ISRAELI COOPERATION.

It is the Sense of Congress that—

(1) partnerships that facilitate basic scientific research between the United States and Israel advance technology development, innovation, and commercialization leading to growth in various sectors, including manufacturing, and creating benefits for both nations;

(2) joint research and development agreements carried out through government organizations like the National Institute of Standards and Technology support these efforts;

(3) partnerships between the United States and Israel that further the basic scientific enterprise should be encouraged; and

(4) the National Institute of Standards and Technology should continue to facilitate scientific collaborations between Israel and United States’ technical agencies working in measurement science and standardization.

### TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY SCIENCE

#### SEC. 501. MISSION.

Section 209 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7139) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) MISSION.—The mission of the Office of Science shall be the delivery of scientific discoveries, capabilities, and major scientific tools to transform the understanding of nature and to advance the energy, economic, and national security of the United States. In support of this mission, the Director shall carry out programs on basic energy sciences, advanced scientific computing research, high energy physics, biological and environmental research, fusion energy sciences, and nuclear physics, including as provided under subtitle A of title V of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015, through activities focused on—

“(1) fundamental scientific discoveries through the study of matter and energy;

“(2) science in the national interest, includ-

“(A) advancing an agenda for American energy security through research on energy production, storage, transmission, efficiency, and use; and

“(B) advancing our understanding of the Earth’s climate through research in atmospheric and environmental sciences; and

“(3) National Scientific User Facilities to deliver the 21st century tools of science, engineering, and technology and provide the Nation’s researchers with the most advanced tools of modern science including accelerators, colliders, supercomputers, light sources and neutron sources, and facilities for studying materials science.

“(d) COORDINATION WITH OTHER DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY PROGRAMS.—The Under Secretary for Science and Energy shall ensure the coordination of Office of Science activities and programs with other activities of the Department.”

#### SEC. 502. BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Director shall carry out a program in basic energy sciences, including materials sciences and engineering, chemical sciences, physical biosciences, and geosciences, for the purpose of providing the scientific foundations for new energy technologies.

(b) MISSION.—The mission of the program described in subsection (a) shall be to support fundamental research to understand, predict, and ultimately control matter and energy at the electronic, atomic, and molecular levels in order to provide the foundations for new energy technologies and to support Department missions in energy, environment, and national security.

(c) BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES USER FACILITIES.—The Director shall carry out a subprogram for the development, construction, operation, and maintenance of national user facilities to support the program under this section. As practicable, these facilities shall serve the needs of the Department, industry, the academic community, and other relevant entities to create and examine new materials and chemical processes for the purposes of advancing new energy technologies and improving the competitiveness of the United States. These facilities shall include—

(1) x-ray light sources;

(2) neutron sources;

(3) nanoscale science research centers; and

(4) other facilities the Director considers appropriate, consistent with section 209 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7139).

(d) LIGHT SOURCE LEADERSHIP INITIATIVE.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—In support of the subprogram authorized in subsection (c), the Director shall establish an initiative to sustain and advance global leadership of light source user facilities.

(2) LEADERSHIP STRATEGY.—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and biennially thereafter, the Director shall prepare, in consultation with relevant stakeholders, and submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a light source leadership strategy that—

(A) identifies, prioritizes, and describes plans for the development, construction, and operation of light sources over the next decade;

(B) describes plans for optimizing management and use of existing light source facilities; and

(C) assesses the international outlook for light source user facilities and describes plans for United States cooperation in such projects.

(3) ADVISORY COMMITTEE FEEDBACK AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 45 days after submission of the strategy described in paragraph (2), the Basic Energy Sciences Advisory Committee shall provide the Director, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report of the Advisory Committee’s analyses,

findings, and recommendations for improving the strategy, including a review of the most recent budget request for the initiative.

(4) PROPOSED BUDGET.—The Director shall transmit annually to Congress a proposed budget corresponding to the activities identified in the strategy.

(e) ACCELERATOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—The Director shall carry out research and development on advanced accelerator and storage ring technologies relevant to the development of Basic Energy Sciences user facilities, in consultation with the Office of Science’s High Energy Physics and Nuclear Physics programs.

(f) ENERGY FRONTIER RESEARCH CENTERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall carry out a program to provide awards, on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis, to multi-institutional collaborations or other appropriate entities to conduct fundamental and use-inspired energy research to accelerate scientific breakthroughs.

(2) COLLABORATIONS.—A collaboration receiving an award under this subsection may include multiple types of institutions and private sector entities.

(3) SELECTION AND DURATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A collaboration under this subsection shall be selected for a period of 5 years. An Energy Frontier Research Center already in existence and supported by the Director on the date of enactment of this Act may continue to receive support for a period of 5 years beginning on the date of establishment of that center.

(B) REAPPLICATION.—After the end of the period described in subparagraph (A), an awardee may reapply for selection for a second period of 5 years on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis.

(C) TERMINATION.—Consistent with the existing authorities of the Department, the Director may terminate an underperforming center for cause during the performance period.

(4) NO FUNDING FOR CONSTRUCTION.—No funding provided pursuant to this subsection may be used for the construction of new buildings or facilities.

#### SEC. 503. ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING RESEARCH.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Director shall carry out a research, development, and demonstration program to advance computational and networking capabilities to analyze, model, simulate, and predict complex phenomena relevant to the development of new energy technologies and the competitiveness of the United States.

(b) FACILITIES.—The Director, as part of the program described in subsection (a), shall develop and maintain world-class computing and network facilities for science and deliver critical research in applied mathematics, computer science, and advanced networking to support the Department’s missions.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2 of the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 5541) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) through (5) and inserting the following:

“(1) CO-DESIGN.—The term ‘co-design’ means the joint development of application algorithms, models, and codes with computer technology architectures and operating systems to maximize effective use of high-end computing systems.

“(2) DEPARTMENT.—The term ‘Department’ means the Department of Energy.

“(3) EXASCALE.—The term ‘exascale’ means computing system performance at or near 10 to the 18th power floating point operations per second.

“(4) HIGH-END COMPUTING SYSTEM.—The term ‘high-end computing system’ means a computing system with performance that substantially exceeds that of systems that are commonly available for advanced scientific and engineering applications.

“(5) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801).

“(6) **LEADERSHIP SYSTEM.**—The term ‘leadership system’ means a high-end computing system that is among the most advanced in the world in terms of performance in solving scientific and engineering problems.

“(7) **NATIONAL LABORATORY.**—The term ‘National Laboratory’ means any one of the seven-teen laboratories owned by the Department.

“(8) **SECRETARY.**—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Energy.

“(9) **SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY.**—The term ‘software technology’ includes optimal algorithms, programming environments, tools, languages, and operating systems for high-end computing systems.”

(d) **DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY HIGH-END COMPUTING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.**—Section 3 of the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 5542) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “program” and inserting “coordinated program across the Department”;

(B) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (1);

(C) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting “; and”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) partner with universities, National Laboratories, and industry to ensure the broadest possible application of the technology developed in this program to other challenges in science, engineering, medicine, and industry.”;

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “vector” and all that follows through “architectures” and inserting “computer technologies that show promise of substantial reductions in power requirements and substantial gains in parallelism of multicore processors, concurrency, memory and storage, bandwidth, and reliability”; and

(3) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

“(d) **EXASCALE COMPUTING PROGRAM.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall conduct a coordinated research program to develop exascale computing systems to advance the missions of the Department.

“(2) **EXECUTION.**—The Secretary shall, through competitive merit review, establish two or more National Laboratory-industry-university partnerships to conduct integrated research, development, and engineering of multiple exascale architectures, and—

“(A) conduct mission-related co-design activities in developing such exascale platforms;

“(B) develop those advancements in hardware and software technology required to fully realize the potential of an exascale production system in addressing Department target applications and solving scientific problems involving predictive modeling and simulation and large-scale data analytics and management; and

“(C) explore the use of exascale computing technologies to advance a broad range of science and engineering.

“(3) **ADMINISTRATION.**—In carrying out this program, the Secretary shall—

“(A) provide, on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis, access for researchers in United States industry, institutions of higher education, National Laboratories, and other Federal agencies to these exascale systems, as appropriate; and

“(B) conduct outreach programs to increase the readiness for the use of such platforms by domestic industries, including manufacturers.

“(4) **REPORTS.**—

“(A) **INTEGRATED STRATEGY AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—The Secretary shall submit to Congress, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015, a report outlining an integrated strategy and program management plan, including target dates for prototypical and production exascale platforms, interim milestones to reaching these targets, functional requirements, roles and responsibil-

ities of National Laboratories and industry, acquisition strategy, and estimated resources required, to achieve this exascale system capability. The report shall include the Secretary’s plan for Departmental organization to manage and execute the Exascale Computing Program, including definition of the roles and responsibilities within the Department to ensure an integrated program across the Department. The report shall also include a plan for ensuring balance and prioritizing across ASCR subprograms in a flat or slow-growth budget environment.

“(B) **STATUS REPORTS.**—At the time of the budget submission of the Department for each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress that describes the status of milestones and costs in achieving the objectives of the exascale computing program.

“(C) **EXASCALE MERIT REPORT.**—At least 18 months prior to the initiation of construction or installation of any exascale-class computing facility, the Secretary shall transmit a plan to the Congress detailing—

“(i) the proposed facility’s cost projections and capabilities to significantly accelerate the development of new energy technologies;

“(ii) technical risks and challenges that must be overcome to achieve successful completion and operation of the facility; and

“(iii) an independent assessment of the scientific and technological advances expected from such a facility relative to those expected from a comparable investment in expanded research and applications at terascale-class and petascale-class computing facilities, including an evaluation of where investments should be made in the system software and algorithms to enable these advances.”

#### **SEC. 504. HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS.**

(a) **PROGRAM.**—The Director shall carry out a research program on the fundamental constituents of matter and energy and the nature of space and time.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Director should incorporate the findings and recommendations of the Particle Physics Project Prioritization Panel’s report entitled “Building for Discovery: Strategic Plan for U.S. Particle Physics in the Global Context”, into the Department’s planning process as part of the program described in subsection (a);

(2) the Director should prioritize domestically hosted research projects that will maintain the United States position as a global leader in particle physics and attract the world’s most talented physicists and foreign investment for international collaboration; and

(3) the nations that lead in particle physics by hosting international teams dedicated to a common scientific goal attract the world’s best talent and inspire future generations of physicists and technologists.

(c) **NEUTRINO RESEARCH.**—As part of the program described in subsection (a), the Director shall carry out research activities on rare decay processes and the nature of the neutrino, which may include collaborations with the National Science Foundation or international collaborations.

(d) **DARK ENERGY AND DARK MATTER RESEARCH.**—As part of the program described in subsection (a), the Director shall carry out research activities on the nature of dark energy and dark matter, which may include collaborations with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration or the National Science Foundation, or international collaborations.

(e) **ACCELERATOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.**—The Director shall carry out research and development in advanced accelerator concepts and technologies, including laser technologies, to reduce the necessary scope and cost for the next generation of particle accelerators. The Director shall ensure access to national laboratory accelerator facilities, infrastructure, and technology for users and developers of ac-

celerators that advance applications in energy and the environment, medicine, industry, national security, and discovery science.

(f) **INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION.**—The Director, as practicable and in coordination with other appropriate Federal agencies as necessary, shall ensure the access of United States researchers to the most advanced accelerator facilities and research capabilities in the world, including the Large Hadron Collider.

#### **SEC. 505. BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH.**

(a) **PROGRAM.**—The Director shall carry out a program of research, development, and demonstration in the areas of biological systems science and climate and environmental science to support the energy and environmental missions of the Department.

(b) **PRIORITY RESEARCH.**—In carrying out this section, the Director shall prioritize fundamental research on biological systems and genomics science with the greatest potential to enable scientific discovery.

(c) **ASSESSMENT.**—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit a report to Congress identifying climate science-related initiatives under this section that overlap or duplicate initiatives of other Federal agencies and the extent of such overlap or duplication.

(d) **LIMITATION.**—The Director shall not approve new climate science-related initiatives to be carried out through the Office of Science without making a determination that such work is unique and not duplicative of work by other Federal agencies. Not later than 3 months after receiving the assessment required under subsection (c), the Director shall cease those climate science-related initiatives identified in the assessment as overlapping or duplicative, unless the Director justifies that such work is critical to achieving American energy security.

#### **(e) LOW DOSE RADIATION RESEARCH PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the Department of Energy Office of Science shall carry out a research program on low dose radiation. The purpose of the program is to enhance the scientific understanding of and reduce uncertainties associated with the effects of exposure to low dose radiation in order to inform improved risk management methods.

(2) **STUDY.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall enter into an agreement with the National Academies to conduct a study assessing the current status and development of a long-term strategy for low dose radiation research. Such study shall be completed not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act. The study shall be conducted in coordination with Federal agencies that perform ionizing radiation effects research and shall leverage the most current studies in this field. Such study shall—

(A) identify current scientific challenges for understanding the long-term effects of ionizing radiation;

(B) assess the status of current low dose radiation research in the United States and internationally;

(C) formulate overall scientific goals for the future of low-dose radiation research in the United States;

(D) recommend a long-term strategic and prioritized research agenda to address scientific research goals for overcoming the identified scientific challenges in coordination with other research efforts;

(E) define the essential components of a research program that would address this research agenda within the universities and the National Laboratories; and

(F) assess the cost-benefit effectiveness of such a program.

(3) **RESEARCH PLAN.**—Not later than 90 days after the completion of the study performed under paragraph (2) the Secretary of Energy

shall deliver to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a 5-year research plan that responds to the study's findings and recommendations and identifies and prioritizes research needs.

(4) **DEFINITION.**—In this subsection, the term “low dose radiation” means a radiation dose of less than 100 millisieverts.

(5) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to subject any research carried out by the Director under the research program under this subsection to any limitations described in section 977(e) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16317(e)).

#### SEC. 506. FUSION ENERGY.

(a) **PROGRAM.**—The Director shall carry out a fusion energy sciences research program to expand the fundamental understanding of plasmas and matter at very high temperatures and densities and to build the scientific foundation necessary to enable fusion power.

(b) **FUSION MATERIALS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.**—As part of the activities authorized in section 978 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16318)—

(1) the Director, in coordination with the Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy of the Department, shall carry out research and development activities to identify, characterize, and demonstrate materials that can endure the neutron, plasma, and heat fluxes expected in a fusion power system; and

(2) the Secretary shall—

(A) provide an assessment of the need for a facility or facilities that can examine and test potential fusion and next generation fission materials and other enabling technologies relevant to the development of fusion power; and

(B) provide an assessment of whether a single new facility that substantially addresses magnetic fusion and next generation fission materials research needs is feasible, in conjunction with the expected capabilities of facilities operational as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) **TOKAMAK RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—As part of the program described in subsection (a), the Director shall support research and development activities and facility operations to optimize the tokamak approach to fusion energy.

(2) **ITER.**—

(A) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report providing an assessment of—

(i) the most recent schedule for ITER that has been approved by the ITER Council; and

(ii) progress of the ITER Council and the ITER Director General toward implementation of the recommendations of the Third Biennial International Organization Management Assessment Report.

(B) **FAIRNESS IN COMPETITION FOR SOLICITATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL PROJECT ACTIVITIES.**—Section 33 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2053) is amended by adding at the end the following: “For purposes of this section, with respect to international research projects, the term ‘private facilities or laboratories’ shall refer to facilities or laboratories located in the United States.”.

(C) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should support a robust, diverse fusion program. It is further the sense of Congress that developing the scientific basis for fusion, providing research results key to the success of ITER, and training the next generation of fusion scientists are of critical importance to the United States and should in no way be diminished by participation of the United States in the ITER project.

(d) **INERTIAL FUSION ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.**—The Secretary shall carry out a program of research and technology development in inertial fusion for energy appli-

cations, including ion beam, laser, and pulsed power fusion systems.

(e) **ALTERNATIVE AND ENABLING CONCEPTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—As part of the program described in subsection (a), the Director shall support research and development activities and facility operations at United States universities, national laboratories, and private facilities for a portfolio of alternative and enabling fusion energy concepts that may provide solutions to significant challenges to the establishment of a commercial magnetic fusion power plant, prioritized based on the ability of the United States to play a leadership role in the international fusion research community. Fusion energy concepts and activities explored under this paragraph may include—

(A) high magnetic field approaches facilitated by high temperature superconductors;

(B) advanced stellarator concepts;

(C) non-tokamak confinement configurations operating at low magnetic fields;

(D) magnetized target fusion energy concepts;

(E) liquid metals to address issues associated with fusion plasma interactions with the inner wall of the enclosing device;

(F) immersion blankets for heat management and fuel breeding;

(G) advanced scientific computing activities; and

(H) other promising fusion energy concepts identified by the Director.

(2) **COORDINATION WITH ARPA-E.**—The Under Secretary and the Director shall coordinate with the Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy (in this paragraph referred to as “ARPA-E”) to—

(A) assess the potential for any fusion energy project supported by ARPA-E to represent a promising approach to a commercially viable fusion power plant;

(B) determine whether the results of any fusion energy project supported by ARPA-E merit the support of follow-on research activities carried out by the Office of Science; and

(C) avoid unintentional duplication of activities.

(f) **GENERAL PLASMA SCIENCE AND APPLICATIONS.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide to Congress an assessment of opportunities in which the United States can provide world-leading contributions to advancing plasma science and non-fusion energy applications, and identify opportunities for partnering with other Federal agencies both within and outside of the Department of Energy.

(g) **IDENTIFICATION OF PRIORITIES.**—

(1) **REPORT.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the Department's proposed fusion energy research and development activities over the following 10 years under at least 3 realistic budget scenarios, including a scenario based on 3 percent annual growth in the non-ITER portion of the budget for fusion energy research and development activities. The report shall—

(A) identify specific areas of fusion energy research and enabling technology development in which the United States can and should establish or solidify a lead in the global fusion energy development effort;

(B) identify priorities for initiation of facility construction and facility decommissioning under each of those scenarios; and

(C) assess the ability of the United States fusion workforce to carry out the activities identified in subparagraphs (A) and (B), including the adequacy of college and university programs to train the leaders and workers of the next generation of fusion energy researchers.

(2) **PROCESS.**—In order to develop the report required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall leverage best practices and lessons learned from the process used to develop the most recent report of the Particle Physics Project Prioritization Panel of the High Energy Physics

Advisory Panel. No member of the Fusion Energy Sciences Advisory Committee shall be excluded from participating in developing or voting on final approval of the report required under paragraph (1).

#### SEC. 507. NUCLEAR PHYSICS.

(a) **PROGRAM.**—The Director shall carry out a program of experimental and theoretical research, and support associated facilities, to discover, explore, and understand all forms of nuclear matter.

(b) **ISOTOPE DEVELOPMENT AND PRODUCTION FOR RESEARCH APPLICATIONS.**—The Director shall carry out a program for the production of isotopes, including the development of techniques to produce isotopes, that the Secretary determines are needed for research, medical, industrial, or other purposes. In making this determination, the Secretary shall—

(1) ensure that, as has been the policy of the United States since the publication in 1965 of Federal Register notice 30 Fed. Reg. 3247, isotope production activities do not compete with private industry unless critical national interests necessitate the Federal Government's involvement;

(2) ensure that activities undertaken pursuant to this section, to the extent practicable, promote the growth of a robust domestic isotope production industry; and

(3) consider any relevant recommendations made by Federal advisory committees, the National Academies, and interagency working groups in which the Department participates.

#### SEC. 508. SCIENCE LABORATORIES INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM.

(a) **PROGRAM.**—The Director shall carry out a program to improve the safety, efficiency, and mission readiness of infrastructure at Office of Science laboratories. The program shall include projects to—

(1) renovate or replace space that does not meet research needs;

(2) replace facilities that are no longer cost effective to renovate or operate;

(3) modernize utility systems to prevent failures and ensure efficiency;

(4) remove excess facilities to allow safe and efficient operations; and

(5) construct modern facilities to conduct advanced research in controlled environmental conditions.

(b) **APPROACH.**—In carrying out this section, the Director shall utilize all available approaches and mechanisms, including capital line items, minor construction projects, energy savings performance contracts, utility energy service contracts, alternative financing, and expense funding, as appropriate.

#### SEC. 509. DOMESTIC MANUFACTURING.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on the current ability of domestic manufacturers to meet the procurement requirements for major ongoing projects funded by the Office of Science of the Department, including a calculation of the percentage of equipment acquired from domestic manufacturers for this purpose.

#### SEC. 510. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **FISCAL YEAR 2016.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for the Office of Science for fiscal year 2016 \$5,339,800,000, of which—

(1) \$1,850,000,000 shall be for Basic Energy Science;

(2) \$788,000,000 shall be for High Energy Physics;

(3) \$550,000,000 shall be for Biological and Environmental Research;

(4) \$624,700,000 shall be for Nuclear Physics;

(5) \$621,000,000 shall be for Advanced Scientific Computing Research;

(6) \$488,000,000 shall be for Fusion Energy Sciences;

(7) \$113,600,000 shall be for Science Laboratories Infrastructure;

(8) \$181,000,000 shall be for Science Program Direction;

(9) \$103,000,000 shall be for Safeguards and Security; and

(10) \$20,500,000 shall be for Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists.

(b) FISCAL YEAR 2017.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for the Office of Science for fiscal year 2017 \$5,339,800,000, of which—

(1) \$1,850,000,000 shall be for Basic Energy Science;

(2) \$788,000,000 shall be for High Energy Physics;

(3) \$550,000,000 shall be for Biological and Environmental Research;

(4) \$624,700,000 shall be for Nuclear Physics;

(5) \$621,000,000 shall be for Advanced Scientific Computing Research;

(6) \$488,000,000 shall be for Fusion Energy Sciences;

(7) \$113,600,000 shall be for Science Laboratories Infrastructure;

(8) \$181,000,000 shall be for Science Program Direction;

(9) \$103,000,000 shall be for Safeguards and Security; and

(10) \$20,500,000 shall be for Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists.

**SEC. 511. DEFINITIONS.**

In this title—

(1) the term “Department” means the Department of Energy;

(2) the term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Science of the Department; and

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

**TITLE VI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY  
APPLIED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT  
Subtitle A—Crosscutting Research and Development**

**SEC. 601. CROSSCUTTING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.**

(a) CROSSCUTTING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary shall, through the Under Secretary for Science and Energy, utilize the capabilities of the Department to identify strategic opportunities for collaborative research, development, demonstration, and commercial application of innovative science and technologies for—

(1) advancing the understanding of the energy-water-land use nexus;

(2) modernizing the electric grid by improving energy transmission and distribution systems security and resiliency;

(3) utilizing supercritical carbon dioxide in electric power generation;

(4) subsurface technology and engineering;

(5) high performance computing;

(6) cybersecurity; and

(7) critical challenges identified through comprehensive energy studies, evaluations, and reviews.

(b) CROSSCUTTING APPROACHES.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall seek to leverage existing programs, and consolidate and coordinate activities, throughout the Department to promote collaboration and crosscutting approaches within programs.

(c) ADDITIONAL ACTIONS.—The Secretary shall—

(1) prioritize activities that promote the utilization of all affordable domestic resources;

(2) develop a rigorous and realistic planning, evaluation, and technical assessment framework for setting objective, long-term strategic goals and evaluating progress that ensures the integrity and independence to insulate planning from political influence and the flexibility to adapt to market dynamics;

(3) ensure that activities shall be undertaken in a manner that does not duplicate other activities within the Department or other Federal Government activities; and

(4) identify programs that may be more effectively left to the States, industry, nongovern-

mental organizations, institutions of higher education, or other stakeholders.

**SEC. 602. STRATEGIC RESEARCH PORTFOLIO ANALYSIS AND COORDINATION PLAN.**

Section 994 of Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16358) is amended to read as follows:

**“SEC. 994. STRATEGIC RESEARCH PORTFOLIO ANALYSIS AND COORDINATION PLAN.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall periodically review all of the science and technology activities of the Department in a strategic framework that takes into account the frontiers of science to which the Department can contribute, the national needs relevant to the Department’s statutory missions, and global energy dynamics.

“(b) COORDINATION ANALYSIS AND PLAN.—As part of the review under subsection (a), the Secretary shall develop a plan to improve coordination and collaboration in research, development, demonstration, and commercial application activities across Department organizational boundaries.

“(c) PLAN CONTENTS.—The plan shall describe—

“(1) cross-cutting scientific and technical issues and research questions that span more than one program or major office of the Department;

“(2) how the applied technology programs of the Department are coordinating their activities, and addressing those questions;

“(3) ways in which the technical interchange within the Department, particularly between the Office of Science and the applied technology programs, can be enhanced, including limited ways in which the research agendas of the Office of Science and the applied programs can better interact and assist each other;

“(4) a description of how the Secretary will ensure that the Department’s overall research agenda include, in addition to fundamental, curiosity-driven research, fundamental research related to topics of concern to the applied programs, and applications in Departmental technology programs of research results generated by fundamental, curiosity-driven research;

“(5) critical assessments of any ongoing programs that have experienced sub-par performance or cost over-runs of 10 percent or more over one or more years; and

“(6) activities that may be more effectively left to the States, industry, nongovernmental organizations, institutions of higher education, or other stakeholders.

“(d) PLAN TRANSMITTAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015, and every 4 years thereafter, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate the results of the review under subsection (a) and the coordination plan under subsection (b).”

**SEC. 603. STRATEGY FOR FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE.**

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Section 993 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16357) is amended—

(1) by amending the section heading to read as follows: “**STRATEGY FOR FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE**”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “2008” and inserting “2018”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 993 in the table of contents of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 is amended to read as follows:

“Sec. 993. Strategy for facilities and infrastructure.”

**Subtitle B—Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability Research and Development**

**SEC. 611. DISTRIBUTED ENERGY AND ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS.**

Section 921 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16211) is amended to read as follows:

**“SEC. 921. DISTRIBUTED ENERGY AND ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out programs of research, development, demonstration, and commercial application on distributed energy resources and systems reliability and efficiency, to improve the reliability and efficiency of distributed energy resources and systems, integrating advanced energy technologies with grid connectivity, including activities described in this subtitle. The programs shall address advanced energy technologies and systems and advanced grid security, resiliency, and reliability technologies.

“(b) OBJECTIVES.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall seek to—

“(1) leverage existing programs;

“(2) consolidate and coordinate activities throughout the Department to promote collaboration and crosscutting approaches;

“(3) ensure activities are undertaken in a manner that does not duplicate other activities within the Department or other Federal Government activities; and

“(4) identify programs that may be more effectively left to the States, industry, nongovernmental organizations, institutions of higher education, or other stakeholders.”

**SEC. 612. ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.**

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Section 925 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16215) is amended—

(1) by amending the section heading to read as follows: “**ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT**”; and

(2) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall establish a comprehensive research, development, and demonstration program to ensure the reliability, efficiency, and environmental integrity of electrical transmission and distribution systems, which shall include innovations for—

“(1) advanced energy delivery technologies, energy storage technologies, materials, and systems;

“(2) advanced grid reliability and efficiency technology development;

“(3) technologies contributing to significant load reductions;

“(4) advanced metering, load management, and control technologies;

“(5) technologies to enhance existing grid components;

“(6) the development and use of high-temperature superconductors to—

“(A) enhance the reliability, operational flexibility, or power-carrying capability of electric transmission or distribution systems; or

“(B) increase the efficiency of electric energy generation, transmission, distribution, or storage systems;

“(7) integration of power systems, including systems to deliver high-quality electric power, electric power reliability, and combined heat and power;

“(8) supply of electricity to the power grid by small scale, distributed, and residential-based power generators;

“(9) the development and use of advanced grid design, operation, and planning tools; and

“(10) any other infrastructure technologies, as appropriate.”; and

(3) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—

“(1) CONSORTIUM.—The Secretary shall consider implementing the program under this section using a consortium of participants from industry, institutions of higher education, and National Laboratories.

“(2) OBJECTIVES.—To the maximum extent practicable the Secretary shall seek to—

“(A) leverage existing programs;

“(B) consolidate and coordinate activities, throughout the Department to promote collaboration and crosscutting approaches;

“(C) ensure activities are undertaken in a manner that does not duplicate other activities within the Department or other Federal Government activities; and

“(D) identify programs that may be more effectively left to the States, industry, nongovernmental organizations, institutions of higher education, or other stakeholders.”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 925 in the table of contents of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 is amended to read as follows:

“Sec. 925. Electric transmission and distribution research and development.”.

**Subtitle C—Nuclear Energy Research and Development**

**SEC. 621. OBJECTIVES.**

Section 951 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16271) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct programs of civilian nuclear energy research, development, demonstration, and commercial application, including activities described in this subtitle. Such programs shall take into consideration the following objectives:

“(1) Enhancing nuclear power’s viability as part of the United States energy portfolio.

“(2) Reducing used nuclear fuel and nuclear waste products generated by civilian nuclear energy.

“(3) Supporting technological advances in areas that industry by itself is not likely to undertake because of technical and financial uncertainty.

“(4) Providing the technical means to reduce the likelihood of nuclear proliferation.

“(5) Maintaining a cadre of nuclear scientists and engineers.

“(6) Maintaining National Laboratory and university nuclear programs, including their infrastructure.

“(7) Supporting both individual researchers and multidisciplinary teams of researchers to pioneer new approaches in nuclear energy, science, and technology.

“(8) Developing, planning, constructing, acquiring, and operating special equipment and facilities for the use of researchers.

“(9) Supporting technology transfer and other appropriate activities to assist the nuclear energy industry, and other users of nuclear science and engineering, including activities addressing reliability, availability, productivity, component aging, safety, and security of nuclear power plants.

“(10) Reducing the environmental impact of nuclear energy-related activities.

“(11) Researching and developing technologies and processes to meet Federal and State requirements and standards for nuclear power systems.”;

(2) by striking subsections (b) through (d); and

(3) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (b).

**SEC. 622. PROGRAM OBJECTIVES STUDY.**

Section 951 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16271) is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) PROGRAM OBJECTIVES STUDY.—In furtherance of the program objectives listed in subsection (a) of this section, the Government Accountability Office shall, within one year after the date of enactment of this subsection, transmit to the Congress a report on the results of a study on the scientific and technical merit of major Federal and State requirements and standards, including moratoria, that delay or impede the further development and commercialization of nuclear power, and how the Department can assist in overcoming such delays or impediments.”.

**SEC. 623. NUCLEAR ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.**

Section 952 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16272) is amended by striking sub-

sections (c) through (e) and inserting the following:

“(c) REACTOR CONCEPTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a program of research, development, demonstration, and commercial application to advance nuclear power systems as well as technologies to sustain currently deployed systems.

“(2) DESIGNS AND TECHNOLOGIES.—In conducting the program under this subsection, the Secretary shall examine advanced reactor designs and nuclear technologies, including those that—

“(A) have higher efficiency, lower cost, and improved safety compared to reactors in operation as of the date of enactment of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015;

“(B) utilize passive safety features;

“(C) minimize proliferation risks;

“(D) substantially reduce production of high-level waste per unit of output;

“(E) increase the life and sustainability of reactor systems currently deployed;

“(F) use improved instrumentation;

“(G) are capable of producing large-scale quantities of hydrogen or process heat;

“(H) minimize water usage or use alternatives to water as a cooling mechanism; or

“(I) use nuclear energy as part of an integrated energy system.

“(3) INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION.—In carrying out the program under this subsection, the Secretary shall seek opportunities to enhance the progress of the program through international cooperation through such organizations as the Generation IV International Forum or any other international collaboration the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(4) EXCEPTIONS.—No funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out the activities described in this subsection shall be used to fund the activities authorized under sections 641 through 645.”.

**SEC. 624. SMALL MODULAR REACTOR PROGRAM.**

Section 952 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16272) is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) SMALL MODULAR REACTOR PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a small modular reactor program to promote research, development, demonstration, and commercial application of small modular reactors, including through cost-shared projects for commercial application of reactor systems designs.

“(2) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall consult with and utilize the expertise of the Secretary of the Navy in establishing and carrying out such program.

“(3) ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES.—Activities may also include development of advanced computer modeling and simulation tools, by Federal and non-Federal entities, which demonstrate and validate new design capabilities of innovative small modular reactor designs.

“(4) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this subsection, the term ‘small modular reactor’ means a nuclear reactor meeting generally accepted industry standards—

“(A) with a rated capacity of less than 300 electrical megawatts;

“(B) with respect to which most parts can be factory assembled and shipped as modules to a reactor plant site for assembly; and

“(C) that can be constructed and operated in combination with similar reactors at a single site.”.

**SEC. 625. FUEL CYCLE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.**

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Section 953 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16273) is amended—

(1) in the section heading by striking “ADVANCED FUEL CYCLE INITIATIVE” and inserting “FUEL CYCLE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT”;

(2) by striking subsection (a);

(3) by redesignating subsections (b) through (d) as subsections (d) through (f), respectively; and

(4) by inserting before subsection (d), as so redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection, the following new subsections:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a fuel cycle research, development, demonstration, and commercial application program (referred to in this section as the ‘program’) on fuel cycle options that improve uranium resource utilization, maximize energy generation, minimize nuclear waste creation, improve safety, mitigate risk of proliferation, and improve waste management in support of a national strategy for spent nuclear fuel and the reactor concepts research, development, demonstration, and commercial application program under section 952(c).

“(b) FUEL CYCLE OPTIONS.—Under this section the Secretary may consider implementing the following initiatives:

“(1) OPEN CYCLE.—Developing fuels, including the use of nonuranium materials and alternate claddings, for use in reactors that increase energy generation, improve safety performance and margins, and minimize the amount of nuclear waste produced in an open fuel cycle.

“(2) RECYCLE.—Developing advanced recycling technologies, including advanced reactor concepts to improve resource utilization, reduce proliferation risks, and minimize radiotoxicity, decay heat, and mass and volume of nuclear waste to the greatest extent possible.

“(3) ADVANCED STORAGE METHODS.—Developing advanced storage technologies for both onsite and long-term storage that substantially prolong the effective life of current storage devices or that substantially improve upon existing nuclear waste storage technologies and methods, including repositories.

“(4) FAST TEST REACTOR.—Investigating the potential research benefits of a fast test reactor user facility to conduct experiments on fuels and materials related to fuel forms and fuel cycles that will increase fuel utilization, reduce proliferation risks, and reduce nuclear waste products.

“(5) ADVANCED REACTOR INNOVATION.—Developing an advanced reactor innovation testbed where national laboratories, universities, and industry can address advanced reactor design challenges to enable construction and operation of privately funded reactor prototypes to resolve technical uncertainty for United States-based designs for future domestic and international markets.

“(6) OTHER TECHNOLOGIES.—Developing any other technology or initiative that the Secretary determines is likely to advance the objectives of the program.

“(c) ADDITIONAL ADVANCED RECYCLING AND CROSSCUTTING ACTIVITIES.—In addition to and in support of the specific initiatives described in paragraphs (1) through (5) of subsection (b), the Secretary may support the following activities:

“(1) Development and testing of integrated process flow sheets for advanced nuclear fuel recycling processes.

“(2) Research to characterize the byproducts and waste streams resulting from fuel recycling processes.

“(3) Research and development on reactor concepts or transmutation technologies that improve resource utilization or reduce the radiotoxicity of waste streams.

“(4) Research and development on waste treatment processes and separations technologies, advanced waste forms, and quantification of proliferation risks.

“(5) Identification and evaluation of test and experimental facilities necessary to successfully implement the advanced fuel cycle initiative.

“(6) Advancement of fuel cycle-related modeling and simulation capabilities.

“(7) Research to understand the behavior of high-burnup fuels.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 953 in the table of contents of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 is amended to read as follows:

“Sec. 953. Fuel cycle research and development.”.

**SEC. 626. NUCLEAR ENERGY ENABLING TECHNOLOGIES PROGRAM.**

(a) AMENDMENT.—Subtitle E of title IX of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16271 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**“SEC. 958. NUCLEAR ENERGY ENABLING TECHNOLOGIES.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a program to support the integration of activities undertaken through the reactor concepts research, development, demonstration, and commercial application program under section 952(c) and the fuel cycle research and development program under section 953, and support cross-cutting nuclear energy concepts. Activities commenced under this section shall be concentrated on broadly applicable research and development focus areas.

“(b) ACTIVITIES.—Activities conducted under this section may include research involving—

- “(1) advanced reactor materials;
- “(2) advanced radiation mitigation methods;
- “(3) advanced proliferation and security risk assessment methods;
- “(4) advanced sensors and instrumentation;
- “(5) high performance computation modeling, including multiphysics, multidimensional modeling simulation for nuclear energy systems, and continued development of advanced modeling simulation capabilities through national laboratory, industry, and university partnerships for operations and safety performance improvements of light water reactors for currently deployed and near-term reactors and advanced reactors and for the development of small modular reactors; and

“(6) any crosscutting technology or transformative concept aimed at establishing substantial and revolutionary enhancements in the performance of future nuclear energy systems that the Secretary considers relevant and appropriate to the purpose of this section.

“(c) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit, as part of the annual budget submission of the Department, a report on the activities of the program conducted under this section, which shall include a brief evaluation of each activity’s progress.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 is amended by adding at the end of the items for subtitle E of title IX the following new item:

“Sec. 958. Nuclear energy enabling technologies.”.

**SEC. 627. TECHNICAL STANDARDS COLLABORATION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall establish a nuclear energy standards committee (in this section referred to as the “technical standards committee”) to facilitate and support, consistent with the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995, the development or revision of technical standards for new and existing nuclear power plants and advanced nuclear technologies.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The technical standards committee shall include representatives from appropriate Federal agencies and the private sector, and be open to materially affected organizations involved in the development or application of nuclear energy-related standards.

(2) CO-CHAIRS.—The technical standards committee shall be co-chaired by a representative from the National Institute of Standards and Technology and a representative from a private sector standards organization.

(c) DUTIES.—The technical standards committee shall, in cooperation with appropriate Federal agencies—

(1) perform a needs assessment to identify and evaluate the technical standards that are needed to support nuclear energy, including those

needed to support new and existing nuclear power plants and advanced nuclear technologies, including developing the technical basis for regulatory frameworks for advanced reactors;

(2) formulate, coordinate, and recommend priorities for the development of new technical standards and the revision of existing technical standards to address the needs identified under paragraph (1);

(3) facilitate and support collaboration and cooperation among standards developers to address the needs and priorities identified under paragraphs (1) and (2);

(4) as appropriate, coordinate with other national, regional, or international efforts on nuclear energy-related technical standards in order to avoid conflict and duplication and to ensure global compatibility; and

(5) promote the establishment and maintenance of a database of nuclear energy-related technical standards.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To the extent provided for in advance by appropriations Acts, the Secretary may transfer to the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology not to exceed \$1,000,000 for fiscal year 2016 for the Secretary of Commerce to carry out this section from amounts appropriated for nuclear energy research and development within the Nuclear Energy Enabling Technologies account for the Department.

**SEC. 628. AVAILABLE FACILITIES DATABASE.**

The Secretary shall prepare a database of non-Federal user facilities receiving Federal funds that may be used for unclassified nuclear energy research. The Secretary shall make this database accessible on the Department’s website.

**SEC. 629. NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL.**

To the extent consistent with the requirements of current law, the Department shall be responsible for disposal of high-level radioactive waste or spent nuclear fuel generated by reactors under the programs authorized in this subtitle, or the amendments made by this subtitle.

**Subtitle D—Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Research and Development**

**SEC. 641. ENERGY EFFICIENCY.**

Section 911 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16191) is amended to read as follows:

**“SEC. 911. ENERGY EFFICIENCY.**

“(a) OBJECTIVES.—The Secretary shall conduct programs of energy efficiency research, development, demonstration, and commercial application, including activities described in this subtitle. Such programs shall prioritize activities that industry by itself is not likely to undertake because of technical challenges or regulatory uncertainty, and take into consideration the following objectives:

- “(1) Increasing energy efficiency.
- “(2) Reducing the cost of energy.
- “(3) Reducing the environmental impact of energy-related activities.

“(b) PROGRAMS.—Programs under this subtitle shall include research, development, demonstration, and commercial application of—

- “(1) innovative, affordable technologies to improve the energy efficiency and environmental performance of vehicles, including weight and drag reduction technologies, technologies, modeling, and simulation for increasing vehicle connectivity and automation, and whole-vehicle design optimization;
- “(2) cost-effective technologies, for new construction and retrofit, to improve the energy efficiency and environmental performance of buildings, using a whole-buildings approach;
- “(3) advanced technologies to improve the energy efficiency, environmental performance, and process efficiency of energy-intensive and waste-intensive industries;
- “(4) technologies to improve the energy efficiency of appliances and mechanical systems for buildings in extreme climates, including cogen-

eration, trigeneration, and polygeneration units;

- “(5) advanced battery technologies; and
- “(6) fuel cell and hydrogen technologies.”.

**SEC. 642. NEXT GENERATION LIGHTING INITIATIVE.**

Section 912 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16192) and the item relating thereto in the table of contents of that Act are repealed.

**SEC. 643. BUILDING STANDARDS.**

Section 914 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16194) is amended by striking subsection (c).

**SEC. 644. SECONDARY ELECTRIC VEHICLE BATTERY USE PROGRAM.**

Section 915 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16195) and the item relating thereto in the table of contents of that Act are repealed.

**SEC. 645. NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION PROGRAM.**

To the extent provided for in advance by appropriations Acts, the Secretary may transfer to the National Institute of Standards and Technology up to \$150,000,000 for the period encompassing fiscal years 2015 through 2017 from amounts appropriated for advanced manufacturing research and development under this subtitle (and the amendments made by this subtitle) for the Secretary of Commerce to carry out the Network for Manufacturing Innovation Program authorized under section 34 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278s).

**SEC. 646. ADVANCED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER CENTERS.**

Section 917 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16197) is amended—

- (1) in subsection (a)—
  - (A) by inserting “and” at the end of paragraph (2)(B);
  - (B) by striking “; and” at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting a period; and
  - (C) by striking paragraph (4);
- (2) in subsection (b)—
  - (A) by striking paragraph (1);
  - (B) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (5) as paragraphs (1) through (4), respectively; and
  - (C) by striking paragraph (6);
- (3) by amending subsection (g) to read as follows:

“(g) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds awarded under this section may be used for the construction of facilities or the deployment of commercially available technologies.”; and

- (4) by striking subsection (i).

**SEC. 647. RENEWABLE ENERGY.**

Section 931 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16231) is amended to read as follows:

**“SEC. 931. RENEWABLE ENERGY.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) OBJECTIVES.—The Secretary shall conduct programs of renewable energy research, development, demonstration, and commercial application, including activities described in this subtitle. Such programs shall prioritize discovery research and development and take into consideration the following objectives:

- “(A) Increasing the conversion efficiency of all forms of renewable energy through improved technologies.
- “(B) Decreasing the cost of renewable energy generation and delivery.
- “(C) Promoting the diversity of the energy supply.
- “(D) Decreasing the dependence of the United States on foreign mineral resources.
- “(E) Decreasing the environmental impact of renewable energy-related activities.
- “(F) Increasing the export of renewable generation technologies from the United States.

“(2) PROGRAMS.—

“(A) SOLAR ENERGY.—The Secretary shall conduct a program of research, development, demonstration, and commercial application for solar energy, including innovations in—

“(i) photovoltaics;  
 “(ii) solar heating;  
 “(iii) concentrating solar power;  
 “(iv) lighting systems that integrate sunlight and electrical lighting in complement to each other; and

“(v) development of technologies that can be easily integrated into new and existing buildings.

“(B) WIND ENERGY.—The Secretary shall conduct a program of research, development, demonstration, and commercial application for wind energy, including innovations in—

“(i) low speed wind energy;  
 “(ii) testing and verification technologies;  
 “(iii) distributed wind energy generation; and  
 “(iv) transformational technologies for harnessing wind energy.

“(C) GEOTHERMAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a program of research, development, demonstration, and commercial application for geothermal energy, including technologies for—

“(i) improving detection of geothermal resources;  
 “(ii) decreasing drilling costs;  
 “(iii) decreasing maintenance costs through improved materials;

“(iv) increasing the potential for other revenue sources, such as mineral production; and  
 “(v) increasing the understanding of reservoir life cycle and management.

“(D) HYDROPOWER.—The Secretary shall conduct a program of research, development, demonstration, and commercial application for technologies that enable the development of new and incremental hydropower capacity, including:

“(i) Advanced technologies to enhance environmental performance and yield greater energy efficiencies.

“(ii) Ocean energy, including wave energy.  
 “(E) MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall conduct research, development, demonstration, and commercial application programs for—

“(i) the combined use of renewable energy technologies with one another and with other energy technologies, including the combined use of renewable power and fossil technologies;

“(ii) renewable energy technologies for cogeneration of hydrogen and electricity; and  
 “(iii) kinetic hydro turbines.

“(b) RURAL DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall give priority to demonstrations that assist in delivering electricity to rural and remote locations including—

“(1) advanced renewable power technology, including combined use with fossil technologies;  
 “(2) biomass; and  
 “(3) geothermal energy systems.

“(c) ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct analysis and evaluation in support of the renewable energy programs under this subtitle. These activities shall be used to guide budget and program decisions, and shall include—

“(A) economic and technical analysis of renewable energy potential, including resource assessment;

“(B) analysis of past program performance, both in terms of technical advances and in market introduction of renewable energy;

“(C) assessment of domestic and international market drivers, including the impacts of any Federal, State, or local grants, loans, loan guarantees, tax incentives, statutory or regulatory requirements, or other government initiatives; and

“(D) any other analysis or evaluation that the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(2) FUNDING.—The Secretary may designate up to 1 percent of the funds appropriated for carrying out this subtitle for analysis and evaluation activities under this subsection.

“(3) SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—This analysis and evaluation shall be submitted to the Com-

mittee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate at least 30 days before each annual budget request is submitted to Congress.”.

**SEC. 648. BIOENERGY PROGRAM.**

Section 932 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16232) is amended to read as follows:

**“SEC. 932. BIOENERGY PROGRAM.**

“(a) PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall conduct a program of research, development, demonstration, and commercial application for bioenergy, including innovations in—

“(1) biopower energy systems;  
 “(2) biofuels;  
 “(3) bioproducts;  
 “(4) integrated biorefineries that may produce biopower, biofuels, and bioproducts; and  
 “(5) cross-cutting research and development in feedstocks.

“(b) BIOFUELS AND BIOPRODUCTS.—The goals of the biofuels and bioproducts programs shall be to develop, in partnership with industry and institutions of higher education—

“(1) advanced biochemical and thermochemical conversion technologies capable of making fuels from lignocellulosic feedstocks that are price-competitive with fossil-based fuels and fully compatible with either internal combustion engines or fuel cell-powered vehicles;  
 “(2) advanced conversion of biomass to biofuels and bioproducts as part of integrated biorefineries based on either biochemical processes, thermochemical processes, or hybrids of these processes; and  
 “(3) other advanced processes that will enable the development of cost-effective bioproducts, including biofuels.

“(c) RETROFIT TECHNOLOGIES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF ETHANOL FROM CELLULOSIC MATERIALS.—The Secretary shall establish a program of research, development, demonstration, and commercial application for technologies and processes to enable biorefineries that exclusively use corn grain or corn starch as a feedstock to produce ethanol to be retrofitted to accept a range of biomass, including lignocellulosic feedstocks.

“(d) LIMITATIONS.—None of the funds authorized for carrying out this section may be used to fund commercial biofuels production for defense purposes.

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) BIOMASS.—The term ‘biomass’ means—  
 “(A) any organic material grown for the purpose of being converted to energy;  
 “(B) any organic byproduct of agriculture (including wastes from food production and processing) that can be converted into energy; or  
 “(C) any waste material that can be converted to energy, is segregated from other waste materials, and is derived from—

“(i) any of the following forest-related resources: mill residues, precommercial thinnings, slash, brush, or otherwise nonmerchantable material;

“(ii) wood waste materials, including waste pallets, crates, dunnage, manufacturing and construction wood wastes (other than pressure-treated, chemically treated, or painted wood wastes), and landscape or right-of-way tree trimmings, but not including municipal solid waste, gas derived from the biodegradation of municipal solid waste, or paper that is commonly recycled; or  
 “(iii) solids derived from waste water treatment processes.

“(2) LIGNOCELLULOSIC FEEDSTOCK.—The term ‘lignocellulosic feedstock’ means any portion of a plant or coproduct from conversion, including crops, trees, forest residues, grasses, and agricultural residues not specifically grown for food, including from barley grain, soybean, rice bran, rice hulls, rice straw, graybeard matter, cornstover, and sugarcane bagasse.”.

**SEC. 649. CONCENTRATING SOLAR POWER RESEARCH PROGRAM.**

Section 934 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16234) and the item relating thereto in the table of contents of that Act are repealed.

**SEC. 650. RENEWABLE ENERGY IN PUBLIC BUILDINGS.**

Section 935 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16235) and the item relating thereto in the table of contents of that Act are repealed.

**Subtitle E—Fossil Energy Research and Development**

**SEC. 661. FOSSIL ENERGY.**

Section 961 of Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16291) is amended to read as follows:

**“SEC. 961. FOSSIL ENERGY.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out research, development, demonstration, and commercial application programs in fossil energy, including activities under this subtitle, with the goal of improving the efficiency, effectiveness, and environmental performance of fossil energy production, upgrading, conversion, and consumption. Such programs shall take into consideration the following objectives:

“(1) Increasing the energy conversion efficiency of all forms of fossil energy through improved technologies.

“(2) Decreasing the cost of all fossil energy production, generation, and delivery.

“(3) Promoting diversity of energy supply.

“(4) Decreasing the dependence of the United States on foreign energy supplies.

“(5) Decreasing the environmental impact of energy-related activities.

“(6) Increasing the export of fossil energy-related equipment, technology, and services from the United States.

“(b) OBJECTIVES.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall seek to—

“(1) leverage existing programs;

“(2) consolidate and coordinate activities throughout the Department to promote collaboration and crosscutting approaches;

“(3) ensure activities are undertaken in a manner that does not duplicate other activities within the Department or other Federal Government activities; and

“(4) identify programs that may be more effectively left to the States, industry, nongovernmental organizations, institutions of higher education, or other stakeholders.

“(c) LIMITATIONS.—

“(1) USES.—None of the funds authorized for carrying out this section may be used for Fossil Energy Environmental Restoration.

“(2) INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—Not less than 20 percent of the funds appropriated for carrying out section 964 of this Act for each fiscal year shall be dedicated to research and development carried out at institutions of higher education.

“(3) USE FOR REGULATORY ASSESSMENTS OR DETERMINATIONS.—The results of any research, development, demonstration, or commercial application projects or activities of the Department authorized under this subtitle may not be used for regulatory assessments or determinations by Federal regulatory authorities.

“(d) ASSESSMENTS.—

“(1) CONSTRAINTS AGAINST BRINGING RESOURCES TO MARKET.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress an assessment of the technical, institutional, policy, and regulatory constraints to bringing new domestic fossil resources to market.

“(2) TECHNOLOGY CAPABILITIES.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a long-term assessment of existing and projected technological capabilities for expanded production from domestic unconventional oil, gas, and methane reserves.”.

**SEC. 662. COAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, DEMONSTRATION, AND COMMERCIAL APPLICATION PROGRAMS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 962 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16292) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (10), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (11), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(12) specific additional programs to address water use and reuse;

“(13) the testing, including the construction of testing facilities, of high temperature materials for use in advanced systems for combustion or use of coal; and

“(14) innovations to application of existing coal conversion systems designed to increase efficiency of conversion, flexibility of operation, and other modifications to address existing usage requirements.”;

(2) by redesignating subsections (b) through (d) as subsections (c) through (e), respectively;

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) TRANSFORMATIONAL COAL TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—As part of the program established under subsection (a), the Secretary may carry out a program designed to undertake research, development, demonstration, and commercial application of technologies, including the accelerated development of—

“(A) chemical looping technology;

“(B) supercritical carbon dioxide power generation cycles;

“(C) pressurized oxycombustion, including new and retrofit technologies; and

“(D) other technologies that are characterized by the use of—

“(i) alternative energy cycles;

“(ii) thermionic devices using waste heat;

“(iii) fuel cells;

“(iv) replacement of chemical processes with biotechnology;

“(v) nanotechnology;

“(vi) new materials in applications (other than extending cycles to higher temperature and pressure), such as membranes or ceramics;

“(vii) carbon utilization, such as in construction materials, using low quality energy to reconvert back to a fuel, or manufactured food;

“(viii) advanced gas separation concepts; and

“(ix) other technologies, including—

“(I) modular, manufactured components; and

“(II) innovative production or research techniques, such as using 3-D printer systems, for the production of early research and development prototypes.

“(2) COST SHARE.—In carrying out the program described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall enter into partnerships with private entities to share the costs of carrying out the program. The Secretary may reduce the non-Federal cost share requirement if the Secretary determines that the reduction is necessary and appropriate considering the technological risks involved in the project.”; and

(4) in subsection (c) (as so redesignated) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out programs authorized by this section, the Secretary shall identify cost and performance goals for coal-based technologies that would permit the continued cost-competitive use of coal for the production of electricity, chemical feedstocks, transportation fuels, and other marketable products.”.

(b) ADVISORY COMMITTEE; AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 963 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16293) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (6) of subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(6) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall establish an advisory committee to undertake, not less frequently than once every 3 years, a review and prepare a report on the progress being made by the Department of Energy to achieve the goals described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 962 and subsection (b) of this section.

“(B) MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS.—Members of the advisory committee established under subparagraph (A) shall be appointed by the Secretary.”; and

(2) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

“(d) STUDY OF CARBON DIOXIDE PIPELINES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress the results of a study to assess the cost and feasibility of engineering, permitting, building, maintaining, regulating, and insuring a national system of carbon dioxide pipelines.”.

SEC. 663. HIGH EFFICIENCY GAS TURBINES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, through the Office of Fossil Energy, shall carry out a multiyear, multiphase program of research, development, demonstration, and commercial application to innovate technologies to maximize the efficiency of gas turbines used in power generation systems.

(b) PROGRAM ELEMENTS.—The program under this section shall—

(1) support innovative engineering and detailed gas turbine design for megawatt-scale and utility-scale electric power generation, including—

(A) high temperature materials, including superalloys, coatings, and ceramics;

(B) improved heat transfer capability;

(C) manufacturing technology required to construct complex three-dimensional geometry parts with improved aerodynamic capability;

(D) combustion technology to produce higher firing temperature while lowering nitrogen oxide and carbon monoxide emissions per unit of output;

(E) advanced controls and systems integration;

(F) advanced high performance compressor technology; and

(G) validation facilities for the testing of components and subsystems;

(2) include technology demonstration through component testing, subscale testing, and full scale testing in existing fleets;

(3) include field demonstrations of the developed technology elements so as to demonstrate technical and economic feasibility; and

(4) assess overall combined cycle and simple cycle system performance.

(c) PROGRAM GOALS.—The goals of the multiphase program established under subsection (a) shall be—

(1) in phase I—

(A) to develop the conceptual design of advanced high efficiency gas turbines that can achieve at least 62 percent combined cycle efficiency or 47 percent simple cycle efficiency on a lower heating value basis; and

(B) to develop and demonstrate the technology required for advanced high efficiency gas turbines that can achieve at least 62 percent combined cycle efficiency or 47 percent simple cycle efficiency on a lower heating value basis; and

(2) in phase II, to develop the conceptual design for advanced high efficiency gas turbines that can achieve at least 65 percent combined cycle efficiency or 50 percent simple cycle efficiency on a lower heating value basis.

(d) PROPOSALS.—Within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall solicit grant and contract proposals from industry, small businesses, universities, and other appropriate parties for conducting activities under this section. In selecting proposals, the Secretary shall emphasize—

(1) the extent to which the proposal will stimulate the creation or increased retention of jobs in the United States; and

(2) the extent to which the proposal will promote and enhance United States technology leadership.

(e) COMPETITIVE AWARDS.—The provision of funding under this section shall be on a competitive basis with an emphasis on technical merit.

(f) COST SHARING.—Section 988 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16352) shall apply to an award of financial assistance made under this section.

#### Subtitle F—Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy

##### SEC. 671. ARPA-E AMENDMENTS.

Section 5012 of the America COMPETES Act (42 U.S.C. 16538) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1) of subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The goals of ARPA-E shall be to enhance the economic and energy security of the United States and to ensure that the United States maintains a technological lead through the development of advanced energy technologies.”;

(2) in subsection (i)(1), by inserting “ARPA-E shall not provide funding for a project unless the prospective grantee demonstrates sufficient attempts to secure private financing or indicates that the project is not independently commercially viable.” after “relevant research agencies.”;

(3) in subsection (l)(1), by inserting “and once every 6 years thereafter,” after “operation for 6 years.”; and

(4) by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (o) and inserting after subsection (m) the following new subsection:

“(m) PROTECTION OF PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The following categories of information collected by the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy from recipients of financial assistance awards shall be considered privileged and confidential and not subject to disclosure pursuant to section 552 of title 5, United States Code:

“(A) Plans for commercialization of technologies developed under the award, including business plans, technology to market plans, market studies, and cost and performance models.

“(B) Investments provided to an awardee from third parties, such as venture capital, hedge fund, or private equity firms, including amounts and percentage of ownership of the awardee provided in return for such investments.

“(C) Additional financial support that the awardee plans to invest or has invested into the technology developed under the award, or that the awardee is seeking from third parties.

“(D) Revenue from the licensing or sale of new products or services resulting from the research conducted under the award.

“(2) EFFECT OF SUBSECTION.—Nothing in this subsection affects—

“(A) the authority of the Secretary to use information without publicly disclosing such information; or

“(B) the responsibility of the Secretary to transmit information to Congress as required by law.”.

#### Subtitle G—Authorization of Appropriations

##### SEC. 681. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for research, development, demonstration, and commercial application for electrical delivery and energy reliability technology activities within the Office of Electricity \$113,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017.

(b) NUCLEAR ENERGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for research, development, demonstration, and commercial application for nuclear energy technology activities within the Office of Nuclear Energy \$504,600,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017.

(2) LIMITATION.—Any amounts made available pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under paragraph (1) shall not be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund established under section 302(c) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10222(c)).

(c) **ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for research, development, demonstration, and commercial application for energy efficiency and renewable energy technology activities within the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy \$1,198,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017.

(d) **FOSSIL ENERGY.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for research, development, demonstration, and commercial application for fossil energy technology activities within the Office of Fossil Energy \$605,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017.

(e) **ARPA-E.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy \$140,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017.

#### Subtitle H—Definitions

##### SEC. 691. DEFINITIONS.

In this title—

(1) the term “Department” means the Department of Energy; and

(2) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Energy.

#### TITLE VII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

##### Subtitle A—In General

##### SEC. 701. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **DEPARTMENT.**—The term “Department” means the Department of Energy.

(2) **NATIONAL LABORATORY.**—The term “National Laboratory” means a Department of Energy nonmilitary national laboratory, including—

- (A) Ames Laboratory;
- (B) Argonne National Laboratory;
- (C) Brookhaven National Laboratory;
- (D) Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory;
- (E) Idaho National Laboratory;
- (F) Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory;
- (G) National Energy Technology Laboratory;
- (H) National Renewable Energy Laboratory;
- (I) Oak Ridge National Laboratory;
- (J) Pacific Northwest National Laboratory;
- (K) Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory;
- (L) Savannah River National Laboratory;
- (M) Stanford Linear Accelerator Center;
- (N) Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility; and

(O) any laboratory operated by the National Nuclear Security Administration, but only with respect to the civilian energy activities thereof.

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

##### SEC. 702. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Nothing in this title or an amendment made by this title abrogates or otherwise affects the primary responsibilities of any National Laboratory to the Department.

#### Subtitle B—Innovation Management at Department of Energy

##### SEC. 711. UNDER SECRETARY FOR SCIENCE AND ENERGY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 202(b) of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7132(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Under Secretary for Science” each place it appears and inserting “Under Secretary for Science and Energy”; and

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (F), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (G), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (G) the following:

“(H) establish appropriate linkages between offices under the jurisdiction of the Under Secretary; and

“(I) perform such functions and duties as the Secretary shall prescribe, consistent with this section.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) Section 3164(b)(1) of the Department of Energy Science Education Enhancement Act (42 U.S.C. 7381a(b)(1)) is amended by striking “Under Secretary for Science” and inserting “Under Secretary for Science and Energy”.

(2) Section 641(h)(2) of the United States Energy Storage Competitiveness Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17231(h)(2)) is amended by striking “Under Secretary for Science” and inserting “Under Secretary for Science and Energy”.

##### SEC. 712. TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER AND TRANSITIONS ASSESSMENT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report which shall include—

(1) an assessment of the Department’s current ability to carry out the goals of section 1001 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16391), including an assessment of the role and effectiveness of the Director of the Office of Technology Transitions; and

(2) recommended departmental policy changes and legislative changes to section 1001 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16391) to improve the Department’s ability to successfully transfer new energy technologies to the private sector.

##### SEC. 713. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary should encourage the National Laboratories and federally funded research and development centers to inform small businesses of the opportunities and resources that exist pursuant to this title.

##### SEC. 714. NUCLEAR ENERGY INNOVATION.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the National Laboratories, relevant Federal agencies, and other stakeholders, shall transmit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report assessing the Department’s capabilities to authorize, host, and oversee privately funded fusion and non-light water reactor prototypes and related demonstration facilities at Department-owned sites. For purposes of this report, the Secretary shall consider the Department’s capabilities to facilitate privately-funded prototypes up to 20 megawatts thermal output. The report shall address the following:

(1) The Department’s safety review and oversight capabilities.

(2) Potential sites capable of hosting research, development, and demonstration of prototype reactors and related facilities for the purpose of reducing technical risk.

(3) The Department’s and National Laboratories’ existing physical and technical capabilities relevant to research, development, and oversight.

(4) The efficacy of the Department’s available contractual mechanisms, including cooperative research and development agreements, work for others agreements, and agreements for commercializing technology.

(5) Potential cost structures related to physical security, decommissioning, liability, and other long-term project costs.

(6) Other challenges or considerations identified by the Secretary, including issues related to potential cases of demonstration reactors up to 2 gigawatts of thermal output.

#### Subtitle C—Cross-Sector Partnerships and Grant Competitiveness

##### SEC. 721. AGREEMENTS FOR COMMERCIALIZING TECHNOLOGY PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall carry out the Agreements for Commercializing Technology pilot program of the Department, as announced by the Secretary on December 8, 2011, in accordance with this section.

(b) **TERMS.**—Each agreement entered into pursuant to the pilot program referred to in subsection (a) shall provide to the contractor of the applicable National Laboratory, to the maximum extent determined to be appropriate by the Secretary, increased authority to negotiate contract terms, such as intellectual property rights, payment structures, performance guarantees, and multiparty collaborations.

(c) **ELIGIBILITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any director of a National Laboratory may enter into an agreement pursuant to the pilot program referred to in subsection (a).

(2) **AGREEMENTS WITH NON-FEDERAL ENTITIES.**—To carry out paragraph (1) and subject to paragraph (3), the Secretary shall permit the directors of the National Laboratories to execute agreements with a non-Federal entity, including a non-Federal entity already receiving Federal funding that will be used to support activities under agreements executed pursuant to paragraph (1), provided that such funding is solely used to carry out the purposes of the Federal award.

(3) **RESTRICTION.**—The requirements of chapter 18 of title 35, United States Code (commonly known as the “Bayh-Dole Act”) shall apply if—

(A) the agreement is a funding agreement (as that term is defined in section 201 of that title); and

(B) at least 1 of the parties to the funding agreement is eligible to receive rights under that chapter.

(d) **SUBMISSION TO SECRETARY.**—Each affected director of a National Laboratory shall submit to the Secretary, with respect to each agreement entered into under this section—

(1) a summary of information relating to the relevant project;

(2) the total estimated costs of the project;

(3) estimated commencement and completion dates of the project; and

(4) other documentation determined to be appropriate by the Secretary.

(e) **CERTIFICATION.**—The Secretary shall require the contractor of the affected National Laboratory to certify that each activity carried out under a project for which an agreement is entered into under this section—

(1) is not in direct competition with the private sector; and

(2) does not present, or minimizes, any apparent conflict of interest, and avoids or neutralizes any actual conflict of interest, as a result of the agreement under this section.

(f) **EXTENSION.**—The pilot program referred to in subsection (a) shall be extended until October 31, 2017.

(g) **REPORTS.**—

(1) **OVERALL ASSESSMENT.**—Not later than 60 days after the date described in subsection (f), the Secretary, in coordination with directors of the National Laboratories, shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that—

(A) assesses the overall effectiveness of the pilot program referred to in subsection (a);

(B) identifies opportunities to improve the effectiveness of the pilot program;

(C) assesses the potential for program activities to interfere with the responsibilities of the National Laboratories to the Department; and

(D) provides a recommendation regarding the future of the pilot program.

(2) **TRANSPARENCY.**—The Secretary, in coordination with directors of the National Laboratories, shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate an annual report that accounts for all incidences of, and provides a justification for, non-Federal entities using funds derived from a Federal contract or award to carry out agreements pursuant to this section.

**SEC. 722. PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS FOR COMMERCIALIZATION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary shall delegate to directors of the National Laboratories signature authority with respect to any agreement described in subsection (b) the total cost of which (including the National Laboratory contributions and project recipient cost share) is less than \$1,000,000.

(b) AGREEMENTS.—Subsection (a) applies to—  
(1) a cooperative research and development agreement;

(2) a non-Federal work-for-others agreement; and

(3) any other agreement determined to be appropriate by the Secretary, in collaboration with the directors of the National Laboratories.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) ACCOUNTABILITY.—The director of the affected National Laboratory and the affected contractor shall carry out an agreement under this section in accordance with applicable policies of the Department, including by ensuring that the agreement does not compromise any national security, economic, or environmental interest of the United States.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—The director of the affected National Laboratory and the affected contractor shall certify that each activity carried out under a project for which an agreement is entered into under this section does not present, or minimizes, any apparent conflict of interest, and avoids or neutralizes any actual conflict of interest, as a result of the agreement under this section.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF RECORDS.—On entering an agreement under this section, the director of a National Laboratory shall submit to the Secretary for monitoring and review all records of the National Laboratory relating to the agreement.

(4) RATES.—The director of a National Laboratory may charge higher rates for services performed under a partnership agreement entered into pursuant to this section, regardless of the full cost of recovery, if such funds are used exclusively to support further research and development activities at the respective National Laboratory.

(d) EXCEPTION.—This section does not apply to any agreement with a majority foreign-owned company.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 12 of the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and indenting the subparagraphs appropriately;

(B) by striking “Each Federal agency” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each Federal agency”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), in accordance with section 722(a) of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015, approval by the Secretary of Energy shall not be required for any technology transfer agreement proposed to be entered into by a National Laboratory of the Department of Energy, the total cost of which (including the National Laboratory contributions and project recipient cost share) is less than \$1,000,000.”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “subsection (a)(1)” each place it appears and inserting “subsection (a)(1)(A)”.

**SEC. 723. INCLUSION OF EARLY-STAGE TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION IN AUTHORIZED TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER ACTIVITIES.**

Section 1001 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16391) is amended by—

(1) redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g) EARLY-STAGE TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION.—The Secretary shall permit the directors

of the National Laboratories to use funds authorized to support technology transfer within the Department to carry out early-stage and pre-commercial technology demonstration activities to remove technology barriers that limit private sector interest and demonstrate potential commercial applications of any research and technologies arising from National Laboratory activities.”.

**SEC. 724. FUNDING COMPETITIVENESS FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND OTHER NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS.**

Section 988(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16352(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3)” and inserting “Except as provided in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) EXEMPTION FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND OTHER NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a research or development activity performed by an institution of higher education or nonprofit institution (as defined in section 4 of the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3703)).

“(B) TERMINATION DATE.—The exemption under subparagraph (A) shall apply during the 6-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this paragraph.”.

**SEC. 725. PARTICIPATION IN THE INNOVATION CORPS PROGRAM.**

The Secretary may enter into an agreement with the Director of the National Science Foundation to enable researchers funded by the Department to participate in the National Science Foundation Innovation Corps program.

**Subtitle D—Assessment of Impact****SEC. 731. REPORT BY GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.**

Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report—

(1) describing the results of the projects developed under sections 721, 722, and 723, including information regarding—

(A) partnerships initiated as a result of those projects and the potential linkages presented by those partnerships with respect to national priorities and other taxpayer-funded research; and

(B) whether the activities carried out under those projects result in—

(i) fiscal savings;

(ii) expansion of National Laboratory capabilities;

(iii) increased efficiency of technology transfers; or

(iv) an increase in general efficiency of the National Laboratory system; and

(2) assess the scale, scope, efficacy, and impact of the Department’s efforts to promote technology transfer and private sector engagement at the National Laboratories, and make recommendations on how the Department can improve these activities.

**TITLE VIII—SENSE OF CONGRESS****SEC. 801. SENSE OF CONGRESS.**

It is the sense of Congress that climate change is real.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 114-120. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amend-

ment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 114-120.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 13, strike “\$834,800,000” and insert “\$823,000,000”.

Page 5, line 15, strike “\$1,050,000,000” and insert “\$1,038,000,000”.

Page 5, line 18, strike “\$1,034,000,000” and insert “\$1,010,000,000”.

Page 6, line 6, strike “\$377,500,000” and insert “\$425,300,000”.

Page 7, line 6, strike “\$834,800,000” and insert “\$823,000,000”.

Page 7, line 8, strike “\$1,050,000,000” and insert “\$1,038,000,000”.

Page 7, line 11, strike “\$1,034,000,000” and insert “\$1,010,000,000”.

Page 7, line 24, strike “\$377,500,000” and insert “\$425,300,000”.

Page 20, line 19, insert “available” after “financial resources”.

Page 21, lines 7 through 11, strike “The Foundation shall also require awardees to report the Foundation, within 30 days of receipt, any sources of non-Federal funds received in excess of \$50,000 during the award period.” and insert “The Foundation shall also require awardees seeking subsequent management fees to report to the Foundation, prior to the consideration of such a request, any sources of non-Federal funds received in excess of \$100,000. This reporting shall apply to the period following any initial management fee award and for the consideration of any subsequent fee.”.

Page 21, line 20, strike “AUDITS” and insert “REVIEW”.

Page 21, line 21, insert “or review” after “may audit”.

Page 21, line 22, strike “paragraph” and insert “subsection”.

Page 22, line 13, insert “or social activities” after “meals”.

Page 22, line 16, insert “or FAR 31.205-22” after “2 C.F.R. 200.450”.

Page 29, line 20, strike “and”.

Page 29, line 23, strike the period and insert “; and”.

Page 29, after line 23, insert the following: (K) efforts to effectively expand, broaden, or scale-up existing activities or programs.

Page 65, line 23, insert “, to be available to the extent provided by appropriations Acts,” after “nonprofit entities.”.

Page 76, line 9, insert “government,” after “industry.”.

Page 91, line 16, insert “, to be available to the extent provided by appropriations Acts,” after “sector.”.

Page 132, line 19, strike “and”.

Page 132, line 23, strike the period and insert “; and”.

Page 132, after line 23, insert the following: “(7) detailed proposals for innovation hubs, institutes, and research centers prior to establishment or renewal by the Department, including—

“(A) certification that all hubs, institutes, and research centers will advance the mission of the Department, and prioritize research, development, and demonstration;

“(B) certification that the establishment or renewal of hubs, institutes, or research centers will not diminish funds available for basic research and development within the Office of Science; and

“(C) certification that all hubs, institutes, and research centers established or renewed within the Office of Science are consistent with the mission of the Office of Science as described in section 209(c) of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7139(c)).”

Page 136, line 14, strike “and” the end of paragraph (9).

Page 136, line 15, redesignate paragraph (10) as paragraph (11).

Page 136, after line 14, insert the following: “(10) technologies to enhance security for electrical transmission and distributions systems; and

Page 151, lines 9 through 14, strike section 629.

Page 180, line 20, through page 182, line 3, strike section 711.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this manager’s amendment makes some changes to improve the underlying legislation.

The amendment shifts \$48 million in funding within the research and related activities account at the National Science Foundation. This is at the request of Appropriations Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies Subcommittee chairman, JOHN CULBERSON of Texas, and provides additional funding for integrative activities to keep it at the fiscal year ’15 level.

This account includes the Graduate Research Fellowship Program and the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research, which will be fully funded at this level.

The amendment directs the Department of Energy to develop technologies to enhance security for electrical transmission and distribution systems.

The amendment includes additional direction on the development of hubs, innovation institutes, and research centers at the Department of Energy.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate that this amendment makes a few small improvements to the bill, so I will not oppose it. However, I want to take a moment to reflect on how this amendment demonstrates how flawed the process on the majority’s bill has been.

In this amendment, the chairman restores an arbitrary 11 percent cut to the EPSCoR program, in addition to the prestigious NSF Graduate Research Fellowship Program, scientific instrumentation for smaller institutions that

cannot afford their own, and interdisciplinary research centers.

Even our colleagues on Appropriations prioritized full funding for this account at NSF while they made steep cuts to other accounts.

It just happens that EPSCoR States overall are represented by many more Republicans than Democrats; so, when the Science Committee Republicans proposed cutting funding for the EPSCoR program by 11 percent, their caucus took notice.

If only the chairman had actually given the stakeholder community, his colleagues, and the research and development agencies an opportunity for a hearing or to see and respond or work in subcommittee on it and respond to this bill before introducing it, we wouldn’t have had to fix all of these very big mistakes today.

I am glad the chairman is now restoring the cut to EPSCoR and the other important programs in that account. I only wish he would have listened to an overwhelming call by the stakeholder community and even some of his own colleagues to restore the other arbitrary and shortsighted cuts in this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have no other speakers on this side, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 114–120.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk as the designee of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 13, through page 17, line 9, strike section 106.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Mr. FOSTER for his leadership on this important issue.

Section 106 exemplifies the majority’s efforts to impose their own personal beliefs and ideologies on the process of scientific discovery. Colleagues, science is not about belief; it is about discovery and the pursuit of questions about both the natural world and the human world.

We should hold NSF accountable, and NSF should hold its grantees accountable. However, accountability should be measured according to the transparency and integrity of the grant re-

view process, not according to what types of science some of us believe in and some don’t.

Had we imposed the section 106 requirement on NSF earlier, they may have never funded the grant that led to billions in revenue from the spectrum auction. They may never have funded the grant that the DOD now uses to help train our soldiers on the front lines to differentiate between friend and foe. They may never have funded the grant that led to the creation of Google.

Chairman SMITH has been investigating NSF grants he doesn’t like since he became chairman of this committee. The entire purpose of section 106 is to give him a bigger club to continue his unfounded investigations in the future.

□ 1615

This is bad for NSF, and it is worse for the U.S. leadership in science and innovation. I urge my colleagues to think long and hard about the consequences of imposing our own political views and review on the NSF’s gold-standard scientific merit review process, and I urge the support of Mr. FOSTER’s amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is just inconceivable to me that any U.S. Representative would oppose requiring government grants funded by the U.S. taxpayer to be spent in the national interest.

Throughout its history, the National Science Foundation has played an integral part in funding breakthrough discoveries in fields as diverse as mathematics, physics, chemistry, computer science, engineering, and biology.

However, the NSF has approved a number of grants for which the scientific merits and national interest are not obvious, to put it politely. These include a climate change musical costing \$800,000, evaluating animal photographs in National Geographic for at least \$200,000, and studying early human-set fires in New Zealand, in the 1800s, for several hundred thousand dollars.

The section this amendment strikes ensures that the NSF is transparent and accountable to the taxpayers about how their hard-earned dollars are spent. The bill requires that every NSF public announcement of a grant award be accompanied by a nontechnical explanation of the project’s scientific merits and how it serves the national interest.

The NSF itself has recognized the need for this transparency and accountability. Last January, the NSF released a new policy that acknowledges that the NSF must communicate clearly and in nontechnical terms the research projects it funds. The policy

emphasizes that the title abstract for each funded grant should explain how the project serves the national interest, a requirement first cited in the 1950 legislation that created the National Science Foundation. Again, the national interest standard that the gentlewoman from Texas opposes was in the NSF's first charter.

The current Director of the NSF herself has endorsed the national interest standard. In her testimony before the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee on February 25, NSF Director France Cordova spoke about the very section the gentlewoman seeks to eliminate.

Dr. Cordova said: "It is very compatible with the new internal NSF guidelines and with the mission statement of NSF."

The national interest standard does not interfere with the merit review process. The bill clearly states: "Nothing in this section shall be construed as altering the Foundation's intellectual merit or broader impacts criteria for evaluating grant applications."

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and to support the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER), a physicist.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment, which I understand has been introduced, would strike section 106 of the bill, which, in my view, adds a dangerous political filter to NSF's gold-standard merit review process.

I do not stand alone in this view. The overwhelming majority of my colleagues in the scientific community are still quite uncomfortable with this language that would, as the American Society for Microbiology stated, "have an adverse impact on NSF's peer review process, which is essential to funding meritorious research." All of us here want to be good stewards of taxpayer money.

This is also true of the National Science Foundation, which currently already requires that the NSF public award abstract consist of a nontechnical component which will include "a public justification for NSF funding by articulating how the project serves the national interest," as stated by NSF's mission: to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; or to secure the national defense.

As the Biophysical Society has pointed out: "NSF is committed to . . . offering the public a better understanding of a research project's intent, which will satisfy this section's objective."

The whole intent of this mystifies me a little bit. I serve on two committees—the Financial Services Committee and the Science, Space, and Technology Committee. On the Financial Services Committee, there is a steady drumbeat of Republican pro-

posals to remove duplicitous and redundant requirements that just waste everyone's time; whereas, it seems to me that section 106 is exactly along this line. While it may just seem an innocuous waste of time to some, we know that for the past 2 years scientists have had their projects targeted as potentially wasteful or not "in the national interest," often based on nothing but their titles. Not only is this wrong, it is blatantly political.

It is easy to make cheap shots here. My parents, actually, both worked for Senator Bill Proxmire, who for years and years did the Golden Fleece Awards. He was a wonderful and thoughtful Senator, but on this one, he consistently missed the mark. It is easy to make fun of projects with funny sounding names or with strange topics, but the NSF is the gold standard for a reason.

Take, for example, anthropologist Dr. Scott Atran, who received funding from the NSF in 1994 for a study that was entitled, "Local Ecological Knowledge of Common-Pool Resources in Campeche, Mexico." Dr. Atran subsequently applied what he learned to questions of extremism in the Middle East and is now a key national expert on countering extremism in the Middle East, valued as a consultant by the Department of Defense and the Department of State.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I will simply say to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) that I recognize and appreciate him. He is a smart, thoughtful, and well-motivated member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, so I am really sorry he opposes this national interest standard that, I think, is the right thing to do for America and for the American taxpayers.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), who is a very active and talented member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my good friend from Illinois for his strong commitment to advocating for scientific research. I share many of his concerns about the underlying bill, and I will be voting against this bill. However, I must also oppose this amendment. I agree with Mr. FOSTER and I disagree with the chairman on some of the attacks on some past grants that have been granted by the NSF. I think section 106 helps to avoid that.

The first incarnation of what is now section 106 was the High Quality Research Act, which was unveiled nearly 2 years ago. I strongly opposed that, as did the vast majority of the research community, and we set about getting that changed. Through a series of discussions, the current language—vastly different and vastly improved from the original—was reached with a broad definition of national interest that does

not do anything to undermine the gold-standard NSF peer review system. I invite all to read the section and decide for themselves, or to simply listen to the NSF and to the NSB, which oversees the NSF.

As the chairman said, NSF Director France Cordova stated her support for section 106 at a committee hearing in February, saying it is "very compatible with the NSF internal guidelines and with the mission statement of NSF."

I applaud NSF for these new guidelines which explain to the public why each proposal is being funded and how it is in the national interest. This will help the NSF defend worthwhile grants that are attacked by critics who sometimes misrepresent projects. In doing so, it will also protect the NSF.

While the National Science Board does not formally endorse legislation, at the meeting 2 weeks ago, the board passed a resolution strongly endorsing the principle that all Foundation-funded research must further the national interest by contributing to the Foundation's mission.

So, while I agree with my friend on almost everything related to science policy, I must reluctantly oppose this amendment. I wish we could have been able to have worked out a COMPETES bill we could all support. Regrettably, we did not, but let's not throw out this language that was worked out and that will help the NSF defend its peer review process.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 114-120.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 29, line 20, strike "and".

Page 29, line 23, strike the period and insert a semicolon.

Page 29, after line 23, insert the following:

(K) creating State and regional workshops to train K-12 teachers in science and technology project-based learning to provide instruction in how to initiate robotics and other STEM competition team development programs; and

(L) encouraging and supporting efforts led by institutions of higher education, businesses, and local public and private educational agencies to establish collaborative

efforts to provide K-12 students residing in areas with unemployment rates that exceed the national average by 1 percent or more.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, let me take a moment to thank both of my fellow Texans and to acknowledge that I know that there is a difference of opinion, but no one can disagree with the crucialness of America's competitiveness and of the necessity for creating a workforce that can compete.

Allow me to acknowledge Congressman JOHNSON for the steadfast commitment and service to the Science, Space, and Technology Committee. I had the privilege of serving with her in the early stages of my membership here in this august body, and I want to thank her personally for the great strides and successes that she has had in expanding opportunities for the most vulnerable in our community.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment speaks to this issue, and it continues to seek to address the STEM education gap for K-12 students. Jackson Lee amendment No. 3 creates State and regional workshops to train K-12 teachers in project-based science and technology learning, which will allow them to provide instruction in initiating robotics and other STEM competition team development programs.

I now serve on the Homeland Security Committee, and I note that the extent of technology in securing this Nation is without comparison. It is necessary. It is crucial. This amendment also leverages the collaboration among higher education businesses and local and private/public education agencies to support STEM efforts at schools located in areas where unemployment is 1 percent or more above the national rate.

We want to get right to the core of the most vulnerable and the most needy students. Robotic competitions and other similar competitive opportunities have proven to be one of the most successful paths for engaging young minds in STEM education. I have held a robotics competition, and it is absolutely amazing to see the young people's minds and hearts gather around it. My amendment has that capacity to it. Of course, it responds to the fact that only 1 out of 10 high schools in the U.S. offers computer science programs, and it is estimated that the education systems in 25 States do not count computer science classes toward high school graduation.

I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would include teacher training for STEM competitions and collaborations as permitted activities under a program in the bill to encourage engagement in STEM education activities. Supporting out-of-school activities, like competitions, is consistent with the underlying bill, so I accept the gentlewoman's amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to focus just a little bit on competitions regarding this amendment, competitions such as FIRST, which is a national robotics competition that engages 400,000 students each year and that awards millions of dollars in scholarships, paving the way for future STEM success.

I submit for the RECORD a document entitled, "Disparities in STEM Employment by Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin."

[From census.gov, Sept. 2013]

DISPARITIES IN STEM EMPLOYMENT BY SEX,  
RACE, AND HISPANIC ORIGIN  
(By Liana Christin Landivar)

AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY REPORTS  
Introduction

Industry, government, and academic leaders cite increasing the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) workforce as a top concern. The National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and the Institute of Medicine describe STEM as "high-quality, knowledge-intensive jobs . . . that lead to discovery and new technology," improving the U.S. economy and standard of living. In 2007, Congress passed the America COMPETES Act, reauthorized in 2010, to increase funding for STEM education and research.

One focus area for increasing the STEM workforce has been to reduce disparities in STEM employment by sex, race, and Hispanic origin. Historically, women, Blacks, and Hispanics have been underrepresented in STEM employment. Researchers find that women, Blacks, and Hispanics are less likely to be in a science or engineering major at the start of their college experience, and less likely to remain in these majors by its conclusion. Because most STEM workers have a science or engineering college degree, underrepresentation among science and engineering majors could contribute to the underrepresentation of women, Blacks, and Hispanics in STEM employment.

This report details the historical demographic composition of STEM occupations, followed by a detailed examination of current STEM employment by age and sex, presence of children in the household, and race and Hispanic origin based on the 2011 American Community Survey (ACS). The report concludes with an examination of the demographic characteristics of science and engineering graduates who are currently employed in a STEM occupation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Specifically, the language says: "Industry, government, and academic leaders cite increasing the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) workforce as a top concern."

This is in the American Community Survey Reports.

"One focus area for increasing the STEM workforce has been to reduce disparities in STEM employment by sex, race, and Hispanic origin. Historically, women, Blacks, and Hispanics have been underrepresented in STEM employment," and it goes on to elaborate.

□ 1630

This amendment gives an added opportunity to focus in, to hone in on teacher training and reaching out to those very hungry minds in the minority communities who are eager to be part of the changing fabric of America that focuses on science, technology, engineering, and math. From financial services, to homeland security, to space and aeronautics, to manufacturing, to the Silicon Valleys of the Nation, STEM is crucial.

I would like to now acknowledge both the committee staff on the majority and minority who assisted us, and I would like to acknowledge my staff, Lillie Coney, for her excellent work on these matters.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I ask for support of the Jackson Lee amendment.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

I thank Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON for the opportunity to speak on my amendment to H.R. 1806, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015.

My amendment included in the Rule to H.R. 1806 would improve the bill by addressing the STEM education gap for K-12 students.

Jackson Lee Amendment #3, creates state and regional workshops to train K-12 teachers in project-based science and technology learning, which will allow them to provide instruction in initiating robotics and other STEM competition team development programs.

This amendment also leverages the collaboration among higher education, businesses, local private and public education agencies to support STEM efforts at schools located in areas with unemployment is 1 percent or more above the national rate.

Robotics competitions and other similar competitive opportunities have proven to be one of the most successful paths for engaging young minds in STEM education.

Competitions such as FIRST, a national robotics competition that engages 400,000 students each year and awards millions of dollars in scholarships are paving the way for future STEM success.

This Jackson Lee amendment focuses on reducing the STEM gaps that currently exists between K-12 students attending schools in different geographic regions or who come from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds.

Only 1 out of 10 high schools in the U.S. offer computer science programs

It is estimated that the education systems in 25 states do not count computer science classes toward high school graduation.

Both economists and business leaders have identified that the future of the American economy will be in STEM fields, which the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates will create more than 9 million jobs between 2012 and 2022.

The STEM gap is more pronounced when considering minority groups.

U.S. Census 2010 data from the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Census Bureau, showed that underrepresented minorities earned 18.6 percent of total undergraduate degrees from 4-year colleges, but only 16.4 percent of the degrees in science fields and less than 13 percent of degrees in physical sciences and engineering.

Many historically underrepresented groups, including low income urban, rural and Native American communities have difficulty accessing STEM education and job training opportunities.

Jackson Lee Amendment #17 would have increased awareness among underrepresented groups in STEM employment and education opportunities by providing information on certification, undergraduate and graduate STEM programs.

One of the most enduring difficulties faced by underrepresented populations is a lack of awareness and understanding of the connection between STEM and employment opportunities.

In 2012, a survey found that despite the nation's growing demand for more workers in science, technology, engineering, and math grows, the skills gap among the largest ethnic and racial minorities groups remain stubbornly wide.

Blacks and Latinos account for only 7 percent, of the STEM workforce despite representing 28 percent of the U.S. population.

Jackson Lee Amendment #18 would have made sure that the issue of reducing the skills and education gap of underrepresented groups in STEM degree programs is considered as current STEM education federal programs were reviewed.

Jackson Lee Amendment #19 could have furthered the skills development and training of teachers who provide instruction in K–12 STEM courses where 40 percent of the students are on free or reduced lunch programs or in areas where unemployment is 1 percent or more above the national average.

Although most STEM specific education occurs in college and graduate school, interest in STEM fields must be fostered from a young age through successful K–12 programs.

Many schools serving low-income students lack the resources to provide continuity of STEM K–12 education, and as a result, students lose the opportunity to develop the skills that will prepare them for higher STEM education.

Jackson Lee Amendment #21 was an effort to identify no-cost or low-cost summer and after school science and technology education programs and have that information broadly disseminated to the public.

Throughout primary and secondary education, skills retention is one of the most pressing concerns facing underrepresented students.

Without access to after-school and summer programs, even those students with a passion for STEM risk falling behind their peers.

Jackson Lee Amendment #22 made grants available to local education agencies to support training in STEM education methods to teachers to improve their instruction at schools serving neglected, delinquent, and migrant students, English learners, at-risk students, and Native Americans as determined by the director.

Jackson Lee Amendment #23 establishes within the Directorate for Education and

Human Resources an Office of STEM Education Gap Awareness with the duties of reducing the STEM gap in K–12 and post-secondary education among underrepresented populations.

The Jackson Lee amendments are intended to bridge the STEM gap in rural and urban areas where opportunities for training in STEM that can enhance the productivity of businesses large and small are lacking.

The Brookings' Metropolitan Policy Program's report "The Hidden STEM Economy," reported that in 2011, 26 million jobs or 20 percent of all occupations required knowledge in 1 or more STEM areas.

Half of all STEM jobs are available to workers without a 4 year degree and these jobs pay on average \$53,000 a year, which is 10 percent higher than jobs with similar education requirements.

There will be STEM winners and losers not because the skills needed are too difficult to obtain, but because people are not aware of the jobs that are going unfilled today nor do they know what education or training will create job security for the next 2 to 3 decades.

I am very aware of the importance of STEM job training and education.

A third of Houston jobs are in STEM-based fields.

Houston has the second largest concentrations of engineers (22.4 for every 1,000 workers according to the Greater Houston Partnership).

Houston has 59,070 engineers, the second largest populations in the nation.

STEM jobs are at the core of Houston's economic success, but what we have done with STEM innovation and job creation in the city of Houston is not enough to satisfy the regions demand for STEM trained workers.

Houston anticipates that in the next 5 years the gap in the number of people with STEM skills and training will not keep up with the number of positions requiring those skills.

This is not just true for Houston, Texas—it is true for every region of the nation—whether you live in a rural community or urban center.

By 2018 the United States will need: 710,000 Computing workers; 160,000 Engineers; 70,000 Physical Scientists; 40,000 Life Science workers; 20,000 Mathematics workers.

STEM Computing Jobs are critical to America's future: Software engineers; Computer networking workers; Systems analysis; Computer researcher or support workers.

Types of STEM Engineering Jobs: Structural Engineers; Mechanical Engineers; Software Engineers; Electrical Engineers; Automotive Engineers; Aeronautical Engineers; Naval Engineers; Architects.

Types of STEM Physical Sciences Jobs: Biologists; Zoologists; Agricultural; Food Scientists; Conservation Scientists; Medical Scientists; Climatologists.

Types of STEM Life Scientists [PhDs]: Political Science; Economists; Anthropologists; Archaeology; Cultural Researchers; Language Experts (Linguistic and Language Skills).

Types of STEM Mathematics: Teachers; Physicists; Cryptographers; Statisticians; Accountants.

In order to ensure that underserved populations reach the level of STEM education and opportunity they choose to pursue, I believe it is integral to create an office that will focus on closing the STEM education gap.

I ask that my colleagues from both sides of the aisle support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. ESTY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 114–120.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 41, line 7, strike "and" after "society";

Page 41, line 12, strike the period at the end and insert "; and";

Page 41, after line 12, insert the following new paragraph:

(4) I-Corps should continue to promote a strong innovation system by investing in and supporting female entrepreneurs, who are historically underrepresented in entrepreneurial fields, through mentorship, education, and training.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would increase support for women in entrepreneurship at the National Science Foundation's Innovation Corps, also known as the I-Corps. It has been an honor and privilege to meet with women across Connecticut who are creating and building their own startups and small businesses.

In March I hosted a Women in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math roundtable, bringing together educators, innovators, and business owners to identify barriers that women face when looking to advance in the critical STEM and entrepreneurial fields.

These local leaders all agreed that one of the biggest problems for women in the STEM fields is the lack of mentorship and support, and, quite simply, women do not have the same support and mentorship as their male counterparts because they are often the first women in leadership positions in their fields.

In fact, our Smaller Manufacturers Association in Connecticut just elected their first female president, Anne Strobel, and she has already hit the ground running to build on our State's strong manufacturing tradition.

National studies and experts echo the concerns women raised at the STEM roundtable in my own district. The Kauffman Foundation recently surveyed 350 female tech startup founders and found that the number one shared concern is a lack of role models and mentors for women thinking of going into business for themselves.

Recent news reports have noted the chronic underrepresentation of women

in the booming tech sector, including startups. In fact, women make up only 30 percent of the tech workforce and 22 percent of the leadership roles, despite being 60 percent of the workforce. It is clear that we must do more for women so they can build businesses and create good-paying jobs.

My amendment would provide that support to women through the NSF's Innovation Corps, known as the I-Corps, by expanding their mission to specifically include support for and investment in female entrepreneurs through mentorship, education, and training.

The I-Corps program fosters entrepreneurship by giving students the tools they need to move discoveries and technology from the research lab to the market. I-Corps is making a difference in helping teach and support entrepreneurs across the country.

In my own State, the University of Connecticut recently received I-Corps funding, and it is designated as an I-Corps site. Accelerate UConn will build on the investment the State of Connecticut is already making to ensure that they remain a leader in our national innovation ecosystem.

Our competitiveness as a nation depends on robust research and technology and on ensuring that we draw on the best and the brightest, whether they be men or women. By increasing the number of women entrepreneurs in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and math, we as a nation will all benefit from the innovation that comes from a diverse workforce.

It is not only morally right, but economically smart to foster entrepreneurship of women. I encourage all my colleagues to support my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, though I don't oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would add a sense of Congress of Congress' support for the NSF's Innovation Corps program in the underlying bill. This language would include the promotion of a strong innovation system with investments and support for female entrepreneurs. I-Corps is an excellent program. I support the gentlewoman's amendment and appreciate her offering it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding and for her leadership on this important issue. I espe-

cially enjoy being on the same side of this issue with the chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my voice to Representative ESTY's voice in support of her amendment. I-Corps is a revolutionary partnership that helps maximize the economic impact of taxpayer-funded research by connecting the brilliant minds at NSF to the brilliant minds in the private sector.

This amendment offered by Representative ESTY today ensures that we foster all of the brilliant minds by supporting female entrepreneurs. Gender diversity makes good business sense. Research conducted by Dow Jones on venture-backed companies found that successful ones had twice the number of women on the founding teams, and there is more research that shows that women-owned firms outperformed those owned by male counterparts. Despite this and despite the fact that women earn more college degrees than men, they comprise only 5 percent of Fortune 500 CEOs and only 19 percent of corporate board seats. Clearly, something is wrong.

For us to fully realize our economic potential, we have got to do a better job of supporting female entrepreneurs. That is why I strongly support her amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I am going to disagree with what the gentlewoman from Connecticut has to say during her remaining time, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. ESTY. I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the ranking member, with my thanks.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment and want to thank the author for bringing it forward and thank the chairman of the committee for supporting it.

Our support historically goes back to Congresswoman Connie Morella. The two of us did a study maybe 15 or 16 years ago, and we both have been very, very supportive of women in the sciences and hope that we can get a better bill so that we can address getting them ready for these jobs.

Ms. ESTY. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. CROWLEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part A of House Report 114-120.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 45, after line 14, insert the following:  
**SEC. 127. HISPANIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM IN EDUCATION AND SCIENCE.**

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall establish the program described in section 7033 of the America COMPETES Act (42 U.S.C. 1862o-12) for Hispanic-serving institutions (as defined in section 502 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1101a)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, 8 years ago when the House first considered the America COMPETES Act, I offered an amendment with my then-colleague Gabby Giffords as well as Congressman JERRY MCNERNEY to correct a longstanding inequity at the National Science Foundation. Unlike their counterparts in higher education, Hispanic-Serving Institutions have not benefited from a specific program at the NSF to provide them with grants for research, curriculum, and infrastructure development.

The amendment corrected this inequity, requiring the NSF to create a separate program for HSIs. It was adopted, and it became law. But to this day, the NSF has not implemented the program as codified in law. This bipartisan amendment would correct that and require the HSI program to finally be implemented within 4 months of the enactment of this measure.

Hispanic-Serving Institutions serve the majority of nearly 2 million Latino students enrolled in college today. In my district alone, about 10,000 students attend Hispanic-Serving Institutions offering degrees in these fields of science. Without access to targeted grants, HSIs have difficulty increasing the ranks of Latinos in the STEM fields, where they have been historically underrepresented.

We must ensure that Latinos, the youngest and fastest growing ethnic group in our Nation, are prepared with the knowledge and skills that will contribute to our Nation's future economic strength, security, and global leadership, because when education is available to everyone, our entire Nation is stronger.

I want to thank my colleagues who worked with me on this issue: Mr. SERRANO, who has a stand-alone bill to make this fix permanent, and Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. HURD, as well as Mr. CURBELO, who have cosponsored this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, though I don't oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would require NSF to establish a program originally authorized in the 2007 COMPETES Act. I support the gentleman's amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments from the chairman.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), my friend and a cosponsor of the amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, as my colleague has said, in 2007 he added a provision to the original America COMPETES Act to give the NSF the discretion to establish a dedicated grant program. However, after years of persistence, the NSF has refused to act. That is why last month Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LUJÁN, and myself introduced the HOPES Act.

Today's amendment replicates the HOPES Act and requires the NSF to establish an undergraduate grant program for Hispanic-Serving Institutions. Hispanics are underrepresented in the STEM fields, and more needs to be done to ensure that we are not missing the best and the brightest from all the parts of America in developing the next generation of scientists, engineers, and mathematicians.

This amendment is a big step in the right direction. I thank Representative CROWLEY for his leadership on this issue. I thank the chairman for accepting the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD).

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, which will benefit the students at several fine institutions in the 23rd Congressional District of Texas.

One thing that everybody here wants is a healthy economy. We want the American economy to continue to be the strongest in the world, and if American businesses are going to compete and win in a global economy, we have to have the best trained and best equipped workforce possible.

This means our institutions of higher learning need to be fully capable of offering their students the opportunities to learn the skills that are going to drive a 21st century economy, and that means STEM degrees must be a priority for our colleges and universities. This amendment will allow institutions that are designated as Hispanic-Serving Institutions to have access to grant programs with the National Science Foundation that they have been limited from participating in in the past.

There are 47 institutions like this in the State of Texas, and more than a

dozen of them serve students in my district. This increased access to grants will help increase the recruitment, retention, and graduation rates of Hispanic students pursuing degrees in STEM fields. That is good for these students; that is good for our universities, our communities, our businesses, and our economy.

I want to thank the gentleman from New York, Mr. CROWLEY, for introducing this amendment. I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank Mr. HURD for his comments.

I want the RECORD to reflect that I was willing and expecting to be yielding the gentleman 1 minute. Since the cooperation is running so smoothly, Mr. Chairman, thank you for yielding the 2 minutes to Mr. HURD.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN).

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment that I am proud to offer with my colleagues.

I want to thank Congressman CROWLEY for his leadership. I want to recognize Chairman SMITH for his responsibility in working and looking out for these students as well.

In today's world, science, technology, engineering, and math degrees translate into high-paying, in-demand jobs. While we are still struggling with high unemployment in my home State of New Mexico, there are sectors, especially in STEM, that are having difficulty finding qualified workers. To help meet this demand, the National Science Foundation manages a number of programs at minority-serving institutions, including Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Tribal Colleges and Universities.

□ 1645

These programs have filled an important void by preparing minority students for meaningful careers in STEM. However, there is no such program and, therefore, a lack of critical support for Hispanic Americans. This is also evident in the fact that Hispanics are severely underrepresented in the STEM workforce.

It is time that we fund the creation of a program for Hispanic-Serving Institutions to develop infrastructure, curriculum, and recruit Hispanic students into STEM fields. To do what is best for America, we need to invest and promote these programs.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the

gentleman and all of the persons who sponsored this amendment. I want to commend them.

When Mr. LUJÁN was on the Science Committee, we actually developed that language that did pass in the last COMPETES Act, so I fully support this amendment.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, let me just use the remaining time to thank Chairman SMITH for his cooperation and that of his staff, as well as the cooperation of Ms. JOHNSON and her staff.

I do think that this amendment is the final tooth we need to make this law work and to drive the money and the resources to the people we intended for them to go to, and that is Latino or Hispanic young men and women who want to strive to succeed in the fields of science and medicine to help make our country an even better country.

I thank you both again for your cooperation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFITH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part A of House Report 114-120.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 49, line 2, insert "The Advisory Panel shall consist of 15 members, with 3 members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and 2 members appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate." after "other appropriate organizations."

Page 171, line 2, insert ", except that 3 members shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and 2 members shall be appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate. The total number of members of the advisory committee shall be 15." after "by the Secretary".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would make a couple of slight changes to two new advisory boards created in this bill: the STEM education advisory panel and a new Department of Energy advisory committee.

My amendment sets the total number of members for these two new advisory boards at 15 each, and most importantly, it ensures that five of the members on each board are chosen by Congress, three by the Speaker of the House and two by the Senate majority leader.

The purpose of my amendment is to ensure that the advisory boards have congressional representation, that we have people on there who work with Congress. The legislative branch is a

coequal branch of government, and I believe that, as an institution, Congress should more aggressively assert itself as a coequal branch.

This amendment has nothing to do with which party controls the legislative branch of government or which party, for that matter, controls the executive branch at any given time, nor does it ask for a majority of the members of these new boards to be congressionally appointed.

The amendment would simply ensure that the legislative branch is involved in these boards that it, the legislative branch, is creating and that we are involved in the process of creating the reports which both the legislative branch and executive branch will rely on to make important decisions for these United States.

If Congress deems an issue important enough to warrant an advisory board that is included in a bill we are passing, it just makes sense that we also appoint a portion of that board's membership.

I hope we will do that as we go forward with many of our boards. I also think it will facilitate more conversation between the executive branch and the legislative branch as time goes forward.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment allows the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the majority leader of the Senate to appoint members to two scientific advisory boards created in the bill. This amendment is the very definition of politicizing science when we have politicians choosing who sits on scientific advisory boards.

While my colleagues across the aisle suggest that this amendment ensures accountability, in reality, it only ensures the political meddling in science. Unfortunately, this is consistent with many provisions in the underlying bill.

Scientific advisory boards provide expert scientific advice and make recommendations on subject matter from STEM education to energy research and development. It is essential that advisory board members be qualified and nonpolitical to provide nonpartisan advice and give appropriate recommendations that are free of bias, advice and recommendations based on the best available evidence, and advice and recommendations that will further science in the country, not inhibit it.

In this amendment, the Speaker of the House would appoint three members, while the majority leader of the Senate would appoint two additional members to this advisory board.

Some of these advisory boards have only 15 members. This amendment

would allow Republican—and only Republican—leaders of Congress to appoint one-third of these members.

This amendment is clearly meant to politicize these advisory boards. While the sponsor of this amendment is messaging it as giving Congress a bigger voice, that is just not accurate, asked for, or necessary. Congress already has the biggest and final voice. We control the Federal budget. Congress writes authorization bills such as the one before us today. We do not lack influence.

Let's keep our scientific advisory boards free from political interference. If we choose to ignore the advice from our scientific advisory boards, as we are doing with H.R. 1806, that is our right. Congress doesn't also have to put its fingerprints directly on the advice itself. We know by what has been said today that we are trying to take over the responsibility on this bill that I am against, so that is one way you can do it.

This amendment follows the underlying attack on science in this bill, but this amendment goes further. It gives Republican politicians a chance to directly influence the scientific process in our country.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chairman, I feel so bad that the gentlewoman thinks this is politicizing this bill. That is the furthest thing from my intent.

I know the gentlewoman does not know me and she does not know that, for 17 years, I served in the Virginia House of Delegates. In Virginia, any time we created a board or policy advisory group like this, we generally had legislative members on there.

What we found when we did that was that, when an idea came from the administrative branch, whether it was of the party that I was in or of a different party, we generally found that, by having people that were familiar with both sides of the issue, but people who also relied on and came to talk to us on a regular basis in the legislature, we felt more comfortable with those recommendations that had been made. We understood better what the background was. It made for better government.

That is what this is intended to do. I didn't ask for a majority. I didn't say that Congress should have complete control. It just says there ought to be some members appointed by the Senate and appointed by the House. It doesn't matter which party is in control of the House or Senate. Recently, that was divided. It doesn't matter which party is in the executive branch.

It just says this is a way to make sure that when you think it is important enough—when Congress thinks it is important enough to create an advisory board—that we both have some members, both the House and Senate, on that advisory board to make sure that there is interaction with us, as well as with the executive branch.

Unless the belief is that the executive branch wants to politicize it because they get all the appointments, I don't know why they would think these appointments would be politicizing it. It is just for informational purposes and to make sure that everybody is heard at the table and that those ideas are shared.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFITH. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I served in both the house and senate in Texas before coming here; I believe strongly in input, but this very bill and its structure has become so political and so politically tainted in attempting to manipulate what is going on in our agencies, I just don't trust your amendment.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Reclaiming my time, I would say that I don't know the gentlewoman's concerns on this particular bill. I do believe, as a Congress, we ought to be working to make sure that we have input on all of these advisory committees, whether it is on this bill or any other bill.

Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. GRIFFITH. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief. I support the gentleman's amendment that will ensure that Congress has input on the composition of the new boards and panels created in the bill, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment as well.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. KELLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part A of House Report 114-120.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 71, line 21, strike "\$933,700,000" and insert "\$938,700,000".

Page 72, line 6, strike "\$130,000,000" and insert "\$135,000,000".

Page 72, line 8, strike "\$125,000,000" and insert "\$130,000,000".

Page 72, line 19, strike “\$933,700,000” and insert “\$938,700,000”.

Page 73, line 3, strike “\$130,000,000” and insert “\$135,000,000”.

Page 73, line 5, strike “\$125,000,000” and insert “\$130,000,000”.

Page 178, line 4, strike “\$1,198,500,000” and insert “\$1,193,500,000”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, my amendment increases the authorized funding for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership by \$5 million and it offsets it by decreasing the authorized funding for the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy by \$5 million, for level funding.

If our goal is to create and retain more American jobs, there is no better program to fund than the Manufacturing Extension Partnership. Administered by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, with centers in every single State, for every \$1 of Federal investment, this public-private partnership generates nearly \$21 in new sales. As a result, this translates into \$2.5 billion annually. For every \$2,001 of Federal investment, MEP creates or retains one American manufacturing job.

The MEP programs provides our Nation’s nearly 350,000 small manufacturers with services and access to resources that enhance growth, improve productivity, and expand capacity. This program is a win-win for our hard-working American taxpayers. Few, if any, other Federal programs can claim such a good return on our taxpayers’ investment.

Considering this amendment authorizes the program at \$130 million that helps small American manufacturers directly and at a 50 percent cost share, this gives taxpayers more bang for their buck.

The Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy has a total budget of over \$1 billion, so moving \$5 million to this valuable program for small businesses is simply good economic policy.

This program is not a government handout. Instead, it requires small manufacturers who partner with their local MEP to have skin in the game with a 50 percent cost share. That is good for our taxpayers; it is good for manufacturing sectors, and it is good for American jobs.

Since 1988, MEP has worked with nearly 80,000 American manufacturers, leading to \$88 billion in sales and 14 billion in cost savings. It has helped create more than 729,000 American jobs.

Last year alone, MEP projects created or retained nearly 64,000 American jobs, generated more than \$6.7 billion in new and retained sales, and provided cost savings of more than \$1.1 billion to small American manufacturers.

□ 1700

With the average small- and mid-size American manufacturing employee earning more than \$77,000 a year in pay and benefits, these are exactly the types of jobs that policymakers need to be encouraging. And at a time when our economy is starting to recover, the MEP’s work is crucial in helping America’s small manufacturers be stronger long-term competitors, both domestically and internationally.

In turn, this will allow them to create good-paying, high-skilled jobs for America’s workers across the country. A growing manufacturing sector in America means more well-paying jobs for low- to moderate-income American families, reduced trade deficit and a robust economy, and a flourishing innovation sector which can drive future growth.

By supporting this amendment, Congress will be sending a clear signal to our small American manufacturers and our job creators that they will continue to play a vital role in the reinvigoration of our economy.

MEP is currently appropriated at \$130 million, and this amendment would simply ensure that this popular, bipartisan program continues to be authorized at its current funding level.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I strongly support the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program, or the MEP, at NIST. Since its establishment in 1988, the MEP program has generated billions of dollars in new sales; it has saved MEP clients billions of dollars; and it has helped create more than 700,000 jobs.

However, I cannot support this amendment because it increases the authorization for MEP by decreasing the authorization for the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy at the Department of Energy. EERE conducts important research on energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies, including critical advance manufacturing initiatives.

Unfortunately, EERE has become a favorite target for my friends on the other side of the aisle. The underlying bill cuts this office by almost 30 percent, and this amendment would make that cut even larger.

I supported an amendment that would have increased MEP authorization to \$141 million for fiscal year 2016, at the President’s request, without cutting EERE. But the amendment was not made in order.

I strongly believe in MEP and want to see this funding level increased. I think it is important to note that this bill is an authorization bill, not an appropriations bill. In authorization bills,

Congress should be deciding authorization levels by determining what the program needs to accomplish its responsibilities.

Notwithstanding current Republican protocols, authorization bills should not have the same constraints as appropriation bills, including needing to offset any increases. This is a bizarre approach to legislating.

Because of the unnecessary cut to EERE, I cannot support this amendment, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject the false notion of needing to offset authorizations.

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding me this time.

I just simply want to say that I believe his amendment restores current funding levels for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program at the National Institute of Standards and Technology while offsetting those costs. It is a great amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would just remark that if we are really trying to create jobs, if we are really trying to boost our economy, if we are really trying to do all these things, if we are really trying to help small manufacturers, I don’t think that asking to transfer \$15 million out of a \$1 billion allotment is going to really have that much effect on that.

This is not turning our back on some of the issues that you have, but this is looking forward to the future and saying we have got to help these people move forward.

This is not a government handout. This is not a free amount of money. This is a 50 percent match. There are very few programs in our government that require that.

This is something that just makes sense for America. It makes sense for all those folks that I represent and you represent back home.

I have got to tell you something. Back in Western Pennsylvania, where I live, in Pennsylvania’s Third District, every morning, moms and dads get up and they throw their feet out over their bed and they go to work so that they can put a roof over the head for their children, food on their table, clothes on their back, and a promise for the future.

This is a small investment. All we are doing is keeping it at \$130 million. And in a government that spends trillions of dollars every year, I don’t know why we would quibble over \$5 million because it is going to help job creation and job retention. It allows us to compete in a global market in a way that we actually win.

We don't have to get political about this. What I want to do is, I want to think about all the people we represent and where those dollars go because every single dollar belongs to the American taxpayer.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is reminded to address all of his remarks to the Chair and not to other Members of the House.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate those remarks. He is describing my constituents as well. And if we had done as requested by the President, we would have left the authorization levels at the level he is trying to bring it to, and it would not have taken away from the other part of the research that is needed so badly in the other areas.

I do not oppose what he is trying to do. What I oppose is how he is trying to do it. And for that, I still oppose the total amount because it is not treating the other program fairly.

It is not that I oppose MEP. My constituents are no different than yours. They get up every day to work hard and need opportunities. I am sure many of yours get more opportunities than some of mine. And so I agree with that totally.

I agreed with the President's level of recommendation of where he wants to take it. What I disagree with is he is taking it out of another area when it is not necessary.

We are not appropriations. We are to recommend authorizations. We can do the authorization for his level without taking away from an area they don't like.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Members are advised to address their remarks to the Chair and not to each other.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part A of House Report 114-120.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 114, line 23, through page 115, line 18, strike subsections (b) through (d).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment would do two important things. First, it would preserve the Energy Department's ability to select projects based on merit, and, second, it would preserve a very basic sci-

entific tenet, the ability of the Department of Energy to replicate scientific results.

Right now, the underlying bill mandates the prioritization of certain scientific fields over others, and it terminates science initiatives that can validate or question the results of previous scientific research.

It is additionally unfortunate that in this formerly bipartisan bill, the majority is again attempting to specifically target and terminate the valuable research programs of some of our Nation's brightest scientists if they study climate change. I think this is shortsighted, I think it is irresponsible, and I believe it is wrong.

In order to ensure America's energy security, we must understand the multiplying risks to our energy infrastructure due to a changing climate. In order to ensure America's energy security, we must understand the lifecycle impacts of the fuels we use. And in order to ensure America's energy security, we must lead the world in developing clean renewable sources of energy.

For this vision to become a reality, the Department of Energy must support sound scientific processes that include selecting the most meritorious methods and questions that they wish to research and verifying those results through replication.

H.R. 1806, as it is currently written, specifically targets the climate change research program in the Energy Department and instructs the director to cease "those climate science-related initiatives that are identified as overlapping or duplicative."

A basic tenet of science is that you have to reproduce scientific results. You don't run an experiment once and go to the world and say, "It's true. We've figured it out."

No—science requires separate and independently verified results in order to draw conclusions. But now Congress is trying to legislate changes to the scientific method, and I think that is a shame.

Science works best when multiple groups and agencies collaborate to find answers to important questions. And guess what? Congress has already created a way to coordinate among the 13 Federal agencies to ensure that each agency is researching the causes and effects of global changes most relevant to their missions. And it is called the U.S. Global Change Research Program. The proposed requirements in section 505 of H.R. 1806 are really just an attempt to create more roadblocks to studying climate change.

My amendment preserves the scientific integrity of the Office of Science, the U.S. Global Change Research Program and, more importantly, the scientific process.

I urge a "yes" vote on the Lowenthal amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), who is a member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the gentleman's amendment and in support of the underlying reforms included in H.R. 1806, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015.

This amendment would remove important measures that ensure greater transparency for the Federal Government's climate science initiative and require accountability for the Office of Science to justify the value of related work going forward.

The gentleman's amendment would also remove underlying language in the America COMPETES Act that would require the Government Accountability Office to identify duplicative climate science initiatives across the entire Federal Government.

All Members of Congress should support transparency in federally funded research. It is our core responsibility to provide oversight for Federal programs and make sure American taxpayer dollars are being spent responsibly, not duplicating work that has already been done.

That said, the language in the America COMPETES Act does not ban any particular area of science but, instead, requires that DOE justify the science's merit and provide greater transparency if climate science work is intentionally duplicated.

This provision in the America COMPETES Act is simply good governance and is more important now than ever. The Obama administration has unapologetically pushed forward a politicized climate agenda through the Federal Government, prioritizing climate change research above all else. Better transparency can help prevent wasteful spending and prioritize the most valuable research.

H.R. 1806 authorizes the Office of Science within the Department of Energy to support basic research in the physical sciences, including research on Earth's atmosphere. By including these good government measures, the America COMPETES Act gives Congress appropriate oversight, funds valuable research, but does not provide a blank check for the President's climate agenda.

This amendment would strike these important accountability measures from the America COMPETES Act research. For that reason, I oppose the amendment and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

□ 1715

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, could you tell me how much time I have left.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON from Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it is not surprising that the Biological and Environmental Research program at DOE is targeted with harmful provisions in this bill. It is targeted because the program is a leader in advancing our understanding of the causes and impacts of climate change.

Hiding our heads in the sand will not solve anything, and it certainly won't stop the Earth from warming. Allowing partisan politics to skew the scientific understanding of climate change is cynical and shortsighted.

It is especially cynical considering that in the majority's own bill, they state that climate change is happening. They just had to take the statement out that it is caused by human beings.

The gentleman from California's amendment would simply strike those harmful provisions so that scientists supported by BER can continue their important work without political interference.

I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I repeat: duplication is good science. Let me repeat that: duplication is good science.

I urge a "yes" vote on the Lowenthal amendment to maintain the Department of Energy's ability to select scientific projects based upon scientific merit, that support the mission of the Department of Energy and the broader energy security of our country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike good government accountability measures within the COMPETES bill that require DOE's Office of Science to prioritize biological systems and genomic science. It would also strike reforms included in the America COMPETES Act that prevent duplication of research, which saves taxpayer dollars.

I encourage Members to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part A of House Report 114-120.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 133, before line 19, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 604. ENERGY INNOVATION HUBS.**

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy shall carry out a program to enhance the Nation's economic, environmental, and energy security by making awards to consortia for establishing and operating Energy Innovation Hubs to conduct and support, whenever practicable at one centralized location, multidisciplinary, collaborative research, development, and demonstration of advanced energy technologies.

(2) TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT FOCUS.—The Secretary shall designate for each Hub a unique advanced energy technology focus.

(3) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall ensure the coordination of, and avoid unnecessary duplication of, the activities of Hubs with those of other Department of Energy research entities, including the National Laboratories, the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, Energy Frontier Research Centers, and within industry.

(b) CONSORTIA.—

(1) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive an award under this section for the establishment and operation of a Hub, a consortium shall—

(A) be composed of no fewer than 2 qualifying entities; and

(B) operate subject to an agreement entered into by its members that documents—

(i) the proposed partnership agreement, including the governance and management structure of the Hub;

(ii) measures to enable cost-effective implementation of the program under this section;

(iii) a proposed budget, including financial contributions from non-Federal sources;

(iv) a plan for managing intellectual property rights; and

(v) an accounting structure that enables the Secretary to ensure that the consortium has complied with the requirements of this section.

(2) APPLICATION.—A consortium seeking to establish and operate a Hub under this section, acting through a prime applicant, shall transmit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such form, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary shall require, including a detailed description of the elements of the consortium agreement required under paragraph (1)(B). If the consortium members will not be located at one centralized location, such application shall include a communications plan that ensures close coordination and integration of the Hub's activities.

(c) SELECTION AND SCHEDULE.—The Secretary shall select consortia for awards for the establishment and operation of Hubs through competitive selection processes. In selecting consortia, the Secretary shall consider the information a consortium must disclose according to subsection (b), as well as any existing facilities a consortium will provide for Hub activities. Awards made to a Hub shall be for a period not to exceed 5 years, subject to the availability of appropriations, after which the award may be renewed, subject to a rigorous merit review. A Hub already in existence on the date of enactment of this Act may continue to receive support for a period of 5 years, subject to the availability of appropriations, beginning on the date of establishment of that Hub.

(d) HUB OPERATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each Hub shall conduct or provide for multidisciplinary, collaborative research, development, and demonstration of advanced energy technologies within the technology development focus designated under subsection (a)(2). Each Hub shall—

(A) encourage collaboration and communication among the member qualifying entities of the consortium and awardees by conducting activities whenever practicable at one centralized location;

(B) develop and publish on the Department of Energy's website proposed plans and programs;

(C) submit an annual report to the Secretary summarizing the Hub's activities, including detailing organizational expenditures, and describing each project undertaken by the Hub; and

(D) monitor project implementation and coordination.

(2) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—

(A) PROCEDURES.—Hubs shall maintain conflict of interest procedures, consistent with those of the Department of Energy, to ensure that employees and consortia designees for Hub activities who are in decision-making capacities disclose all material conflicts of interest, and avoid such conflicts.

(B) DISQUALIFICATION AND REVOCATION.—The Secretary may disqualify an application or revoke funds distributed to a Hub if the Secretary discovers a failure to comply with conflict of interest procedures established under subparagraph (A).

(3) PROHIBITION ON CONSTRUCTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—No funds provided pursuant to this section may be used for construction of new buildings or facilities for Hubs. Construction of new buildings or facilities shall not be considered as part of the non-Federal share of a Hub cost-sharing agreement.

(B) TEST BED AND RENOVATION EXCEPTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit the use of funds provided pursuant to this section, or non-Federal cost share funds, for research or for the construction of a test bed or renovations to existing buildings or facilities for the purposes of research if the Secretary determines that the test bed or renovations are limited to a scope and scale necessary for the research to be conducted.

(e) TERMINATION.—Consistent with the existing authorities of the Department, the Secretary may terminate an underperforming Hub for cause during the performance period.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) ADVANCED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY.—The term "advanced energy technology" means—

(A) an innovative technology—

(i) that produces energy from solar, wind, geothermal, biomass, tidal, wave, ocean, or other renewable energy resources;

(ii) that produces nuclear energy;

(iii) for carbon capture and sequestration;

(iv) that enables advanced vehicles, vehicle components, and related technologies that result in significant energy savings;

(v) that generates, transmits, distributes, utilizes, or stores energy more efficiently than conventional technologies, including through Smart Grid technologies; or

(vi) that enhances the energy independence and security of the United States by enabling improved or expanded supply and production of domestic energy resources, including coal, oil, and natural gas;

(B) research, development, and demonstration activities necessary to ensure the long-term, secure, and sustainable supply of energy critical elements; or

(C) another innovative energy technology area identified by the Secretary.

(2) HUB.—The term “Hub” means an Energy Innovation Hub established or operating in accordance with this section, including any Energy Innovation Hub existing as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) QUALIFYING ENTITY.—The term “qualifying entity” means—

(A) an institution of higher education;

(B) an appropriate State or Federal entity, including the Department of Energy Federally Funded Research and Development Centers;

(C) a nongovernmental organization with expertise in advanced energy technology research, development, demonstration, or commercial application; or

(D) any other relevant entity the Secretary considers appropriate.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, this amendment seeks to authorize the Energy Innovation Hubs program within the Department of Energy.

I would like to thank Chairman SMITH and his staff for working with me to craft this amendment. Because I know that the chairman supports the amendment, I will keep my remarks brief.

Energy Innovation Hubs are collaborative research centers that bring together teams of scientists and engineers from academia, industry, and national laboratories in order to accelerate scientific discoveries that address critical energy issues. They were created in 2010 and have received almost \$500 million in funding already.

The four hubs currently focus on everything from improving nuclear reactors through computer-based modeling to improving battery technology for transportation and the grid.

The amendment before us would not only authorize this important research but would also provide critical guidelines and accountability measures for the program.

A rigorous merits-based renewal process would be implemented. The Secretary would be empowered to terminate underperforming hubs at any time, and funds would be prohibited from being used for the purpose of constructing buildings so that every taxpayer dollar goes toward the research for which it is intended.

Again, I thank the gentleman from Texas, Chairman SMITH, for his help and guidance in developing this amendment. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, though I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would authorize the Department of Energy Innovation Hubs. These integrated research platforms conduct fundamental research to

address critical challenges in energy technology.

Currently, DOE operates four hubs, which all focus on the critical energy issues. They include the Consortium for Advanced Simulation of Light Water Reactors, which uses high performance computation modeling to simulate and improve reactors. And it includes the Joint Center for Energy Storage Research, which focuses on developing the next generation of battery technologies.

My thanks go to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON), a very active and alert member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, for offering this amendment and for working with us to develop this bipartisan amendment. I encourage Members to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part A of House Report 114-120.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 162, lines 3 through 5, strike subsection (d).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to address an issue of national security.

The Department of Defense is the world's largest institutional consumer of fuel. As a result, the volatility of oil prices directly affects military readiness. Every \$10 increase on a barrel of oil costs the Department of Defense an additional \$1.3 billion a year.

To reduce our military's and our Nation's dependence on a single source of fuel, the Departments of Defense, Energy, and Agriculture have been working closely over the past 4 years with the private sector to scale up an advanced “drop-in” biofuel production capability.

One of those projects is in Lakeview, Oregon, where a forest biomass plant will produce fuel for the U.S. Navy and Marines. It is one of three companies selected by the Departments of Defense, Energy, and Agriculture to produce cost-competitive drop-in military biofuels. Once at scale, these bio-refineries will have a combined capac-

ity to produce 100 million gallons of fuel for military ships and planes while reducing their greenhouse gas emissions by 50 percent compared to conventional fuels.

Our military and Nation are faced with a growing global demand for energy. We need to have a greater emphasis on renewable energy and energy-efficient technologies. Yet, without any apparent logic, this bill would prohibit the Department of Energy—the lead agency with deep, technical expertise in this area—from partnering with the Department of Defense to develop biofuels.

The amendment that I am offering strikes this prohibition and would allow the Departments of Energy and Defense to continue their efforts to learn from each other's expertise.

Mr. Chairman, I will introduce into the RECORD a letter opposing the prohibition from the Truman National Security Project, where they note—these are retired military—that 4 years of partnership between the Departments of Defense, Energy, and Agriculture have seen impressive progress in the development of advanced drop-in biofuels that will allow the military to turn away from an outdated fuel source. Members of the military from every rank and service have spoken out in favor of the continued investment in biofuels for the reasons of cost and capability.

OPERATION FREE,  
April 21, 2015.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,  
Hon. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON,  
House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH AND RANKING MEMBER JOHNSON: The American military is the greatest fighting force the world has ever seen. The United States Congress has the critical responsibility of empowering our military leaders by equipping that force with the tools they need to engage effectively in a world of ever-increasing security threats. Accordingly, we urge you to withdraw the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015, which would bar the Department of Energy from continuing a four-year collaboration with the Departments of Defense and Agriculture to develop cost-effective advanced biofuels.

Time and again throughout our history, the military has chosen to innovate towards new solutions. While the advances resulting from these efforts have often benefited our nation as a whole, they are undertaken not for the sake of novelty or adventure but to fill a key operational or tactical need. Advanced biofuels fills such a need: Reducing the dangerous dependence of the U.S. military on fossil fuels.

The Department of Defense is the world's largest institutional consumer of fuel. With approximately \$15 billion per year budgeted simply to maintain freedom of movement, the U.S. military is dangerously sensitive to the volatility of oil prices; a \$10 change in the price per barrel of crude oil leaves the Department of Defense with a \$1.3 billion shortfall and sees increased profits to countries who oppose our interests around the world. And because oil is priced in a global market, no amount of domestic production can insulate the military from these effects.

We have learned firsthand that oil truly is the Achilles' heel of our military. With most

of the world's oil traveling through two or three major chokepoints, the military must allocate significant manpower and resources to keeping those sea lanes open and secure. Moreover, as the military transitions from large-scale land engagements in the Middle East and towards a broader engagement in the Asia-Pacific, the costs and logistical challenges associated with moving fuel over thousands of miles of ocean will only increase.

The threat of oil dependence along with the need for energy security isn't going away any time soon. And we shouldn't impede progress of alternatives that are moving forward now. Four years of partnership between the Departments of Defense, Energy, and Agriculture have seen impressive progress in the development of advanced, "drop in" biofuels that will allow the military to turn away from an outdated fuel source. Top line military platforms as diverse as the supersonic F/A-18 "Green Hornet," the Air Force's F16 fighter jets, the MH-60S Seahawk helicopter, the AV-8B Harrier, the Fire Scout unmanned vehicle, the Riverine Command Boat (RCB-X) and the frigate USS Ford have all operated at full capacity and with no adverse side effects using American-made biofuels.

Members of the military from every rank and service have spoken out in favor of the continued investment in biofuels for reasons of cost and capabilities alike. These voices, rather than political leanings or parochial interests, must steer national security policy. Accordingly, we urge you to withdraw the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015 and to ensure that the U.S. military is free to pursue the fuel sources its leaders deem necessary for maximum operational and tactical success.

Respectfully,

MICHAEL BREEN,  
*Executive Director,  
Truman National Security Project Army  
Captain (Fmr.).*

RADM LEENDERT "LEN"  
HERING,  
*USN (Ret.).*  
LT GEN NORMAN SEIP,  
*USAF (Ret.).*

Ms. BONAMICI. I urge adoption of the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER), who is the chairman of the Energy Subcommittee of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment and in support of the underlying reforms included in H.R. 1806, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015.

This amendment would remove a limitation included in the underlying bill that prevents the Department of Energy from using funding authorized for the EERE Biofuels program to conduct commercial production of biofuels for defense purposes.

The fact is that EERE already spends too much of their current budget on de-

ployment and commercialization of renewable and energy efficient technologies instead of research and development.

The DOE's ongoing effort to fund commercial-scale biofuels production for military purposes in cooperation with the Department of Defense and USDA is just one example.

Redirecting funds from biofuels R&D is part of a broader problem. Department of Energy research and development programs should be focused on science, not creating a market for certain types of fuels. The DOE should focus on a new idea for the market, not a market for the new idea.

The Department of Defense spends billions annually on fuel costs, billions. When viable biofuels technology is able to compete with conventional fuels—trust me—the private sector can and will develop commercial-scale biofuels production to meet demand. It is just that simple, Mr. Chairman.

And despite significant Federal programs to support the use of biofuels, a recent GAO, Government Accountability Office, study concluded that the long-term viability of alternative fuels is dependent on market factors, not Federal funds or mandates. That same study reported that the Department of Defense paid \$150 per gallon for 1,500 gallons of alternative jet fuel derived from algal oil. Taxpayers should be outraged.

The other side may be, in fact, promoting their global warming theory because when taxpayers find out about this kind of waste, there are going to be a lot of them hot under the collar.

The Department of Energy should focus on research and development, not commercial biofuels production. This limitation is consistent with the broader goals of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act, which prioritizes research and development in all R&D program areas while cutting spending on deployment and commercialization.

I am aghast, Mr. Chairman, that the other side somehow thinks Congress shouldn't be paying attention to the way taxpayer dollars are spent.

For these reasons, I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chair, may I please inquire as to the amount of time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Oregon has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. BONAMICI. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS), a member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. PETERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise as a cosponsor of this amendment, and I am glad to be working with Congresswoman BONAMICI and my colleague on the Armed Services Committee, Ranking Member ADAM SMITH.

Our amendment simply allows the Department of Energy to continue its

collaborative work with the Department of Defense to produce biofuels for the military.

The Department of Defense is the single largest institutional consumer of fuel in the world, and this is all about saving money because our military spends about \$20 billion a year on energy, \$16 billion of which goes to oil fuels.

As we have seen in recent years, global oil markets are volatile. And despite massive production increases in the United States, according to the Energy Information Administration, last year, our net imports of petroleum were 5 million barrels per day, with our top five suppliers being Canada, Saudi Arabia, Mexico, Venezuela, and Iraq. That reliance on a volatile, foreign-produced source of fuel puts our national security at risk, particularly when we face dynamic, new threats from nonstate actors such as ISIS, al Qaeda, or individual terrorists who can disrupt oil production and supply lines in new and intimidating ways.

The constraints of depending so heavily on a single source of fuel also puts our readiness at risk, a problem that will only increase as we are forced to respond to international incidents across the globe at a moment's notice and as our military makes its strategic pivot toward the vast Pacific Ocean.

Instead of standing idly by and waiting for a fuel-supply crisis that would endanger our ability to confront those wanting to harm our country, the Departments of Defense, Energy, and Agriculture have been working with private sector innovators to develop renewable biofuels that could be used by planes, tactical vehicles, and ships.

The Navy already has innovative partnerships with algae producers and their high-skilled workers in my district in San Diego.

Congress should be laying the groundwork for more strategic public-private partnerships to develop like those in San Diego, not mandating that they cannot exist.

The military is not pursuing this fuel supply diversity because they are tree-hugging environmentalists but because it is a national security imperative.

Foolishly, today's COMPETES Act would bar the Department of Defense from working with the Department of Energy on developing biofuels. Why would we undercut an effort that our military commanders are for and say will save lives?

□ 1730

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER), a member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my dear friend, Ms. BONAMICI, for yielding and for her leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of this commonsense amendment to allow

the Department of Energy and the Department of Defense to continue working together to develop biofuel options for our Nation's military.

DOD's reliance on a single source of fuel deepens dependence on foreign oil, threatens our national security, and contributes significantly to spending. Why would we not want the Department of Energy with their deep technical expertise in this area to assist DOD to create alternatives for petroleum-based fuels? It makes no sense, and I urge my colleagues' support.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, in closing, the gentlewoman's amendment would remove an important limitation from the underlying bill that prevents the Department of Energy from spending research dollars to fund commercial-scale biofuels development for defense purposes. DOE should focus on innovative research and development, not commercial production of any particular form of energy.

For those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I encourage Members to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part A of House Report 114-120.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk for Mr. DESAULNIER and myself.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 174, lines 18 through 24, strike paragraph (1).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to speak in support of our amendment, which would restore the ARPA-E goal of developing energy technologies that result in reductions in energy-related emissions, including greenhouse gases. I believe this is an important and urgent area of research and that it should remain explicitly stated in the statute as a goal for ARPA-E.

When I look at the existing statute, it says:

The goals of ARPA-E shall be reductions of imports of energy from foreign sources; reductions of energy-related emissions, including greenhouse gases; and improvement in the energy efficiency of all economic sectors.

These are the three goals which have been removed from the current bill. Global carbon dioxide concentrations have risen more than 120 parts per million since preindustrial times, half of that arrived just since 1980. The burning of coal, oil, and natural gas is driving the acceleration of greenhouse gas concentrations in our atmosphere. Just 2 weeks ago, NOAA reported that the monthly global average of concentration of carbon dioxide has surpassed 400 parts per million. The last time this happened was over 1 million years ago.

We must look to develop alternative energy sources that will reduce man-made emissions. ARPA-E is a unique agency that can help us with this mission. Since 2009, it has funded over 400 potentially transformational energy technology projects. A number of these projects have spurred follow-on private sector funding, and a number of ARPA-E awardees have formed startup companies or partnered with other parts of the government and industry to advance their technologies.

Reducing energy-related emissions, including greenhouse gases, is an important component to our Nation's economic and energy security. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support our amendment to reinstate these three goals for ARPA-E, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK), who is also the chairman of the Oversight Subcommittee of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment to H.R. 1806 because I support research that will enhance both the economic security and the energy security of the United States.

The original America COMPETES Act, which established the Advanced Research Projects Agency within the Department of Energy, ARPA-E, required the agency to only pursue projects that reduce greenhouse gases. The bill before us today, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act, allows any advanced energy technology that could enhance U.S. economic and energy security to compete for ARPA-E funding. This levels the playing field and ensures that ARPA-E funds research with the greatest potential to have a positive impact on the American economy.

The COMPETES Act provides a balanced approach to ARPA-E by reprioritizing funding towards innovative projects that are truly in need of Federal research dollars. The bill also

removes restrictions that allow the administration to play favorites in the energy sector. However, this amendment would strike the language which expands the ARPA-E project eligibility. As a result, this amendment would then limit innovative research and development.

With all of the national security challenges we face today, from terrorism, to cybersecurity breaches, to our skyrocketing national debt, we should focus our attention on broadening our energy base and achieving energy independence, not limiting ourselves to one small area of environmental science. I believe we must adopt an all-of-the-above energy strategy that improves our energy security and emphasizes all energy opportunities, including those which reduce greenhouse gases.

Congress should not put in place arbitrary limits on innovation that will prevent groundbreaking technologies from across the energy sector from participating in ARPA-E programs. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the ranking member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it is deeply troubling to me that this amendment had to be offered. This amendment fixes a provision in this bill that strips away a foundational component of the ARPA-E program.

As virtually every preeminent climatologist in the world agrees, greenhouse gas emissions are growing so rapidly and are a growing threat to our way of life. Why wouldn't we want one of the most innovative agencies to develop technologies that could address this critical issue?

ARPA-E has made good funding choices supporting valuable research, as proven by its impressive track record of successful projects since it was first authorized. I certainly see no value in changing something that no serious energy policy analyst believes is broken.

Mr. DESAULNIER's and Mr. BEYER's amendment sets this clearly misguided provision aside. I enthusiastically support it and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the rebuttal of the alternative argument from my friend, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and I found myself agreeing with almost everything that he said, but misunderstanding why retaining these three goals somehow played favorites, how they created arbitrary limits on innovation, and how they opposed efforts to find our economic and

energy security. The purpose of the amendment is to recognize that reducing dependence on foreign oil, that trying to find ways to limit greenhouse gases, and improving the energy efficiency of all economic sectors are worthy goals.

Perhaps what we need to do is add a fourth one, which I would be happy to place first if the chairman would agree, that says the goals will be, first, to develop any breakthroughs in innovation that help the economic and energy security of the Nation so that there is no playing of favorites and there are no arbitrary limitations. If we could work that out, that would be great. Otherwise, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment as offered, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment would remove key policy reforms to ARPA-E from the COMPETES bill and instead place limitations on the research and development conducted at ARPA-E. Federally funded research should include innovative technologies for all forms of energy, not just the President's personal preferences. So I encourage Members to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in part A of House Report 114-120.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.**  
(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “America Competes Reauthorization Act of 2015”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

**TITLE I—OSTP; GOVERNMENTWIDE SCIENCE**

Subtitle A—General Provisions

Sec. 101. Federal research and development funding.

Sec. 102. National Science and Technology Council amendments.

Sec. 103. Review of Federal regulations and reporting requirements.

Sec. 104. Amendments to prize competitions.

Sec. 105. Coordination of international science and technology partnerships.

Sec. 106. Scientific and technical conferences.

Subtitle B—Reauthorization of the National Nanotechnology Initiative

Sec. 111. Short title.

Sec. 112. National Nanotechnology Program amendments.

Sec. 113. Societal dimensions of nanotechnology.

Sec. 114. Nanotechnology education.

Sec. 115. Technology transfer.

Sec. 116. Signature initiatives in areas of national importance.

Sec. 117. Nanomanufacturing research.

Sec. 118. Definitions.

Subtitle C—Engineering Biology

Sec. 121. Short title.

Sec. 122. Findings.

Sec. 123. Definitions.

Sec. 124. National Engineering Biology Research and Development Program.

Sec. 125. Advisory Committee.

Sec. 126. External review of ethical, legal, environmental, and societal issues.

Sec. 127. Agency activities.

**TITLE II—STEM EDUCATION AND DIVERSITY**

Subtitle A—STEM Education and Workforce

Sec. 201. Sense of Congress.

Sec. 202. Coordination of Federal STEM education.

Sec. 203. Grand challenges in education research.

Sec. 204. National Research Council report on STEAM education.

Sec. 205. Engaging Federal scientists and engineers in STEM education.

Subtitle B—Broadening Participation in STEM

Sec. 211. Short title.

Sec. 212. Purpose.

Sec. 213. Federal science agency policies for caregivers.

Sec. 214. Collection and reporting of data on Federal research grants.

Sec. 215. Policies for review of Federal research grants.

Sec. 216. Collection of data on demographics of faculty.

Sec. 217. Cultural and institutional barriers to expanding the academic and Federal STEM workforce.

Sec. 218. Research and dissemination at the National Science Foundation.

Sec. 219. Report to Congress.

Sec. 220. National Science Foundation support for increasing diversity among STEM faculty at institutions of higher education.

Sec. 221. National Science Foundation support for broadening participation in undergraduate STEM education.

Sec. 222. Definitions.

**TITLE III—NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION**

Subtitle A—General Provisions

Sec. 301. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 302. Findings and sense of Congress on support for all fields of science and engineering.

Sec. 303. National Science Foundation merit review.

Sec. 304. Management and oversight of large facilities.

Sec. 305. Support for potentially transformative research.

Sec. 306. Strengthening institutional research partnerships.

Sec. 307. Innovation Corps.

Sec. 308. Definitions.

Subtitle B—STEM Education

Sec. 321. National Science Board report on consolidation of STEM education activities at the Foundation.

Sec. 322. Models for graduate student support.

Sec. 323. Undergraduate STEM education reform.

Sec. 324. Advanced manufacturing education.

Sec. 325. STEM education partnerships.

Sec. 326. Noyce scholarship program amendments.

Sec. 327. Informal STEM education.

Sec. 328. Research and development to support improved K-12 learning.

**TITLE IV—NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY**

Sec. 401. Short title.

Sec. 402. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 403. Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership.

Sec. 404. National Academies review.

Sec. 405. Improving NIST collaboration with other agencies.

Sec. 406. Miscellaneous provisions.

**TITLE V—INNOVATION**

Sec. 501. Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship.

Sec. 502. Federal loan guarantees for innovative technologies in manufacturing.

Sec. 503. Innovation voucher pilot program.

Sec. 504. Federal Acceleration of State Technology Commercialization Pilot Program.

**TITLE VI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

Subtitle A—Office of Science

Sec. 601. Short title.

Sec. 602. Definitions.

Sec. 603. Mission of the Office of Science.

Sec. 604. Basic energy sciences program.

Sec. 605. Biological and environmental research.

Sec. 606. Advanced scientific computing research program.

Sec. 607. Fusion energy research.

Sec. 608. High energy physics program.

Sec. 609. Nuclear physics program.

Sec. 610. Science laboratories infrastructure program.

Sec. 611. Authorization of appropriations.

Subtitle B—ARPA-E

Sec. 621. Short title.

Sec. 622. ARPA-E amendments.

Subtitle C—Energy Innovation

Sec. 641. Energy Innovation Hubs.

Sec. 642. Participation in the Innovation Corps program.

Sec. 643. Technology transfer.

Sec. 644. Funding competitiveness for institutions of higher education and other nonprofit institutions.

Sec. 645. Under Secretary for Science and Energy.

Sec. 646. Special hiring authority for scientific, engineering, and project management personnel.

**TITLE I—OSTP; GOVERNMENTWIDE SCIENCE**

Subtitle A—General Provisions

**SEC. 101. FEDERAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDING.**

Congress finds the following:

(1) The predominant driver of gross domestic product growth over the past half century has been scientific and technological advancement.

(2) Investments in research and development have also delivered significant benefits for national security, health, energy security, education, and the personal well-being of all Americans.

(3) Virtually every new technological product is traceable to a research discovery, often one pursued with no application in mind.

(4) Nondefense Federal research and development accounts for only 1.7 percent of the

Federal budget. Federal basic research accounts for only 1 percent of the budget.

(5) There is a deficit between what America is investing and what it should be investing to remain competitive, not only in research but in technology transfer, innovation, and job creation, thereby causing America's highly successful science and technology enterprise to atrophy.

(6) Many research and development initiatives, due to the long time periods required to achieve completion, have benefited from stable and predictable investments and from multiyear financial planning.

(7) The Federal science agencies should receive sustained and steady growth in funding for research and development activities, including basic research, across a wide range of disciplines, including physical, geological, and life sciences, mathematics, engineering, and social, behavioral, and economic sciences.

#### SEC. 102. NATIONAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COUNCIL AMENDMENTS.

Section 401 of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 6651) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “Federal Coordinating Council for Science, Engineering, and Technology” and inserting “National Science and Technology Council”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “and Energy Research and Development Administration” and inserting “Department of Energy, and any other agency designated by the President”;

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking “engineering, and technology” and inserting “engineering, technology, innovation, and STEM education”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “engineering, and technological” and inserting “engineering, technological, innovation, and STEM education”;

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively; and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(3) address research needs identified under paragraph (2) through appropriate funding mechanisms, which may include solicitations involving 2 or more agencies and public-private partnerships.”

#### SEC. 103. REVIEW OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall establish or designate a working group under the National Science and Technology Council with the responsibility of reviewing Federal regulatory and reporting requirements across Federal agencies that affect the conduct of United States research in an effort to reduce regulatory burdens and to eliminate and harmonize duplicative regulatory and reporting requirements.

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The working group established or designated under subsection (a) shall—

(1) periodically review all Federal regulations and reporting requirements that affect the conduct of United States research to—

(A) identify ways to harmonize overlapping or duplicative research regulations and reporting requirements across Federal agencies;

(B) evaluate such regulations and reporting requirements in relationship to the risks the requirements seek to address to determine if the benefits of the requirements are commensurate with the costs to the progress of science or to the taxpayer;

(C) identify any regulations that are applied to scientific researchers or to research-performing institutions for which exemptions could be reasonably applied or for which adjustments could be made to better

fit those regulations to diverse research environments; and

(D) identify any specific regulations which could be refocused on performance-based goals rather than on process while still meeting the desired outcome;

(2) examine the extent to which agencies' guidance documents adhere with the most recently updated version of the Office of Management and Budget's Agency Good Guidance Practices bulletin; and

(3) develop and update at least once every 3 years a strategic plan for streamlining Federal regulations and reporting requirements that affect the conduct of United States research that contains, at a minimum—

(A) a priority list of research-related regulations, reporting requirements, and agency guidance to be harmonized, streamlined, updated, or eliminated; and

(B) a plan, including a timeline, for implementing the regulatory and reporting reforms identified in subparagraph (A).

(c) STAKEHOLDER INPUT.—In carrying out the responsibilities under subsection (b), including the development of the strategic plan under subsection (b)(3), the working group established or designated under subsection (a) shall take into account input and recommendations from non-Federal stakeholders, including federally funded and non-federally funded researchers, institutions of higher education, scientific disciplinary societies and associations, nonprofit research institutions, industry, including small businesses, federally funded research and development centers, and others with a stake in ensuring effectiveness, efficiency, and accountability in the performance of scientific research.

(d) RESPONSIBILITIES OF OSTP.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in collaboration with the Office of Management and Budget Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, shall encourage and monitor the efforts of the participating agencies to ensure that the strategic plan is developed under subsection (b)(3) and that appropriate steps are taken by the agencies to effectively implement the recommendations, achieve the objectives, and to adhere to the timeline in the strategic plan.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall transmit the priority list and strategic plan developed under subsection (b)(3) to the Congress. The Director shall further provide a report annually to the Congress, to be submitted not later than 60 days after the submission of the President's annual budget request, on the progress toward implementation of the regulatory reforms outlined in the strategic plan.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall transmit the priority list and strategic plan developed under subsection (b)(3) to the Congress. The Director shall further provide a report annually to the Congress, to be submitted not later than 60 days after the submission of the President's annual budget request, on the progress toward implementation of the regulatory reforms outlined in the strategic plan.

#### SEC. 104. AMENDMENTS TO PRIZE COMPETITIONS.

Section 24 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3719) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) by inserting “competition” after “section, a prize”;

(B) by inserting “types” after “following”;

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking “prizes” and inserting “prize competitions”;

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking “in the Federal Register” and inserting “on a publicly accessible Government website, such as www.challenge.gov.”;

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking “prize” and inserting “cash prize purse”;

(3) in subsection (g), by striking “prize” and inserting “cash prize purse”;

(4) in subsection (h), by inserting “prize” before “competition” both places it appears;

(5) in subsection (i)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting “prize” before “competition”;

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by inserting “prize” before “competition” both places it appears;

(C) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(3) WAIVER.—An agency may waive the requirement under paragraph (2). The annual report under subsection (p) shall include a list of such waivers granted during the preceding fiscal year, along with an explanation of the reasons for granting the waivers.”;

(6) in subsection (j) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.—

“(A) LICENSES.—The Federal Government may negotiate a license for the use of intellectual property developed by a participant for a prize competition.

“(B) OTHER CONDITIONS.—A Federal agency or agencies in cooperation may require participants to agree in advance to a specific approach to intellectual property as a condition for eligibility to participate in a prize competition.”;

(7) in subsection (k)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(A), by inserting “prize” before “competition”;

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting “prize” before “competitions” both places it appears;

(8) in subsection (l), by striking all after “may enter into” and inserting “a grant, contract, cooperative agreement, or other agreement with a private sector for-profit or nonprofit entity to administer the prize competition, subject to the provisions of this section.”;

(9) in subsection (m)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Support for a prize competition under this section, including financial support for the design and administration of a prize competition or funds for a cash prize purse, may consist of Federal appropriated funds and funds provided by private sector for-profit and nonprofit entities. The head of an agency may accept funds from other Federal agencies, private sector for-profit entities, and nonprofit entities, to be available to the extent provided by appropriations Acts, to support such prize competitions. The head of an agency may not give any special consideration to any private sector for-profit or nonprofit entity in return for a donation.”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “prize awards” and inserting “cash prize purses”;

(C) in paragraph (3)(A)—

(i) by striking “No prize” and inserting “No prize competition”;

(ii) by striking “the prize” and inserting “the cash prize purse”;

(D) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking “a prize” and inserting “a cash prize purse”;

(E) in paragraph (3)(B)(i), by inserting “competition” after “prize”;

(F) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking “a prize” and inserting “a cash prize purse”;

(G) in paragraph (4)(B), by striking “cash prizes” and inserting “cash prize purses”;

(10) in subsection (n), by inserting “for both for-profit and nonprofit entities,” after “contract vehicle”;

(11) in subsection (o)(1), by striking “or providing a prize” and insert “a prize competition or providing a cash prize purse”;

(12) in subsection (p)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “ANNUAL REPORT” and inserting “BIENNIAL REPORT”;

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “of each year” and inserting “of each odd-numbered year”;

(ii) by striking “preceding fiscal year” and inserting “preceding 2 fiscal years”; and

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (C), by striking “cash prizes” both places it occurs and inserting “cash prize purses”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(G) PLAN.—A description of crosscutting topical areas and agency-specific mission needs that may be the strongest opportunities for prize competitions during the upcoming 2 fiscal years.”.

**SEC. 105. COORDINATION OF INTERNATIONAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PARTNERSHIPS.**

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “International Science and Technology Cooperation Act of 2015”.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall establish a body under the National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) with the responsibility to identify and coordinate international science and technology cooperation that can strengthen the United States science and technology enterprise, improve economic and national security, and support United States foreign policy goals.

(c) NSTC BODY LEADERSHIP.—The body established under subsection (b) shall be co-chaired by senior level officials from the Office of Science and Technology Policy and the Department of State.

(d) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The body established under subsection (b) shall—

(1) plan and coordinate interagency international science and technology cooperative research and training activities and partnerships supported or managed by Federal agencies and work with other National Science and Technology Council committees to help plan and coordinate the international component of national science and technology priorities;

(2) establish Federal priorities and policies for aligning, as appropriate, international science and technology cooperative research and training activities and partnerships supported or managed by Federal agencies with the foreign policy goals of the United States;

(3) identify opportunities for new international science and technology cooperative research and training partnerships that advance both the science and technology and the foreign policy priorities of the United States;

(4) in carrying out paragraph (3), solicit input and recommendations from non-Federal science and technology stakeholders, including universities, scientific and professional societies, industry, and relevant organizations and institutions; and

(5) identify broad issues that influence the ability of United States scientists and engineers to collaborate with foreign counterparts, including barriers to collaboration and access to scientific information.

(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall transmit a report, to be updated annually, to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. The report shall also be made available to the public on the reporting agency’s website. The report shall contain a description of—

(1) the priorities and policies established under subsection (d)(2);

(2) the ongoing and new partnerships established since the last update to the report;

(3) the means by which stakeholder input was received, as well as summary views of stakeholder input; and

(4) the issues influencing the ability of United States scientists and engineers to collaborate with foreign counterparts.

**SEC. 106. SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL CONFERENCES.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Cooperative research and development activities, including collaboration between domestic and international government, industry, and academic science and engineering organizations, are important to promoting innovation and knowledge creation.

(2) Scientific and technical conferences and trade events support the sharing of information, processes, and data within the scientific and engineering communities.

(3) In hosting and attending scientific and technical conferences and trade events, Federal agencies—

(A) gain greater access to top researchers and to new and potentially transformative ideas;

(B) keep abreast of developments relevant to their respective missions, as is relevant for future program planning;

(C) help disseminate Federal research results;

(D) provide opportunities both for employee professional development and for recruiting new employees;

(E) participate in scientific peer review; and

(F) support the reputation, visibility, and leadership both of the specific agency and of the United States.

(4) For those Federal agencies that provide financial support for external research and development activities, participation in scientific and technical conferences can help ensure that funds are directed toward the most promising ideas, thereby maximizing the Federal investment.

(b) POLICY.—To the extent practicable given budget, security, and other constraints, the National Science Foundation, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and the Department of Energy, in addition to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, should support Federal employee and contractor attendance at scientific and technical conferences and trade events as relevant both to employee and contractor duties and to the agency’s mission.

(c) OVERSIGHT.—Consistent with other relevant law, the Federal agencies, through appropriate oversight, shall aim to minimize the costs to the Federal Government related to conference and trade event attendance, through methods such as—

(1) ensuring that related fees collected by the Federal agency help offset total costs to the Federal Government;

(2) developing or maintaining procedures for investigating unexpected increases in related costs; and

(3) strengthening policies and training relevant to conference and trade event planning and participation.

**Subtitle B—Reauthorization of the National Nanotechnology Initiative**

**SEC. 111. SHORT TITLE.**

This subtitle may be cited as the “National Nanotechnology Initiative Amendments Act of 2015”.

**SEC. 112. NATIONAL NANOTECHNOLOGY PROGRAM AMENDMENTS.**

The 21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7501 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 2—

(A) in subsection (c), by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

“(4) develop, and update every 3 years thereafter, a strategic plan to guide the activities described under subsection (b) that

specifies near-term and long-term objectives for the Program, the anticipated timeframe for achieving the near-term objectives, and the metrics to be used for assessing progress toward the objectives, and that describes—

“(A) how the Program will move results out of the laboratory and into applications for the benefit of society, including through cooperation and collaborations with nanotechnology research, development, and technology transition initiatives supported by the States; and

“(B) proposed research in areas of national importance in accordance with the requirements of section 116 of the National Nanotechnology Initiative Amendments Act of 2015;”;

(B) in subsection (d)—

(i) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5) as paragraphs (2) through (6), respectively;

(ii) by inserting before paragraph (2), as redesignated by clause (i), the following:

“(1) the Program budget, for the previous fiscal year, for each agency that participates in the Program, and for each program component area;”;

(iii) by amending paragraph (6), as redesignated by clause (i), to read as follows:

“(6) an assessment of how Federal agencies are implementing the plan described in subsection (c)(7) and a description of the amount of Small Business Innovative Research and Small Business Technology Transfer Research funds supporting the plan.”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) STANDARDS SETTING.—The agencies participating in the Program shall support the activities of committees involved in the development of standards for nanotechnology and may reimburse the travel costs of scientists and engineers who participate in activities of such committees.”;

(2) in section 3—

(A) by amending subsection (b)(1) to read as follows:

“(b) FUNDING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The operation of the National Nanotechnology Coordination Office shall be supported by funds from each agency participating in the Program.

“(2) PROPORTION.—The portion of such Office’s total budget provided by each agency for each fiscal year shall be in the same proportion as the agency’s share of the total budget for the Program for the previous fiscal year, as specified in the report required under section 2(d)(1).

“(3) EXCEPTION.—The Director of the National Nanotechnology Coordination Office may establish a minimum contribution or other exception to the requirement in paragraph (2) for participating agencies whose share of the total budget for the Program is below a threshold level, to be set by the Director.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) PUBLIC INFORMATION.—

“(1) DATABASE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The National Nanotechnology Coordination Office shall develop and maintain a database accessible by the public of projects funded under at least the Environmental, Health, and Safety program component area, or any successor program component area, including, to the extent practicable, a description of each project, its source of funding by agency, and its funding history.

“(B) ORGANIZATION.—Projects shall be grouped by major objective as defined by the research plan required under section 113(b) of the National Nanotechnology Initiative Amendments Act of 2015.

“(2) ACCESSIBLE FACILITIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The National Nanotechnology Coordination Office shall develop, maintain, and publicize information on nanotechnology facilities supported under the Program, and may include information on nanotechnology facilities supported by the States, that are accessible for use by individuals from academic institutions and from industry.

“(B) WEBSITES.—The National Nanotechnology Coordination Office shall maintain active web links to the websites for each of these facilities and shall work with each facility supported under the Program to ensure that each facility publishes on its respective website updated information on the terms and conditions for the use of the facility, a description of the capabilities of the instruments and equipment available for use at the facility, and a description of the technical support available to assist users of the facility.”;

(3) in section 4—

(A) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following: “The co-chairs of the Advisory Panel shall meet the qualifications of Panel membership required in subsection (b) and may be members of the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology. The Advisory Panel shall include members having specific qualifications tailored to enable it to carry out the requirements of subsection (c)(6).”;

(B) in subsection (c)—

(i) by striking paragraph (1); and

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (7) as paragraphs (1) through (6), respectively; and

(C) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

“(d) REPORTS.—The Advisory Panel shall report not less frequently than every 3 years, and, to the extent practicable, 1 year following each of the National Research Council triennial reviews required under section 5, to the President on its assessments under subsection (c) and its recommendations for ways to improve the Program. The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall transmit a copy of each report under this subsection to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives, and other appropriate committees of the Congress.”;

(4) by amending section 5 to read as follows:

**“SEC. 5. TRIENNIAL EXTERNAL REVIEW OF THE NATIONAL NANOTECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National Nanotechnology Coordination Office shall enter into an arrangement with the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a triennial review of the Program. The Director shall ensure that the arrangement with the National Research Council is concluded in order to allow sufficient time for the reporting requirements of subsection (b) to be satisfied. Each triennial review shall include an evaluation of the—

“(1) research priorities and technical content of the Program, including whether the balance of funding among program component areas, as designated according to section 2(c)(2), is appropriate;

“(2) Program’s scientific and technological accomplishments and its success in transferring technology to the private sector; and

“(3) adequacy of the Program’s activities addressing ethical, legal, environmental, and other appropriate societal concerns, including human health concerns.

“(b) PRIORITY REPORTS.—If the Director of the National Nanotechnology Coordination Office, working with the National Research

Council and with input from the Advisory Panel, determines that a more narrowly focused review of the Program is in the best interests of the Program, the Director may enter into such an arrangement with the National Research Council in lieu of a full review as required under subsection (a), but not more often than every second triennial review.

“(c) EVALUATION TO BE TRANSMITTED TO CONGRESS.—The National Research Council shall document the results of each triennial review carried out in accordance with this section in a report that includes any recommendations for changes to the Program’s objectives, technical content, or other policy or Program changes. Each report shall be submitted to the Director of the National Nanotechnology Coordination Office, who shall transmit it to the Advisory Panel, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives.”; and

(5) in section 10—

(A) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) NANOTECHNOLOGY.—The term ‘nanotechnology’ means the science and technology that will enable one to understand, measure, model, image, manipulate, and manufacture at the nanoscale, aimed at creating materials, devices, and systems with fundamentally new properties or functions.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) NANOSCALE.—The term ‘nanoscale’ means one or more dimensions of between approximately 1 and 100 nanometers.”.

**SEC. 113. SOCIETAL DIMENSIONS OF NANOTECHNOLOGY.**

(a) COORDINATOR FOR ENVIRONMENTAL, HEALTH, AND SAFETY RESEARCH.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall designate an associate director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy or other appropriate senior government official as the Coordinator for Environmental, Health, and Safety Research. The Coordinator shall be responsible for oversight of the coordination, planning, and budget prioritization of research and other activities related to environmental, health, safety, and other appropriate societal concerns related to nanotechnology. The responsibilities of the Coordinator shall include—

(1) ensuring that a research plan for the environmental, health, and safety research activities required under subsection (b) is developed, updated, and implemented and that the plan is responsive to the recommendations of the Advisory Panel established under section 4(a) of the 21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7503(a)); and

(2) encouraging and monitoring the efforts of the agencies participating in the Program to allocate the level of resources and management attention necessary to ensure that the environmental, health, safety, and other appropriate societal concerns related to nanotechnology are addressed under the Program.

(b) RESEARCH PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Coordinator for Environmental, Health, and Safety Research shall convene and chair a panel comprised of representatives from the agencies funding research activities under the Environmental, Health, and Safety program component area of the Program, or any successor program component area, and from such other agencies as the Coordinator considers necessary to develop, periodically update, and coordinate the implementation of a research plan for this program component area. Such panel may be a subgroup of the Nanoscale Science,

Engineering, and Technology Subcommittee of the National Science and Technology Council. In developing and updating the plan, the panel convened by the Coordinator shall solicit and be responsive to recommendations and advice from—

(A) the Advisory Panel established under section 4(a) of the 21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7503(a)); and

(B) the agencies responsible for environmental, health, and safety regulations associated with the production, use, and disposal of nanoscale materials and products.

(2) DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARDS.—The plan required under paragraph (1) shall include a description of how the Program will help to ensure the development of—

(A) standards related to nomenclature associated with engineered nanoscale materials;

(B) engineered nanoscale standard reference materials for environmental, health, and safety testing; and

(C) standards related to methods and procedures for detecting, measuring, monitoring, sampling, and testing engineered nanoscale materials for environmental, health, and safety impacts.

(3) COMPONENTS OF PLAN.—The plan required under paragraph (1) shall, with respect to activities described in paragraphs (1) and (2)—

(A) specify near-term research objectives and long-term research objectives;

(B) specify milestones associated with each near-term objective and the estimated time and resources required to reach each milestone;

(C) with respect to subparagraphs (A) and (B), describe the role of each agency carrying out or sponsoring research in order to meet the objectives specified under subparagraph (A) and to achieve the milestones specified under subparagraph (B); and

(D) specify the funding allocated to each major objective of the plan and the source of funding by agency for the current fiscal year.

(4) TRANSMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the plan required under paragraph (1) shall be transmitted to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives.

(5) UPDATING AND APPENDING TO REPORT.—The plan required under paragraph (1) shall be updated at least every 3 years and may be submitted as part of the report required under section 2(c)(4) of the 21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7501(c)(4)).

**SEC. 114. NANOTECHNOLOGY EDUCATION.**

(a) UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION PROGRAMS.—The Program shall support efforts to introduce nanoscale science, engineering, and technology into undergraduate science and engineering education through a variety of interdisciplinary approaches. Activities supported may include—

(1) development of courses of instruction or modules to existing courses;

(2) faculty professional development; and

(3) acquisition of equipment and instrumentation suitable for undergraduate education and research in nanotechnology.

(b) INTERAGENCY COORDINATION OF EDUCATION.—The Committee established under section 2(c) of the 21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7501(c)) shall coordinate, as appropriate, with the Committee established under section 101 of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 6621)

to prioritize, plan, and assess the educational activities supported under the Program.

(c) SOCIETAL DIMENSIONS IN NANOTECHNOLOGY EDUCATION ACTIVITIES.—Activities supported under the Education and Societal Dimensions program component area, or any successor program component area, that involve informal, precollege, or undergraduate nanotechnology education shall include education regarding the environmental, health and safety, and other societal aspects of nanotechnology.

(d) REMOTE ACCESS TO NANOTECHNOLOGY FACILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Agencies supporting nanotechnology research facilities as part of the Program shall require the entities that operate such facilities to allow access via the Internet, and support the costs associated with the provision of such access, by secondary school students and teachers, to instruments and equipment within such facilities for educational purposes. The agencies may waive this requirement for cases when particular facilities would be inappropriate for educational purposes or the costs for providing such access would be prohibitive.

(2) PROCEDURES.—The agencies identified in paragraph (1) shall require the entities that operate such nanotechnology research facilities to establish and publish procedures, guidelines, and conditions for the submission and approval of applications for the use of the facilities for the purpose identified in paragraph (1) and shall authorize personnel who operate the facilities to provide necessary technical support to students and teachers.

#### SEC. 115. TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER.

(a) PROTOTYPING.—

(1) ACCESS TO FACILITIES.—In accordance with section 2(b)(7) of 21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7501(b)(7)), the agencies supporting nanotechnology research facilities as part of the Program shall provide access to such facilities to companies for the purpose of assisting the companies in the development of prototypes of nanoscale products, devices, or processes (or products, devices, or processes enabled by nanotechnology) for determining proof of concept. The agencies shall publicize the availability of these facilities and encourage their use by companies as provided for in this section. The agencies may waive this requirement for academic facilities for which the costs of providing such access would be prohibitive.

(2) PROCEDURES.—The agencies identified in paragraph (1)—

(A) shall establish and publish procedures, guidelines, and conditions for the submission and approval of applications for use of nanotechnology facilities;

(B) shall publish descriptions of the capabilities of facilities available for use under this subsection, including the availability of technical support; and

(C) may waive recovery, require full recovery, or require partial recovery of the costs associated with use of the facilities for projects under this subsection.

(3) SELECTION AND CRITERIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In cases when less than full cost recovery is required pursuant to paragraph (2)(C), projects provided access to nanotechnology facilities in accordance with this subsection shall be selected through a competitive, merit-based process, and the criteria for the selection of such projects shall include at a minimum the readiness of the project for technology demonstration.

(B) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.—The agencies may give special consideration in selecting projects to applications that are relevant to important national needs or requirements.

(b) COLLABORATION WITH INDUSTRY.—The Program shall coordinate with industry from all industrial sectors that would benefit from applications of nanotechnology by—

(1) enhancing communication of information related to nanotechnology innovation, including information about research, education and training, manufacturing issues, and market-driven needs;

(2) advancing and accelerating the creation of new products and manufacturing processes derived from discovery at the nanoscale by working with industry, including small and medium-sized manufacturers;

(3) developing innovative methods for transferring nanotechnology products and processes from Federal agencies to industry; and

(4) facilitating industry-led partnerships between the Program and industry sectors, including regional partnerships.

(c) COORDINATION WITH STATE, REGIONAL, AND LOCAL INITIATIVES.—Section 2(b)(5) of the 21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7501(b)(5)) is amended to read as follows:

“(5) ensuring United States global leadership in the development and application of nanotechnology, including through the coordination and leveraging of Federal investments with nanotechnology research, development, and technology transition initiatives supported by the States and regions across the country;”

#### SEC. 116. SIGNATURE INITIATIVES IN AREAS OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Program shall include support for nanotechnology research and development activities directed toward topical and application areas that have the potential for significant contributions to national economic competitiveness and for other significant societal benefits. The activities supported shall be designed to advance the development of research discoveries by demonstrating technical solutions to important national challenges. The Advisory Panel shall make recommendations to the Program for candidate research and development areas for support under this section.

(b) CHARACTERISTICS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Research and development activities under this section shall—

(A) include projects selected on the basis of applications for support through a competitive, merit-based process;

(B) involve collaborations among researchers in academic institutions and industry, and may involve nonprofit research institutions and Federal laboratories, as appropriate;

(C) when possible, leverage Federal investments through collaboration with related State initiatives; and

(D) include a plan for fostering the transfer of research discoveries and the results of technology demonstration activities to industry for commercial development.

(2) JOINT SOLICITATIONS.—Projects supported under this section shall include projects for which determination of the requirements for applications, review and selection of applications for support, and subsequent funding of projects shall be carried out by a collaboration of no fewer than 2 agencies participating in the Program. In selecting applications for support, agencies may, as appropriate, give special consideration to projects that include cost sharing from non-Federal sources.

(3) INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH CENTERS.—Research and development activities under this section may be supported through interdisciplinary nanotechnology research centers, as authorized by section 2(b)(4) of the 21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7501(b)(4)), that

are organized to investigate basic research questions and carry out technology demonstration activities in areas such as those identified in subsection (a).

(c) REPORT.—Reports required under section 2(d) of the 21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7501(d)) shall include a description of research and development areas supported in accordance with this section.

#### SEC. 117. NANOMANUFACTURING RESEARCH.

(a) RESEARCH AREAS.—The Program shall include research on—

(1) the development of instrumentation and tools required for the rapid characterization of nanoscale materials and for monitoring of nanoscale manufacturing processes; and

(2) approaches and techniques for scaling the synthesis of new nanoscale materials to achieve industrial-level production rates.

(b) GREEN NANOTECHNOLOGY.—Interdisciplinary research centers supported under the Program in accordance with section 2(b)(4) of the 21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7501(b)(4)) that are focused on nanomanufacturing research shall include as part of the activities of such centers—

(1) research on methods and approaches to develop environmentally benign nanoscale products and nanoscale manufacturing processes, taking into consideration relevant findings and results of research supported under the Environmental, Health, and Safety program component area, or any successor program component area;

(2) fostering the transfer of the results of such research to industry; and

(3) providing for the education of scientists and engineers through interdisciplinary studies in the principles and techniques for the design and development of environmentally benign nanoscale products and processes.

#### SEC. 118. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle, terms that are defined in section 10 of the 21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7509) have the meaning given those terms in that section.

##### Subtitle C—Engineering Biology

#### SEC. 121. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Engineering Biology Research and Development Act of 2015”.

#### SEC. 122. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Cellular and molecular processes may be used, mimicked, or redesigned to develop new products, processes, and systems that improve societal well-being, strengthen national security, and contribute to the economy.

(2) Engineering biology relies on scientists and engineers with a diverse and unique set of skills combining the biological, physical, and information sciences and engineering.

(3) Long-term research and development is necessary to create breakthroughs in engineering biology. Such research and development requires government investment as the benefits are too distant or uncertain for industry to support alone.

(4) The Federal Government can play an important role by facilitating the development of tools and technologies to further advance engineering biology, including multiple user facilities that the Federal Government is uniquely able to support.

(5) Since other countries are investing significant resources in engineering biology, the United States is at risk of losing its competitive lead in this emerging area if it does not invest the necessary resources and have a national strategy.

(6) A National Engineering Biology Initiative can serve to establish new research directions and technology goals, improve interagency coordination and planning processes, drive technology transfer, and help ensure optimal returns on the Federal investment.

#### SEC. 123. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle—

(1) the term “Advisory Committee” means the advisory committee designated under section 125;

(2) the term “biomanufacturing” means the manufacturing of products using biological manufacturing technologies;

(3) the term “engineering biology” means the science and engineering of cellular and molecular processes to advance fundamental understanding of complex natural systems and to develop new and advance existing products, processes, and systems that will contribute significantly to societal well-being, national security, and the economy;

(4) the term “Interagency Committee” means the interagency committee designated under section 124(e); and

(5) the term “Program” means the National Engineering Biology Research and Development Program established under section 124.

#### SEC. 124. NATIONAL ENGINEERING BIOLOGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall implement a National Engineering Biology Research and Development Program to advance societal well-being, national security, and economic productivity and competitiveness through—

(1) advancing areas of research at the intersection of the biological, physical, and information sciences and engineering;

(2) supporting social science research that advances the field of engineering biology and contributes to the adoption of new products, processes, and technologies;

(3) expanding the number of researchers, educators, and students with engineering biology training;

(4) accelerating the translation and commercialization of engineering biology research and development by the private sector; and

(5) improving the interagency planning and coordination of Federal Government activities related to engineering biology.

(b) PROGRAM ACTIVITIES.—The activities of the Program shall include—

(1) sustained support for engineering biology research and development through—

(A) grants to individual investigators and interdisciplinary teams of investigators;

(B) projects funded under joint solicitations by a collaboration of no fewer than two agencies participating in the Program; and

(C) interdisciplinary research centers that are organized to investigate basic research questions and carry out technology development and demonstration activities;

(2) education and training of undergraduate and graduate students in research at the intersection of biological, physical, and information sciences and engineering;

(3) activities to develop robust mechanisms for tracking and quantifying the outputs and economic benefits of engineering biology; and

(4) activities to accelerate the translation and commercialization of new products, processes, and technologies by—

(A) identifying precompetitive research opportunities;

(B) facilitating public-private partnerships in engineering biology research and development;

(C) connecting researchers, graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows with entre-

preneurship education and training opportunities; and

(D) supporting proof of concept activities and the formation of startup companies including through programs such as the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program.

(c) EXPANDING PARTICIPATION.—The Program shall include, to the maximum extent practicable, outreach to primarily undergraduate and minority-serving institutions about Program opportunities, and shall encourage the development of research collaborations between research-intensive universities and primarily undergraduate and minority-serving institutions.

(d) ETHICAL, LEGAL, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND SOCIETAL ISSUES.—Program activities shall take into account ethical, legal, environmental, and other appropriate societal issues, including the need for safeguards and monitoring systems to protect society against the unintended release of engineered materials produced, by—

(1) supporting research, including in the social sciences, and other activities addressing ethical, legal, environmental, and other appropriate societal issues related to engineering biology, including integrating research on these topics with the research and development in engineering biology, and ensuring that the results of such research are widely disseminated, including through interdisciplinary engineering biology research centers described in subsection (b)(1)(C); and

(2) ensuring, through the agencies and departments that participate in the Program, that public input and outreach are integrated into the Program by the convening of regular and ongoing public discussions through mechanisms such as citizen panels, consensus conferences, and educational events, as appropriate.

(e) INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE.—The President shall designate an interagency committee on engineering biology, which shall include representatives from the Office of Science and Technology Policy, the National Science Foundation, the Department of Energy, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the Environmental Protection Agency, and any other agency that the President considers appropriate. The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall select a chairperson from among the members of the Interagency Committee. The Interagency Committee shall oversee the planning, management, and coordination of the Program. The Interagency Committee shall—

(1) provide for interagency coordination of Federal engineering biology research, development, and other activities undertaken pursuant to the Program;

(2) establish and periodically update goals and priorities for the Program;

(3) develop, not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this subtitle, and update every 5 years, a strategic plan to guide the activities of the Program and meet the goals and priorities established under paragraph (2) and describe—

(A) the Program’s support for long-term funding for interdisciplinary engineering biology research and development;

(B) the Program’s support for education and public outreach activities;

(C) the Program’s support for research and other activities on ethical, legal, environmental, and other appropriate societal issues related to engineering biology; and

(D) how the Program will move results out of the laboratory and into application for the benefit of society and United States competitiveness;

(4) propose an annually coordinated interagency budget for the Program that will ensure the maintenance of a robust engineering biology research and development portfolio and ensure that the balance of funding across the Program is sufficient to meet the goals and priorities established for the Program;

(5) develop a plan to utilize Federal programs, such as the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, in support of the goals described in subsection (b)(4); and

(6) in carrying out its responsibilities under this section, take into consideration the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the results of the workshop convened under section 126, existing reports on related topics, and the views of academic, State, industry, and other appropriate groups.

(f) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Interagency Committee shall prepare an annual report, to be submitted to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate not later than 90 days after submission of the President’s annual budget request, that includes—

(1) the Program budget for the fiscal year to which such budget request applies, and for the then current fiscal year, including a breakout of spending for each agency participating in the Program, and for the development and acquisition of any research facilities and instrumentation; and

(2) an assessment of how Federal agencies are implementing the plan described in subsection (e)(5), and a description of the amount and number of Small Business Innovation Research and Small Business Technology Transfer awards made in support of the Program.

#### SEC. 125. ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall designate an advisory committee on engineering biology research and development with at least 12 members, including representatives of research and academic institutions, industry, and nongovernmental entities, who are qualified to provide advice on the Program.

(b) ASSESSMENT.—The Advisory Committee shall assess—

(1) progress made in implementing the Program;

(2) the need to revise the Program;

(3) the balance of activities and funding across the Program;

(4) whether the Program priorities and goals developed by the Interagency Committee are helping to maintain United States leadership in engineering biology;

(5) the management, coordination, implementation, and activities of the Program; and

(6) whether ethical, legal, environmental, and other appropriate societal issues are adequately addressed by the Program.

(c) REPORTS.—The Advisory Committee shall report within 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and thereafter not less frequently than once every 5 years, to the President, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, on its findings of the assessment carried out under this section and its recommendations for ways to improve the Program.

(d) FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT APPLICATION.—Section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Advisory Committee.

**SEC. 126. EXTERNAL REVIEW OF ETHICAL, LEGAL, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND SOCIETAL ISSUES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall enter into an agreement with the National Academies to convene a workshop to review the ethical, legal, environmental, and other appropriate societal issues related to engineering biology research and development. The goals of the workshop shall be to—

- (1) assess the current research on such issues;
- (2) evaluate the research gaps relating to such issues; and
- (3) provide recommendations on how the Program can address the research needs identified.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall transmit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a summary report containing the findings of the workshop convened under this section.

**SEC. 127. AGENCY ACTIVITIES.**

(a) NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.—As part of the Program, the National Science Foundation shall—

- (1) support basic research at the intersection of the biological, physical, and information sciences and engineering through individual grants and through interdisciplinary research centers;
- (2) support research on the environmental and social effects of engineering biology;
- (3) provide research instrumentation support for engineering biology disciplines; and
- (4) award grants, on a competitive basis, to enable institutions to support graduate students and postdoctoral fellows who perform some of their engineering biology research in an industry setting.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.—As part of the Program, the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall—

- (1) establish a bioscience research program to advance the development of standard reference materials and measurements and to create new data tools, techniques, and processes necessary to advance engineering biology and biomanufacturing;
- (2) provide access to user facilities with advanced or unique equipment, services, materials, and other resources to industry, institutions of higher education, nonprofit organizations, and government agencies to perform research and testing; and
- (3) provide technical expertise to inform the development of guidelines and safeguards for new products, processes, and systems of engineering biology.

(c) DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.—As part of the Program, the Secretary of Energy shall—

- (1) conduct and support basic research, development, demonstration, and commercial application activities in engineering biology disciplines, including in the areas of synthetic biology, advanced biofuel development, biobased materials, and environmental remediation; and
- (2) provide access to user facilities with advanced or unique equipment, services, materials, and other resources, as appropriate, to industry, institutions of higher education, nonprofit organizations, and government agencies to perform research and testing.

(d) NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION.—As part of the Program, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall—

- (1) conduct and support basic and applied research in engineering biology fields, in-

cluding in the field of synthetic biology, and related to Earth and space sciences, aeronautics, space technology, and space exploration and experimentation, consistent with the priorities established in the National Academies' decadal surveys; and

- (2) award grants, on a competitive basis, that enable institutions to support graduate students and postdoctoral fellows who perform some of their engineering biology research in an industry setting.

(e) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.—As part of the Program, the Environmental Protection Agency shall support research on how products, processes, and systems of engineering biology will affect the environment.

**TITLE II—STEM EDUCATION AND DIVERSITY****Subtitle A—STEM Education and Workforce****SEC. 201. SENSE OF CONGRESS.**

It is the sense of Congress that the National Science and Technology Council's Committee on STEM Education (CoSTEM), established under section 101 of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 6621), has taken important initial steps toward developing and implementing a strategic plan for Federal investments in STEM education, but that more work must be done to solicit and take into account views and experience from stakeholders who help implement or are the beneficiaries of Federal STEM programs across the Nation. It is further the sense of Congress that science mission agencies such as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the Department of Energy are essential partners in contributing to the goals and implementation of a Federal STEM strategic plan because such agencies have unique scientific and technological facilities as well as highly trained scientists who are eager and able to contribute to improved STEM learning outcomes in their own communities.

**SEC. 202. COORDINATION OF FEDERAL STEM EDUCATION.**

Section 101 of America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 6621) is amended—

- (1) in subsection (b)(5)—
  - (A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (D) as subparagraphs (B) through (E), respectively; and
  - (B) by inserting before subparagraph (B), as so redesignated by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, the following new subparagraph:
 

“(A) have as its primary goal to leverage the limited STEM education funding and other assets, including intellectual capital, invested by Federal STEM agencies for maximum benefit to student learning;”;
  - (2) by striking the second subsection (b);
  - (3) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (f);
  - (4) by inserting after subsection (b), the following new subsections:
 

“(c) COORDINATOR FOR STEM EDUCATION.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall designate an associate director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy as the Coordinator for STEM Education. When an appropriate associate director is not available, the Director may designate another appropriate senior government official as the Coordinator for STEM Education. The Coordinator shall chair the committee established under subsection (a). The Coordinator shall, with the assistance of appropriate senior officials from other Committee on STEM Education agencies, ensure that the requirements of this section are satisfied.

“(d) STAKEHOLDER INPUT.—

“(1) INTERAGENCY CONSOLIDATION.—For all agency proposals to consolidate or transfer

budgets or functions for STEM education programs or activities between agencies, at the time of submission of such proposals to Congress, the Director shall report to Congress on activities undertaken by the Office of Science and Technology Policy or by relevant agencies to take into consideration relevant input from the STEM Education Advisory Panel established under subsection (e) and other relevant education stakeholders.

“(2) INTRAAGENCY CONSOLIDATION.—For all agency proposals to internally consolidate or terminate STEM education programs with budgets exceeding \$10,000,000, at the time of submission of such proposals to Congress, the head of the relevant agency shall report to Congress on activities to solicit and take into consideration input on such proposals from the STEM Education Advisory Panel established under subsection (e) and other relevant education stakeholders.

“(e) STEM EDUCATION ADVISORY PANEL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall establish or designate a STEM Education Advisory Panel. The cochair of the Advisory Panel shall meet the qualifications of Panel membership required in paragraph (2) and may be members of the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology.

“(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—The Advisory Panel established or designated by the President under this subsection shall consist of members from academic institutions, industry, informal education providers, nonprofit STEM education organizations, foundations, and local and State educational agencies. Members of the Advisory Panel shall be qualified to provide advice on Federal STEM education programs, best practices in STEM education, assessment of STEM education programs, STEM education standards, industry needs for STEM graduates, and public-private STEM education partnerships.

“(3) DUTIES.—The Advisory Panel shall advise the President and the committee established under subsection (a) on implementing the Federal STEM education strategic plan required under subsection (b)(5) and coordinating Federal STEM programs with non-governmental STEM initiatives and State and local educational agencies.

“(4) REPORT.—The Advisory Panel shall report, not more than 1 year after enactment of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015, on options for evidence-based implementation of the Federal STEM strategic plan required under subsection (b)(5), including options for designating certain agencies as coordinating leads for different priority investment areas, timelines for implementation, and specific management, budget, policy, or other steps that agencies must take to effectively implement the strategic plan.

“(5) SUNSET.—The authorization for the Advisory Panel established under this subsection shall expire 3 years after the date of enactment of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015.”; and

(5) in subsection (f), as so redesignated by paragraph (3) of this section—

- (A) by inserting “progress made in implementing” after “describing”;
- (B) by striking paragraph (3); and
- (C) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively.

**SEC. 203. GRAND CHALLENGES IN EDUCATION RESEARCH.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National Science Foundation and the Secretary of Education shall collaborate in—

- (1) identifying, prioritizing, and developing strategies to address grand challenges in research and development, including assessment, on the teaching and learning of STEM at the pre-K–12 level, in formal and informal settings, for diverse learning populations, including individuals identified in section 33 or

34 of the Science and Engineering Equal Opportunities Act (42 U.S.C. 1885a or 1885b); and

(2) ensuring the dissemination and promoting the utilization of the results of such research and development.

(b) **STAKEHOLDER INPUT.**—In identifying the grand challenges under subsection (a), the Director and the Secretary shall—

(1) take into consideration critical research gaps identified in existing reports, including reports by the National Academies, on the teaching and learning of STEM at the pre-K–12 level in formal and informal settings; and

(2) solicit input from a wide range of stakeholders, including officials from State educational agencies and local educational agencies, STEM teachers, STEM education researchers, scientific and engineering societies, STEM faculty at institutions of higher education, informal STEM education providers, businesses with a large STEM workforce, and other stakeholders in the teaching and learning of STEM at the pre-K–12 level, and may enter into an arrangement with the National Research Council for these purposes.

(c) **TOPICS TO CONSIDER.**—In identifying the grand challenges under subsection (a), the Director and the Secretary shall, at a minimum, consider research and development on—

(1) scalability, sustainability, and replication of successful STEM activities, programs, and models, in formal and informal environments;

(2) model systems that support improved teaching and learning of STEM across entire local educational agencies and States, including rural areas, and encompassing and integrating the teaching and learning of STEM in formal and informal venues;

(3) implementation of new State mathematics and science standards;

(4) what makes a STEM teacher effective and STEM teacher professional development effective, including development of tools and methodologies to measure STEM teacher effectiveness;

(5) cyber-enabled and other technology tools for teaching and learning, including massive open online courses;

(6) STEM teaching and learning in informal environments, including development of tools and methodologies for assessing STEM teaching and learning in informal environments; and

(7) how integrating engineering with mathematics and science education may—

(A) improve student learning of mathematics and science;

(B) increase student interest and persistence in STEM; or

(C) improve student understanding of engineering design principles and of the built world.

(d) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director and the Secretary shall report to Congress with a description of—

(1) the grand challenges identified pursuant to this section;

(2) the role of each agency in supporting research and development activities to address the grand challenges;

(3) the common metrics that will be used to assess progress toward meeting the grand challenges;

(4) plans for periodically updating the grand challenges;

(5) how the agencies will disseminate and promote the utilization of the results of research and development activities carried out under this section to STEM education practitioners, to other Federal agencies that support STEM programs and activities, and to non-Federal funders of STEM education; and

(6) how the agencies will support implementation of best practices identified by the research and development activities.

**SEC. 204. NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL REPORT ON STEAM EDUCATION.**

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Talent Expansion Program set an important goal of increasing the number of students graduating with associate or baccalaureate degrees in the STEM fields, and this should continue to be a focus of that program;

(2) to further the goal of the STEM Talent Expansion Program, as well as STEM education promotion programs across the Federal Government, innovative approaches are needed to enhance STEM education in the United States;

(3) STEAM, which is the integration of arts and design, broadly defined, into Federal STEM programming, research, and innovation activities, is a method-validated approach to maintaining the competitiveness of the United States in both workforce and innovation and to increasing and broadening students' engagement in the STEM fields;

(4) STEM graduates need more than technical skills to thrive in the 21st century workforce; they also need to be creative, innovative, collaborative, and able to think critically;

(5) STEAM should be recognized as providing value to STEM research and education programs across Federal agencies, without supplanting the focus on the traditional STEM disciplines;

(6) Federal agencies should work cooperatively on interdisciplinary initiatives to support the integration of arts and design into STEM, and current interdisciplinary programs should be strengthened;

(7) Federal agencies should allow for STEAM activities under current and future grant-making and other activities; and

(8) Federal agencies should clarify that, where appropriate, data collection, surveys, and reporting on STEM activities and grant-making should examine activities that involve cross-disciplinary learning that integrates specialized skills and expertise from both art and science.

(b) **NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL WORKSHOP.**—The National Science Foundation shall enter into an arrangement with the National Research Council to conduct a workshop on the integration of arts and design with STEM education. The workshop shall include a discussion of—

(1) how the perspectives and experience of artists and designers may contribute to the advancement of science, engineering, and innovation, for example through the development of visualization aids for large experimental and computational data sets;

(2) how arts and design-based education experiences might support formal and informal STEM education at the pre-K–12 level, particularly in fostering creativity and risk taking, and encourage more students to pursue STEM studies, including students from groups historically underrepresented in STEM;

(3) how the teaching of design principles can be better integrated into undergraduate engineering and other STEM curricula, including in the first two years of undergraduate studies, to enhance student capacity for creativity and innovation and improve student retention, including students from groups historically underrepresented in STEM; and

(4) what additional steps, if any, Federal science agencies should take to promote the inclusion of arts and design principles in their respective STEM programs and activities in order to improve student STEM learn-

ing outcomes, increase the recruitment and retention of students into STEM studies and careers, and increase innovation in the United States.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the National Research Council shall submit a report to Congress providing a summary description of the discussion and findings from the workshop required under subsection (b).

**SEC. 205. ENGAGING FEDERAL SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS IN STEM EDUCATION.**

The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall develop guidance for Federal agencies to increase opportunities and training, as appropriate, for Federal scientists and engineers to participate in STEM engagement activities through their respective agencies and in their communities.

**Subtitle B—Broadening Participation in STEM**

**SEC. 211. SHORT TITLE.**

This subtitle may be cited as the “STEM Opportunities Act of 2015”.

**SEC. 212. PURPOSE.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, acting through the Federal science agencies, shall carry out programs and activities with the purpose of ensuring that Federal science agencies and institutions of higher education receiving Federal research and development funding are fully engaging their entire talent pool.

(b) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of this subtitle are as follows:

(1) To promote research on and increase understanding of the participation and trajectories of women and underrepresented minorities in STEM careers at institutions of higher education and Federal science agencies, including Federal laboratories.

(2) To raise awareness within Federal science agencies, including Federal laboratories, and institutions of higher education about cultural and institutional barriers limiting the recruitment, retention, promotion, and other indicators of participation and achievement of women and underrepresented minorities in academic and Government STEM research careers at all levels.

(3) To identify, disseminate, and implement best practices at Federal science agencies, including Federal laboratories, and at institutions of higher education to remove or reduce cultural and institutional barriers limiting the recruitment, retention, and success of women and underrepresented minorities in academic and Government STEM research careers.

(4) To provide grants to institutions of higher education to recruit, retain, and advance STEM faculty members from underrepresented minority groups and to implement or expand reforms in undergraduate STEM education in order to increase the number of students from underrepresented minority groups receiving degrees in these fields.

**SEC. 213. FEDERAL SCIENCE AGENCY POLICIES FOR CAREGIVERS.**

(a) **OSTP GUIDANCE.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall provide guidance to Federal science agencies to establish policies that—

(1) apply to all—

(A) intramural and extramural research awards; and

(B) primary investigators who have caregiving responsibilities, including care for a newborn or newly adopted child and care for an immediate family member who is sick or disabled; and

(2) provide—

(A) flexibility in timing for the initiation of approved research awards;

(B) no-cost extensions of research awards;  
 (C) grant supplements as appropriate to research awards for research technicians or equivalent to sustain research activities; and  
 (D) any other appropriate accommodations at the discretion of the head of each agency.

(b) UNIFORMITY OF GUIDANCE.—In providing such guidance, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall encourage uniformity and consistency in the policies across all agencies.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF POLICIES.—Consistent with the guidance provided under this section, Federal science agencies shall maintain or develop and implement policies for caregivers and shall broadly disseminate such policies to current and potential grantees.

(d) DATA ON USAGE.—Federal science agencies shall—

(1) collect data on the usage of the policies under subsection (c), by gender, at both institutions of higher education and Federal laboratories; and

(2) report such data on an annual basis to the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy in such form as required by the Director.

**SEC. 214. COLLECTION AND REPORTING OF DATA ON FEDERAL RESEARCH GRANTS.**

(a) COLLECTION OF DATA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each Federal science agency shall collect standardized record-level annual information on demographics, primary field, award type, budget request, funding outcome, and awarded budget for all applications for merit-reviewed research and development grants to institutions of higher education and Federal laboratories supported by that agency.

(2) UNIFORMITY AND STANDARDIZATION.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall establish a policy to ensure uniformity and standardization of the data collection required under paragraph (1).

(3) RECORD-LEVEL DATA.—

(A) REQUIREMENT.—On an annual basis, beginning with the deadline under subparagraph (C), each Federal science agency shall submit to the Director of the National Science Foundation record-level data collected under paragraph (1) in the form required by such Director.

(B) PREVIOUS DATA.—As part of the first submission under subparagraph (A), each Federal science agency, to the extent practicable, shall also submit comparable record-level data for the 5 years preceding the deadline under subparagraph (C).

(C) DEADLINE.—The deadline under this paragraph is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) REPORTING OF DATA.—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall publish statistical summary data collected under this section, disaggregated and cross-tabulated by race, ethnicity, gender, age, and years since completion of doctoral degree, including in conjunction with the National Science Foundation's report required by section 37 of the Science and Technology Equal Opportunities Act (42 U.S.C. 1885d; Public Law 96-516).

**SEC. 215. POLICIES FOR REVIEW OF FEDERAL RESEARCH GRANTS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in collaboration with the Director of the National Science Foundation, shall identify information and best practices useful for educating program officers and members of standing peer review committees at Federal science agencies about—

(1) research on implicit bias based on gender, race, or ethnicity; and

(2) methods to minimize the effect of such bias in the review of extramural and intramural Federal research grants.

(b) GUIDANCE TO ALL FEDERAL SCIENCE AGENCIES.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall disseminate the information and best practices identified in subsection (a) to all Federal science agencies and provide guidance as necessary on policies to implement such practices within each agency.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF POLICIES.—Consistent with the guidance provided in subsection (b), Federal science agencies shall maintain or develop and implement policies and practices to minimize the effects of implicit bias in the review of extramural and intramural Federal research grants.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall report to Congress on what steps all Federal science agencies have taken to implement policies and practices to minimize the effects of bias in the review of extramural and intramural Federal research grants.

**SEC. 216. COLLECTION OF DATA ON DEMOGRAPHICS OF FACULTY.**

(a) COLLECTION OF DATA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and at least every 5 years thereafter, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall carry out a survey to collect institution-level data on the demographics of STEM faculty, by broad fields of STEM, at different types of institutions of higher education.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—To the extent practicable, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall consider, by gender, race, ethnicity, citizenship status, age, and years since completion of doctoral degree—

(A) the number and percentage of faculty;

(B) the number and percentage of faculty at each rank;

(C) the number and percentage of faculty who are in nontenure-track positions, including teaching and research;

(D) the number and percentage of faculty who are reviewed for promotion, including tenure, and the percentage of that number who are promoted, including being awarded tenure;

(E) faculty years in rank;

(F) the number and percentage of faculty to leave tenure-track positions;

(G) the number and percentage of faculty hired, by rank; and

(H) the number and percentage of faculty in leadership positions.

(b) EXISTING SURVEYS.—The Director of the National Science Foundation—

(1) may carry out the requirements under subsection (a) by collaborating with statistical centers at other Federal agencies to modify or expand, as necessary, existing Federal surveys of higher education; or

(2) may award a grant or contract to an institution of higher education or other nonprofit organization to design and carry out the requirements under subsection (a).

(c) REPORTING DATA.—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall publish statistical summary data collected under this section, including as part of the National Science Foundation's report required by section 37 of the Science and Technology Equal Opportunities Act (42 U.S.C. 1885d; Public Law 96-516).

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Director of the National Science Foundation \$3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2018 to develop and carry out the initial survey required in subsection (a).

**SEC. 217. CULTURAL AND INSTITUTIONAL BARRIERS TO EXPANDING THE ACADEMIC AND FEDERAL STEM WORKFORCE.**

(a) BEST PRACTICES AT INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT OF GUIDANCE.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall develop written guidance for institutions of higher education on the best practices for—

(A) conducting periodic campus culture surveys of STEM departments, with a particular focus on identifying any cultural or institutional barriers to or successful enablers for the recruitment, retention, promotion, and other indicators of participation and achievement, of women and underrepresented minorities in STEM degree programs and academic STEM careers; and

(B) providing educational opportunities, including workshops as described in subsection (c), for STEM faculty and administrators to learn about current research on implicit bias in recruitment, evaluation, and promotion of faculty in STEM and recruitment and evaluation of undergraduate and graduate students in STEM degree programs.

(2) EXISTING GUIDANCE.—In developing the guidance in paragraph (1), the Director of the National Science Foundation shall utilize guidance already developed by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Department of Energy, and the Department of Education.

(3) DISSEMINATION OF GUIDANCE.—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall broadly disseminate the guidance developed in paragraph (1) to institutions of higher education that receive Federal research funding.

(4) REPORTS TO THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall develop a policy that—

(A) applies to, at a minimum, the institutions classified under the Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research Carnegie Classification on January 1, 2015, as a doctorate-granting university with a very high level of research activity; and

(B) requires each institution identified in subparagraph (A), not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, to report to the Director of the National Science Foundation on activities and policies developed and implemented based on the guidance provided in paragraph (1).

(b) BEST PRACTICES AT FEDERAL LABORATORIES.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT OF GUIDANCE.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall develop written guidance for Federal laboratories to develop and implement practices and policies to—

(A) conduct periodic laboratorywide culture surveys of research personnel at all levels, with a particular focus on identifying any cultural or institutional barriers to the recruitment, retention, and success of women and underrepresented minorities in STEM careers at Federal laboratories; and

(B) provide educational opportunities, including workshops as described in subsection (c), for STEM research personnel to learn about current research in implicit bias in recruitment, evaluation, and promotion of research personnel at Federal laboratories.

(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF POLICIES.—Consistent with the guidance provided in paragraph (1), Federal science agencies with Federal laboratories shall maintain or develop and implement policies for their respective Federal laboratories.

(c) WORKSHOPS TO ADDRESS CULTURAL BARRIERS TO EXPANDING THE ACADEMIC AND FEDERAL STEM WORKFORCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall recommend a uniform policy for Federal science agencies to carry out a program

of workshops that educate STEM department chairs at institutions of higher education, senior managers at Federal laboratories, and other federally funded researchers about methods that minimize the effects of implicit bias in the career advancement, including hiring, tenure, promotion, and selection for any honor based in part on the recipient's research record, of academic and Federal STEM researchers.

(2) **INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.**—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall ensure that workshops supported under this subsection are coordinated across Federal science agencies and jointly supported as appropriate.

(3) **MINIMIZING COSTS.**—To the extent practicable, workshops shall be held in conjunction with national or regional STEM disciplinary meetings to minimize costs associated with participant travel.

(4) **PRIORITY FIELDS FOR ACADEMIC PARTICIPANTS.**—In considering the participation of STEM department chairs and other academic researchers, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall prioritize workshops for the broad fields of STEM in which the national rate of representation of women among tenured or tenure-track faculty or non-faculty researchers at doctorate-granting institutions of higher education is less than 25 percent, according to the most recent data available from the National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics.

(5) **ORGANIZATIONS ELIGIBLE TO CARRY OUT WORKSHOPS.**—Federal science agencies may carry out the program of workshops under this subsection by making grants to eligible organizations. In addition to any other organizations made eligible by the Federal science agencies, the following organizations are eligible for grants under this subsection:

(A) Nonprofit scientific and professional societies and organizations that represent one or more STEM disciplines.

(B) Nonprofit organizations that have the primary mission of advancing the participation of women or underrepresented minorities in STEM.

(6) **CHARACTERISTICS OF WORKSHOPS.**—The workshops shall have the following characteristics:

(A) Invitees to workshops shall include at least—

(i) the chairs of departments in the relevant STEM discipline or disciplines from at least the top 50 institutions of higher education, as determined by the amount of Federal research and development funds obligated to each institution of higher education in the prior year based on data available from the National Science Foundation; and

(ii) in the case of Federal laboratories, individuals with personnel management responsibilities comparable to those of an institution of higher education department chair.

(B) Activities at the workshops shall include research presentations and interactive discussions or other activities that increase the awareness of the existence of implicit bias in recruitment, hiring, tenure review, promotion, and other forms of formal recognition of individual achievement for faculty and other federally funded STEM researchers and shall provide strategies to overcome such bias.

(C) Research presentations and other workshop programs, as appropriate, shall include a discussion of the unique challenges faced by underrepresented subgroups, including minority women, minority men, and first generation minority graduates in research.

(D) Workshop programs shall include information on best practices for mentoring undergraduate and graduate women and underrepresented minority students.

(7) **DATA ON WORKSHOPS.**—Any proposal for funding by an organization seeking to carry out a workshop under this subsection shall include a description of how such organization will—

(A) collect data on the rates of attendance by invitees in workshops, including information on the home institution and department of attendees, and the rank of faculty attendees;

(B) conduct attitudinal surveys on workshop attendees before and after the workshops; and

(C) collect follow-up data on any relevant institutional policy or practice changes reported by attendees not later than 1 year after attendance in such a workshop.

(8) **REPORT TO NSF.**—Organizations receiving funding to carry out workshops under this subsection shall report the data required in paragraph (7) to the Director of the National Science Foundation in such form as required by such Director.

(d) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall submit a report to Congress that includes—

(1) a summary and analysis of the types and frequency of activities and policies developed and carried out under subsection (a) based on the reports submitted under paragraph (4) of such subsection; and

(2) a description and evaluation of the status and effectiveness of the program of workshops required under subsection (c), including a summary of any data reported under paragraph (8) of such subsection.

(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Director of the National Science Foundation \$2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 to carry out this section.

**SEC. 218. RESEARCH AND DISSEMINATION AT THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall award research grants and carry out dissemination activities consistent with the purposes of this subtitle, including—

(1) research grants to analyze the record-level data collected under section 214 and section 216, consistent with policies to ensure the privacy of individuals identifiable by such data;

(2) research grants to study best practices for work-life accommodation;

(3) research grants to study the impact of policies and practices that are implemented under this subtitle or that are otherwise consistent with the purposes of this subtitle;

(4) collaboration with other Federal science agencies and professional associations to exchange best practices, harmonize work-life accommodation policies and practices, and overcome common barriers to work-life accommodation; and

(5) collaboration with institutions of higher education in order to clarify and catalyze the adoption of a coherent and consistent set of work-life accommodation policies and practices.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Director of the National Science Foundation \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 to carry out this section.

**SEC. 219. REPORT TO CONGRESS.**

Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall submit a report to Congress that includes—

(1) a description and evaluation of the status and usage of caregiver policies at all Federal science agencies, including any recommendations for revising or expanding such policies;

(2) a description of any significant updates to the policies for review of Federal research grants required under section 215, and any evidence of the impact of such policies on the review or awarding of Federal research grants; and

(3) a description and evaluation of the status of Federal laboratory policies and practices required under section 217(b), including any recommendations for revising or expanding such policies.

**SEC. 220. NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION SUPPORT FOR INCREASING DIVERSITY AMONG STEM FACULTY AT INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.**

(a) **GRANTS.**—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall award grants to institutions of higher education (or consortia thereof) for the development of innovative reform efforts designed to increase the recruitment, retention, and advancement of individuals from underrepresented minority groups in academic STEM careers.

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

(c) **USE OF FUNDS.**—Activities supported by grants under this section may include—

(1) institutional assessment activities, such as data analyses and policy review, in order to identify and address specific issues in the recruitment, retention, and advancement of faculty members from underrepresented minority groups;

(2) implementation of institution-wide improvements in workload distribution, such that faculty members from underrepresented minority groups are not disadvantaged in the amount of time available to focus on research, publishing papers, and engaging in other activities required to achieve tenure status and run a productive research program;

(3) development and implementation of training courses for administrators and search committee members to ensure that candidates from underrepresented minority groups are not subject to implicit biases in the search and hiring process;

(4) development and hosting of intra- or inter-institutional workshops to propagate best practices in recruiting, retaining, and advancing faculty members from underrepresented minority groups;

(5) professional development opportunities for faculty members from underrepresented minority groups;

(6) activities aimed at making undergraduate STEM students from underrepresented minority groups aware of opportunities for academic careers in STEM fields;

(7) activities to identify and engage exceptional graduate students from underrepresented minority groups at various stages of their studies and to encourage them to enter academic careers; and

(8) other activities consistent with subsection (a), as determined by the Director of the National Science Foundation.

(d) **SELECTION PROCESS.**—

(1) **APPLICATION.**—An institution of higher education (or consortia thereof) seeking funding under this section shall submit an application to the Director of the National Science Foundation at such time, in such manner, and containing such information and assurances as such Director may require. The application shall include, at a minimum, a description of—

(A) the reform effort that is being proposed for implementation by the institution of higher education;

(B) any available evidence of specific difficulties in the recruitment, retention, and advancement of faculty members from underrepresented minority groups in STEM academic careers within the institution of higher education submitting an application,

and how the proposed reform effort would address such issues;

(C) how the institution of higher education submitting an application plans to sustain the proposed reform effort beyond the duration of the grant; and

(D) how the success and effectiveness of the proposed reform effort will be evaluated and assessed in order to contribute to the national knowledge base about models for catalyzing institutional change.

(2) REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS.—In selecting grant recipients under this section, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall consider, at a minimum—

(A) the likelihood of success in undertaking the proposed reform effort at the institution of higher education submitting the application, including the extent to which the administrators of the institution are committed to making the proposed reform effort a priority;

(B) the degree to which the proposed reform effort will contribute to change in institutional culture and policy such that greater value is placed on the recruitment, retention, and advancement of faculty members from underrepresented minority groups;

(C) the likelihood that the institution of higher education will sustain or expand the proposed reform effort beyond the period of the grant; and

(D) the degree to which evaluation and assessment plans are included in the design of the proposed reform effort.

(3) GRANT DISTRIBUTION.—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall ensure, to the extent practicable, that grants awarded under this section are made to a variety of types of institutions of higher education.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Director of the National Science Foundation \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 to carry out this section.

**SEC. 221. NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION SUPPORT FOR BROADENING PARTICIPATION IN UNDERGRADUATE STEM EDUCATION.**

(a) GRANTS.—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall award grants to institutions of higher education (or consortia thereof) to implement or expand research-based reforms in undergraduate STEM education for the purpose of recruiting and retaining students from minority groups who are underrepresented in STEM fields, with a priority focus on natural science and engineering fields.

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

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—Activities supported by grants under this section may include—

(1) implementation or expansion of innovative, research-based approaches to broaden participation of underrepresented minority groups in STEM fields;

(2) implementation or expansion of bridge, cohort, tutoring, or mentoring programs designed to enhance the recruitment and retention of students from underrepresented minority groups in STEM fields;

(3) implementation or expansion of outreach programs linking institutions of higher education and K-12 school systems in order to heighten awareness among pre-college students from underrepresented minority groups of opportunities in college-level STEM fields and STEM careers;

(4) implementation or expansion of faculty development programs focused on improving retention of undergraduate STEM students from underrepresented minority groups;

(5) implementation or expansion of mechanisms designed to recognize and reward faculty members who demonstrate a commit-

ment to increasing the participation of students from underrepresented minority groups in STEM fields;

(6) expansion of successful reforms aimed at increasing the number of STEM students from underrepresented minority groups beyond a single course or group of courses to achieve reform within an entire academic unit, or expansion of successful reform efforts beyond a single academic unit to other STEM academic units within an institution of higher education;

(7) expansion of opportunities for students from underrepresented minority groups to conduct STEM research in industry, at Federal laboratories, and at international research institutions or research sites;

(8) provision of stipends for students from underrepresented minority groups participating in research;

(9) development of research collaborations between research-intensive universities and primarily undergraduate minority-serving institutions;

(10) support for graduate students and postdoctoral fellows from underrepresented minority groups to participate in instructional or assessment activities at primarily undergraduate institutions, including primarily undergraduate minority-serving institutions and two-year institutions of higher education; and

(11) other activities consistent with subsection (a), as determined by the Director of the National Science Foundation.

(d) SELECTION PROCESS.—

(1) APPLICATION.—An institution of higher education (or consortium thereof) seeking a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Director of the National Science Foundation at such time, in such manner, and containing such information and assurances as such Director may require. The application shall include, at a minimum—

(A) a description of the proposed reform effort;

(B) a description of the research findings that will serve as the basis for the proposed reform effort or, in the case of applications that propose an expansion of a previously implemented reform, a description of the previously implemented reform effort, including data about the recruitment, retention, and academic achievement of students from underrepresented minority groups;

(C) evidence of an institutional commitment to, and support for, the proposed reform effort, including a long-term commitment to implement successful strategies from the current reform beyond the academic unit or units included in the grant proposal;

(D) a description of existing or planned institutional policies and practices regarding faculty hiring, promotion, tenure, and teaching assignment that reward faculty contributions to improving the education of students from underrepresented minority groups in STEM; and

(E) how the success and effectiveness of the proposed reform effort will be evaluated and assessed in order to contribute to the national knowledge base about models for catalyzing institutional change.

(2) REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS.—In selecting grant recipients under this section, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall consider, at a minimum—

(A) the likelihood of success of the proposed reform effort at the institution submitting the application, including the extent to which the faculty, staff, and administrators of the institution are committed to making the proposed institutional reform a priority of the participating academic unit or units;

(B) the degree to which the proposed reform effort will contribute to change in institutional culture and policy such that greater value is placed on faculty engagement in the retention of students from underrepresented minority groups;

(C) the likelihood that the institution will sustain or expand the proposed reform effort beyond the period of the grant; and

(D) the degree to which evaluation and assessment plans are included in the design of the proposed reform effort.

(3) PRIORITY.—For applications that include an expansion of existing reforms beyond a single academic unit, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall give priority to applications for which a senior institutional administrator, such as a dean or other administrator of equal or higher rank, serves as the principal investigator.

(4) GRANT DISTRIBUTION.—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall ensure, to the extent practicable, that grants awarded under this section are made to a variety of types of institutions of higher education, including two-year and minority-serving institutions of higher education.

(e) EDUCATION RESEARCH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—All grants made under this section shall include an education research component that will support the design and implementation of a system for data collection and evaluation of proposed reform efforts in order to build the knowledge base on promising models for increasing recruitment and retention of students from underrepresented minority groups in STEM education at the undergraduate level across a diverse set of institutions.

(2) DISSEMINATION.—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall coordinate with relevant Federal agencies in disseminating the results of the research under this subsection to ensure that best practices in broadening participation in STEM education at the undergraduate level are made readily available to all institutions of higher education, other Federal agencies that support STEM programs, non-Federal funders of STEM education, and the general public.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Director of the National Science Foundation \$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 to carry out this section.

**SEC. 222. DEFINITIONS.**

(a) THIS SUBTITLE.—In this subtitle:

(1) FEDERAL LABORATORY.—The term “Federal laboratory” has the meaning given such term in section 4 of the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3703).

(2) FEDERAL SCIENCE AGENCY.—The term “Federal science agency” means any Federal agency with at least \$100,000,000 in research and development expenditures in fiscal year 2014.

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

(4) STEM.—The term “STEM” means science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, including other academic subjects that build on these disciplines such as computer science.

(b) NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2002.—Section 4 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (16) as paragraph (17); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (15) the following new paragraph:

“(16) STEM.—The term ‘STEM’ means science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, including other academic subjects that build on these disciplines such as computer science.”.

### TITLE III—NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

#### Subtitle A—General Provisions

##### SEC. 301. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2016.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation \$7,723,550,000 for fiscal year 2016.

(2) SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS.—Of the amount authorized under paragraph (1)—

(A) \$6,186,300,000 shall be made available for research and related activities;

(B) \$962,570,000 shall be made available for education and human resources;

(C) \$200,310,000 shall be made available for major research equipment and facilities construction;

(D) \$354,840,000 shall be made available for agency operations and award management;

(E) \$4,370,000 shall be made available for the Office of the National Science Board, including salaries and compensation for members of the Board and staff appointed under section 4 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1863), travel and training costs for members of the Board and such staff, general and Board operating expenses, representational expenses for the Board, honorary awards made by the Board, Board reports (other than the report entitled “Science and Engineering Indicators”), and contracts; and

(F) \$15,160,000 shall be made available for the Office of Inspector General.

(b) FISCAL YEAR 2017.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation \$8,099,010,000 for fiscal year 2017.

(2) SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS.—Of the amount authorized under paragraph (1)—

(A) \$6,495,620,000 shall be made available for research and related activities;

(B) \$1,010,700,000 shall be made available for education and human resources;

(C) \$200,000,000 shall be made available for major research equipment and facilities construction;

(D) \$372,580,000 shall be made available for agency operations and award management;

(E) \$4,500,000 shall be made available for the Office of the National Science Board, including salaries and compensation for members of the Board and staff appointed under section 4 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1863), travel and training costs for members of the Board and such staff, general and Board operating expenses, representational expenses for the Board, honorary awards made by the Board, Board reports (other than the report entitled “Science and Engineering Indicators”), and contracts; and

(F) \$15,610,000 shall be made available for the Office of Inspector General.

(c) FISCAL YEAR 2018.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation \$8,493,560,000 for fiscal year 2018.

(2) SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS.—Of the amount authorized under paragraph (1)—

(A) \$6,820,400,000 shall be made available for research and related activities;

(B) \$1,061,230,000 shall be made available for education and human resources;

(C) \$200,000,000 shall be made available for major research equipment and facilities construction;

(D) \$391,210,000 shall be made available for agency operations and award management;

(E) \$4,640,000 shall be made available for the Office of the National Science Board, including salaries and compensation for mem-

bers of the Board and staff appointed under section 4 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1863), travel and training costs for members of the Board and such staff, general and Board operating expenses, representational expenses for the Board, honorary awards made by the Board, Board reports (other than the report entitled “Science and Engineering Indicators”), and contracts; and

(F) \$16,080,000 shall be made available for the Office of Inspector General.

(d) FISCAL YEAR 2019.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation \$8,907,820,000 for fiscal year 2019.

(2) SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS.—Of the amount authorized under paragraph (1)—

(A) \$7,161,420,000 shall be made available for research and related activities;

(B) \$1,114,300,000 shall be made available for education and human resources;

(C) \$200,000,000 shall be made available for major research equipment and facilities construction;

(D) \$410,770,000 shall be made available for agency operations and award management;

(E) \$4,780,000 shall be made available for the Office of the National Science Board, including salaries and compensation for members of the Board and staff appointed under section 4 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1863), travel and training costs for members of the Board and such staff, general and Board operating expenses, representational expenses for the Board, honorary awards made by the Board, Board reports (other than the report entitled “Science and Engineering Indicators”), and contracts; and

(F) \$16,570,000 shall be made available for the Office of Inspector General.

(e) FISCAL YEAR 2020.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation \$9,342,790,000 for fiscal year 2020.

(2) SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS.—Of the amount authorized under paragraph (1)—

(A) \$7,519,490,000 shall be made available for research and related activities;

(B) \$1,170,010,000 shall be made available for education and human resources;

(C) \$200,000,000 shall be made available for major research equipment and facilities construction;

(D) \$431,310,000 shall be made available for agency operations and award management;

(E) \$4,920,000 shall be made available for the Office of the National Science Board, including salaries and compensation for members of the Board and staff appointed under section 4 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1863), travel and training costs for members of the Board and such staff, general and Board operating expenses, representational expenses for the Board, honorary awards made by the Board, Board reports (other than the report entitled “Science and Engineering Indicators”), and contracts; and

(F) \$17,060,000 shall be made available for the Office of Inspector General.

##### SEC. 302. FINDINGS AND SENSE OF CONGRESS ON SUPPORT FOR ALL FIELDS OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that the Foundation’s investments in social, behavioral, and economic research have addressed challenges, including—

(1) in medicine, matching organ donors to patients, leading to a dramatic growth in paired kidney transplants;

(2) in policing, implementing predictive models that help to yield significant reductions in crime;

(3) in resource allocation, developing the theories underlying the Federal Communica-

tions Commission spectrum auction, which has generated over \$60,000,000,000 in revenue;

(4) in disaster preparation and recovery, identifying barriers to effective disaster evacuation strategies;

(5) in national defense, assisting United States troops in cross-cultural communication and in identifying threats; and

(6) in areas such as economics, education, cybersecurity, transportation, and national defense, supporting informed decisionmaking in foreign and domestic policy.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that in order to achieve its mission “to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense” the Foundation must continue to support unfettered, competitive, merit-reviewed basic research across all fields of science and engineering, including the social, behavioral, and economic sciences.

##### SEC. 303. NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION MERIT REVIEW.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Foundation’s Intellectual Merit and Broader Impacts criteria remain appropriate for evaluating grant proposals, as concluded by the 2011 National Science Board Task Force on Merit Review;

(2) evaluating proposals on the basis of the Foundation’s Intellectual Merit and Broader Impacts criteria ensures that—

(A) proposals funded by the Foundation are of high quality and advance scientific knowledge; and

(B) the Foundation’s overall funding portfolio addresses societal needs through research findings or through related activities; and

(3) as evidenced by the Foundation’s contributions to scientific advancement, economic development, human health, and national security, its peer review and merit review processes have successfully identified and funded scientifically and societally relevant research, remain the gold standard for the world, and must be preserved.

(b) CRITERIA.—The Foundation shall maintain the Intellectual Merit and Broader Impacts criteria as the basis for evaluating grant proposals in the merit review process.

##### SEC. 304. MANAGEMENT AND OVERSIGHT OF LARGE FACILITIES.

(a) LARGE FACILITIES OFFICE.—The Director shall maintain a Large Facilities Office within the Foundation. The functions of the Large Facilities Office shall be to support the research directorates in the development and implementation of major research facilities, including by—

(1) serving as the Foundation’s primary resource for all policy or process issues related to the development and implementation of major research facilities;

(2) serving as a Foundation-wide resource on project management, including providing expert assistance on non-scientific and non-technical aspects of project planning, budgeting, implementation, management, and oversight; and

(3) coordinating and collaborating with research directorates to share best management practices and lessons learned from prior projects.

(b) OVERSIGHT OF LARGE FACILITIES.—The Director shall appoint a senior agency official within the Office of the Director whose primary responsibility is oversight of major research facilities. The duties of this official shall include—

(1) oversight of the development, construction, and operation of major research facilities across the Foundation;

(2) in collaboration with the directors of the research directorates and other senior

agency officials as appropriate, ensuring that the requirements of section 14(a) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 are satisfied;

(3) serving as a liaison to the National Science Board for approval and oversight of major research facilities; and

(4) periodically reviewing and updating as necessary Foundation policies and guidelines for the development and construction of major research facilities.

(c) **POLICIES FOR COSTING LARGE FACILITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall ensure that the Foundation's policies for developing and managing major research facility construction costs are consistent with the best practices described in the March 2009 General Accountability Office Report GAO-09-3SP.

(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit to Congress a report describing the Foundation's policies for developing and managing major research facility construction costs, including a description of any aspects of the policies that diverge from the best practices recommended in General Accountability Office Report GAO-09-3SP.

**SEC. 305. SUPPORT FOR POTENTIALLY TRANSFORMATIVE RESEARCH.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall establish and periodically update grant solicitation, merit review, and funding policies and mechanisms designed to identify and provide support for high-risk, high-reward basic research proposals.

(b) **POLICIES AND MECHANISMS.**—Such policies and mechanisms may include—

(1) development of solicitations specifically for high-risk, high-reward basic research;

(2) establishment of review panels for the primary purpose of selecting high-risk, high-reward proposals;

(3) development of guidance to standard review panels to encourage the identification and consideration of high-risk, high-reward proposals; and

(4) support for workshops and other conferences with the primary purpose of identifying new opportunities for high-risk, high-reward basic research, especially at interdisciplinary interfaces.

(c) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this section, the term “high-risk, high-reward basic research” means research driven by ideas that have the potential to radically change our understanding of an important existing scientific or engineering concept, or leading to the creation of a new paradigm or field of science or engineering, and that is characterized by its challenge to current understanding or its pathway to new frontiers.

**SEC. 306. STRENGTHENING INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH PARTNERSHIPS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—For any Foundation research grant, in an amount greater than \$5,000,000, to be carried out through a partnership that includes one or more minority-serving institutions or predominantly undergraduate institutions and one or more institutions described in subsection (b), the Director shall award funds directly, according to the budget justification described in the grant proposal, to at least two of the institutions of higher education in the partnership, including at least one minority-serving institution or one predominantly undergraduate institution, to ensure a strong and equitable partnership.

(b) **INSTITUTIONS.**—The institutions referred to in subsection (a) are institutions of higher education that are among the 100 institutions receiving, over the 3-year period immediately preceding the awarding of grants, the highest amount of research funding from the Foundation.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall provide a report to Congress on institutional research partnerships identified in subsection (a) funded in the 2 previous fiscal years and make any recommendations for how such partnerships can continue to be strengthened.

**SEC. 307. INNOVATION CORPS.**

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the National Science Foundation's Innovation Corps (I-Corps) was established to foster a national innovation ecosystem by encouraging institutions, scientists, engineers, and entrepreneurs to identify and explore the innovation and commercial potential of Foundation-funded research well beyond the laboratory;

(2) the Foundation's I-Corps includes investments in entrepreneurship and commercialization education, training, and mentoring, ultimately leading to the practical deployment of technologies, products, processes, and services that improve the Nation's competitiveness, promote economic growth, and benefit society; and

(3) by building networks of entrepreneurs, educators, mentors, institutions, and collaborations, and supporting specialized education and training, I-Corps is at the leading edge of a strong, lasting foundation for an American innovation ecosystem.

(b) **PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall carry out a program to award grants for entrepreneurship and commercialization education to Foundation-funded researchers to increase the economic and social impact of federally funded research.

(2) **PURPOSES.**—The purpose of the program shall be to increase the capacity of STEM researchers and students to successfully engage in entrepreneurial activities and to help transition the results of federally funded research into the marketplace by—

(A) identifying STEM research that can lead to the practical deployment of technologies, products, processes, and services that improve the Nation's economic competitiveness;

(B) bringing STEM researchers and students together with entrepreneurs, venture capitalists, and other industry representatives experienced in commercialization of new technologies;

(C) supporting entrepreneurship and commercialization education and training for faculty, students, postdoctoral fellows, and other STEM researchers; and

(D) promoting the development of regional and national networks of entrepreneurs, venture capitalists, and other industry representatives who can serve as mentors to researchers and students at Foundation-funded institutions across the country.

(3) **ADDITIONAL USE OF FUNDS.**—Grants awarded under this subsection may be used to help support—

(A) prototype and proof-of-concept development for the funded project; and

(B) additional activities needed to build a national infrastructure for STEM entrepreneurship.

(4) **OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.**—The Director may establish agreements with other Federal agencies that fund scientific research to make researchers funded by those agencies eligible to participate in the Foundation's Innovation Corps program.

**SEC. 308. DEFINITIONS.**

For purposes of this title:

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

(2) **FOUNDATION.**—The term “Foundation” means the National Science Foundation.

(3) **INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.**—The term “institution of higher education” has

the meaning given such term in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).

(4) **STEM.**—The term “STEM” means science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, including other academic subjects that build on these disciplines such as computer science.

**Subtitle B—STEM Education**

**SEC. 321. NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD REPORT ON CONSOLIDATION OF STEM EDUCATION ACTIVITIES AT THE FOUNDATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The National Science Board shall review and evaluate the appropriateness of the Foundation's portfolio of STEM education programs and activities at the pre-K-12 and undergraduate levels, including informal education, taking into account the mission of the Foundation and the 2013 Federal STEM Education 5-Year Strategic Plan.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the National Science Board shall submit to Congress a report summarizing their findings and including—

(1) an analysis of how well the Foundation's portfolio of STEM education programs is contributing to the mission of the Foundation;

(2) an analysis of how well STEM education programs and activities are coordinated and best practices are shared across the Foundation;

(3) an analysis of how well the Foundation's portfolio of STEM education programs is aligned with and contributes to priority STEM education investment areas described in the 2013 Federal STEM Education 5-Year Strategic Plan;

(4) any Board recommendations regarding internal reorganization, including consolidation, of the Foundation's STEM education programs and activities, taking into account both the mission of the Foundation and the 2013 Federal STEM Education 5-Year Strategic Plan;

(5) any Board recommendations regarding the Foundation's role in helping to implement the Federal STEM Education 5-Year Strategic Plan, including opportunities for the Foundation to more effectively partner and collaborate with other Federal agencies; and

(6) any additional Board recommendations regarding specific management, policy, budget, or other steps the Foundation should take to increase effectiveness and accountability across its portfolio of STEM education programs and activities.

**SEC. 322. MODELS FOR GRADUATE STUDENT SUPPORT.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall enter into an agreement with the National Research Council to convene a workshop or roundtable to examine models of Federal support for STEM graduate students, including the Foundation's Graduate Research Fellowship program and comparable fellowship programs at other agencies, traineeship programs, and the research assistant model.

(b) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of the workshop or roundtable shall be to compare and evaluate the extent to which each of these models helps to prepare graduate students for diverse careers utilizing STEM degrees, including at diverse types of institutions of higher education, in industry, and at government agencies and research laboratories, and to make recommendations regarding—

(1) how current Federal programs and models, including programs and models at the Foundation, can be improved;

(2) the appropriateness of the current distribution of funding among the different models at the Foundation and across the agencies; and

(3) the appropriateness of creating a new education and training program for graduate students distinct from programs that provide direct financial support, including the grants authorized in section 527 of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 1862p-15).

(c) **CRITERIA.**—At a minimum, in comparing programs and models, the workshop or roundtable participants shall consider the capacity of such programs or models to provide students with knowledge and skills—

(1) to become independent, creative, successful researchers;

(2) to participate in large interdisciplinary research projects, including in an international context;

(3) to adhere to the highest standards for research ethics;

(4) to become high-quality teachers utilizing the most currently available evidence-based pedagogy;

(5) in oral and written communication, to both technical and nontechnical audiences;

(6) in innovation, entrepreneurship, and business ethics; and

(7) in program management.

(d) **GRADUATE STUDENT INPUT.**—The participants in the workshop or roundtable shall include current or recent STEM graduate students.

(e) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the National Research Council shall submit to Congress a summary report of the findings and recommendations of the workshop or roundtable convened under this section.

#### **SEC. 323. UNDERGRADUATE STEM EDUCATION REFORM.**

Section 17 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n-6) is amended to read as follows:

##### **“SEC. 17. UNDERGRADUATE STEM EDUCATION REFORM.**

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director, through the Directorate for Education and Human Resources, shall award grants, on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis, to institutions of higher education (or to consortia thereof) and to other eligible nonprofit organizations to reform undergraduate STEM education for the purpose of increasing the number and quality of students studying toward and completing baccalaureate degrees in STEM and improving the STEM learning outcomes for all undergraduate students.

“(b) **INTERDIRECTORATE WORKING GROUP ON UNDERGRADUATE STEM EDUCATION.**—In carrying out the requirements of this section, the Directorate for Education and Human Resources shall collaborate and coordinate with the Research Directorates, including through the establishment of an interdirectorate working group on undergraduate STEM education reform, in order to identify and implement new and expanded opportunities for collaboration between STEM disciplinary researchers and education researchers on the reform of undergraduate STEM education.

“(c) **GRANTS.**—Research and development supported by grants under this section may encompass a single discipline, multiple disciplines, or interdisciplinary education at the undergraduate level, and may include—

“(1) research foundational to the improvement of teaching, learning, and retention;

“(2) development, implementation, and assessment of innovative, research-based approaches to transforming teaching, learning, and retention; and

“(3) scaling of successful efforts on learning and learning environments, broadening participation, workforce preparation, employing emerging technologies, or other reforms in STEM education, including expansion of successful STEM reform efforts be-

yond a single course or group of courses to achieve reform within an entire academic unit, or expansion of successful reform efforts beyond a single academic unit to other STEM academic units within an institution or to comparable academic units at other institutions.

“(d) **SELECTION PROCESS.**—

“(1) **APPLICATIONS.**—An institution of higher education or other eligible nonprofit organization seeking a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Director at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Director may require. In addition to a description of the proposed research, development, or scaling effort, including a description of the research findings that will serve as the basis for the proposed effort, applications shall include, at a minimum—

“(A) evidence of institutional support for, and commitment to, the proposed effort, including long-term commitment to implementation and scale successful strategies resulting from the current effort;

“(B) a description of existing or planned institutional policies and practices regarding faculty hiring, promotion, tenure, and teaching assignment that reward faculty contributions to undergraduate STEM education; and

“(C) a description of the plans for assessment and evaluation of the effort, including evidence of participation by individuals with experience in assessment and evaluation of teaching and learning programs.

“(2) **REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS.**—In selecting grant recipients for funding under this section, the Director shall consider, as appropriate to the scale of the proposed effort—

“(A) the likelihood of success in undertaking the proposed effort at the institution submitting the application, including the extent to which the faculty, staff, and administrators of the institution are committed to making undergraduate STEM education reform a priority of the participating academic unit or units;

“(B) the degree to which the proposed effort will contribute to change in institutional culture and policy such that a greater value is placed on faculty engagement in undergraduate education;

“(C) the likelihood that the institution will sustain or expand the effort beyond the period of the grant; and

“(D) the degree to which the proposed effort will contribute to the systematic accumulation of knowledge on STEM education.

“(3) **PRIORITY.**—The Director shall give priority to proposals focused on the first 2 years of undergraduate education, including STEM education at 2-year institutions of higher education.

“(4) **GRANT DISTRIBUTION.**—The Director shall ensure, to the extent practicable, that grants awarded under this section are made to a variety of types of institutions of higher education.”

#### **SEC. 324. ADVANCED MANUFACTURING EDUCATION.**

Section 506(b) of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 1862p-1(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) **ADVANCED MANUFACTURING EDUCATION.**—The Director shall award grants, on a competitive, merit reviewed basis, to community colleges for the development and implementation of innovative advanced manufacturing education reforms to ensure an adequate and well-trained advanced manufacturing workforce. Activities supported by grants under this subsection may include—

“(1) the development or expansion of educational materials, courses, curricula, strategies, and methods that will lead to improved advanced manufacturing degree or certification programs, including the inte-

gration of industry standards and workplace competencies into the curriculum;

“(2) the development and implementation of faculty professional development programs that enhance a faculty member’s capabilities and teaching skills in advanced manufacturing, including efforts to understand current advanced manufacturing technologies and practices;

“(3) the establishment of centers that provide models and leadership in advanced manufacturing education and serve as regional or national clearinghouses for educational materials and methods, including in rural areas;

“(4) activities to enhance the recruitment and retention of students into certification and degree programs in advanced manufacturing, including the provision of improved mentoring and internship opportunities;

“(5) the establishment of partnerships with private sector entities to ensure the development of an advanced manufacturing workforce with the skills necessary to meet regional economic needs; and

“(6) other activities as determined appropriate by the Director.”

#### **SEC. 325. STEM EDUCATION PARTNERSHIPS.**

Section 9 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “**MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE**” and inserting “**STEM**”;

(2) by striking “mathematics and science” each place it appears in subsections (a) and (b) and inserting “STEM”;

(3) by striking “mathematics or science” each place it appears in subsection (a)(3) and (4)(A) and inserting “STEM”;

(4) by striking “mathematics, science, or engineering” in subsection (a)(2)(B) and inserting “STEM”;

(5) by striking “mathematics, science, and technology” in subsection (a)(3)(B)(ii)(II) and (8) and inserting “STEM”;

(6) by striking “professional mathematicians, scientists, and engineers” in subsection (a)(3)(F) and inserting “STEM professionals”;

(7) by striking “mathematicians, scientists, and engineers” in subsection (a)(3)(J) and (M) and inserting “STEM professionals”;

(8) by striking “scientists, technologists, engineers, or mathematicians” in subsection (a)(8) and inserting “STEM professionals”;

(9) by striking “science, technology, engineering, and mathematics” each place it appears in subsection (a)(3)(K) and (10) and inserting “STEM”;

(10) by striking “science, technology, engineering, or mathematics” in subsection (a)(10)(A)(ii)(II) and inserting “STEM”;

(11) by striking “science, mathematics, engineering, and technology” each place it appears in subsection (a)(5) and inserting “STEM”;

(12) by striking “science, mathematics, engineering, or technology” in subsection (a)(5) and inserting “STEM”;

(13) by striking “mathematics, science, engineering, and technology” in subsection (b)(1) and (2) and inserting “STEM”;

and (14) by striking subsection (d).

#### **SEC. 326. NOYCE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM AMENDMENTS.**

Section 10A of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n-1a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)(B), by inserting “or bachelor’s” after “master’s”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (2)(B);

(B) in paragraph (3), by—

(i) inserting “for teachers with master’s degrees in their field” after “Teaching Fellowships”; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) in the case of National Science Foundation Master Teaching Fellowships for teachers with bachelor’s degrees in their field—

“(A) offering academic courses leading to a master’s degree and leadership training to prepare individuals to become master teachers in elementary and secondary schools; and

“(B) offering programs both during and after matriculation in the program for which the fellowship is received to enable fellows to become highly effective mathematics and science teachers, including mentoring, training, induction, and professional development activities, to fulfill the service requirements of this section, including the requirements of subsection (e), and to exchange ideas with others in their fields.”;

(3) in subsection (e), by striking “subsection (g)” and inserting “subsection (h)”; and

(4) by adding after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

“(g) SUPPORT FOR MASTER TEACHING FELLOWS WHILE ENROLLED IN A MASTER’S DEGREE PROGRAM.—A National Science Foundation Master Teacher Fellow may receive a maximum of 1 year of fellowship support while enrolled in a master’s degree program as described in subsection (c)(4)(A), except that if such fellow is enrolled in a part-time program, such amount shall be prorated according to the length of the program.”.

#### SEC. 327. INFORMAL STEM EDUCATION.

(a) GRANTS.—The Director, through the Directorate for Education and Human Resources, shall continue to award competitive, merit-reviewed grants to support—

(1) research and development of innovative out-of-school STEM learning and emerging STEM learning environments in order to improve STEM learning outcomes and engagement in STEM; and

(2) research that advances the field of informal STEM education.

(b) USES OF FUNDS.—Activities supported by grants under this section may encompass a single STEM discipline, multiple STEM disciplines, or integrative STEM initiatives and shall include—

(1) research and development that improves our understanding of learning and engagement in informal environments, including the role of informal environments in broadening participation in STEM; and

(2) design and testing of innovative STEM learning models, programs, and other resources for informal learning environments to improve STEM learning outcomes and increase engagement for K–12 students, K–12 teachers, and the general public, including design and testing of the scalability of models, programs, and other resources.

#### SEC. 328. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT TO SUPPORT IMPROVED K–12 LEARNING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director, acting through the Directorate for Education and Human Resources, shall award competitive, merit-reviewed grants to support research and development on alignment, implementation, impact, and ongoing improvement of standards and equivalent learning expectations used by States in mathematics, science, and, as appropriate, other State-based STEM standards.

(b) RESEARCH AREAS.—In making awards under this section, the Director shall consider proposals for research and development, including, as appropriate, large-scale research and development, of—

(1) resources, including virtual resources such as web portals, for content, professional development, and research results;

(2) teacher education and professional development;

(3) learning progressions;

(4) assessments;

(5) metrics for evaluating the impact of standards; and

(6) other areas of research and development that are likely to contribute to the alignment, implementation, impact, and ongoing improvement of standards in STEM subjects.

### TITLE IV—NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY

#### SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “National Institute of Standards and Technology Authorization Act of 2015”.

#### SEC. 402. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2016.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce \$1,119,700,000 for the National Institute of Standards and Technology for fiscal year 2016.

(2) SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS.—Of the amount authorized by paragraph (1)—

(A) \$754,700,000 shall be authorized for scientific and technical research and services laboratory activities;

(B) \$59,000,000 shall be authorized for the construction and maintenance of facilities; and

(C) \$306,000,000 shall be authorized for industrial technology services activities, of which—

(i) \$141,000,000 shall be authorized for the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership under section 25 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k) and the program under section 26 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 278l), of which not more than \$20,000,000 shall be for the competitive grant program under section 25(f) of such Act; and

(ii) \$150,000,000 shall be authorized for the Network for Manufacturing Innovation Program established under section 34 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 278s).

(b) FISCAL YEAR 2017.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce \$1,174,390,000 for the National Institute of Standards and Technology for fiscal year 2017.

(2) SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS.—Of the amount authorized by paragraph (1)—

(A) \$792,440,000 shall be authorized for scientific and technical research and services laboratory activities;

(B) \$61,950,000 shall be authorized for the construction and maintenance of facilities; and

(C) \$320,000,000 shall be authorized for industrial technology services activities, of which—

(i) \$160,000,000 shall be authorized for the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership under section 25 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k) and the program under section 26 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 278l), of which not more than \$20,000,000 shall be for the competitive grant program under section 25(f) of such Act; and

(ii) \$150,000,000 shall be authorized for the Network for Manufacturing Innovation Program established under section 34 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 278s).

(c) FISCAL YEAR 2018.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce \$1,207,100,000 for the National Institute of Standards and Technology for fiscal year 2018.

(2) SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS.—Of the amount authorized by paragraph (1)—

(A) \$832,060,000 shall be authorized for scientific and technical research and services laboratory activities;

(B) \$65,050,000 shall be authorized for the construction and maintenance of facilities; and

(C) \$310,000,000 shall be authorized for industrial technology services activities, of which—

(i) \$160,000,000 shall be authorized for the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership under section 25 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k) and the program under section 26 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 278l), of which not more than \$20,000,000 shall be for the competitive grant program under section 25(f) of such Act; and

(ii) \$150,000,000 shall be authorized for the Network for Manufacturing Innovation Program established under section 34 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 278s).

(d) FISCAL YEAR 2019.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce \$1,251,960,000 for the National Institute of Standards and Technology for fiscal year 2019.

(2) SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS.—Of the amount authorized by paragraph (1)—

(A) \$873,660,000 shall be authorized for scientific and technical research and services laboratory activities;

(B) \$68,300,000 shall be authorized for the construction and maintenance of facilities; and

(C) \$310,000,000 shall be authorized for industrial technology services activities, of which—

(i) \$160,000,000 shall be authorized for the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership under section 25 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k) and the program under section 26 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 278l), of which not more than \$20,000,000 shall be for the competitive grant program under section 25(f) of such Act; and

(ii) \$150,000,000 shall be authorized for the Network for Manufacturing Innovation Program established under section 34 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 278s).

(e) FISCAL YEAR 2020.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce \$1,299,060,000 for the National Institute of Standards and Technology for fiscal year 2020.

(2) SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS.—Of the amount authorized by paragraph (1)—

(A) \$917,340,000 shall be authorized for scientific and technical research and services laboratory activities;

(B) \$71,710,000 shall be authorized for the construction and maintenance of facilities; and

(C) \$310,000,000 shall be authorized for industrial technology services activities, of which—

(i) \$160,000,000 shall be authorized for the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership under section 25 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k) and the program under section 26 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 278l), of which not more than \$20,000,000 shall be for the competitive grant program under section 25(f) of such Act; and

(ii) \$150,000,000 shall be authorized for the Network for Manufacturing Innovation Program established under section 34 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 278s).

#### SEC. 403. HOLLINGS MANUFACTURING EXTENSION PARTNERSHIP.

Section 25 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k) is amended to read as follows:

#### “SEC. 25. HOLLINGS MANUFACTURING EXTENSION PARTNERSHIP.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, through the Director shall provide assistance for the creation and support of regional manufacturing extension centers for the transfer of manufacturing technology and best business practices. These centers shall be known as the ‘Hollings Manufacturing Extension Centers’ (in this Act referred to as the ‘Centers’). The program under this section shall be known as the ‘Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership’.

“(2) AFFILIATIONS.—Such Centers shall be affiliated with any United States-based public or nonprofit institution or organization, or group thereof, that applies for and is awarded financial assistance under this section.

“(3) OBJECTIVE.—The objective of the program is to enhance productivity, competitiveness, and technological performance in United States manufacturing through—

“(A) the transfer of manufacturing technology and techniques to Centers and, through them, to manufacturing companies throughout the United States;

“(B) the participation of individuals from industry, institutions of higher education, State governments, other Federal agencies, and, when appropriate, the Institute in cooperative technology transfer activities;

“(C) efforts to make new manufacturing technology and processes usable by United States-based small and medium-sized companies;

“(D) the active dissemination of scientific, engineering, technical, and management information about manufacturing to industrial firms, including small and medium-sized manufacturing companies;

“(E) the development of new partnerships, networks, and services that will assist small and medium-sized manufacturing companies expand into new markets, including global markets;

“(F) the utilization, when appropriate, of the expertise and capability that exists in Federal laboratories other than the Institute; and

“(G) the provision to community colleges and area career and technical education schools of information about the job skills needed in small and medium-sized manufacturing businesses in the regions they serve.

“(b) ACTIVITIES.—The activities of the Centers shall include—

“(1) the establishment of automated manufacturing systems and other advanced production technologies, based on research by the Institute and other entities, for the purpose of demonstrations and technology transfer;

“(2) assistance to Federal agencies in supporting United States-based manufacturing by identifying and providing technical assistance to small and medium-sized manufacturers to help them meet Federal agency procurement and acquisition needs;

“(3) the active transfer and dissemination of research findings and Center expertise to a wide range of companies and enterprises, particularly small and medium-sized manufacturers; and

“(4) the facilitation of collaborations and partnerships between small and medium-sized manufacturing companies and community colleges and area career and technical education schools to help such colleges and schools better understand the specific needs of manufacturers and to help manufacturers better understand the skill sets that students learn in the programs offered by such colleges and schools.

“(c) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AND REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) FINANCIAL SUPPORT.—The Secretary may provide financial support to any Center created under subsection (a) for an initial period of 5 years, which may be renewed for an

additional 5-year period. The Secretary may provide to a Center up to 50 percent of the capital and annual operating and maintenance funds required to create and maintain such Center.

“(2) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall implement, review, and update the sections of the Code of Federal Regulations related to this section at least once every 5 years.

“(3) APPLICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Any public or nonprofit institution, or consortium thereof, may submit to the Secretary an application for financial support under this section, in accordance with the procedures established by the Secretary.

“(B) COST-SHARING.—In order to receive assistance under this section, an applicant for financial assistance under subparagraph (A) shall provide adequate assurances that non-Federal assets obtained from the applicant and the applicant’s partnering organizations will be used as a funding source to meet not less than 50 percent of the costs incurred. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the costs incurred means the costs incurred in connection with the activities undertaken to improve the management, productivity, competitiveness, and technological performance of small and medium-sized manufacturing companies.

“(C) AGREEMENTS WITH OTHER ENTITIES.—In meeting the 50-percent requirement, it is anticipated that a Center will enter into agreements with other entities such as private industry, institutions of higher education, and State governments to accomplish programmatic objectives and access new and existing resources that will further the impact of the Federal investment made on behalf of small and medium-sized manufacturing companies.

“(D) LEGAL RIGHTS.—Each applicant under subparagraph (A) shall submit a proposal for the allocation of the legal rights associated with any invention that may result from the proposed Center’s activities.

“(4) MERIT REVIEW.—The Secretary shall subject each such application to merit review. In making a decision whether to approve such application and provide financial support under this section, the Secretary shall consider, at a minimum, the following:

“(A) The merits of the application, particularly those portions of the application regarding technology transfer, training and education, and adaptation of manufacturing technologies to the needs of particular industrial sectors.

“(B) The quality of service to be provided.

“(C) Geographical diversity and extent of service area.

“(D) The percentage of funding and amount of in-kind commitment from other sources.

“(5) EVALUATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each Center that receives financial assistance under this section shall be evaluated during its third year of operation by an evaluation panel appointed by the Secretary.

“(B) COMPOSITION.—Each such evaluation panel shall be composed of independent experts, none of whom shall be connected with the involved Center, and Federal officials.

“(C) CHAIR.—An official of the Institute shall chair the panel.

“(D) PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT.—Each evaluation panel shall measure the involved Center’s performance against the objectives specified in this section.

“(E) POSITIVE EVALUATION.—If the evaluation is positive, the Secretary may provide continued funding through the fifth year.

“(F) CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN.—The Secretary may not provide funding for the remaining years of a Center’s operation unless the evaluation is positive. A Center that has

not received a positive evaluation by the evaluation panel shall be notified by the panel of the deficiencies in its performance and shall be placed on a corrective action plan and provided the opportunity to address deficiencies unless immediate action is necessary to protect the public interest. The program shall re-evaluate the Center within one year and if the Center has not addressed the deficiencies identified by the panel, or shown a significant improvement in its performance, the Director shall conduct a new competition or may close the Center.

“(G) ADDITIONAL FINANCIAL SUPPORT.—After the fifth year, a Center may receive additional financial support under this section if it has received a positive evaluation through an independent review, under procedures established by the Institute.

“(H) RECOMPETITION.—If a Center has received financial support for 10 consecutive years, the Director shall conduct a new competition. An existing Center may submit an application as part of the new competition.

“(I) RECOMPETITION PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the America Competes Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Director shall submit a plan to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate detailing how the program will implement the new competitions required under subparagraph (H). The Director shall consult with the MEP Advisory Board established under subsection (f) in the development and implementation of the plan.

“(6) OVERSIGHT BOARD.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each Center that receives financial assistance under this section shall establish an oversight board that is broadly representative of regional stakeholders with a majority of board members drawn from local small and medium-sized manufacturing firms.

“(B) BYLAWS AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST.—Each board under subparagraph (A) shall adopt and submit to the Director bylaws to govern the operation of the board, including a conflict of interest policy to ensure relevant relationships are disclosed and proper recusal procedures are in place.

“(C) LIMITATION.—Board members may not serve simultaneously on more than one Center’s oversight board or serve as a contractor providing services to a Center.

“(7) PROTECTION OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall ensure that the following are not publically disclosed:

“(A) Confidential information on the business operations of—

“(i) a participant under the program; or

“(ii) a client of a Center.

“(B) Trade secrets possessed by any client of a Center.

“(8) PATENT RIGHTS.—The provisions of chapter 18 of title 35, United States Code, shall apply, to the extent not inconsistent with this section, to the promotion of technology from research by Centers under this section except for contracts for such specific technology extension or transfer services as may be specified by statute or by the Director.

“(d) REPORTING AND AUDITING REQUIREMENTS.—The Director shall establish procedures regarding Center financial reporting and auditing to ensure that awards are used for the purposes specified in this section and are in accordance with sound accounting practices.

“(e) ACCEPTANCE OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to such sums as may be appropriated to the Secretary and Director to operate the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership, the Secretary and Director also may accept funds from

other Federal departments and agencies and, under section 2(c)(7), from the private sector, to be available to the extent provided by appropriations Acts, for the purpose of strengthening United States manufacturing.

“(2) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—

“(A) FUNDS ACCEPTED FROM OTHER FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS OR AGENCIES.—The Director shall determine whether funds accepted from other Federal departments or agencies shall be counted in the calculation of the Federal share of capital and annual operating and maintenance costs under subsection (c).

“(B) FUNDS ACCEPTED FROM THE PRIVATE SECTOR.—Funds accepted from the private sector under section 2(c)(7), if allocated to a Center, may not be considered in the calculation of the Federal share under subsection (c) of this section.

“(f) MEP ADVISORY BOARD.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Institute a Manufacturing Extension Partnership Advisory Board (in this subsection referred to as the ‘MEP Advisory Board’).

“(2) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The MEP Advisory Board shall consist of not fewer than 10 members broadly representative of stakeholders, to be appointed by the Director. At least 2 members shall be employed by or on an advisory board for the Centers, at least 1 member shall represent a community college, and at least 5 other members shall be from United States small businesses in the manufacturing sector. No member shall be an employee of the Federal Government.

“(B) TERM.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C) or (D), the term of office of each member of the MEP Advisory Board shall be 3 years.

“(C) VACANCIES.—Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

“(D) SERVING CONSECUTIVE TERMS.—Any person who has completed two consecutive full terms of service on the MEP Advisory Board shall thereafter be ineligible for appointment during the one-year period following the expiration of the second such term.

“(3) MEETINGS.—The MEP Advisory Board shall meet not less than 2 times annually and shall provide to the Director—

“(A) advice on Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership programs, plans, and policies;

“(B) assessments of the soundness of Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership plans and strategies; and

“(C) assessments of current performance against Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership program plans.

“(4) FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT APPLICABILITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In discharging its duties under this subsection, the MEP Advisory Board shall function solely in an advisory capacity, in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act shall not apply to the MEP Advisory Board.

“(5) REPORT.—The MEP Advisory Board shall transmit an annual report to the Secretary for transmittal to Congress within 30 days after the submission to Congress of the President's annual budget request in each year. Such report shall address the status of the program established pursuant to this section and comment on the relevant sections of the programmatic planning document and updates thereto transmitted to Congress by the Director under subsections (c) and (d) of section 23.

“(g) COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director shall establish, within the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership, a program of competitive awards among participants described in paragraph (2) for the purposes described in paragraph (3).

“(2) PARTICIPANTS.—Participants receiving awards under this subsection shall be the Centers, or a consortium of such Centers.

“(3) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the program under this subsection is to add capabilities to the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership, including the development of projects to solve new or emerging manufacturing problems as determined by the Director, in consultation with the Director of the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership, the MEP Advisory Board, and small and medium-sized manufacturers.

“(4) THEMES.—One or more themes for the competition may be identified, which may vary from year to year, depending on the needs of manufacturers and the success of previous competitions. These themes may include—

“(A) supply chain integration and quality management;

“(B) the creation of partnerships to encourage the development of a workforce with the skills necessary to meet the needs of a region, including the creation of apprenticeship opportunities and the adoption of universally recognized credential programs, as appropriate;

“(C) energy efficiency, including efficient building technologies and environmentally friendly materials, products, and processes;

“(D) enhancing the competitiveness of small and medium-sized manufacturers in the global marketplace;

“(E) the transfer of technology based on the technological needs of manufacturers and available technologies from institutions of higher education, laboratories, and other technology producing entities; and

“(F) areas that extend beyond traditional areas of manufacturing extension activities, including projects related to construction industry modernization.

“(5) REIMBURSEMENT.—Centers may be reimbursed for costs incurred under the program under this subsection.

“(6) APPLICATIONS.—Applications for awards under this subsection shall be submitted in such manner, at such time, and containing such information as the Director shall require, in consultation with the MEP Advisory Board.

“(7) SELECTION.—Awards under this subsection shall be peer reviewed and competitively awarded. The Director shall endeavor to have broad geographic diversity among selected proposals. The Director shall select proposals to receive awards that will—

“(A) utilize innovative or collaborative approaches to solving the problem described in the competition;

“(B) improve the competitiveness of industries in the region in which the Center or Centers are located; and

“(C) contribute to the long-term economic stability of that region, including the creation of jobs or training employees.

“(8) PROGRAM CONTRIBUTION.—Recipients of awards under this subsection shall not be required to provide a matching contribution.

“(9) DURATION.—Awards under this subsection shall last no longer than 5 years.

“(h) INNOVATIVE SERVICES INITIATIVE.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director, in coordination with the Advanced Manufacturing Office of the Department of Energy, shall establish, within the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership, an innovative services initiative to assist small and medium-sized manufacturers in—

“(A) reducing their energy usage, greenhouse gas emissions, and environmental waste to improve profitability;

“(B) accelerating the domestic commercialization of new product technologies, including components for renewable energy and energy efficiency systems; and

“(C) identifying and diversifying to new markets, including support for transitioning to the production of components for renewable energy and energy efficiency systems.

“(2) MARKET DEMAND.—The Director may not undertake any activity to accelerate the domestic commercialization of a new product technology under this subsection unless an analysis of market demand for the new product technology has been conducted.

“(i) EXPORT ASSISTANCE TO SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED MANUFACTURERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall—

“(A) evaluate obstacles that are unique to small and medium-sized manufacturers that prevent such manufacturers from effectively competing in the global market;

“(B) implement a comprehensive export assistance initiative through the Centers to help small and medium-sized manufacturers address such obstacles; and

“(C) to the maximum extent practicable, ensure that the activities carried out under this subsection are coordinated with, and do not duplicate the efforts of, other export assistance programs within the Federal Government.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The initiative shall include—

“(A) export assistance counseling;

“(B) the development of partnerships that will provide small and medium-sized manufacturers with greater access to and knowledge of global markets; and

“(C) improved communication between the Centers to assist such manufacturers in implementing appropriate, targeted solutions to such obstacles.

“(j) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) AREA CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION SCHOOL.—The term ‘area career and technical education school’ has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2302).

“(2) COMMUNITY COLLEGE.—The term ‘community college’ means an institution of higher education (as defined under section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a))) at which the highest degree that is predominately awarded to students is an associate's degree.”

**SEC. 404. NATIONAL ACADEMIES REVIEW.**

Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall enter into a contract with the National Academies to conduct a single, comprehensive review of the Institute's laboratory programs. The review shall—

(1) assess the technical merits and scientific caliber of the research conducted at the laboratories;

(2) examine the strengths and weaknesses of the 2010 laboratory reorganization on the Institute's ability to fulfill its mission;

(3) evaluate how cross-cutting research and development activities are planned, coordinated, and executed across the laboratories; and

(4) assess how the laboratories are engaging industry, including the incorporation of industry need, into the research goals and objectives of the Institute.

**SEC. 405. IMPROVING NIST COLLABORATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.**

Section 8 of the National Bureau of Standards Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1983 (15 U.S.C. 275b) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by inserting “AND WITH” after “PERFORMED FOR”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: “The Secretary may accept, apply for, use, and spend Federal, State, and non-governmental acquisition and assistance funds to further the mission of the Institute without regard to the source or the period of availability of these funds as well as share personnel, associates, facilities, and property with these partner organizations, with or without reimbursement, upon mutual agreement.”.

#### SEC. 406. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

(a) FUNCTIONS AND ACTIVITIES.—Section 15 of the of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278e) is amended—

(1) by striking “of the Government; and” and inserting “of the Government;”;

(2) by striking “transportation services for employees of the Institute” and inserting “transportation services for employees, associates, or fellows of the Institute”; and

(3) by striking “Code,” and inserting “Code; and (i) the protection of Institute buildings and other plant facilities, equipment, and property, and of employees, associates, visitors, or other persons located therein or associated therewith, notwithstanding any other provision of law.”.

(b) POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.—Section 19 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g-2) is amended to read as follows:

#### “SEC. 19. POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.

“The Director, in conjunction with the National Academy of Sciences, shall establish and conduct a post-doctoral fellowship program that shall include not less than 20 new fellows per fiscal year. In evaluating applications for fellowships under this section, the Director shall give consideration to the goal of promoting the participation of underrepresented minorities in research areas supported by the Institute.”.

### TITLE V—INNOVATION

#### SEC. 501. OFFICE OF INNOVATION AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP.

Section 25 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3720) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by inserting “with a Director and full-time staff” after “Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) providing access to relevant data, research, and technical assistance on innovation and commercialization, including best practices for university-based incubators and accelerators;”;

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively; and

(C) by inserting the following after paragraph (3):

“(4) overseeing the implementation of the loan guarantee programs and the Regional Innovation Program established under sections 26 and 27, respectively;

“(5) developing, within 180 days after the date of enactment of the America Competes Reauthorization Act of 2015, and updating at least every 5 years, a strategic plan to guide the activities of the Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship that shall—

“(A) specify and prioritize near-term and long-term goals, objectives, and policies to accelerate innovation and advance the commercialization of research and development, including federally funded research and development, set forth the anticipated time for achieving the objectives, and identify metrics for use in assessing progress toward such objectives;

“(B) describe how the Department of Commerce is working in conjunction with other

Federal agencies to foster innovation and commercialization across the United States; and

“(C) provide a summary of the activities, including the development of metrics to evaluate regional innovation strategies undertaken through the Regional Innovation Research and Information Program established under section 27(e);”;

(3) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(c) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish or designate an advisory committee, which shall meet at least twice each fiscal year, to provide advice to the Secretary on carrying out the duties and responsibilities of the Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship.

“(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The advisory committee shall prepare a report, to be submitted to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate every 3 years. The first report shall be submitted not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the America Competes Reauthorization Act of 2015 and shall include—

“(A) an assessment of the strategic plan developed under subsection (b)(5) and the progress made in implementing the plan and the duties of the Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship;

“(B) an assessment of how the Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship is working with other Federal agencies to meet the goals and duties of the office; and

“(C) any recommendations for how the Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship could be improved.”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 to carry out this section.”.

#### SEC. 502. FEDERAL LOAN GUARANTEES FOR INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES IN MANUFACTURING.

Section 26(t) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3721(t)) is amended by striking “fiscal years 2011 through 2013” and inserting “fiscal years 2016 through 2020”.

#### SEC. 503. INNOVATION VOUCHER PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 25 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3720) as amended by section 501 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) INNOVATION VOUCHER PILOT PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship and in conjunction with the States, shall establish an innovation voucher pilot program to accelerate innovative activities and enhance the competitiveness of small and medium-sized manufacturers in the United States. The pilot program shall—

“(A) foster collaborations between small and medium-sized manufacturers and research institutions; and

“(B) enable small and medium-sized manufacturers to access technical expertise and capabilities that will lead to the development of innovative products or manufacturing processes, including through—

“(i) research and development, including proof of concept, technical development, and compliance testing activities;

“(ii) early-stage product development, including engineering design services; and

“(iii) technology transfer and related activities.

“(2) AWARD SIZE.—The Secretary shall competitively award vouchers worth up to

\$20,000 to small and medium-sized manufacturers for use at eligible research institutions to acquire the services described in paragraph (1)(B).

“(3) STREAMLINED PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall streamline and simplify the application, administrative, and reporting procedures for vouchers administered under the program.

“(4) REGULATIONS.—Prior to awarding any vouchers under the program, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations—

“(A) establishing criteria for the selection of recipients of awards under this subsection;

“(B) establishing procedures regarding financial reporting and auditing—

“(i) to ensure that awards are used for the purposes of the program; and

“(ii) that are in accordance with sound accounting practices; and

“(C) describing any other policies, procedures, or information necessary to implement this subsection, including those intended to streamline and simplify the program in accordance with paragraph (3).

“(5) TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may transfer funds appropriated to the Department of Commerce to other Federal agencies for the performance of services authorized under this subsection.

“(6) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—All of the amounts appropriated to carry out this subsection for a fiscal year shall be used for vouchers awarded under this subsection, except that the Secretary may set aside a percentage of such amounts for eligible research institutions performing the services described in paragraph (1)(B) to defray administrative costs associated with the services. The Secretary shall establish a single, fixed percentage for such purposes that will apply to all eligible research institutions.

“(7) OUTREACH.—The Secretary may use centers established under section 25 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k) to provide information about the program established under this subsection and to conduct outreach to potential applicants, as appropriate.

“(8) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

“(A) PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the America Competes Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a plan that will serve as a guide for the activities of the program. The plan shall include a description of the specific objectives of the program and the metrics that will be used in assessing progress toward those objectives.

“(B) OUTCOMES.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the America Competes Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report containing—

“(i) a summary of the activities carried out under this subsection;

“(ii) an assessment of the impact of such activities on the innovative capacity of small and medium-sized manufacturers receiving assistance under the pilot program; and

“(iii) any recommendations for administrative and legislative action that could optimize the effectiveness of the pilot program.

“(9) COORDINATION AND NONDUPLICATION.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure that the activities carried out under this subsection are coordinated with, and do not duplicate the efforts of, other programs within the Federal Government.

“(10) ELIGIBLE RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS DEFINED.—For the purposes of this subsection, the term ‘eligible research institution’ means—

“(A) an institution of higher education, as such term is defined in section 101(a) of the

Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a));

“(B) a Federal laboratory;

“(C) a federally funded research and development center; or

“(D) a Hollings Manufacturing Extension Center established under section 25 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k).

“(11) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out the pilot program in this subsection \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.”

**SEC. 504. FEDERAL ACCELERATION OF STATE TECHNOLOGY COMMERCIALIZATION PILOT PROGRAM.**

The Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“SEC. 28. FEDERAL ACCELERATION OF STATE TECHNOLOGY COMMERCIALIZATION PILOT PROGRAM.**

“(a) AUTHORITY.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a Federal Acceleration of State Technology Commercialization Pilot Program or FAST Commercialization Pilot Program to award grants to States, or consortia thereof, for the purposes described in paragraph (2). Awards under this section shall be made through a competitive, merit-based process.

“(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the program under this section is to advance United States productivity and global competitiveness by accelerating commercialization of innovative technology by leveraging Federal support for State commercialization efforts. The program shall provide matching funds to a State, or consortium thereof, for the acceleration of commercialization activities and the promotion of small manufacturing enterprises in the United States.

“(b) APPLICATION.—Applications for awards under this section shall be submitted in such a manner, at such a time, and containing such information as the Secretary shall require, including—

“(1) a description of the current state of technology commercialization in the State or States, including successes and barriers to commercialization; and

“(2) a description of the State’s or consortium’s plan for increasing commercialization of new technologies, products, processes, and services.

“(c) SELECTION CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall establish criteria for the selection of awardees, which shall consider at a minimum a review of efforts during the fiscal year prior to submitting an application to—

“(1) promote manufacturing; and

“(2) commercialize new technologies, products, processes, and services, including activities to translate federally funded research and technologies to small manufacturing enterprises.

“(d) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—A State or consortium receiving a grant under this section shall provide non-Federal cash contributions in an amount equal to 50 percent of the total cost of the project for which the grant is provided.

“(e) COORDINATION AND NONDUPLICATION.—In carrying out the program under this section, the Secretary shall ensure that grants made under the program are coordinated with, and do not duplicate, the efforts of other commercialization programs within the Federal Government.

“(f) EVALUATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the America Competes Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Secretary shall enter into a contract with an independent entity, such as the National Academy of Sciences, to conduct an evalua-

tion of the program established under subsection (a).

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The evaluation shall—

“(A) assess whether the program is achieving its goals;

“(B) include any recommendations for how the program may be improved; and

“(C) include a recommendation as to whether the program should be continued or terminated.

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘State’ has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3122); and

“(2) the term ‘commercialization’ has the meaning given that term in section 9(e)(10) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(e)(10)).

“(h) DURATION.—Each award shall be for a 5-year period.

“(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary \$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2018 to carry out this section.”

**TITLE VI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

**Subtitle A—Office of Science**

**SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE.**

This subtitle may be cited as the “Department of Energy Office of Science Authorization Act of 2015”.

**SEC. 602. DEFINITIONS.**

Except as otherwise provided, in this subtitle:

(1) DEPARTMENT.—The term “Department” means the Department of Energy.

(2) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Science.

(3) OFFICE OF SCIENCE.—The term “Office of Science” means the Department of Energy Office of Science.

(4) UNDER SECRETARY.—The term “Under Secretary” means the Under Secretary for Science and Energy.

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

**SEC. 603. MISSION OF THE OFFICE OF SCIENCE.**

Section 209 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7139) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) MISSION.—The mission of the Office of Science shall be the delivery of scientific discoveries, capabilities, and major scientific tools to transform the understanding of nature and to advance the energy, economic, and national security of the United States.

“(d) DUTIES.—In support of this mission, the Director shall carry out programs, including those in basic energy sciences, biological and environmental research, advanced scientific computing research, fusion energy sciences, high energy physics, and nuclear physics, through activities focused on—

“(1) Science for Discovery to unravel nature’s mysteries through activities which range from the study of subatomic particles, atoms, and molecules that make up the materials of our everyday world to the study of DNA, proteins, cells, and entire biological systems;

“(2) Science for National Need by—

“(A) advancing a clean energy agenda through research on energy production, storage, transmission, efficiency, and use; and

“(B) advancing our understanding of the Earth and its climate through research in atmospheric and environmental sciences and climate change; and

“(3) National Scientific User Facilities to deliver the 21st century tools of science, engineering, and technology and provide the Nation’s researchers with the most advanced tools of modern science including accelerators, colliders, supercomputers, light sources

and neutron sources, and facilities for studying complex molecular systems and the nanoworld.

“(e) SUPPORTING ACTIVITIES.—The activities described in subsection (d) shall include providing for relevant facilities and infrastructure, programmatic analysis, interagency coordination, and workforce development and outreach activities.

“(f) USER FACILITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall carry out the construction, operation, and maintenance of user facilities, including underground research facilities, to support the activities described in subsection (d). As practicable, these facilities shall serve the needs of the Department, industry, the academic community, and other relevant entities for the purposes of advancing the missions of the Department.

“(2) COORDINATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Director may form partnerships to enhance the utilization of and ensure access to user facilities, including underground research facilities, by other Federal agencies.

“(g) OTHER AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—In addition to the activities authorized under the Department of Energy Office of Science Authorization Act of 2015, the Office of Science shall carry out other such activities as it is authorized or required to carry out by law.

“(h) COORDINATION AND JOINT ACTIVITIES WITH OTHER DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY PROGRAMS.—The Under Secretary shall ensure the coordination of activities under the Department of Energy Office of Science Authorization Act of 2015 with the other activities of the Department, and shall support joint activities among the programs of the Department.

“(i) DOMESTIC MANUFACTURING CAPABILITY FOR OFFICE OF SCIENCE FACILITIES REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of the Department of Energy Office of Science Authorization Act of 2015, the Secretary shall transmit a report to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate. The report shall—

“(1) assess the current ability of domestic manufacturers to meet the procurement requirements for major ongoing projects funded by the Office of Science, including a calculation of the percentage of equipment acquired from domestic manufacturers for this purpose; and

“(2) identify steps that can be taken by the Federal Government and by private industry to increase the capability of domestic manufacturers to meet procurement requirements of the Office of Science for major projects.”

**SEC. 604. BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES PROGRAM.**

(a) PROGRAM.—As part of the activities authorized under the amendment made by section 603, the Director shall carry out a program in basic energy sciences, including materials sciences and engineering, chemical sciences, physical biosciences, and geosciences, for the purpose of providing the scientific foundations for new energy technologies and addressing scientific grand challenges.

(b) BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES USER FACILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall carry out a subprogram to support and oversee the construction, operation, and maintenance of national user facilities that support the program under this section. As practicable, these facilities shall serve the needs of the Department, industry, the academic community, and other relevant entities to create and examine new materials and chemical processes for the purposes of advancing new energy technologies and improving the competitiveness of the United States. These facilities shall include—

(A) x-ray light sources;  
 (B) neutron sources;  
 (C) nanoscale science research centers; and  
 (D) other facilities the Director considers appropriate, consistent with section 209(f) of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7139(f)).

(2) **FACILITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.**—The Director shall carry out research and development on advanced accelerator and storage ring technologies relevant to the Basic Energy Sciences user facilities, in consultation with the Office of Science's High Energy Physics and Nuclear Physics programs.

(3) **FACILITY CONSTRUCTION AND UPGRADES.**—Consistent with the Office of Science's project management practices, the Director shall support construction of—

(A) an upgrade of the Advanced Photon Source to optimize and enhance beam brightness;

(B) a Second Target Station at the Spallation Neutron Source to double user capacity and expand the suite of instruments to meet new scientific challenges;

(C) the Linac Coherent Light Source II to expand the x-ray wavelength range, incorporate high repetition rate operation for soft and medium energy x-rays, and increase user capacity of the Linac Coherent Light Source; and

(D) an upgrade to the Advanced Light Source to improve brightness and performance.

(c) **ENERGY FRONTIER RESEARCH CENTERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall carry out a program to provide awards, on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis, to multi-institutional collaborations or other appropriate entities to conduct fundamental and use-inspired energy research to accelerate scientific breakthroughs related to needs identified in—

(A) the Grand Challenges report of the Department's Basic Energy Sciences Advisory Committee;

(B) the report of the Department's Basic Energy Sciences Advisory Committee entitled "From Quanta to the Continuum: Opportunities for Mesoscale Science";

(C) the Basic Energy Sciences Basic Research Needs workshop report; or

(D) other relevant reports identified by the Director.

(2) **COLLABORATIONS.**—A collaboration receiving an award under this subsection may include multiple types of institutions and private sector entities.

(3) **SELECTION AND DURATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A collaboration under this subsection shall be selected for a period of 5 years. An Energy Frontier Research Center already in existence and supported by the Director on the date of enactment of this Act may continue to receive support for a period of 5 years beginning on the date of establishment of that center.

(B) **REAPPLICATION.**—After the end of the period described in subparagraph (A), an awardee may reapply for selection for a second period of 5 years on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis.

(C) **TERMINATION.**—Consistent with the existing authorities of the Department, the Director may terminate an underperforming center for cause during the performance period.

(4) **NO FUNDING FOR CONSTRUCTION.**—No funding provided pursuant to this subsection may be used for the construction of new buildings or facilities.

**SEC. 605. BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—As part of the activities authorized under section 209 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7139), and coordinated with the activities authorized under section 604 and section 606,

the Director shall carry out a program of research and development in the areas of biological systems science and climate and environmental science, including subsurface science, to support the energy and environmental missions of the Department.

(b) **BIOLOGICAL SYSTEMS SCIENCE ACTIVITIES.**—

(1) **ACTIVITIES.**—As part of the activities authorized under subsection (a), the Director shall carry out research and development activities in fundamental, structural, computational, and systems biology to increase systems-level understanding of the complex biological systems, which shall include activities to—

(A) accelerate breakthroughs and new knowledge that will enable cost-effective sustainable production of—

(i) biomass-based liquid transportation fuels;

(ii) bioenergy; and

(iii) biobased materials;

(B) improve understanding of the global carbon cycle, including processes for removing carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, through photosynthesis and other biological processes, for sequestration and storage; and

(C) understand the biological mechanisms used to transform, immobilize, or remove contaminants from subsurface environments.

(2) **BIOENERGY RESEARCH CENTERS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out activities under paragraph (1), the Director shall support at least 3 bioenergy research centers to accelerate advanced research and development of biomass-based liquid transportation fuels, bioenergy, or biobased materials that are produced from a variety of regionally diverse feedstocks.

(B) **SELECTION AND DURATION.**—A center established under subparagraph (A) shall be selected on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis for a period of 5 years beginning on the date of establishment of that center. A center already in existence on the date of enactment of this Act may continue to receive support for a period of 5 years beginning on the date of establishment of that center.

(C) **RENEWAL.**—After the end of the period described in subparagraph (B), an awardee may apply for a second period of 5 years on a merit-reviewed basis.

(D) **TERMINATION.**—Consistent with the existing authorities of the Department, the Director may terminate an underperforming center for cause during the performance period.

(3) **LOW DOSE RADIATION RESEARCH PROGRAM.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall carry out a research program on low dose radiation. The purpose of the program is to enhance the scientific understanding of and reduce uncertainties associated with the effects of exposure to low dose radiation in order to inform improved risk management methods.

(B) **DEFINITION.**—In this paragraph, the term "low dose radiation" means a radiation dose of less than 100 millisieverts.

(C) **STUDY.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall enter into an agreement with the National Academies to conduct a study assessing the current status and development of a long-term strategy for low dose radiation research. The study shall be conducted in coordination with Federal agencies that perform ionizing radiation effects research.

(D) **CONTENTS.**—The study performed under subparagraph (C) shall—

(i) identify current scientific challenges for understanding the long-term effects of ionizing radiation;

(ii) assess the status of current low dose radiation research in the United States and internationally;

(iii) formulate overall scientific goals for the future of low-dose radiation research in the United States;

(iv) recommend a long-term strategic and prioritized research agenda to address scientific research goals for overcoming the identified scientific challenges in coordination with other research efforts;

(v) define the essential components of a research program that would address this research agenda within the universities and the National Laboratories; and

(vi) assess the cost-benefit effectiveness of such a program.

(E) **5-YEAR RESEARCH PLAN.**—Not later than 90 days after the completion of the assessment performed under subparagraph (C), the Secretary shall deliver to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a five-year research plan that responds to the assessment's findings and recommendations and identifies and prioritizes research needs.

(4) **REPEAL.**—Section 977 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16317) is repealed.

(c) **CLIMATE AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE ACTIVITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—As part of the activities authorized under subsection (a), and in coordination with activities carried out under subsection (b), the Director shall carry out climate and environmental science research, which shall include activities to—

(A) understand, observe, and model the response of Earth's atmosphere and biosphere to increased concentrations of greenhouse gas emissions and any associated changes in climate;

(B) understand the processes for immobilization, or removal of, and understand the movement of, energy production-derived contaminants such as radionuclides and heavy metals, and understand the process of sequestration and transformation of carbon dioxide in subsurface environments; and

(C) inform potential mitigation and adaptation options for increased concentrations of greenhouse gas emissions and any associated changes in climate.

(2) **SUBSURFACE BIOGEOCHEMICAL RESEARCH.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—As part of the activities described in paragraph (1), the Director shall carry out research to advance a fundamental understanding of coupled physical, chemical, and biological processes for controlling the movement of sequestered carbon and subsurface environmental contaminants.

(B) **COORDINATION.**—

(i) **DIRECTOR.**—The Director shall carry out activities under this paragraph in accordance with priorities established by the Under Secretary to support and accelerate the decontamination of relevant facilities managed by the Department.

(ii) **UNDER SECRETARY.**—The Under Secretary shall ensure the coordination of activities of the Department, including activities under this paragraph, to support and accelerate the decontamination of relevant facilities managed by the Department.

(3) **CLIMATE AND EARTH MODELING.**—As part of the activities described in paragraph (1), the Director, in collaboration with the Advanced Scientific Computing Research program described in section 606, shall carry out research to develop, evaluate, and use high-resolution regional climate, global climate, and Earth models to inform decisions on reducing the impacts of a changing climate. Such modeling shall include, among other critical elements, greenhouse gas emissions, land use, and interaction among human and Earth systems.

**SEC. 606. ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING RESEARCH PROGRAM.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—As part of the activities authorized under section 209 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7139), the Director shall carry out a research, development, demonstration, and commercial application program to advance computational and networking capabilities for data-driven discovery and to analyze, model, simulate, and predict complex phenomena relevant to the development of new energy technologies and the competitiveness of the United States.

(b) COORDINATION.—The Under Secretary shall ensure the coordination of the activities of the Department, including activities under this section, to determine and meet the computational and networking research and facility needs of the Office of Science and all other relevant energy technology and energy efficiency programs within the Department.

**(c) RESEARCH TO SUPPORT ENERGY APPLICATIONS.—**

(1) IN GENERAL.—As part of the activities authorized under subsection (a), the program shall support research in high-performance computing and networking relevant to energy applications including modeling, simulation, and advanced data analytics for basic and applied energy research programs carried out by the Secretary.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to the Congress a plan to integrate and leverage the expertise and capabilities of the program described in subsection (a), as well as other relevant computational and networking research programs and resources supported by the Federal Government, to advance the missions of the Department's applied energy and energy efficiency programs.

(d) APPLIED MATHEMATICS AND SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT FOR HIGH-END COMPUTING SYSTEMS.—The Director shall carry out activities to develop, test, and support mathematics, models, and algorithms for complex systems, as well as programming environments, tools, languages, and operating systems for high-end computing systems (as defined in section 2 of the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 5541)).

(e) EXASCALE COMPUTING PROGRAM.—Section 3 of the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 5542) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “program” and inserting “coordinated program across the Department”;

(B) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (1);

(C) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting “; and”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) partner with universities, National Laboratories, and industry to ensure the broadest possible application of the technology developed in this program to other challenges in science, engineering, medicine, and industry.”;

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “vector” and all that follows through “architectures” and inserting “computer technologies that show promise of substantial reductions in power requirements and substantial gains in parallelism of multicore processors, concurrency, memory and storage, bandwidth, and reliability”; and

(3) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

“(d) EXASCALE COMPUTING PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a coordinated research program to de-

velop exascale computing systems to advance the missions of the Department.

“(2) EXECUTION.—The Secretary shall, through competitive merit review, establish two or more National Laboratory-industry-university partnerships to conduct integrated research, development, and engineering of multiple exascale architectures, and—

“(A) conduct mission-related co-design activities in developing such exascale platforms;

“(B) develop those advancements in hardware and software technology required to fully realize the potential of an exascale production system in addressing Department target applications and solving scientific problems involving predictive modeling and simulation and large-scale data analytics and management; and

“(C) explore the use of exascale computing technologies to advance a broad range of science and engineering.

“(3) ADMINISTRATION.—In carrying out this program, the Secretary shall—

“(A) provide, on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis, access for researchers in United States industry, institutions of higher education, National Laboratories, and other Federal agencies to these exascale systems, as appropriate; and

“(B) conduct outreach programs to increase the readiness for the use of such platforms by domestic industries, including manufacturers.

“(4) REPORTS.—

“(A) INTEGRATED STRATEGY AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Department of Energy Office of Science Authorization Act of 2015, a report outlining an integrated strategy and program management plan, including target dates for prototypical and production exascale platforms, interim milestones to reaching these targets, functional requirements, roles and responsibilities of National Laboratories and industry, acquisition strategy, and estimated resources required, to achieve this exascale system capability. The report shall include the Secretary's plan for Departmental organization to manage and execute the Exascale Computing Program, including definition of the roles and responsibilities within the Department to ensure an integrated program across the Department. The report shall also include a plan for ensuring balance and prioritizing across ASCR subprograms in a flat or slow-growth budget environment.

“(B) STATUS REPORTS.—At the time of the budget submission of the Department for each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress that describes the status of milestones and costs in achieving the objectives of the exascale computing program.

“(C) EXASCALE MERIT REPORT.—At least 18 months prior to the initiation of construction or installation of any exascale-class computing facility, the Secretary shall transmit a plan to the Congress detailing—

“(i) the proposed facility's cost projections and capabilities to significantly accelerate the development of new energy technologies;

“(ii) technical risks and challenges that must be overcome to achieve successful completion and operation of the facility; and

“(iii) an independent assessment of the scientific and technological advances expected from such a facility relative to those expected from a comparable investment in expanded research and applications at terascale-class and petascale-class computing facilities, including an evaluation of where investments should be made in the system software and algorithms to enable these advances.”.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2 of the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 5541) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) through (5) and inserting the following:

“(1) CO-DESIGN.—The term ‘co-design’ means the joint development of application algorithms, models, and codes with computer technology architectures and operating systems to maximize effective use of high-end computing systems.

“(2) DEPARTMENT.—The term ‘Department’ means the Department of Energy.

“(3) EXASCALE.—The term ‘exascale’ means computing system performance at or near 10 to the 18th power floating point operations per second.

“(4) HIGH-END COMPUTING SYSTEM.—The term ‘high-end computing system’ means a computing system with performance that substantially exceeds that of systems that are commonly available for advanced scientific and engineering applications.

“(5) LEADERSHIP SYSTEM.—The term ‘Leadership System’ means a high-end computing system that is among the most advanced in the world in terms of performance in solving scientific and engineering problems.

“(6) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801).

“(7) NATIONAL LABORATORY.—The term ‘National Laboratory’ has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801).

“(8) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Energy.

“(9) SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY.—The term ‘software technology’ includes optimal algorithms, programming environments, tools, languages, and operating systems for high-end computing systems.”.

**SEC. 607. FUSION ENERGY RESEARCH.**

(a) PROGRAM.—As part of the activities authorized under section 209 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7139) and section 972 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16312), the Director shall carry out a fusion energy sciences research and enabling technology development program to effectively address the scientific and engineering challenges to building a cost-competitive fusion power plant and to establish a competitive fusion power industry in the United States. As part of this program, the Director shall carry out research activities to expand the fundamental understandings of plasmas and matter at very high temperatures and densities for fusion applications and for other plasma science applications.

(b) TOKAMAK RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As part of the program described in subsection (a), the Director shall support research and development activities and facility operations to—

(A) optimize the tokamak approach to fusion energy; and

(B) determine the viability of the tokamak approach to fusion energy to lead to a commercial fusion power plant.

(2) ITER.—

(A) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Director shall coordinate and carry out the responsibilities of the United States with respect to the ITER international fusion project pursuant to the Agreement on the Establishment of the International Fusion Energy Organization for the Joint Implementation of the ITER Project.

(B) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report providing an assessment of—

(i) the most recent schedule for ITER that has been approved by the ITER Council; and

(ii) progress of the ITER Council and the ITER Director-General toward implementation of the recommendations of the Third Biennial International Organization Management Assessment Report.

(C) FAIRNESS IN COMPETITION FOR SOLICITATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL PROJECT ACTIVITIES.—Section 33 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2053) is amended by adding at the end the following: “For purposes of this section, with respect to international research projects, the term ‘private facilities or laboratories’ shall refer to facilities or laboratories located in the United States.”.

(D) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should support a robust, diverse program in addition to meeting its commitments to ITER. It is further the sense of Congress that developing the scientific basis for fusion, providing research results key to the success of ITER, and training the next generation of fusion scientists are of critical importance to the United States and should in no way be diminished by participation of the United States in the ITER project.

(C) INERTIAL FUSION ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall carry out a program of research and technology development in inertial fusion for energy applications, including ion beam, laser, and pulsed power fusion systems.

(D) ALTERNATIVE AND ENABLING CONCEPTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As part of the program described in subsection (a), the Director shall support research and development activities and facility operations at United States universities, national laboratories, and private facilities for a portfolio of alternative and enabling fusion energy concepts that may provide solutions to significant challenges to the establishment of a commercial magnetic fusion power plant, prioritized based on the ability of the United States to play a leadership role in the international fusion research community. Fusion energy concepts and activities explored under this paragraph may include—

(A) high magnetic field approaches facilitated by high temperature superconductors;

(B) advanced stellarator concepts;

(C) non-tokamak confinement configurations operating at low magnetic fields;

(D) magnetized target fusion energy concepts;

(E) liquid metals to address issues associated with fusion plasma interactions with the inner wall of the enclosing device;

(F) immersion blankets for heat management and fuel breeding;

(G) advanced scientific computing activities; and

(H) other promising fusion energy concepts identified by the Director.

(2) COORDINATION WITH ARPA-E.—The Under Secretary and the Director shall coordinate with the Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency–Energy (in this paragraph referred to as “ARPA-E”) to—

(A) assess the potential for any fusion energy project supported by ARPA-E to represent a promising approach to a commercially viable fusion power plant;

(B) determine whether the results of any fusion energy project supported by ARPA-E merit the support of follow-on research activities carried out by the Office of Science; and

(C) avoid unintentional duplication of activities.

(E) FUSION MATERIALS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—As part of the activities authorized in section 978 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16318), the Director, in coordination with the Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy of the Department, shall carry out research and development activi-

ties to identify, characterize, and create materials that can endure the neutron, plasma, and heat fluxes expected in a commercial fusion power plant. As part of the activities authorized under subsection (g), the Secretary shall—

(1) provide an assessment of the need for a facility or facilities that can examine and test potential fusion and next generation fission reactor materials and other enabling technologies relevant to the development of commercial fusion power plants; and

(2) provide an assessment of whether a single new facility that substantially addresses magnetic fusion, inertial fusion, and next generation fission materials research needs is feasible, in conjunction with the expected capabilities of facilities operational at the time of this assessment.

(F) GENERAL PLASMA SCIENCE AND APPLICATIONS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide to Congress an assessment of opportunities in which the United States can provide world-leading contributions to advancing plasma science and non-fusion energy applications, and identify opportunities for partnering with other Federal agencies both within and outside of the Department of Energy.

(G) IDENTIFICATION OF PRIORITIES.—

(1) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the Department’s proposed fusion energy research and development activities over the following 10 years under at least 3 realistic budget scenarios, including a scenario based on 3 percent annual growth in the non-ITER portion of the budget for fusion energy research and development activities. The report shall—

(A) identify specific areas of fusion energy research and enabling technology development in which the United States can and should establish or solidify a lead in the global fusion energy development effort;

(B) identify priorities for initiation of facility construction and facility decommissioning under each of those scenarios;

(C) provide a roadmap addressing critical scientific challenges to ensure that within 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act there is sufficient basis to justify and motivate the initiation of an applied fusion energy development program; and

(D) assess the ability of the United States fusion workforce to carry out the activities identified in subparagraphs (A) through (C), including the adequacy of college and university programs to train the leaders and workers of the next generation of fusion energy researchers.

(2) PROCESS.—In order to develop the report required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall leverage best practices and lessons learned from the process used to develop the most recent report of the Particle Physics Project Prioritization Panel of the High Energy Physics Advisory Panel. No member of the Fusion Energy Sciences Advisory Committee shall be excluded from participating in developing or voting on final approval of the report required under paragraph (1).

#### SEC. 608. HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As part of the activities authorized under section 209 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7139), the Director shall carry out a research program on the elementary constituents of matter and energy and the nature of space and time.

(b) ENERGY FRONTIER RESEARCH.—As part of the program described in subsection (a), the Director shall carry out research using high energy accelerators and advanced de-

tectors to create and study interactions of novel particles and investigate fundamental forces.

(c) NEUTRINO RESEARCH.—As part of the program described in subsection (a), the Director shall carry out research activities on rare decay processes and the nature of the neutrino, which may include collaborations with the National Science Foundation or international collaborations on relevant research projects.

(d) DARK ENERGY AND DARK MATTER RESEARCH.—As part of the program described in subsection (a), the Director shall carry out research activities on the nature of dark energy and dark matter. These activities shall be consistent with the research priorities identified by the High Energy Physics Advisory Panel or the National Academy of Sciences, and may include—

(1) collaborations with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, or international collaborations on relevant research projects; and

(2) the development of space-based, land-based, and underground facilities and experiments.

(e) FACILITY CONSTRUCTION AND MAJOR ITEMS OF EQUIPMENT.—Consistent with the Office of Science’s project management practices, the Director shall support construction or fabrication of—

(1) an international Long-Baseline Neutrino Facility based in the United States;

(2) the Muon to Electron Conversion Experiment;

(3) Second Generation Dark Matter experiments;

(4) the Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument;

(5) the Large Synoptic Survey Telescope camera;

(6) upgrades to components of the Large Hadron Collider; and

(7) other high priority projects recommended in the most recent report of the Particle Physics Project Prioritization Panel of the High Energy Physics Advisory Panel.

(f) ACCELERATOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—As part of the program described in subsection (a), the Director shall carry out research and development in advanced accelerator concepts and technologies, including laser technologies, to reduce the necessary scope and cost for the next generation of particle accelerators, in coordination with the Office of Science’s Basic Energy Sciences and Nuclear Physics programs.

(g) INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION.—The Director, as practicable and in coordination with other appropriate Federal agencies as necessary, shall ensure the access of United States researchers to the most advanced accelerator facilities and research capabilities in the world, including the Large Hadron Collider.

#### SEC. 609. NUCLEAR PHYSICS PROGRAM.

(a) PROGRAM.—As part of the activities authorized under section 209 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7139), the Director shall carry out a research program, and support relevant facilities, to discover and understand various forms of nuclear matter.

(b) FACILITY CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with the Office of Science’s project management practices, the Director shall continue to support the construction of the Facility for Rare Isotope Beams.

(2) REPEAL.—Section 981 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16321) is repealed.

(c) ISOTOPE DEVELOPMENT AND PRODUCTION FOR RESEARCH APPLICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall carry out a program for the production of isotopes

that the Director determines are needed for research and applications, including—

(A) the development of techniques to produce isotopes; and

(B) support for infrastructure required for isotope research and production.

(2) **COORDINATION.**—In making the determination described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) ensure that isotope production activities do not compete with private industry unless critical national interests necessitate the Federal Government's involvement; and

(B) consider any relevant recommendations made by Federal advisory committees, the National Academies, and interagency working groups in which the Department participates.

**SEC. 610. SCIENCE LABORATORIES INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM.**

(a) **PROGRAM.**—The Director shall carry out a program to improve the safety, efficiency, and mission readiness of infrastructure at Office of Science laboratories. The program shall include projects to—

(1) renovate or replace space that does not meet research needs;

(2) replace facilities that are no longer cost effective to renovate or operate;

(3) modernize utility systems to prevent failures and ensure efficiency;

(4) remove excess facilities to allow safe and efficient operations; and

(5) construct modern facilities to conduct advanced research in controlled environmental conditions.

(b) **APPROACH.**—In carrying out this section, the Director shall utilize all available approaches and mechanisms, including capital line items, minor construction projects, energy savings performance contracts, utility energy service contracts, alternative financing, and expense funding, as appropriate.

(c) **DEFINITION.**—The term “Office of Science laboratory” means a subset of National Laboratories as defined in section 2(3) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801) consisting of subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), (F), (K), (L), (M), (P), and (Q).

**SEC. 611. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for the activities of the Office of Science—

(1) \$5,339,794,000 for fiscal year 2016;

(2) \$5,606,783,700 for fiscal year 2017;

(3) \$5,887,122,885 for fiscal year 2018;

(4) \$6,181,479,029 for fiscal year 2019; and

(5) \$6,490,552,981 for fiscal year 2020.

**Subtitle B—ARPA-E**

**SEC. 621. SHORT TITLE.**

This subtitle may be cited as the “ARPA-E Reauthorization Act of 2015”.

**SEC. 622. ARPA-E AMENDMENTS.**

Section 5012 of the America COMPETES Act (42 U.S.C. 16538) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (o) and inserting after subsection (m) the following new subsection:

“(n) **PROTECTION OF PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.**—The following categories of information collected by the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy from recipients of financial assistance awards shall be considered privileged and confidential and not subject to disclosure pursuant to section 552 of title 5, United States Code:

“(1) Plans for commercialization of technologies developed under the award, including business plans, technology to market plans, market studies, and cost and performance models.

“(2) Investments provided to an awardee from third parties, such as venture capital, hedge fund, or private equity firms, including amounts and percentage of ownership of

the awardee provided in return for such investments.

“(3) Additional financial support that the awardee plans to invest or has invested into the technology developed under the award, or that the awardee is seeking from third parties.

“(4) Revenue from the licensing or sale of new products or services resulting from the research conducted under the award.”; and

(2) in paragraph (2) of subsection (o), as so redesignated by paragraph (1) of this section, by—

(A) striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (D);

(B) striking the period at the end of subparagraph (E) and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) adding at the end the following:

“(F) \$325,000,000 for fiscal year 2016;

“(G) \$341,250,000 for fiscal year 2017;

“(H) \$358,312,500 for fiscal year 2018;

“(I) \$376,228,125 for fiscal year 2019; and

“(J) \$395,039,531 for fiscal year 2020.”.

**Subtitle C—Energy Innovation**

**SEC. 641. ENERGY INNOVATION HUBS.**

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Energy shall carry out a program to enhance the Nation's economic, environmental, and energy security by making awards to consortia for establishing and operating Energy Innovation Hubs to conduct and support, whenever practicable at one centralized location, multidisciplinary, collaborative research, development, demonstration, and commercial application of advanced energy technologies.

(2) **TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT FOCUS.**—The Secretary shall designate for each Hub a unique advanced energy technology focus.

(3) **COORDINATION.**—The Secretary shall ensure the coordination of, and avoid unnecessary duplication of, the activities of Hubs with those of other Department of Energy research entities, including the National Laboratories, the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, Energy Frontier Research Centers, and within industry.

(b) **CONSORTIA.**—

(1) **ELIGIBILITY.**—To be eligible to receive an award under this section for the establishment and operation of a Hub, a consortium shall—

(A) be composed of no fewer than 2 qualifying entities; and

(B) operate subject to an agreement entered into by its members that documents—

(i) the proposed partnership agreement, including the governance and management structure of the Hub;

(ii) measures to enable cost-effective implementation of the program under this section;

(iii) a proposed budget, including financial contributions from non-Federal sources;

(iv) a plan for managing intellectual property rights; and

(v) an accounting structure that enables the Secretary to ensure that the consortium has complied with the requirements of this section.

(2) **APPLICATION.**—A consortium seeking to establish and operate a Hub under this section, acting through a prime applicant, shall transmit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such form, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary shall require, including a detailed description of the elements of the consortium agreement required under paragraph (1)(B). If the consortium members will not be located at one centralized location, such application shall include a communications plan that ensures close coordination and integration of the Hub's activities.

(c) **SELECTION AND SCHEDULE.**—The Secretary shall select consortia for awards for the establishment and operation of Hubs

through competitive selection processes. In selecting consortia, the Secretary shall consider the information a consortium must disclose according to subsection (b), as well as any existing facilities a consortium will provide for Hub activities. Awards made to a Hub shall be for a period not to exceed 5 years, after which the award may be renewed, subject to a rigorous merit review. A Hub already in existence on the date of enactment of this Act may continue to receive support for a period of 5 years beginning on the date of establishment of that Hub.

(d) **HUB OPERATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each Hub shall conduct or provide for multidisciplinary, collaborative research, development, demonstration, and, where appropriate, commercial application of advanced energy technologies within the technology development focus designated under subsection (a)(2). Each Hub shall—

(A) encourage collaboration and communication among the member qualifying entities of the consortium and awardees by conducting activities whenever practicable at one centralized location;

(B) develop and publish on the Department of Energy's website proposed plans and programs;

(C) submit an annual report to the Secretary summarizing the Hub's activities, including detailing organizational expenditures, and describing each project undertaken by the Hub; and

(D) monitor project implementation and coordination.

(2) **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.**—

(A) **PROCEDURES.**—Hubs shall maintain conflict of interest procedures, consistent with those of the Department of Energy, to ensure that employees and consortia designees for Hub activities who are in decision-making capacities disclose all material conflicts of interest.

(B) **DISQUALIFICATION AND REVOCATION.**—The Secretary may disqualify an application or revoke funds distributed to a Hub if the Secretary discovers a failure to comply with conflict of interest procedures established under subparagraph (A).

(3) **PROHIBITION ON CONSTRUCTION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—No funds provided pursuant to this section may be used for construction of new buildings or facilities for Hubs. Construction of new buildings or facilities shall not be considered as part of the non-Federal share of a Hub cost-sharing agreement.

(B) **TEST BED AND RENOVATION EXCEPTION.**—Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit the use of funds provided pursuant to this section, or non-Federal cost share funds, for research or for the construction of a test bed or renovations to existing buildings or facilities for the purposes of research if the Secretary determines that the test bed or renovations are limited to a scope and scale necessary for the research to be conducted.

(e) **TERMINATION.**—Consistent with the existing authorities of the Department, the Secretary may terminate an underperforming Hub for cause during the performance period.

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section:

(1) **ADVANCED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY.**—The term “advanced energy technology” means—

(A) an innovative technology—

(i) that produces energy from solar, wind, geothermal, biomass, tidal, wave, ocean, or other renewable energy resources;

(ii) that produces nuclear energy;

(iii) for carbon capture and sequestration;

(iv) that enables advanced vehicles, vehicle components, and related technologies that result in significant energy savings;

(v) that generates, transmits, distributes, utilizes, or stores energy more efficiently

than conventional technologies, including through Smart Grid technologies; or

(vi) that enhances the energy independence and security of the United States by enabling improved or expanded supply and production of domestic energy resources, including coal, oil, and natural gas;

(B) research, development, demonstration, and commercial application activities necessary to ensure the long-term, secure, and sustainable supply of energy critical elements; or

(C) another innovative energy technology area identified by the Secretary.

(2) **ENERGY CRITICAL ELEMENT.**—The term “energy critical element” means any of a class of chemical elements that have a high risk of a supply disruption and are critical to one or more new, energy-related technologies such that a shortage of such element would significantly inhibit large-scale deployment of technologies that produce, transmit, store, or conserve energy.

(3) **HUB.**—The term “Hub” means an Energy Innovation Hub established or operating in accordance with this section, including any Energy Innovation Hub existing as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(4) **QUALIFYING ENTITY.**—The term “qualifying entity” means—

(A) an institution of higher education;

(B) an appropriate State or Federal entity, including the Department of Energy Federally Funded Research and Development Centers;

(C) a nongovernmental organization with expertise in advanced energy technology research, development, demonstration, or commercial application; or

(D) any other relevant entity the Secretary considers appropriate.

**SEC. 642. PARTICIPATION IN THE INNOVATION CORPS PROGRAM.**

(a) **AGREEMENT.**—The Secretary of Energy shall enter into an agreement with the Director of the National Science Foundation to enable researchers funded by the Department of Energy to participate in the Innovation Corps program authorized by section 307.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION.**—The Secretary of Energy may also establish a Department of Energy Innovation Corps program, modeled after the National Science Foundation Innovation Corps program, to incorporate experts from the Department of Energy National Laboratories in the training curriculum of the program.

**SEC. 643. TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER.**

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Energy shall transmit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report which shall include—

(1) an assessment of the Department’s current ability to carry out the goals of section 1001 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16391), including an assessment of the role and effectiveness of the Director of the Office of Technology Transitions; and

(2) recommended departmental policy changes and legislative changes to section 1001 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16391) to improve the Department’s ability to successfully transfer new energy technologies to the private sector.

(b) **AMENDMENTS.**—Section 1001 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16391) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e), by striking “for commercial purposes” and inserting “of any sort for commercial purposes, including energy technologies not currently supported by the Department of Energy”;

(2) by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (h) and (i), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsections:

“(f) **AGREEMENTS FOR COMMERCIALIZING TECHNOLOGY PILOT PROGRAM.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall carry out the Agreements for Commercializing Technology pilot program of the Department, as announced by the Secretary on December 8, 2011, in accordance with this subsection.

“(2) **TERMS.**—Each agreement entered into pursuant to the pilot program referred to in paragraph (1) shall provide to the contractor of the applicable National Laboratory, to the maximum extent determined to be appropriate by the Secretary, increased authority to negotiate contract terms, such as intellectual property rights, payment structures, performance guarantees, and multiparty collaborations.

“(3) **ELIGIBILITY.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Any director of a National Laboratory may enter into an agreement pursuant to the pilot program referred to in paragraph (1).

“(B) **AGREEMENTS WITH NON-FEDERAL ENTITIES.**—To carry out subparagraph (A) and subject to subparagraph (C), the Secretary shall permit the directors of the National Laboratories to execute agreements with a non-Federal entity, including a non-Federal entity already receiving Federal funding that will be used to support activities under agreements executed pursuant to subparagraph (A), provided that such funding is solely used to carry out the purposes of the Federal award.

“(C) **RESTRICTION.**—The requirements of chapter 18 of title 35, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Bayh-Dole Act’) shall apply if—

“(i) the agreement is a funding agreement (as that term is defined in section 201 of that title); and

“(ii) at least 1 of the parties to the funding agreement is eligible to receive rights under that chapter.

“(4) **SUBMISSION TO SECRETARY.**—Each affected director of a National Laboratory shall submit to the Secretary, with respect to each agreement entered into under this subsection—

“(A) a summary of information relating to the relevant project;

“(B) the total estimated costs of the project;

“(C) estimated commencement and completion dates of the project; and

“(D) other documentation determined to be appropriate by the Secretary.

“(5) **CERTIFICATION.**—The Secretary shall require the contractor of the affected National Laboratory to certify that each activity carried out under a project for which an agreement is entered into under this subsection—

“(A) is not in direct competition with the private sector; and

“(B) does not present, or minimizes, any apparent conflict of interest, and avoids or neutralizes any actual conflict of interest, as a result of the agreement under this subsection.

“(6) **EXTENSION.**—The pilot program referred to in paragraph (1) shall be extended until October 31, 2017.

“(7) **REPORTS.**—

“(A) **OVERALL ASSESSMENT.**—Not later than 60 days after the date described in paragraph (6), the Secretary, in coordination with directors of the National Laboratories, shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that—

“(i) assesses the overall effectiveness of the pilot program referred to in paragraph (1);

“(ii) identifies opportunities to improve the effectiveness of the pilot program;

“(iii) assesses the potential for program activities to interfere with the responsibilities of the National Laboratories to the Department; and

“(iv) provides a recommendation regarding the future of the pilot program.

“(B) **TRANSPARENCY.**—The Secretary, in coordination with directors of the National Laboratories, shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate an annual report that accounts for all incidences of, and provides a justification for, non-Federal entities using funds derived from a Federal contract or award to carry out agreements pursuant to this subsection.

“(g) **INCLUSION OF TECHNOLOGY MATURATION IN AUTHORIZED TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER ACTIVITIES.**—The Secretary shall permit the directors of the National Laboratories to use funds authorized to support technology transfer, following the standard practices of the Department, to carry out technology maturation activities to identify and improve potential commercial application opportunities and demonstrate applications of research and technologies arising from National Laboratory activities.”.

(c) **DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY FOR TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER AGREEMENTS.**—

(1) **AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary of Energy shall delegate to directors of the National Laboratories signature authority for any technology transfer agreement with a total cost of not more than \$500,000, including both National Laboratory contributions and the project recipient cost share contribution, if such an agreement falls within the scope of a strategic plan for the National Laboratory that has been approved by the Department.

(2) **AGREEMENTS INCLUDED.**—The agreements to which this subsection applies include—

(A) Cooperative Research and Development Agreements; and

(B) non-Federal Work for Others Agreements.

(3) **AVAILABILITY OF RECORDS.**—

(A) Not later than 7 days after the date on which the director of a National Laboratory enters into an agreement under this subsection, such director shall submit to the Secretary of Energy for monitoring and review all records of the National Laboratory relating to the agreement.

(B) Not later than 30 days after the date on which the director of a specific National Laboratory enters into an agreement under this subsection, the Secretary may terminate the agreement and the authority of any director of such National Laboratory to enter into agreements under this subsection if—

(i) all records of the National Laboratory relating to the agreement have not been transmitted to the Secretary in accordance with subparagraph (A); or

(ii) the Secretary determines that this agreement is inconsistent with the mission of the Department.

(4) **LIMITATION.**—This subsection does not apply to any agreement with a majority foreign-owned company.

(5) **SUNSET.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—This subsection shall apply only during the 4-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) **ASSESSMENT.**—Not later than the date that is 180 days prior to the last day of the period described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate

an assessment of the effectiveness of the authority provided to the directors of the National Laboratories under this subsection to accelerate the development of new technologies, and an assessment of any incidences of potential misuse of this authority in the opinion of the Secretary.

**SEC. 644. FUNDING COMPETITIVENESS FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND OTHER NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS.**

Section 988(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16352(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3)” and inserting “Except as provided in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) EXEMPTION FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND OTHER NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a research or development activity performed by an institution of higher education or nonprofit institution (as defined in section 4 of the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3703)).

“(B) TERMINATION DATE.—The exemption under subparagraph (A) shall apply during the 6-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this paragraph.”.

**SEC. 645. UNDER SECRETARY FOR SCIENCE AND ENERGY.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 202(b) of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7132(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Under Secretary for Science” each place it appears and inserting “Under Secretary for Science and Energy”; and

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (F), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (G), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (G) the following:

“(H) establish appropriate linkages between offices under the jurisdiction of the Under Secretary; and

“(I) perform such functions and duties as the Secretary shall prescribe, consistent with this section.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 3164(b)(1) of the Department of Energy Science Education Enhancement Act (42 U.S.C. 7381a(b)(1)) is amended by striking “Under Secretary for Science” and inserting “Under Secretary for Science and Energy”.

(2) Section 641(h)(2) of the United States Energy Storage Competitiveness Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17231(h)(2)) is amended by striking “Under Secretary for Science” and inserting “Under Secretary for Science and Energy”.

**SEC. 646. SPECIAL HIRING AUTHORITY FOR SCIENTIFIC, ENGINEERING, AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary shall have the authority to—

(1) make appointments of scientific, engineering, and professional personnel, without regard to civil service laws, to assist the Department in meeting specific project or research needs;

(2) fix the basic pay of any employee appointed under this section at a rate to be determined by the Under Secretary at rates not in excess of the Executive Schedule (EX-II) without regard to the civil service laws; and

(3) pay any employee appointed under this section payments in addition to basic pay, except that the total amount of additional payments paid to an employee under this subsection for any 12-month period shall not exceed the least of the following amounts:

(A) \$25,000.

(B) The amount equal to 25 percent of the annual rate of basic pay of that employee.

(C) The amount of the limitation that is applicable for a calendar year under section 5307(a)(1) of title 5, United States Code.

(b) TERM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The term of any employee appointed under this section shall not exceed 3 years.

(2) TERMINATION.—The Under Secretary shall have the authority to terminate any employee appointed under this section at any time based on performance or changing project or research needs of the Department.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, so much of today’s debate has been about how harmful the underlying legislation is for our Nation and how it violates every one of the principles of the original COMPETES bill. I am now pleased to be offering a positive way forward in the form of a substitute bill cosponsored by every Democratic member of the committee in addition to the minority leader, Mr. HOYER.

I spoke earlier about the history of the COMPETES bill and the principles it has embodied since the Rising Above the Gathering Storm report set us on this path 10 years ago. The substitute amendment, which we introduced as H.R. 1898, stays true to one of these principles.

It sets targets that provide for steady and sustained real growth in funding for our research and development agencies. It makes a strong statement that the U.S. Congress sees funding for research across all fields of basic research as a top national priority. It does not include false and detrimental choices and tradeoffs among different fields of science and engineering. It ensures that scientific experts, not politicians, continue to set priorities for funding within and among different fields of basic research and for individual grants.

The principles embodied in my substitute amendment continue a pact that the Federal Government made with our Nation’s great research universities following our victory in World War II and the onset of the space race that led us to the creation of NSF and NASA.

This pact is what has made NSF, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, or NIST, and the Department of Energy among the world’s greatest and most admired research agencies.

Specifically, my amendment fully funds these agencies at the fiscal year 2016 request level and continues to provide 5 percent annual increases for 5 years. This modest investment is already a compromise, given the im-

mense economic return on our basic research investments. The original Rising Above the Gathering Storm report called for even greater increases.

My amendment also reauthorizes and fully funds ARPA-E, which was created in the 2007 COMPETES Act and has exceeded every expectation for creating innovative new energy technologies and spurring private sector follow-on investment.

In addition, my amendment authorizes and funds important innovation programs at the Department of Commerce, including an innovation voucher pilot program that will help small- and medium-sized manufacturers across the country grow their businesses and create new jobs.

My amendment fully funds the standards work of NIST, in addition to their work to help accelerate growth in U.S. advanced manufacturing. We need to bring those manufacturing jobs back home, and we need to Make It In America. NIST is an essential partner in this effort.

□ 1745

Finally, my amendment takes seriously the issue of STEM education, including broadening participation in STEM. Our STEM language is not just senses of Congress about how important STEM is and other filler provisions.

Our language directs real important policy changes to help ensure that all U.S. students and researchers have the opportunity to fully develop their talents in STEM and pursue successful STEM careers.

We are facing a demographic imperative. If we do not find a way to turn around the underrepresentation of women and minorities in STEM fields, our Nation will fall well short of the skilled workforce our industries demand. Our substitute puts our money before where our mouth is when it comes to STEM and corrects a glaring deficit in the underlying legislation.

I am proud of my work that I have done on this committee for many years and of the contributions that many of my colleagues made to this substitute amendment. It truly is a COMPETES Reauthorization Act in every way.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to carefully consider the fork in the road before us. If you really want to do right by this great Nation and by our children and our grandchildren, you will vote for the substitute amendment and replace the underlying legislation with a positive path forward.

This amendment will open the doors for innovation and education for our Nation’s future. It will not be trade, as many have said, that will cause us to lose these jobs; it will be our companies searching around the world looking for talent and innovation.

Look out for America’s future. Vote for this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the gentlewoman's amendment.

As I mentioned in my opening remarks, I support a responsible and sustainable path forward for U.S. science, research, and development. We must prioritize the areas of basic research to ensure future U.S. economic competitiveness and spur private sector innovation.

This amendment ignores the caps set by the Budget Control Act, which the ranking member herself supported, and ignores the tough choices that must be made to protect the American taxpayer and future generations from more debt. It is irresponsible not to adhere to the Budget Control Act, which was signed into law by President Obama.

The Budget Control Act was a bipartisan agreement that 95 Democrats voted for, including the ranking member. Now, she wants to ignore that particular law. Although many Members would like to see the Budget Control Act replaced, it is the law of the land, and we should abide by it.

Of course, it is easy just to propose more spending, knowing it will sound good, even if it is irresponsible and against the law. In fiscal year 2016 alone, this amendment would increase spending by \$600 million over the current level and the underlying bill. The amendment increases spending on later-stage research and technology, best done by the private sector.

Since last Congress, we have worked hard to reach an agreement with the minority on numerous policy issues, and we have accepted many of their provisions and ideas to make this bill stronger.

For example, we strengthened STEM provisions related to a new advisory panel and coordinating office. We also included language in support of NIST that passed the House floor on a bipartisan vote last year.

Also, in title III of the bill are three pieces of bipartisan legislation that passed the Science Committee by voice vote in March. Two of those three pieces of legislation were sponsored by Democrats.

I urge my colleagues to support a balanced approach of fiscal responsibility and targeted investments in priority science and basic research and vote "no" on the Democratic substitute. The Democratic substitute ignores the Budget Control Act and does not advance good science in America.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ms. JOHNSON for yielding.

I am proud to rise in support of Ms. JOHNSON's amendment in the nature of a substitute, and I am also proud to co-sponsor H.R. 1898, which contains the same language, because this alternative is much more in keeping with

the principles of the original America COMPETES Act.

Mr. Chairman, in 2007, I served on the conference committee that worked out the House-Senate compromise on the original COMPETES bill. In 2010, I wrote the NSF title on the reauthorization. These are two of my proudest moments in Congress because those were bipartisan bills that set us on a path to continue leading the world in scientific research and innovation for the next generation.

Sadly, in recent years, we have let that progress stall. Make no mistake, other nations are continuing to invest and are continuing to innovate. If we don't come together to send a strong message and provide strong support for scientific research, America will no longer be able to compete.

The COMPETES bill is an investment bill. I understand the threat of our enormous Federal debt; but, without the types of investments that are made in the COMPETES bill, we will not promote the economic growth that we need to end our deficits and pay down our debt.

Ranking Member JOHNSON's alternative makes those investments. Unlike the base bill, it does not make drastic cuts to Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, which promotes and funds research and development of advanced energy technologies.

It does not make drastic cuts to the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy that invests in high-risk, high-value research and development in the fields of energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies. It doesn't cut the geosciences or make a more than 50 percent cut to research in the social, behavioral, and economic sciences.

Some might think that last one is warranted; but, in the Science Committee, we are constantly hearing from witnesses about how social science is vital to the work going on in other fields. Members of Congress have frequently relied on spectrum auctions, developed by NSF social science research, to raise billions of dollars.

Social science is perhaps the most critical component to preventing cyber crimes. Considering that the majority of all cyber breaches occur because of social factors, like using easy-to-guess passwords or clicking on a link in a phishing attack, we should want to increase funding in these areas.

Mr. Chairman, Ms. JOHNSON's amendment provides robust support in all of these areas. I agree that the chairman's bill has gotten better and things have been added to the bill which have made it a better bill, but still, I think there is no question that Ms. JOHNSON's substitute is a much better bill for making the types of investments we need in scientific research right now if we want to make sure that America still competes. This is critical to the future of our country; this is critical to innovation.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN), who is a member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

The gentlewoman's amendment makes everything a priority so that nothing really is. This amendment rubberstamps the administration's budget request, which fails to make choices, spreading a little bit of research funding around to try to please everyone.

Compared to the gentlewoman's proposal, H.R. 1806 funds 329 more new grants in biology next year, 398 more new grants in computer science, 457 more new grants in engineering, and 955 more new grants in math and the physical sciences.

These are research grants that are going to universities and research institutions across the country, fueling innovation and driving economic competitiveness in the United States.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise today in support of the substitute amendment to H.R. 1806 and focus on one issue. The underlying bill would set a harmful new precedent by authorizing funding at the directorate level.

Currently, funding levels for the National Science Foundation for each directorate are based on strategic priorities and science-based recommendations from the National Science Board. This is how it should be and how it remains under the substitute amendment.

By setting authorization levels according to directorate, this bill would limit the flexibility NSF needs to set strategic priorities and adapt and capitalize on unanticipated discoveries.

I share the concerns of many experts that the underlying bill would reduce authorized funding levels for specific directorates: the Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences and the Directorate for Geosciences.

Some of this funding has been used, for example, for Oregon State University to conduct research on ocean acidification. It has also been used critically to support the work in Oregon to develop our understanding of the risks posed by a Cascadia subduction zone earthquake. Other examples are around the country.

In summary, the underlying bill diminishes the ability of the National Science Foundation to make strategic science-based decisions.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the substitute amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we are prepared to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I simply will close by saying, as we have been on this floor, we continue to get emails and letters from universities and scientists around this Nation.

I am not presenting this substitute to be funny; I am presenting this substitute to take us to the professional level that the research brought us when we first had America COMPETES. It is not a picking and choosing; it is a professional approach to funding scientific projects.

If we mean to look out for the future of the Nation, as we say we are, this is the legislation that will do it.

I urge everyone to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman's amendment ignores the law of the land. She and more than 90 other Democrats supported the Budget Control Act, which was signed into law by the President. This amendment ignores those budget caps.

I support a responsible and sustainable path forward for U.S. science, research, and development; but it is neither responsible, nor sustainable, to spend more and more taxpayer dollars and increase the debt that future generations will inherit. We must prioritize the areas of basic research to ensure future economic competitiveness and spur private sector innovation.

Since the last Congress, we have worked hard to reach an agreement with the minority on numerous policy issues, but we have been clear since the beginning that increases in spending need to have reasonable offsets. This amendment fails to include any offsets and openly ignores the Budget Control Act.

I urge my colleagues to support a balanced approach of fiscal responsibility and targeted investments in priority, science, and basic research. Vote "no" on the amendment and "yes" on the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I request a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 114-

120 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. LOWENTHAL of California.

Amendment No. 10 by Ms. BONAMICI of Oregon.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. BEYER of Virginia.

Amendment No. 12 by Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment printed in part A of House Report 114-120 offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 243, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 252]

AYES—177

Adams	DeBene	Kilmer
Aguilar	DeSaulnier	Kind
Ashford	Deutch	Kuster
Bass	Dingell	Langevin
Beatty	Doggett	Larsen (WA)
Becerra	Dold	Larson (CT)
Beyer	Doyle, Michael	Lawrence
Bishop (GA)	F.	Lee
Blumenauer	Duckworth	Levin
Bonamici	Ewards	Lewis
Boyle, Brendan	Ellison	Lieu, Ted
F.	Engel	Loeb
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Lofgren
Brown (FL)	Esty	Lowenthal
Brownley (CA)	Farr	Lowey
Bustos	Fattah	Lujan Grisham
Butterfield	Poster	(NM)
Capuano	Frankel (FL)	Lujan, Ben Ray
Cardenas	Fudge	(NM)
Carney	Gabbard	Lynch
Cartwright	Gallego	Maloney,
Castor (FL)	Grayson	Carolyn
Castro (TX)	Green, Al	Maloney, Sean
Chu, Judy	Green, Gene	Matsui
Ciциlline	Grijalva	McCollum
Clark (MA)	Gutiérrez	McDermott
Clarke (NY)	Hahn	McGovern
Clay	Hastings	McNerney
Cleaver	Heck (WA)	Meeks
Clyburn	Higgins	Meng
Cohen	Himes	Moore
Connolly	Hinojosa	Moulton
Conyers	Honda	Murphy (FL)
Cooper	Hoyer	Nadler
Courtney	Huffman	Napolitano
Crowley	Israel	Neal
Cuellar	Jefferson Lee	Nolan
Cummings	Jeffries	Norcross
Curbelo (FL)	Johnson (GA)	O'Rourke
Davis (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
Davis, Danny	Kaptur	Pascarell
DeFazio	Keating	Payne
DeGette	Kelly (IL)	Pelosi
Delaney	Kennedy	Perlmutter
DeLauro	Kildee	Peters

Pingree	Schiff	Tiberi
Pocan	Scott (VA)	Titus
Polis	Scott, David	Tonko
Price (NC)	Serrano	Torres
Quigley	Sewell (AL)	Van Hollen
Rangel	Sherman	Vargas
Richmond	Sires	Veasey
Roybal-Allard	Slaughter	Vela
Ruiz	Smith (WA)	Velázquez
Rush	Speier	Vislousky
Ryan (OH)	Stivers	Walz
Sánchez, Linda	Swalwell (CA)	Waters, Maxine
T.	Takai	Watson Coleman
Sanchez, Loretta	Takano	Welch
Sarbanes	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Schakowsky	Thompson (MS)	Yarmuth

NOES—243

Abraham	Grothman	Pearce
Aderholt	Guinta	Perry
Allen	Guthrie	Peterson
Amash	Hanna	Pittenger
Amodei	Hardy	Pitts
Babin	Harper	Poe (TX)
Barletta	Harris	Poliquin
Barr	Hartzler	Pompeo
Barton	Heck (NV)	Posey
Benishek	Hensarling	Price, Tom
Bilirakis	Herrera Beutler	Ratcliffe
Bishop (MI)	Hice, Jody B.	Reed
Bishop (UT)	Hill	Reichert
Black	Holding	Renacci
Blackburn	Hudson	Ribble
Blum	Huelskamp	Rice (NY)
Bost	Huizenga (MI)	Rice (SC)
Boustany	Hultgren	Rigell
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Roby
Brat	Hurd (TX)	Roe (TN)
Bridenstine	Hurt (VA)	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (AL)	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (KS)	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Jenkins (WV)	Rokita
Buck	Johnson (OH)	Rooney (FL)
Bucshon	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Jolly	Roskam
Byrne	Jones	Ross
Calvert	Jordan	Rothfus
Carter (GA)	Joyce	Rouzer
Carter (TX)	Katko	Royce
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Ruppersberger
Clawson (FL)	King (IA)	Russell
Coffman	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Cole	Kinzinger (IL)	Salmon
Collins (GA)	Kline	Sanford
Collins (NY)	Knight	Scalise
Conaway	LaMalfa	Schraeder
Cook	Lamborn	Schweikert
Costa	Lance	Scott, Austin
Costello (PA)	Latta	Sensenbrenner
Cramer	Lipinski	Sessions
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Shimkus
Culberson	Long	Shuster
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Simpson
Denham	Love	Sinema
Dent	Lucas	Smith (MO)
DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NE)
DesJarlais	Lummis	Smith (NJ)
Diaz-Balart	MacArthur	Smith (TX)
Duffy	Marchant	Stefanik
Duncan (SC)	Marino	Stewart
Duncan (TN)	Massie	Stutzman
Ellmers (NC)	McCarthy	Thompson (PA)
Emmer (MN)	McCaul	Thornberry
Farenthold	McClintock	Tipton
Fincher	McHenry	Trott
Fitzpatrick	McKinley	Turner
Fleischmann	McMorris	Upton
Fleming	Rodgers	Valadao
Flores	McSally	Wagner
Forbes	Meadows	Walberg
Fortenberry	Meehan	Walden
Fox	Messer	Walker
Franks (AZ)	Mica	Walorski
Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)	Walters, Mimi
Garamendi	Miller (MI)	Weber (TX)
Garrett	Moolenaar	Webster (FL)
Gibbs	Mooney (WV)	Wenstrup
Gibson	Mullin	Westerman
Gohmert	Mulvaney	Westmoreland
Goodlatte	Murphy (PA)	Whitfield
Gosar	Neugebauer	Williams
Gowdy	Newhouse	Wilson (SC)
Graham	Nugent	Wittman
Granger	Nunes	Womack
Graves (GA)	Olson	Woodall
Graves (LA)	Palazzo	Yoder
Graves (MO)	Palmer	
Griffith	Paulsen	

Yoho Young (IA) Zeldin  
 Young (AK) Young (IN) Zinke

NOT VOTING—12

Bera Crawford Tsongas  
 Capps Donovan Wasserman  
 Carson (IN) Kirkpatrick Schultz  
 Chaffetz Labrador  
 Comstock Noem

□ 1827

Messrs. TIPTON, LUCAS, FORBES, McCLINTOCK, and STEWART changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. ASHFORD, Ms. DEGETTE, Messrs. STIVERS, YARMUTH, and DOLD changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 252, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFITH

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment printed in part A of House Report 114-120 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 183, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 253]

AYES—234

Abraham Cook Graves (MO)  
 Aderholt Costello (PA) Griffith  
 Allen Cramer Grothman  
 Amash Crenshaw Guinta  
 Babin Culberson Guthrie  
 Barletta Curbelo (FL) Hanna  
 Barr Davis, Rodney Israel  
 Barton Denham Harper  
 Benishek Dent Harris  
 Bilirakis DeSantis Hartzler  
 Bishop (MI) DesJarlais Heck (NV)  
 Bishop (UT) Diaz-Balart Hensarling  
 Black Dold Herrera Beutler  
 Blackburn Duffy Hice, Jody B.  
 Blum Duncan (SC) Hill  
 Bost Duncan (TN) Holding  
 Boustany Ellmers (NC) Hudson  
 Brady (TX) Emmer (MN) Huelskamp  
 Brat Farenthold Huizenga (MI)  
 Bridenstine Fincher Hultgren  
 Brooks (AL) Fitzpatrick Hunter  
 Brooks (IN) Fleischmann Hurd (TX)  
 Buchanan Fleming Hurt (VA)  
 Buck Flores Issa  
 Buehson Forbes Jenkins (KS)  
 Burgess Fortenberry Jenkins (WV)  
 Byrne Fox Johnson (OH)  
 Calvert Franks (AZ) Johnson, Sam  
 Carter (GA) Frelinghuysen Jolly  
 Carter (TX) Garrett Jordan  
 Chabot Gibbs Joyce  
 Clawson (FL) Gohmert Katko  
 Coffman Goodlatte Kelly (PA)  
 Cole Gosar King (NY)  
 Collins (GA) Gowdy Kinzinger (IL)  
 Collins (NY) Granger Kline  
 Comstock Graves (GA) Knight  
 Conaway Graves (LA) Labrador

LaMalfa Paulsen  
 Lamborn Pearce  
 Lance Perry  
 Latta Pittenger  
 LoBiondo Pitts  
 Long Poe (TX)  
 Loudermilk Poliquin  
 Love Pompeo  
 Lucas Posey  
 Luetkemeyer Price, Tom  
 Lummis Ratcliffe  
 MacArthur Reed  
 Marchant Reichert  
 Marino Renacci  
 Massie Ribble  
 McCarthy Rice (SC)  
 McCaul Rigell  
 McClintock Roby  
 McHenry Roe (TN)  
 McKinley Rogers (AL)  
 McMorris Rogers (KY)  
 Rodgers Rohrabacher  
 McSally Rooney (FL)  
 Meadows Ros-Lehtinen  
 Meehan Roskam  
 Messer Ross  
 Mica Rothfus  
 Miller (FL) Rouzer  
 Miller (MI) Royce  
 Moolenaar Russell  
 Mooney (WV) Ryan (WI)  
 Mullin Salmon  
 Mulvaney Sanford  
 Murphy (PA) Scalise  
 Neugebauer Schweikert  
 Neuhouse Scott, Austin  
 Nugent Sensenbrenner  
 Nunes Sessions  
 Olson Shimkus  
 Palazzo Shuster  
 Palmer Simpson

NOES—183

Adams  
 Aguilar  
 Ashford  
 Bass  
 Beatty  
 Beyer  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Blumenauer  
 Bonamici  
 Boyle, Brendan F.  
 Brady (PA)  
 Brown (FL)  
 Brownley (CA)  
 Bustos  
 Butterfield  
 Capuano  
 Cárdenas  
 Carney  
 Cartwright  
 Castor (FL)  
 Castro (TX)  
 Chu, Judy  
 Cicilline  
 Clark (MA)  
 Clarke (NY)  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Cohen  
 Connolly  
 Conyers  
 Cooper  
 Costa  
 Courtney  
 Crowley  
 Cuellar  
 Cummings  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis, Danny  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 Delaney  
 DeLauro  
 DeBene  
 DeSaulnier  
 Deutch  
 Dingell  
 Doyle, Michael F.  
 Duckworth  
 Edwards  
 Ellison  
 Engel  
 Eshoo  
 Esty

Smith (MO)  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Stefanik  
 Stewart  
 Stivers  
 Stutzman  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiberi  
 Tipton  
 Trott  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Valadao  
 Wagner  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walker  
 Walorski  
 Walters, Mimi  
 Weber (TX)  
 Webster (FL)  
 Wenstrup  
 Westerman  
 Whitfield  
 Williams  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Yoder  
 Yoho  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (IA)  
 Young (IN)  
 Zinke

Swalwell (CA)  
 Takai  
 Takano  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Titus  
 Tonko

Torres  
 Van Hollen  
 Vargas  
 Veasey  
 Velázquez  
 Vislosky

Walz  
 Waters, Maxine  
 Watson Coleman  
 Welch  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Yarmuth  
 Zeldin

NOT VOTING—15

Amodei Crawford Schrader  
 Becerra Doggett Tsongas  
 Bera Donovan Wasserman  
 Capps King (IA) Schultz  
 Carson (IN) Noem  
 Chaffetz Rokita

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1831

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment printed in part A of House Report 114-120 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 236, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 254]

AYES—187

Adams Davis, Danny Hoyer  
 Aguilar DeFazio Huffman  
 Ashford DeGette Israel  
 Bass Delaney Jackson Lee  
 Beatty DeLauro Jeffries  
 Beyer DeBene Johnson (GA)  
 Bishop (GA) DeSaulnier Johnson, E. B.  
 Blumenauer Deutch Kaptur  
 Bonamici Dingell Keating  
 Boyle, Brendan Doggett Kelly (IL)  
 F. Dold Kennedy  
 Brady (PA) Doyle, Michael  
 Brown (FL) F. Kildee  
 Brownley (CA) Duckworth Kilmer  
 Bustos Edwards Kind  
 Butterfield Ellison Kirkpatrick  
 Capuano Engel Kuster  
 Cárdenas Eshoo Langevin  
 Carney Esty Larsen (WA)  
 Carson (IN) Farr Larson (CT)  
 Cartwright Fattah Lawrence  
 Castor (FL) Foster Lee  
 Castro (TX) Frankel (FL) Levin  
 Chu, Judy Fudge Lieu, Ted  
 Cicilline Gabbard Lipinski  
 Clark (MA) Gallego Loeb sack  
 Clarke (NY) Garamendi Lofgren  
 Clay Gibson Lowenthal  
 Cleaver Graham Lowey  
 Clyburn Grayson Lujan Grisham  
 Cohen Green, Al (NM)  
 Connolly Green, Gene Lujan, Ben Ray  
 Conyers Grijalva (NM)  
 Cooper Gutiérrez Lynch  
 Costa Hahn Maloney,  
 Courtney Hastings Carolyn  
 Crowley Heck (WA) Maloney, Sean  
 Cuellar Higgins Matsui  
 Cummings Himes McCollum  
 Curbelo (FL) Hinojosa McDermott  
 Davis (CA) Honda McGovern

McNerney Reichert Smith (WA) Weber (TX) Williams Yoho McCollum Price (NC) Smith (NE)  
 Meeks Rice (NY) Speier Webster (FL) Wilson (SC) Young (AK) McDermott Quigley Smith (WA)  
 Meng Richmond Swallow (CA) Wenstrup Wittman Young (IA) McGovern Rangel Speier  
 Moore Ros-Lehtinen Takai Westerman Womack Young (IN) McMorris Reichert Stefanik  
 Moulton Roybal-Allard Takano Westmoreland Woodall Zeldin Rice (NY) Stewart  
 Murphy (FL) Ruiz Thompson (CA) Whitfield Yoder Zinke Richmond Swallow (CA)  
 Nadler Ruppertsberger Thompson (MS) Titus Meng Rokita Roybal-Allard Takai  
 Napolitano Rush Titus Moore Moulton Ruppertsberger Ruiz Thompson (CA)  
 Neal Ryan (OH) Tonko Berra Crawford Wasserman Moulton Ruppertsberger Rush Thompson (MS)  
 Nolan Sanchez, Linda Torres Capps Noem Schultz Murphy (FL) Ryan (OH) Titus  
 Norcross T. Van Hollen Capps Noem Schultz Ryan (OH) Salmon Tonko  
 O'Rourke Sanchez, Loretta Vargas Veasey Nadler Ryan (OH) Sanchez, Linda Torres  
 Pallone Sarbanes Vargases Schiff Neuhouse Nolan Sanchez, Loretta T. Vargases  
 Pascrell Schakowsky Vela Velázquez Velázquez Velázquez Vela Vargases  
 Payne Schiff Schrader Scott (VA) Visclosky Visclosky Visclosky Visclosky  
 Pelosi Schrader Scott (VA) Walz Waters, Maxine Watson Coleman  
 Perlmutter Scott (VA) Walz Waters, Maxine Watson Coleman  
 Peters Scott, David Serrano Sewell (AL) Sherman Welch  
 Pingree Serrano Sewell (AL) Sherman Welch  
 Pocan Sewell (AL) Sinema Wilson (FL) Yarmuth  
 Polis Sherman Wilson (FL) Yarmuth  
 Price (NC) Sinema Wilson (FL) Yarmuth  
 Quigley Sires Yarmuth  
 Rangel Slaughter Young (IA)

NOT VOTING—9  
 Becerra Crawford Wasserman  
 Berra Donovan Schultz  
 Capps Noem  
 Chaffetz Tsongas

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1835  
 So the amendment was rejected.  
 The result of the vote was announced  
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI  
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
 business is the demand for a recorded  
 vote on the amendment printed in part  
 A of House Report 114–120 offered by  
 the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms.  
 BONAMICI) 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 amend-  
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE  
 The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.  
 The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-  
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
 vice, and there were—ayes 208, noes 215,  
 not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 255]

AYES—208

NOES—236  
 Abraham Graves (GA) Mullin  
 Aderholt Graves (LA) Mulvaney  
 Allen Graves (MO) Murphy (PA)  
 Amash Griffith Neugebauer  
 Amodei Grothman Newhouse  
 Babin Guinta Nugent  
 Barletta Guthrie Nunes  
 Barr Hanna Olson  
 Barton Hardy Palazzo  
 Benishek Harper Palmer  
 Bilirakis Harris Paulsen  
 Bishop (MI) Hartzler Pearce  
 Bishop (UT) Heck (NV) Perry  
 Black Hensarling Peterson  
 Blackburn Herrera Beutler Pittenger  
 Blum Hice, Jody B. Pitts  
 Bost Hill Poe (TX)  
 Boustany Holding Poliquin  
 Brady (TX) Hudson Pompeo  
 Brat Huelskamp Posey  
 Bridenstine Huizenga (MI) Price, Tom  
 Brooks (AL) Hultgren Ratcliffe  
 Brooks (IN) Hunter Reed  
 Buchanan Hurd (TX) Renacci  
 Buck Hurt (VA) Ribble  
 Bucshon Issa Rice (SC)  
 Burgess Jenkins (KS) Rigell  
 Byrne Jenkins (WV) Roby  
 Calvert Johnson (OH) Roe (TN)  
 Carter (GA) Johnson, Sam Rogers (AL)  
 Carter (TX) Jolly Rogers (KY)  
 Chabot Jones Rohrabacher  
 Clawson (FL) Jordan Rokita  
 Coffman Joyce Rooney (FL)  
 Cole Katko Roskam  
 Collins (GA) Kelly (PA) Ross  
 Collins (NY) King (IA) Rothfus  
 Comstock King (NY) Rouzer  
 Conaway Kinzinger (IL) Royce  
 Cook Kline Russell  
 Costello (PA) Knight Ryan (WI)  
 Cramer Labrador Salmon  
 Crenshaw LaMalfa Sanford  
 Culberson Lamborn Scalise  
 Davis, Rodney Lance Schweikert  
 Denham Latta Scott, Austin  
 Dent LoBiondo Sensenbrenner  
 DeSantis Long Sessions  
 DesJarlais Loudermilk Shimkus  
 Diaz-Balart Love Shuster  
 Duffy Lucas Simpson  
 Duncan (SC) Luetkemeyer Smith (MO)  
 Duncan (TN) Lummis Smith (NE)  
 Ellmers (NC) MacArthur Smith (NJ)  
 Emmer (MN) Marchant Smith (TX)  
 Farenthold Marino Stefanik  
 Fincher Massie Stewart  
 Fitzpatrick McCarthy Stivers  
 Fleischmann McCaul Stutzman  
 Fleming McClintock Thompson (PA)  
 Flores McHenry Thornberry  
 Forbes McKinley Tiberi  
 Fortenberry McMorris Tipton  
 Foyx Rodgers Trott  
 Franks (AZ) McCally Turner  
 Frelinghuysen Meadows Upton  
 Garrett Meehan Valadao  
 Gibbs Messer Wagner  
 Gohmert Mica Walberg  
 Goodlatte Miller (FL) Walden  
 Gosar Miller (MI) Walker  
 Gowdy Moolenaar Walorski  
 Granger Mooney (WV) Walters, Mimi

Adams Davis, Rodney Honda  
 Aguilar DeFazio Hoyer  
 Ashford DeGette Huffman  
 Bass Israel  
 Beatty DeLauro Jackson Lee  
 Beyer DelBene Jeffries  
 Bishop (GA) DeSaulnier Johnson (GA)  
 Blum Deutch Johnson, E. B.  
 Blumenauer Dingell Jones  
 Bonamici Doggett Kaptur  
 Bost Dodd Keating  
 Boyle, Brendan Doyle, Michael Kelly (IL)  
 F, Kennedy  
 Brady (PA) Duckworth Kildee  
 Brown (FL) Edwards Kilmer  
 Ellison Brown (CA) Kind  
 Bustos Emmer (MN) King (IA)  
 Butterfield Engel Kinzinger (IL)  
 Capuano Eshoo Kirkpatrick  
 Cárdenas Esty Kuster  
 Carney Farr Lance  
 Carson (IN) Fattah Langevin  
 Cartwright Fitzpatrick Larsen (WA)  
 Castor (FL) Fortenberry Larson (CT)  
 Castro (TX) Foster Lawrence  
 Chu, Judy Frankel (FL)  
 Cicilline Fudge Levin  
 Clark (MA) Gabbard Lewis  
 Clarke (NY) Gallego Lieu, Ted  
 Clay Garamendi Lipinski  
 Cleaver Gibson LoBiondo  
 Clyburn Graham Loeback  
 Cohen Grayson Loftgren  
 Connolly Green, Al Lowenthal  
 Conyers Green, Gene Lowey  
 Cooper Grijalva Lujan Grisham  
 Costa Gutierrez (NM)  
 Courtney Hahn Luján, Ben Ray  
 Crowley Hastings (NM)  
 Cuellar Heck (WA) Lynch  
 Cummings Herrera Beutler Maloney  
 Curbelo (FL) Higgins Carolyn  
 Davis (CA) Himes Maloney, Sean  
 Davis, Danny Hinojosa Matsui

Price (NC) Smith (NE)  
 Quigley Smith (WA)  
 Rangel Speier  
 Reichert Stefanik  
 Rice (NY) Stewart  
 Richmond Swallow (CA)  
 Rokita Takai  
 Roybal-Allard Takano  
 Ruiz Thompson (CA)  
 Ruppertsberger Thompson (MS)  
 Rush Titus  
 Ryan (OH) Tonko  
 Salmon Torres  
 Sanchez, Linda Vargases  
 T. Vargases  
 Sanchez, Loretta Veasey  
 Sarbanes Vela  
 Schakowsky Velázquez  
 Schiff Velázquez  
 Schrader Visclosky  
 Scott (VA) Walz  
 Scott, David Waters, Maxine  
 Serrano Watson Coleman  
 Sewell (AL) Welch  
 Sherman Wilson (FL)  
 Sinema Yarmuth  
 Sires Yoder  
 Slaughter Young (IA)

NOES—215

Abraham Graves (MO) Olson  
 Aderholt Griffith Palazzo  
 Allen Grothman Palmer  
 Amash Guinta Paulsen  
 Amodei Guthrie Pearce  
 Babin Hanna Perry  
 Barletta Hardy Pittenger  
 Barr Harper Pitts  
 Barton Harris Poe (TX)  
 Benishek Hartzler Poliquin  
 Bilirakis Heck (NV) Pompeo  
 Bishop (MI) Hensarling Posey  
 Bishop (UT) Hice, Jody B. Price, Tom  
 Black Hill Ratcliffe  
 Blackburn Holding Reed  
 Boustany Hudson Renacci  
 Brady (TX) Huelskamp Ribble  
 Brat Huizenga (MI) Rice (SC)  
 Bridenstine Hultgren Rigell  
 Brooks (AL) Hunter Roby  
 Brooks (IN) Hurd (TX) Roe (TN)  
 Buchanan Hurt (VA) Rogers (AL)  
 Buck Issa Rogers (KY)  
 Bucshon Jenkins (KS) Rohrabacher  
 Burgess Jenkins (WV) Rooney (FL)  
 Byrne Johnson (OH) Ros-Lehtinen  
 Calvert Johnson, Sam Roskam  
 Carter (GA) Jolly Ross  
 Carter (TX) Jordan Rothfus  
 Chabot Joyce Rouzer  
 Clawson (FL) Katko Royce  
 Coffman Kelly (PA) Russell  
 Cole King (NY) Ryan (WI)  
 Collins (GA) Kline Sanford  
 Collins (NY) Knight Scalise  
 Comstock Labrador Schweikert  
 Conaway LaMalfa Scott, Austin  
 Cook Lamborn Sensenbrenner  
 Costello (PA) Latta Sessions  
 Cramer Long Shimkus  
 Crenshaw Loudermilk Shuster  
 Culberson Love Simpson  
 Davis, Rodney Lucas Smith (MO)  
 Denham Lucas Smith (NJ)  
 Dent Luetkemeyer Smith (TX)  
 DeSantis Lummis Smith (TX)  
 DesJarlais MacArthur Stivers  
 Diaz-Balart Marchant Stutzman  
 Duffy Marino Thompson (PA)  
 Duncan (SC) Massie Thornberry  
 Duncan (TN) McCarthy Tiberi  
 Ellmers (NC) McCaul Tipton  
 Emmer (MN) Farenthold McClintock Trott  
 Farenthold Fincher McHenry Turner  
 Fincher Fleischmann McKinley Upton  
 Fitzpatrick Fleming McSally Valadao  
 Fleischmann McCaul Meadows Wagner  
 Fleming Flores Meehan Walberg  
 Flores Forbes Messer Walden  
 Forbes Foyx Mica Walker  
 Fortenberry Franks (AZ) Miller (FL) Walorski  
 Foyx Frelinghuysen Garrett Miller (MI) Walters, Mimi  
 Franks (AZ) Gibbs Moolenaar Weber (TX)  
 Frelinghuysen Gohmert Mooney (WV) Webster (FL)  
 Garrett Goodlatte Mullin Wenstrup  
 Gibbs Gosar Mulvaney  
 Gohmert Gowdy Murphy (PA) Westerman  
 Goodlatte Granger Neugebauer Whitfield  
 Gosar Graves (GA) Nugent Williams  
 Gowdy Graves (LA) Nunes Wilson (SC)

Wittman Yoho Zeldin  
Womack Young (AK) Zinke  
Woodall Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Becerra Crawford Wasserman  
Bera Donovan Schultz  
Capps Noem  
Chaffetz Tsongas

□ 1840

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota and Ms. KAPTUR changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment printed in part A of House Report 114-120 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 232, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 256]

AYES—190

Adams Deutch Kind  
Aguilar Dingell Kirkpatrick  
Ashford Doggett Kuster  
Bass Dold Langevin  
Beatty Doyle, Michael Larsen (WA)  
Beyer F. Larson (CT)  
Bishop (GA) Duckworth Lawrence  
Blumenauer Edwards Lee  
Bonamici Ellison Levin  
Boyle, Brendan Engel Lewis  
F. Eshoo Lieu, Ted  
Brady (PA) Esty Lipinski  
Brown (FL) Farr Loeb sack  
Brownley (CA) Fattah Lofgren  
Bustos Foster Lowenthal  
Butterfield Frankel (FL) Lowey  
Capuano Fudge Lujan Grisham  
Cárdenas Gabbard (NM)  
Carney Gallego Lujan, Ben Ray  
Carson (IN) Garamendi (NM)  
Cartwright Gibson Lynch  
Castor (FL) Graham Maloney,  
Castro (TX) Grayson Carolyn  
Chu, Judy Green, Al Maloney, Sean  
Cicilline Green, Gene Matsui  
Clark (MA) Grijalva McCollum  
Clarke (NY) Gutiérrez McDermott  
Clay Hahn McGovern  
Cleaver Hastings McMorris  
Clyburn Heck (WA) Meeks  
Cohen Higgins Meng  
Connolly Himes Moore  
Conyers Hinojosa Moulton  
Cooper Honda Murphy (FL)  
Costa Hoyer Nadler  
Courtney Huffman Napolitano  
Crowley Israel Neal  
Cuellar Jackson Lee Nolan  
Cummings Jeffries Norcross  
Curbelo (FL) Johnson (GA) O'Rourke  
Davis (CA) Johnson, E. B. Pallone  
Davis, Danny Kaptur Pascrell  
DeFazio Katko Payne  
DeGette Keating Pelosi  
Delaney Kelly (IL) Perlmutter  
DeLauro Kennedy Peters  
DelBene Kildee Peterson  
DeSaulnier Kilmer Pingree

Pocan Schradler Thompson (PA)  
Polis Scott (VA) Titus  
Price (NC) Scott, David Tonko  
Quigley Serrano Torres  
Rangel Sewell (AL) Van Hollen  
Rice (NY) Sherman Vargas  
Richmond Sinema Veasey  
Roybal-Allard Sires Vela  
Ruiz Slaughter Velázquez  
Ruppersberger Smith (WA) Visclosky  
Rush Speier Walz  
Ryan (OH) Stefanik Waters, Maxine  
Sánchez, Linda Stewart Watson Coleman  
T. Swalwell (CA) Welch  
Sanchez, Loretta Takai Wilson (FL)  
Sarbanes Takano Yarmuth  
Schakowsky Thompson (CA)  
Schiff Thompson (MS)

NOES—232

Abraham Pearce  
Aderholt Guthrie Perry  
Allen Hanna Pittenger  
Amash Hardy Pitts  
Amodei Harper Poe (TX)  
Babin Harris Poliquin  
Barletta Hartzler Pompeo  
Barr Heck (NV) Posey  
Barton Hensarling Price, Tom  
Benishek Herrera Beutler Ratcliffe  
Bilirakis Hice, Jody B. Reed  
Bishop (MI) Hill Reichert  
Bishop (UT) Holding Renacci  
Black Hudson Ribble  
Blackburn Huelskamp Rice (SC)  
Blum Huizenga (MI) Rigell  
Bost Hultgren Roby  
Boustany Hunter Roe (TN)  
Brady (TX) Hurd (TX) Rogers (AL)  
Brat Hurt (VA) Rogers (KY)  
Bridenstine Issa Rohrabacher  
Brooks (AL) Jenkins (KS) Rokita  
Brooks (IN) Jenkins (WV) Rooney (FL)  
Buchanan Johnson (OH) Ros-Lehtinen  
Buck Johnson, Sam  
Bucshon Jolly  
Burgess Jones  
Byrne Jordan  
Calvert Joyce  
Carter (GA) Kelly (PA)  
Carter (TX) King (IA)  
Chabot King (NY)  
Clawson (FL) Kinzinger (IL)  
Coffman Kline  
Cole Knight  
Collins (GA) Labrador Schweikert  
Collins (NY) LaMalfa Scott, Austin  
Comstock Lamborn Sensenbrenner  
Conaway Lance Sessions  
Cook Latta Shimkus  
Costello (PA) LoBiondo Shuster  
Cramer Long Simpson  
Crenshaw Loudermill Smith (MO)  
Culberson Love Smith (NE)  
Davis, Rodney Lucas Smith (NJ)  
Denham Luetkemeyer Smith (TX)  
Dent Lummis Stutzman  
DeSantis MacArthur Thornberry  
DesJarlais Marchant Tiberi  
Diaz-Balart Marino Tipton  
Duffy Massie Trott  
Duncan (SC) McCarthy Turner  
Duncan (TN) McCaul Upton  
Ellmers (NC) McClintock Valadao  
Emmer (MN) McHenry Wagner  
Farenthold McKinley Walberg  
Fincher McMorris Walden  
Fitzpatrick Rodgers Walker  
Fleischmann McSally Walorski  
Fleming Meadows Walters, Mimi  
Flores Meehan Weber (TX)  
Forbes Messer Webster (FL)  
Fortenberry Mica Wenstrup  
Foxy Miller (FL) Westerman  
Franks (AZ) Miller (MI) Westmoreland  
Frelinghuysen Moonenar Whitfield  
Garrett Moore (WV) Williams  
Gibbs Mullin Wilson (SC)  
Gohmert Mulvaney Wittman  
Goodlatte Murphy (PA) Womack  
Gosar Neugebauer Woodall  
Gowdy Newhouse Yoder  
Granger Nugent Yoho  
Graves (GA) Nunes Young (AK)  
Graves (LA) Olson Young (IA)  
Graves (MO) Palazzo Young (IN)  
Griffith Palmer Zeldin  
Grothman Paulsen Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Becerra Crawford Tsongas  
Bera Donovan Wasserman  
Capps Noem Schultz  
Chaffetz Stivers

□ 1844

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment printed in part A of House Report 114-120 offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 239, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 257]

AYES—179

Adams Ellison Lowey  
Aguilar Engel Lujan Grisham  
Bass Eshoo (NM)  
Beatty Esty Lujan, Ben Ray  
Beyer Farr (NM)  
Bishop (GA) Fattah Lynch  
Blumenauer Foster Maloney,  
Bonamici Frankel (FL) Carolyn  
Boyle, Brendan Fudge Maloney, Sean  
F. Gabbard Matsui  
Brady (PA) Gallego McCollum  
Brown (FL) Garamendi McDermott  
Brownley (CA) Graham McGovern  
Bustos Grayson McNeerney  
Butterfield Green, Al Meeks  
Capuano Green, Gene Meng  
Cárdenas Grijalva Moore  
Carney Gutiérrez Moulton  
Carson (IN) Hahn Murphy (FL)  
Cartwright Hastings Nadler  
Castor (FL) Heck (WA) Napolitano  
Castro (TX) Higgins Neal  
Chu, Judy Himes Nolan  
Cicilline Hinojosa Norcross  
Clark (MA) Clark (MA) Honda O'Rourke  
Clarke (NY) Hoyer Pallone  
Clay Huffman Pascrell  
Cleaver Israel Payne  
Clyburn Jackson Lee Pelosi  
Cohen Jeffries Perlmutter  
Connolly Johnson (GA) Peters  
Conyers Johnson, E. B. Peterson  
Cooper Kaptur Pingree  
Costa Keating Pocan  
Courtney Kelly (IL) Polis  
Crowley Kennedy Price (NC)  
Cuellar Kildee Quigley  
Cummings Kilmier Rangel  
Curbelo (FL) Kind Rice (NY)  
Davis (CA) Kirkpatrick Richmond  
Davis, Danny Kuster Ruiz  
DeFazio Langevin Ruppersberger  
DeGette Delaney Larsen (WA) Ryan (OH)  
DelLauro DeLauro Larson (CT) Sánchez, Linda  
DelBene Lawrence T.  
DeSaulnier Lee Sanchez, Loretta  
Deutch Levin Sarbanes  
Dingell Lewis Schakowsky  
Doggett Lieu, Ted Schiff  
Doyle, Michael Lipinski Schrader  
F. F. Loeb sack Scott (VA)  
Duckworth Lofgren Scott, David  
Edwards Lowenthal Serrano

Sewell (AL)	Thompson (CA)	Velázquez
Sinema	Thompson (MS)	Visclosky
Sires	Titus	Walz
Slaughter	Tonko	Waters, Maxine
Smith (WA)	Torres	Watson Coleman
Speier	Van Hollen	Welch
Swalwell (CA)	Vargas	Wilson (FL)
Takai	Veasey	Yarmuth
Takano	Vela	

□ 1848

So the amendment was rejected.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
Stated for:  
Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 257, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.  
The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN) having assumed the chair, Mr. POE of Texas, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1806) to provide for technological innovation through the prioritization of Federal investment in basic research, fundamental scientific discovery, and development to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 271, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.  
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, and the order of the House of today, this 5-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motion to recommit on H.R. 880, and passage of H.R. 880, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 217, noes 205, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 258]

AYES—217

Buchanan	Hurd (TX)	Ribble
Bucshon	Hurt (VA)	Rice (SC)
Burgess	Issa	Rigell
Byrne	Jenkins (WV)	Roby
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Roe (TN)
Carter (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Carter (TX)	Jolly	Rogers (KY)
Chabot	Jordan	Rohrabacher
Clawson (FL)	Katko	Rokita
Coffman	Kelly (PA)	Rooney (FL)
Cole	King (IA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Collins (GA)	Kinzinger (IL)	Roskam
Collins (NY)	Kline	Ross
Comstock	Knight	Rothfus
Conaway	Labrador	Rouzer
Cook	LaMalfa	Royce
Costello (PA)	Lamborn	Russell
Cramer	Lance	Ryan (WI)
Crenshaw	Latta	Salmon
Culberson	Long	Sanford
Denham	Loudermilk	Scalise
DeSantis	Love	Schweikert
DesJarlais	Lucas	Scott, Austin
Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	Sessions
Duffy	Lummis	Shimkus
Duncan (SC)	MacArthur	Shuster
Duncan (TN)	Marchant	Simpson
Ellmers (NC)	Marino	Smith (MO)
Emmer (MN)	Massie	Smith (NE)
Farenthold	McCarthy	Smith (NJ)
Fincher	McCaul	Smith (TX)
Fitzpatrick	McHenry	Stefanik
Fleischmann	McKinley	Stewart
Fleming	McMorris	Stivers
Flores	Rodgers	Stutzman
Forbes	Meadows	Thornberry
Foxx	Messer	Tiberi
Franks (AZ)	Mica	Tipton
Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)	Trott
Garrett	Miller (MI)	Turner
Gibbs	Moolenaar	Upton
Gibson	Mooney (WV)	Valadao
Gohmert	Mullin	Wagner
Goodlatte	Mulvaney	Walberg
Gosar	Murphy (PA)	Walden
Gowdy	Neugebauer	Walker
Granger	Newhouse	Walorski
Graves (GA)	Nugent	Walters, Mimi
Graves (LA)	Nunes	Weber (TX)
Graves (MO)	Olson	Webster (FL)
Griffith	Palazzo	Westerman
	Palmer	Westmoreland
	Paulsen	Whitfield
		Williams
		Wilson (SC)
		Wittman
		Womack
		Woodall
		Yoder
		Yoho
		Young (AK)
		Young (IA)
		Young (IN)
		Zinke

NOES—205

Adams	Clyburn	Eshoo
Aguilar	Cohen	Esty
Amash	Connolly	Farr
Ashford	Conyers	Fattah
Bass	Cooper	Fortenberry
Beatty	Costa	Foster
Beyer	Courtney	Frankel (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Crowley	Fudge
Blum	Cuellar	Gabbard
Blumenauer	Cummings	Gallego
Bonamici	Curbelo (FL)	Garamendi
Boyle, Brendan	Davis (CA)	Gibson
F.	Davis, Danny	Graham
Brady (PA)	Davis, Rodney	Grayson
Brown (FL)	DeFazio	Green, Al
Brownley (CA)	DeGette	Green, Gene
Buck	Delaney	Grijalva
Bustos	DeLauro	Gutiérrez
Butterfield	DelBene	Hahn
Capuano	Dent	Hanna
Cárdenas	DeSaulnier	Hastings
Carney	Deuch	Heck (WA)
Carson (IN)	Dingell	Higgins
Cartwright	Doggett	Himes
Castor (FL)	Dold	Hinojosa
Castro (TX)	Doyle, Michael	Honda
Chu, Judy	F.	Hoyer
Cicilline	Duckworth	Huelskamp
Clark (MA)	Edwards	Huffman
Clarke (NY)	Ellison	Huizenga (MI)
Clay	Engel	Israel

NOES—239

Abraham	Grothman	Pearce
Aderholt	Guinta	Perry
Allen	Guthrie	Pittenger
Amash	Hanna	Pitts
Amodei	Hardy	Poe (TX)
Babin	Harper	Poliquin
Barletta	Harris	Pompeo
Barr	Hartzler	Posey
Barton	Heck (NV)	Price, Tom
Benishkek	Hensarling	Ratcliffe
Billirakis	Herrera Beutler	Reed
Bishop (MI)	Hice, Jody B.	Reichert
Bishop (UT)	Hill	Renacci
Black	Holding	Ribble
Blackburn	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Blum	Huelskamp	Rigell
Bost	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Boustany	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Brat	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (KY)
Bridenstine	Hurt (VA)	Rohrabacher
Brooks (AL)	Issa	Rokita
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (KS)	Rooney (FL)
Buchanan	Jenkins (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen
Buck	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Bucshon	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Burgess	Jolly	Rothfus
Byrne	Jones	Rouzer
Calvert	Jordan	Royce
Carter (GA)	Joyce	Russell
Carter (TX)	Katko	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Salmon
Clawson (FL)	King (IA)	Sanford
Coffman	King (NY)	Scalise
Cole	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Collins (GA)	Kline	Scott, Austin
Collins (NY)	Knight	Sensenbrenner
Comstock	Labrador	Sessions
Conaway	LaMalfa	Shimkus
Cook	Lamborn	Shuster
Costello (PA)	Lance	Simpson
Cramer	Latta	Smith (MO)
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Long	Smith (NJ)
Curbeo (FL)	Loudermilk	Smith (TX)
Davis, Rodney	Love	Stefanik
Denham	Lucas	Stewart
Dent	Luetkemeyer	Stivers
DeSantis	Lummis	Stutzman
DesJarlais	MacArthur	Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Thornberry
Dold	Marino	Tiberi
Duffy	Massie	Tipton
Duncan (SC)	McCarthy	Trott
Duncan (TN)	McCaul	Turner
Ellmers (NC)	McClintock	Upton
Emmer (MN)	McHenry	Valadao
Farenthold	McKinley	Wagner
Fincher	McMorris	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Walden
Fleischmann	McSally	Walker
Fleming	Meadows	Walorski
Flores	Meehan	Walters, Mimi
Forbes	Messer	Weber (TX)
Fortenberry	Mica	Webster (FL)
Foxx	Miller (FL)	Westerman
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Frelinghuysen	Moolenaar	Whitfield
Garrett	Mooney (WV)	Williams
Gibbs	Mullin	Wilson (SC)
Gibson	Mulvaney	Wittman
Gohmert	Murphy (PA)	Womack
Goodlatte	Neugebauer	Yoder
Gosar	Newhouse	Yoho
Gowdy	Nugent	Young (AK)
Granger	Nunes	Young (IA)
Graves (GA)	Olson	Young (IN)
Graves (LA)	Palazzo	Zeldin
Graves (MO)	Palmer	Zinke
Griffith	Paulsen	

NOT VOTING—14

Ashford	Crawford	Sherman
Becerra	Donovan	Tsongas
Bera	Noem	Wasserman
Capps	Roybal-Allard	Schultz
Chaffetz	Rush	Woodall

Abraham	Barton	Bost
Aderholt	Benishkek	Boustany
Allen	Billirakis	Brady (TX)
Amodei	Bishop (MI)	Brat
Babin	Bishop (UT)	Bridenstine
Barletta	Black	Brooks (AL)
Barr	Blackburn	Brooks (IN)

Jackson Lee  
 Jeffries  
 Jenkins (KS)  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Jones  
 Joyce  
 Kaptur  
 Keating  
 Kelly (IL)  
 Kennedy  
 Kildee  
 Kilmer  
 Kind  
 King (NY)  
 Kirkpatrick  
 Kuster  
 Langevin  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Lawrence  
 Lee  
 Levin  
 Lewis  
 Lieu, Ted  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Loeback  
 Lofgren  
 Lowenthal  
 Lowey  
 Lujan Grisham (NM)  
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)  
 Lynch  
 Maloney, Carolyn  
 Maloney, Sean  
 Matsui

McClintock  
 McCollum  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McNerney  
 McSally  
 Meehan  
 Meeks  
 Meng  
 Moore  
 Moulton  
 Murphy (FL)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Nolan  
 Norcross  
 O'Rourke  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Payne  
 Pelosi  
 Perlmutter  
 Peters  
 Peterson  
 Pingree  
 Pocan  
 Polis  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Rangel  
 Rice (NY)  
 Richmond  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Ruiz  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sánchez, Linda  
 T.

Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schrader  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, David  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Serrano  
 Sewell (AL)  
 Sherman  
 Sinema  
 Sires  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (WA)  
 Speier  
 Swalwell (CA)  
 Takai  
 Takano  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Titus  
 Tonko  
 Torres  
 Van Hollen  
 Vargas  
 Veasey  
 Vela  
 Velázquez  
 Vislosky  
 Walz  
 Waters, Maxine  
 Watson Coleman  
 Welch  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Yarmuth  
 Zeldin

Corps, Wildomar, California, California's 42nd Congressional District.

Mr. MICA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

Mr. FOSTER. Corporal Sara Abigail Medina, Aurora, Illinois, Illinois' 11th Congressional District.

Mr. MICA. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Lance Corporal Jacob Andrew Hug, Phoenix, Arizona, Arizona's Eighth Congressional District.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I will now read the name of the brave Marine from my district:

Sergeant Ward Mark Johnson IV, Altamonte Springs, Florida, Florida's Seventh Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his fellow man.

We, the Members who represent those brave Marines, ask you to join us in a moment of silence. And we also ask, as we approach this Memorial Day, that we remember in our thoughts and in our prayers all those brave Americans and their families who have paid the ultimate price in service to our Nation.

Heck (WA)  
 Higgins  
 Himes  
 Hinojosa  
 Honda  
 Hoyer  
 Huffman  
 Israel  
 Jackson Lee  
 Jeffries  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Kaptur  
 Keating  
 Kelly (IL)  
 Kennedy  
 Kildee  
 Kilmer  
 Kind  
 Kirkpatrick  
 Kuster  
 Langevin  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Lawrence  
 Lee  
 Levin  
 Lewis  
 Lieu, Ted  
 Lipinski  
 Loeback  
 Lofgren  
 Lowenthal  
 Lowey  
 Lujan Grisham (NM)  
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)  
 Lynch

Maloney, Carolyn  
 Maloney, Sean  
 Matsui  
 McCollum  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McNerney  
 Meeks  
 Meng  
 Moore  
 Moulton  
 Murphy (FL)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Nolan  
 Norcross  
 O'Rourke  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Payne  
 Pelosi  
 Perlmutter  
 Peters  
 Peterson  
 Pingree  
 Pocan  
 Polis  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Rangel  
 Rice (NY)  
 Richmond  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Ruiz  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)

Sánchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schrader  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, David  
 Serrano  
 Sewell (AL)  
 Sherman  
 Sinema  
 Sires  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (WA)  
 Speier  
 Swalwell (CA)  
 Takai  
 Takano  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Titus  
 Tonko  
 Torres  
 Van Hollen  
 Vargas  
 Veasey  
 Vela  
 Velázquez  
 Vislosky  
 Walz  
 Waters, Maxine  
 Watson Coleman  
 Welch  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Becerra  
 Bera  
 Capps  
 Chaffetz

Cleaver  
 Crawford  
 Donovan  
 Noem

Tsongas  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz

□ 1858

So the bill was passed.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN HONOR OF THE MARINES WHO LOST THEIR LIVES ON MAY 12, 2015, IN NEPAL

(Mr. MICA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to pay tribute to six United States Marines who lost their lives on May 12, 2015. They died not in combat but in a mission of mercy, aiding the people of Nepal, who, as we have read, have been devastated by a horrific and deadly earthquake.

I would like to at this time yield to their Members of Congress to recognize each of the Marines who sacrificed their lives.

First, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

Mr. POMPEO. Captain Christopher Lee Norgren, Wichita, Kansas, Kansas' Fourth Congressional District.

Mr. MICA. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Captain Dustin Ryan Lukasiewicz, Alma, Nebraska, Nebraska's Third Congressional District.

Mr. MICA. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Sergeant Eric Matthew Seaman, United States Marine

AMERICAN RESEARCH AND COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 880) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify and make permanent the research credit, offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 181, nays 240, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 259]

YEAS—181

Aguilar  
 Ashford  
 Bass  
 Beatty  
 Beyer  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Blumenauer  
 Bonamici  
 Boyle, Brendan  
 F.  
 Brady (PA)  
 Brown (FL)  
 Brownlee (CA)  
 Bustos  
 Butterfield  
 Capuano  
 Cárdenas  
 Carney  
 Carson (IN)  
 Cartwright  
 Castor (FL)  
 Castro (TX)  
 Chu, Judy  
 Cicilline

Clark (MA)  
 Clarke (NY)  
 Clay  
 Clyburn  
 Cohen  
 Connolly  
 Conyers  
 Cooper  
 Costa  
 Courtney  
 Crowley  
 Cuellar  
 Cummings  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis, Danny  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 Delaney  
 DeLauro  
 DelBene  
 DeSaunier  
 Deutch  
 Dingell  
 Doggett

Doyle, Michael  
 F.  
 Duckworth  
 Edwards  
 Ellison  
 Engel  
 Eshoo  
 Esty  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Foster  
 Frankel (FL)  
 Fudge  
 Gabbard  
 Gallego  
 Garamendi  
 Graham  
 Grayson  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Grijalva  
 Gutiérrez  
 Hahn  
 Hastings

Abraham  
 Aderholt  
 Allen  
 Amash  
 Amodei  
 Babin  
 Barletta  
 Barr  
 Barton  
 Benishek  
 Billirakis  
 Bishop (MI)  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Black  
 Blackburn  
 Blum  
 Bost  
 Boustany  
 Brady (TX)  
 Brat  
 Bridenstine  
 Brooks (AL)  
 Brooks (IN)  
 Buchanan  
 Buck  
 Bucshon  
 Burgess  
 Byrne  
 Calvert  
 Carter (GA)  
 Carter (TX)  
 Chabot  
 Clawson (FL)  
 Coffman  
 Cole  
 Collins (GA)  
 Collins (NY)  
 Comstock  
 Conaway  
 Cook  
 Costello (PA)  
 Cramer  
 Crenshaw  
 Culberson  
 Curbelo (FL)  
 Davis, Rodney  
 Denham  
 Dent  
 DeSantis  
 DesJarlais  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Dold  
 Duffy  
 Duncan (SC)  
 Duncan (TN)  
 Ellumers (NC)  
 Emmer (MN)  
 Farenthold

Fincher  
 Fitzpatrick  
 Fleischmann  
 Fleming  
 Flores  
 Forbes  
 Fortenberry  
 Foxx  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Garrett  
 Gibbs  
 Gibson  
 Gohmert  
 Goodlatte  
 Gosar  
 Gowdy  
 Granger  
 Graves (GA)  
 Graves (LA)  
 Graves (MO)  
 Griffith  
 Grothman  
 Guinta  
 Guthrie  
 Hanna  
 Hardy  
 Harper  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Heck (NV)  
 Hensarling  
 Herrera Beutler  
 Hice, Jody B.  
 Hill  
 Holding  
 Hudson  
 Huelskamp  
 Huizenga (MI)  
 Hultgren  
 Hunter  
 Hurd (TX)  
 Hurt (VA)  
 Issa  
 Jenkins (KS)  
 Jenkins (WV)  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jolly  
 Jones  
 Jordan  
 Joyce  
 Katko  
 Kelly (PA)  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kinzinger (IL)  
 Kline

Knight  
 Labrador  
 LaMalfa  
 Lamborn  
 Lance  
 Latta  
 LoBiondo  
 Long  
 Loudermilk  
 Love  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Lummis  
 MacArthur  
 Marchant  
 Marino  
 Massie  
 McCarthy  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McHenry  
 McKinley  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 McSally  
 Meadows  
 Meehan  
 Messer  
 Mica  
 Miller (FL)  
 Miller (MI)  
 Moolenaar  
 Mooney (WV)  
 Mullin  
 Mulvaney  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Neugebauer  
 Newhouse  
 Nugent  
 Nunes  
 Olson  
 Palazzo  
 Palmer  
 Paulsen  
 Pearce  
 Perry  
 Pittenger  
 Pitts  
 Poe (TX)  
 Poliquin  
 Pompeo  
 Posey  
 Price, Tom  
 Ratcliffe  
 Reed  
 Reichert  
 Renacci  
 Ribble

NAYS—240

Rice (SC) Sessions  
 Rigell Shimkus  
 Roby Shuster  
 Roe (TN) Simpson  
 Rogers (AL) Smith (MO)  
 Rogers (KY) Smith (NE)  
 Rohrabacher Smith (NJ)  
 Rokita Smith (TX)  
 Rooney (FL) Stefanik  
 Ros-Lehtinen Stewart  
 Roskam Stivers  
 Ross Stutzman  
 Rothfus Thompson (PA)  
 Rouzer Thornberry  
 Royce Tiberi  
 Russell Tipton  
 Ryan (WI) Trott  
 Salmon Turner  
 Sanford Upton  
 Scalise Valadao  
 Schweikert Wagner  
 Scott, Austin Walberg  
 Sensenbrenner Walden

Walker Johnson (OH)  
 Walorski Johnson, Sam  
 Walters, Mimi Jolly  
 Weber (TX) Jordan  
 Webster (FL) Joyce  
 Wenstrup Katko  
 Westerman Keating  
 Westmoreland Kelly (PA)  
 Whitfield Kennedy  
 Williams Kilmer  
 Wilson (SC) King (IA)  
 Wittman King (NY)  
 Womack Kinzinger (IL)  
 Woodall Kline  
 Yoder Knight  
 Yoho Kuster  
 Young (AK) Labrador  
 Young (IA) LaMalfa  
 Young (IN) Lamborn  
 Zeldin Lance  
 Zinke Larson (CT)  
 Latta  
 LoBiondo  
 Loeb sack  
 Long  
 Loudermilk  
 Love  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Lujan Grisham (NM)  
 Lummis  
 Lynch  
 MacArthur  
 Maloney, Sean  
 Marchant  
 Marino  
 Massie  
 McCarthy  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McDermott  
 McHenry  
 McKinley  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 McSally  
 Meadows  
 Meehan  
 Messer  
 Mica  
 Miller (FL)

Miller (MI) Sanford  
 Moolenaar Scalise  
 Mooney (WV) Schweikert  
 Mullin Scott, Austin  
 Mulvaney Sensenbrenner  
 Murphy (FL) Sessions  
 Neal Shimkus  
 Neugebauer Shuster  
 Newhouse Simpson  
 Nolan Sinema  
 Nugent Smith (MO)  
 Nunes Smith (NE)  
 Olson Smith (NJ)  
 Palazzo Smith (TX)  
 Palmer Stefanik  
 Paulsen Stewart  
 Pearce Stivers  
 Perry Stutzman  
 Peters Thompson (PA)  
 Peterson Thornberry  
 Pittenger Tiberi  
 Pitts Titus  
 Poe (TX) Tonko  
 Poliquin Trott  
 Pompeo Turner  
 Posey Upton  
 Price, Tom Valadao  
 Ratcliffe Wagner  
 Reed Walberg  
 Reichert Walden  
 Renacci Walker  
 Ribble Walorski  
 Rice (SC) Walters, Mimi  
 Rigell Walz  
 Roby Weber (TX)  
 Roe (TN) Webster (FL)  
 Rogers (AL) Wenstrup  
 Rogers (KY) Westernman  
 Rohrabacher Westmoreland  
 Rokita Whitfield  
 Rooney (FL) Williams  
 Ros-Lehtinen Wilson (SC)  
 Roskam Wittman  
 Ross Womack  
 Rothfus Woodall  
 Rouzer Yoder  
 Royce Yoho  
 Ruiz Young (AK)  
 Ruppertsberger Young (IA)  
 Russell Young (IN)  
 Ryan (WI) Zeldin  
 Salmon Zinke

Takano Vargas  
 Thompson (CA) Veasey  
 Thompson (MS) Vela  
 Torres Velázquez  
 Van Hollen Visclosky

Waters, Maxine  
 Watson Coleman  
 Welch  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Yarmuth  
 Tipton  
 Tsongas  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz

NOT VOTING—13

Adams Cleaver  
 Becerra Crawford  
 Bera Donovan  
 Capps Murphy (PA)  
 Chaffetz Noem

□ 1916

So the bill was passed.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1335, STRENGTHENING FISHING COMMUNITIES AND INCREASING FLEXIBILITY IN FISHERIES MANAGEMENT ACT

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 274 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 274

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1335) to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide flexibility for fishery managers and stability for fishermen, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-16. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any

NOT VOTING—11

Adams Chaffetz  
 Becerra Cleaver  
 Bera Crawford  
 Capps Donovan

Noem  
 Tsongas  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz

□ 1909

Mr. GARAMENDI changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 274, nays 145, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 260]

YEAS—274

Abraham Clawson (FL) Franks (AZ)  
 Aderholt Coffman Frelinghuysen  
 Aguilar Cole Garrett  
 Allen Collins (GA) Gibbs  
 Amash Collins (NY) Gibson  
 Amodei Comstock Gohmert  
 Ashford Conaway Goodlatte  
 Babin Connolly Gosar  
 Barletta Cook Gowdy  
 Barr Costello (PA) Graham  
 Barton Courtney Granger  
 Benishek Cramer Graves (GA)  
 Bilirakis Crenshaw Graves (LA)  
 Bishop (GA) Cuellar Graves (MO)  
 Bishop (MI) Culberson Griffith  
 Bishop (UT) Curbelo (FL) Grothman  
 Black Davis, Rodney Guinta  
 Blackburn Delaney Guthrie  
 Blum DelBene Hanna  
 Bost Denham Hardy  
 Boustany Dent Harper  
 Brady (TX) DeSantis Harris  
 Brat DesJarlais Hartzler  
 Bridenstine Diaz-Balart Heck (NV)  
 Brooks (AL) Dold Heck (WA)  
 Brooks (IN) Duffy Hensarling  
 Brownley (CA) Duncan (SC) Herrera Beutler  
 Buchanan Duncan (TN) Hice, Jody B.  
 Buck Ellmers (NC) Hill  
 Bucshon Emmer (MN) Holding  
 Burgess Esty Hudson  
 Bustos Farenthold Huelskamp  
 Byrne Fincher Huizenga (MI)  
 Calvert Fitzpatrick Hultgren  
 Capuano Fleischmann Hunter  
 Carson (IN) Fleming Hurd (TX)  
 Carter (GA) Flores Hurt (VA)  
 Carter (TX) Forbes Issa  
 Chabot Fortenberry Jenkins (KS)  
 Clark (MA) Foxx Jenkins (WV)

Bass  
 Beatty  
 Beyer  
 Blumenauer  
 Bonamici  
 Boyle, Brendan  
 F.  
 Brady (PA)  
 Brown (FL)  
 Butterfield  
 Cárdenas  
 Carney  
 Cartwright  
 Castor (FL)  
 Castro (TX)  
 Chu, Judy  
 Cicilline  
 Clarke (NY)  
 Clay  
 Clyburn  
 Cohen  
 Conyers  
 Cooper  
 Costa  
 Crowley  
 Cummings  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis, Danny  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 DeLauro  
 DeSaulnier  
 Deutch  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Doyle, Michael  
 F.  
 Duckworth  
 Edwards  
 Ellison  
 Engel  
 Eshoo  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Foster

NAYS—145

Frankel (FL)  
 Fudge  
 Gabbard  
 Gallego  
 Garamendi  
 Grayson  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Grijalva  
 Gutiérrez  
 Hahn  
 Hastings  
 Higgins  
 Himes  
 Hinojosa  
 Honda  
 Hoyer  
 Huffman  
 Israel  
 Jackson Lee  
 Jeffries  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Jones  
 Kapur  
 Kelly (IL)  
 Kildee  
 Kind  
 Kirkpatrick  
 Langevin  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Lawrence  
 Lee  
 Levin  
 Lewis  
 Lieu, Ted  
 Lipinski  
 Lofgren  
 Lowenthal  
 Lowey  
 Lujan, Ben Ray  
 (NM)  
 Maloney,  
 Carolyn  
 Matsui

McCollum  
 McGovern  
 McNeerney  
 Meeks  
 Meng  
 Moore  
 Moulton  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Norcross  
 O'Rourke  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Payne  
 Pelosi  
 Perlmutter  
 Pingree  
 Pocan  
 Polis  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Rangel  
 Rice (NY)  
 Richmond  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sanchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schrader  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, David  
 Serrano  
 Sewell (AL)  
 Sherman  
 Sires  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (WA)  
 Speier  
 Swalwell (CA)  
 Takai

amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Iowa). The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 274 provides a structured rule for consideration of the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act. The rule makes in order eight amendments, five of which are from Democratic sponsors. One of the amendments is a Democrat substitute, which will be debated for twice as long as the other amendments.

As someone who has lived his whole life on the Gulf Coast, I can tell you just how important this bill is. For many people who live on our Nation's coast, this bill is about a way of life.

This bill is for our Nation's commercial fishermen, who depend on a reliable fishing stock in order to make a living. This bill is also for our Nation's charter boat fleets, which are an important source of tourism. That means jobs, Mr. Speaker, and all too often people in this town and government scientists seem not to care about that.

Just as importantly, this bill is for our recreational fishermen and everyday anglers who just enjoy spending time on the waters. For my family, this is a lifelong tradition. I remember fishing with my dad on the Gulf of Mexico. I treasured opportunities to fish with my four children, and as a new grandfather, I look forward to fishing with my grandson.

This is a good bill, and as a former member of the committee of jurisdiction, the Natural Resources Committee, I can tell you that a great amount of time and effort have gone into this bill. This process started over 2 years ago, and there was a lot of work to bring our parties together to get a bill that everyone can agree on.

Unfortunately, as happens far too often here in Washington, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have decided to make this into a partisan fight. President Obama has said he will veto this bill. All this despite

real efforts to work together, across the aisle, to get a bill that works for everyone.

Now I want to briefly talk about the idea of science that the President and my colleagues on the other side claim the bill undermines. All too often here in D.C., what passes for science is just political ideology dressed up with some technical language with no real basis in observable data.

I don't know if the gentleman from Colorado has ever been fishing for red snapper in the Gulf Coast—if he hasn't, then I invite him to do so—but I can tell you that there are more red snapper there than there has ever been before. Despite that good news, NOAA and the Federal Government is consistently undercounting the number of fish in the Gulf of Mexico.

Here is the craziest part of all: NOAA is not sampling for red snapper on reefs, despite the fact that the red snapper is a reef fish. That is simply absurd. If you look for red snapper somewhere other than the reefs, you are not going to find them because they live on reefs.

Now, NOAA is also overestimating the number of red snapper caught each year. For example, last year the Federal Government estimated that 1,041,000 pounds of red snapper were caught off the coast of Alabama, where I am from. The Alabama red snapper reporting system, which is run by the State, only estimated a catch of 418,000 pounds. That is a remarkable disparity.

So what has happened is a very dangerous combination of NOAA underestimating how many fish are actually out there and overestimating the number of fish caught each year. This has resulted in a dramatically shortened season for our red snapper fisherman. Last year's red snapper season was only 9 days. This year it has been increased to 10 days. That is simply unacceptable.

I support science-based management, and the committee supports science-based management, but I don't support and the committee doesn't support flawed science-based management. And this House shouldn't either.

So that is why I get so frustrated when I hear my colleagues say that this bill undermines good science. Come tell that to my fishermen on the Gulf Coast. Come tell that to the marine scientists on the Gulf Coast who have done extensive scientific research on this.

This bill is important because it includes real reforms that are designed to get some better science for all of our fisheries, not only as it relates to red snapper, but as it relates to the fisheries all around the United States of America. Why don't we encourage stronger partnerships with local colleges and universities that have done great work in the past?

Mr. Speaker, I do want to touch on that red snapper issue a little more because it is so important to the people I represent, and it is very important to

debate on this bill. This bill includes three important reforms that local scientists, stakeholders, and I believe will get us a real red snapper season. Number one, it repeals inflexible quotas that have been in place up to this point. Number two, it creates jurisdictional parity by expanding State waters out to 9 nautical miles gulfwide. Number three, it shifts the stock assessment and data collection responsibilities from the Federal Government and gives those responsibilities to the Gulf States so we can get some real science, not flawed science.

Far too often people in Washington think we know best; people in Washington think we have all the answers. This is an issue where that simply is not the case. This bill empowers our Nation's fishing communities and gives them the flexibility they need.

So regardless of whether or not you go fishing, this issue should matter to all Americans because this issue is about freedom and limiting the role of the Federal Government in areas where it just doesn't belong.

This is an extremely fair rule. I urge its support, Mr. Speaker, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. The gentleman from Alabama said there are more red snapper than there have ever been before, and that would seem to indicate that the policies are working, and I don't think it is a time to reverse course.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN), the ranking member of the Natural Resources Subcommittee on Water, Power, and Oceans and the author of the Democratic substitute, which is a cleaner reauthorization.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Like the gentleman from Alabama, I do represent a coastal district, a fishing district. In fact, the Second District of California includes about one-third of the California coastline and many working harbors and ports where fishing men and women have been catching fish with their families for many, many generations, as well as the Native American tribes that I represent, who have been depending on healthy fisheries for hundreds, if not thousands, of years.

So this is important to me. I share the gentleman's concern that we continue to make fishing available for ourselves and for future generations. We have some disagreements on how to get there, and we will talk about that.

I think the thing that we have to recognize at the outset of this debate is that the Magnuson-Stevens Act has been a great success by just about any measure. It succeeded initially in helping us protect and rebuild fisheries from the threat of foreign fleets that were coming into U.S. waters and overfishing and harming our American fishing communities and fishing families. It then went on to succeed in preventing overfishing by U.S. fishermen

by a number of mechanisms in the bill that we will talk about in a moment.

The other way in which Magnuson-Stevens has been a huge success is that it has always been bipartisan. Both the original act and the subsequent reauthorizations of Magnuson-Stevens have always been strongly bipartisan. And unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we are departing from that positive history with the bill we have before us today, and we need to get it back on track.

□ 1930

The keys to Magnuson-Stevens' success have included strict rules on rebuilding of fishery stocks and also very strict fishery specific quotas, so that we can make sure that we prevent overfishing and ensure a sustainable fishery population. This is not so that we stop fishing, quite the contrary. The purpose of these mechanisms is so that we can continue to fish for future generations by maintaining sustainable populations.

Absent these mechanisms, these very successful provisions in Magnuson-Stevens' history teaches us what would happen. We have a history that is played out over and over again in this country and, frankly, around the world—that, without strict protections for sustainable fish populations, we will overfish them, we will deplete them.

It puts us on a path where the tragedy of the commons plays out over and over again, and the end result of that is fisheries closures. We are not helping the folks who want to fish. When we don't manage these populations, we are actually hurting them in the long run.

Now, Democrats have put forward a substitute amendment that is much closer to a clean reauthorization of Magnuson-Stevens. We think that is really the conversation we need to be having. What kind of clean reauthorization can we have? And are there consensus areas where we can actually improve Magnuson-Stevens?

The gentleman from Alabama might be surprised to find Democrats strongly agreeing with him, that we could benefit from additional science, better science. There may be better data available on the red snapper in the Gulf. We are also working with Republicans to try to get that science and make it available to the decision-makers who set those rules for that fishery.

There is also more than meets the eye, even for that red snapper fishery because, while you are talking about a small number of days for recreational fishermen in Federal waters, you have got a much greater number of days in State waters.

You also can fish for red snapper and any other species just about any day you want. When you are in Federal waters, you can only keep them during those certain number of days. The reason for that is because approximately half the fish caught are reserved for commercial fishermen who have made

their case to the regional council that it is only fair that about half the fish ought to be available to them and about half the fish are allocated to recreational fishermen.

In those small number of days, believe it or not, the recreational folks catch almost the same amount of fish that the commercial fishermen catch during a much greater number of days. There is always a little more than meets the eye. You hear sensational statistics perhaps about the very small number of days available. There is, frankly, much more to the story.

Where we do agree is, if we can get better data, better science, better monitoring, all of this should be subject to discussion and revision in the councils. That is the flexibility of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, and that ought to be something that we can work on here together.

Unfortunately, though, Mr. Speaker, we have a Republican bill that is taking away some of the key provisions of the act that have actually been the very source of its great success over the years, so that heads in a wrong direction.

Then, unfortunately, we have the obligatory runs at NEPA and various environmental laws, including the Antiquities Act. This is no place to be carrying out that endless assault on America's environmental laws.

Let's get back to that point of consensus, sustainable management of our fisheries. If we can do that, I think we have something we can work on together in this House.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the gentleman's comments. It is very important that we try to find ways to try to work together when the form of this bill that we worked on in the committee last year, which is almost identical to the one that we adopted this year, was before the Natural Resources Committee.

In Mr. DEFazio's opening statement, he said:

Thank you, Chairman, and I appreciate the changes that were negotiated on a number of provisions in the bill.

Then he said:

This has been traditionally a very bipartisan exercise, and this is, in good part, bipartisan.

Mr. PALLONE, same time, his opening statement in the committee last year on a virtually identical bill was:

I do want to say that I do appreciate the fact that you reach out to us on the Democratic side of the aisle; and many of the provisions, as you mentioned, that are in the bill did come from input from the Democratic side.

The gentleman referenced the substitute:

The substitute has been made in order and has given more time than anything else for us to debate.

We have really leaned over backwards, particularly when you consider that the majority of amendments that we have made in order in this rule are amendments offered by the Democrats.

Now, I appreciate that the gentleman has a substitute—and we are going to give him an opportunity to talk about it—but if you look at his substitute, we might as well call his substitute “The Environmental Litigation and Fisheries Disaster Creation Act of 2015” because that is what it is going to do.

This amendment would allow the Secretary of Commerce to accept outside funds from NGOs to support cooperative research projects. This gives the litigation community of the world an avenue to influence NOAA decision making.

This amendment requires the Secretary of Commerce to ignore current procedure and forces the Secretary to retroactively declare a fishery disaster in California from a January 2004 emergency proclamation on California drought.

Mr. HUFFMAN's amendment seems to single out and blame the Central Valley Project for a fishery disaster. As we all know, there are many factors for fish declines, mainly including ocean conditions.

This amendment seeks to blame farmers for a fishery disaster. Above all, this amendment erases the flexibilities, transparency, and science improvements made in the underlying bill, but we give him the opportunity to make his case before this House to show our willingness to work with them.

I was greatly surprised when I read the Statement of Administration Policy that we received from the administration when we were marking this bill up in Rules Committee yesterday, and I was most surprised at what they had to say about the snapper language. Now, that language came from me. I asked the committee to put it in the bill, and I am greatly appreciative of the fact that they did.

Remember what I said about what the science has done to our fishery in the Gulf of Mexico. Here is what the administration says:

H.R. 1335 would also severely undermine the authority of the Gulf of Mexico Regional Fishery Management Council by extending State jurisdiction over the recreational red snapper fishery to 9 miles in the Gulf of Mexico. We intend to give the States more authority by going out.

Now, yes, that would give us some flexibility for the fishing out there, but a lot of the reefs that these red snappers grow on are further out than 9 miles, so it doesn't solve the whole problem.

The administration goes on to say:

This proposed extension of jurisdiction would create an untenable situation where recreational and commercial fishermen fishing side by side would be subject to different regulatory regimes.

How do they know in advance what the States are going to do? Why do they presume that that is going to be the case? They do so because they have such an aversion to the States having any control, any input, in the way that this fishery is governed.

They go on to say:

Absent an agreement among the States as to how to allocate recreationally caught red snapper, the bill would encourage interstate conflict and jeopardize the sustainability of this gulfwide resource.

No one has a greater stake in making sure we keep this fish stock healthy than those of us that live on the Gulf Coast do. Whether we are in commercial fishing, whether we are in charter boat fishing, whether we are in recreational fishing, if we overfish this stock, it is gone; I won't get to fish it with my grandson.

Future commercial fishermen won't get to make money off of this and provide jobs. Charter boat people won't be able to come down to the beach and enjoy themselves. No one wants that to happen.

The administration presumes that we are going to be so self-defeating that we would allow that to happen. I am greatly disappointed that, after all the work we did to solve this problem that was created by the government scientists, that still the administration is attacking us, still they are trying to keep us from solving this problem.

I appreciate what the gentleman had to say. I think we should try to work together on every bill we try to pass in this House; but, at some point, we have got to stand up for people who fish in this country. We have a right to fish in the waters of the United States, and the waters of the United States don't belong to the government scientists; they belong to the people of America.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Here we are debating the gutting of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, which both sides agree has successfully helped restore some of our counts of wild stock, including snapper. It hardly seems the time to reverse course without any scientific evidence that, somehow, we will get to a different place than we were when Congress wrote the Magnuson-Stevens Act to address the very issue, which it seems to be successfully addressing.

The gentleman from Alabama mentioned some remarks from Mr. DEFAZIO. I wanted to be clear that then-Ranking Member DEFAZIO opposed a similar bill, this similar bill, in the last Congress. I am not sure of the context of the remarks he made, but he stood here on the floor urging his colleagues to oppose the bill. He opposed it as well in committee.

He was not happy with the result last time; he is not happy with the result this time, nor is our new ranking member of either the subcommittee or the committee. I should add it passed out of committee without a single Democratic vote. To be clear, there was not a bipartisan effort in committee to talk about the best policy with regard to fisheries.

Now, before I jump into the debate about fish populations and fisheries in

our oceans—something I have to admit, as representing the landlocked State of Colorado, I had to take a crash course on in the last few days—I want to talk about some of the events from the last week that I think should merit congressional attention.

One item that happened in the last week is a 16-year-old student from the Atlanta Public School system in Georgia was attacked in his courtyard just because he was gay. A crowd surrounded to watch as 15 people beat this young person into a bloody pulp while yelling derogatory slurs at him.

Again, we could be addressing that through passing the Student Non-Discrimination Act or the antibullying act from Representative SANCHEZ, but instead, we are talking about gutting Magnuson-Stevens' protections of our fisheries.

Also this week, a south Texas family detention facility, similar to facilities in other parts of the country for immigrants who were caught in the wrong place at the wrong time, testimony came out that women and children were severely punished, abused, and neglected. We could be pursuing detention reform or immigration reform; but, again, we are not.

This last week, Los Angeles raised its minimum wage to \$15 an hour. Now, in LA, that puts families closer to a living wage, but the bad news is this Congress refuses to take up any minimum wage hike. Whether it is a \$12 proposal, which Democrats put forward, whether it is a \$10.10 proposal, whether it is even a \$9 proposal, this Congress has not, instead of bringing forward a bill to increase the minimum wage—by the way, when somebody works full time at minimum wage, they earn about \$14,500 a year. I don't know what we are saying to people where you work full time and we are forcing you to rely on government programs to subsist.

Republicans are keeping people on public housing, on food stamps, on welfare, rather than helping them support their own way and regaining their dignity in the process, which is what raising the minimum wage would do; but, no, we are not talking about that here today. We are talking about gutting the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

21,000 gallons of oil spilled in the Pacific Ocean off the coast of Santa Barbara County—that is probably not good for the fish there either—following the eruption of an 11-mile long underground pipeline; but, instead of talking about a renewable energy future, instead of talking about ending our reliance on fossil fuels or a national renewable energy portfolio standard, we are talking about gutting our fisheries protection and gutting the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

Tragically, we had funerals for eight people who were killed in the derailment of the Amtrak train in Pennsylvania; our House observed a moment of silence earlier on that, but rather than discussing measures that can prevent future derailment accidents—and I un-

derstand there is some technology that, when implemented, could have helped avoid this kind of accident—here we are again, discussing gutting the Magnuson-Stevens Act that has successfully protected our wild fisheries and helped restore some of the stock so that precisely the recreational and charter fishermen and the gentleman from Alabama can continue to enjoy fishing. Absent the support of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, it is likely we would not be able to support the level of recreational and commercial fishing that we can today.

Seven people were shot in Baltimore yesterday amid a recent spike in violence following the death of Freddie Gray while in police custody; but, instead of addressing nonlethal use of force or video cameras on police officers, we are discussing gutting the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

We all know that the Federal highway reauthorization is running up against the May 31 deadline. The body of this Congress chose to renew it for 60 days and just created another crisis in another 59 days; yet we are not discussing what a deal would look like, a bipartisan deal, for a longer-term reauthorization of the Federal highway trust fund.

□ 1945

One hundred eighty Democrats signed a discharge petition for a bill that seeks to renew the charter of the Export-Import Bank, a critical driver for job creation and American competitiveness, fully permissible under WTO rules, under proposed trade agreement rules. Other countries have these kinds of banks, and to unilaterally disarm would cost American jobs. But instead of talking about how Congress gets out of this political box on the Export-Import Bank, we are discussing gutting the Magnuson-Stevens fisheries protection legislation.

This Congress could do a lot better with regard to dealing with issues that I hear about from my constituents every day, day in and day out, whether that is fixing our broken immigration system, whether it is protecting our country from terrorism, whether it is preventing future Amtrak derailments. Those are the kinds of topics that, I think, the American people want to see us discussing here today rather than gutting an important piece of legislation which many charter fishermen, recreational fishermen, and commercial fishermen applaud in having successfully sustained their livelihoods or their passions for the last generation.

Let's talk about fish.

The bill we are looking at today would devastate our wild fisheries. It would make our waters much more of a "free for all." Under the guise of flexibility, it would allow for the overfishing of critical species, risking not only their sustainability and the future enjoyment of recreational fishermen but also the health of entire ecosystems that rely on the fish stocks that we are debating.

It would set an alarming precedent for the circumvention of our bedrock environmental laws by allowing fishery management councils to supersede NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act; the Endangered Species Act; the Antiquities Act; and the National Marine Sanctuaries Act.

The Fishery Conservation and Management Act was introduced in 1976 to stop unregulated fishing that had demonstrably led to the depletion across a number of wild fisheries. In both 1996 and 2007, the legislation was reauthorized—bipartisan bills again. This bill passed committee without a single Democratic vote. Each time, through a comprehensive drafting process, good ideas from both sides of the aisle were put to paper.

Ironically, the one thing that, I think, the gentleman from Alabama and I can agree on is that the 2007 authorization has been successful. We have shown the increased health of our wild fish stocks. So the question is: Do we want to reverse course and jeopardize that, or do we want to move forward with scientific-backed evidence?

Unfortunately, the Republicans are trying to make sweeping changes to gut the Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Protection Act. This iteration of the bill was drafted with almost no Democratic input, and it passed out of committee without a single Democratic vote.

Look, if we want to go through this kind of exercise with a bill that the President has said he would veto—a bill that breaks with the proud bipartisan tradition of fisheries protection—why aren't we spending time on some of the issues I mentioned earlier, like immigration reform, like protecting LGBT students from discrimination, like socioeconomic disparities in our country, how we can deal with mental health among returning veterans who fought overseas, or the risk of terrorism here at home? Let's do that.

If we are going to talk fish, Mr. Speaker, let's at least bring up a bill that has been drafted by all stakeholders. Let's at least bring up a bill that ensures that the fishing community will have an industry in 10 years, in 20 years, in 50 years—a bill that protects the interests of our recreational fishermen and that preserves the health of our oceans for the enjoyment of all Americans and for the health of our planet now into the future.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I was listening to the gentleman from Colorado speak. We heard about immigration, minimum wage, LGBT, renewable energy, highways, the Ex-Im Bank, and a little bit about fish. This is a bill about fish. It is not about all of that stuff.

We have heard from our friends on the other side of the aisle that we in the majority are using too many combined rules, where you have more than one bill in the rule, which they say

confuses the debate and distracts from the individual merits of each bill and the process by which it will be considered. I have just got to tell you that it seems to me we had a lot of confusion and distraction with the interjection into this debate of a bunch of issues that have nothing to do with fishing. Today, we have one rule covering one bill; yet the gentleman just spent the majority of his time discussing issues not covered in the rule before us.

Let me tell you that the people in my area are suffering. Charter boat people have lost their boats. Dads who want to take their children fishing can't take their children fishing. It is destroying a way of life for people. I am not saying those other issues aren't important, that they are not serious, but they are not covered by this rule, and they are not in this bill. We need to debate that.

The gentleman said something about the 2007 act, that it was successful. Let me tell you what it has been successful in doing. It has taken a summer red snapper season and reduced it to 10 days. That is what it has been successful in doing. It has been successful in almost decimating our charter boat fleets and in putting a lot of people out of work. I hear a lot from the other side about needing to put people to work. The people on these charter boats work. They lost their jobs because of this. It was successful all right. It was successful in destroying something that worked for people for generations.

I have great respect for my fellow colleague from Colorado who is on the Rules Committee. I know he doesn't get to fish much in the Gulf of Mexico, but I extend an invitation to him. I will take him out there and let him catch some red snapper. I believe, Mr. Speaker, once he does that, he will be as enthusiastic for this bill as I am.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if the gentleman has any further speakers or is prepared to close.

Mr. BYRNE. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I invite the gentleman from Alabama to come to Colorado to fish our wonderful mountain trout, which we have in our streams and rivers. Obviously, he is no stranger to a different kind of fisheries management policy where, of course, our economy in Colorado relies on fishing and sportsmen as well, and I certainly understand that driver of jobs locally.

I think the disconnect here is that the gentleman talks about what the 2007 Magnuson-Stevens bill has accomplished in that it has reduced the number of days that people can fish. That was the action that was taken. The effect of that is that the wild stocks are up, so there are more snapper. I think both sides agree on that. I believe there is a direct causal link to the fact that there are more snapper because there

have been fewer that have been taken out of the water. If we manage our fisheries for the short term, if we throw caution to the wind, people might have a good season or two, but it simply won't be there either for the future generation of recreationists or for those whose livelihoods depend on a viable commercial fishing stock.

Now, this bill is about fish. If this rule allowed for the discussion of some of the other bills I mentioned, I could support it. If this bill allowed a debate of #raisethewage, either to our Democratic proposal of a \$12 an hour minimum wage or to whatever number the gentleman from Alabama would like—if he would like to propose \$9 an hour, \$8.50—I would be willing to support this rule, or if it even allowed 2 minutes of debate for raising the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, I would support this bill if it allowed for us to consider our bipartisan immigration reform measure. If we allowed that debate under this bill, I would do that. I would support this rule if it allowed debate about the Student Nondiscrimination Act to make sure that LGBT students don't face bullying in our schools and so that it is a safe learning environment for all students. I would support this rule if it addressed what we have learned from the Amtrak derailment and prevented future derailments and saved lives.

None of those items, along with countless others, are included under this rule. In fact, all of the amendments under this rule, as well as the underlying bill, are related to fish.

No, I don't know deny that fish are important. We might be discussing our mountain trout someday here on the floor of the House and defending the President's efforts around clean water or on protecting some of our watersheds in Colorado. We have a lot of interest in protecting our fishing stock as well. But I would be proud to be able to bring forth some of the priorities that I hear from my constituents that are so critical.

Rather than continually bringing up bills that attack the integrity of our environment—in this case, a bill that would gut the fisheries protections that have been afforded under the Magnuson-Stevens Act and that both sides have acknowledged have successfully helped restore the red snapper population—I would hope that perhaps our next rule will allow us to raise the minimum wage, that perhaps our next rule will allow us to consider immigration reform, that perhaps our next rule will help us deal with the bullying in schools, that perhaps our next rule will save lives and prevent future derailments, and so many other issues.

I say to my colleagues that this particular bill needs to go back to the drawing board. It needs to go back to the drawing board to have a bipartisan effort in a committee I serve on, the Natural Resources Committee, to include priorities from both sides and good science and continue to build upon the legacy of success that the 2007

bipartisan reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Act has had in increasing the health of our wild fishing stocks. I encourage my colleagues to vote “no” on this rule.

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

I was listening very carefully to the gentleman from Colorado, and I accept his invitation to go trout fishing. I would love to do that. Fishing of all kind is great for everybody to do, and I appreciate his invitation.

The reason we have the problem we have today is not because the Federal Government knows how many fish are out there. It doesn't. Remember what I said earlier—this is a reef fish, and they don't sample for reef fish on reefs. So, if you don't sample for reef fish on reefs, you are not going to find the fish. Now, we know there are so many fish out there because we haven't been allowed to fish them and that snapper are not only eating other species but they are eating other snapper.

What our scientists have done is they have actually gone out there with submersible vehicles with high-def cameras, and they count the fish on the reef and sample them that way. They have a real number. They do a real sampling so they get accurate data, and these government scientists don't.

My friend said that we should go back to the drawing board. We have waited too long already. We should have done this last year so that we could have had a real snapper season this year. If we wait again, we won't have a snapper season next year, and that is not acceptable. We have enough fish out there—and the science from our region has proven it—to have a real snapper season. It is not just about snapper. We have these problems in other areas of the fishery that need to be taken care of and taken care of in a responsible way. No one is more environmentally conscious than someone who hunts and fishes, because that is where we get our enjoyment, and we want it to be there for us and for our children and, now that I have a grandson, for my grandchildren.

I have appreciated this debate today. I always welcome the opportunity to draw attention to some of the real issues which are affecting my constituents back on the Gulf Coast. To some people up here, this issue doesn't mean much. To some people, they only listen to the political talking points put out by lobbyists or by political parties or by environmental groups. But to the small restaurant employees in Gulf Shores or to the charter boat captain in Orange Beach or to the gas station in Foley or to the condo owners on Dauphin Island or to the thousands of families who spend time fishing on the Gulf Coast and all around our country, this bill is critically important. This bill is about getting the Federal Government off our backs so that we can fish.

Let's not fall back into another political debate. Let's come together on be-

half of our Nation's coastal communities. Let's get some real relief for our fishermen. I encourage my colleagues to support this rule and to support this commonsense bill and to support the people of America and their freedom to fish in our waters.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

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

□ 2000

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF CORPORAL SARA MEDINA

(Mr. FOSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, today it is with great sorrow that I rise to mark the loss of one of Aurora's brightest lights. On May 12, 2015, while performing relief work following the Nepal earthquake, Corporal Sara Abigail Medina and five other marines tragically lost their lives in a helicopter crash.

Corporal Medina was from Aurora, Illinois, and graduated from East Aurora High School in 2010. While still in high school, she decided to serve her country by joining the Marines.

In the face of such a tragedy, we often ask why; and to paraphrase the President, whenever a disaster strikes, the world looks to America to lead because of our extraordinary people who rise to the challenge.

As a father, I know that no words that I say on this floor will be able to fill the hole in the hearts of all those who knew and loved Sara, but still we must speak because all should know that Corporal Sara Medina gave her last full measure of devotion in service to her country, helping those who needed it most.

For her sacrifice and for her family's terrible loss, we offer our condolences and thanks of a grateful nation.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE). The Chair will entertain Special Order speeches without prejudice to the resumption of legislative business.

#### TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to join with my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida, as we discuss an issue of great importance to my district and, quite frankly, to every Member of Congress: transportation infrastructure.

Last week our Nation endured a terrible tragedy as Amtrak Northeast Regional train 188 derailed in Philadelphia on its way to Trenton en route to New York. That accident killed eight Americans, including one of my constituents, injured more than 200, and disrupted service on the busiest rail corridor in the Nation for nearly a week.

In the days since the accident, investigators have indicated that high speeds may have played a significant role in the derailment, speeds that were more than double the limit in that stretch of the track. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have used those details to deflect attention away from discussing our Nation's investments, or the lack thereof, in rail and all of our other surface transportation infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, burying our heads in the sand and waiting until an accident indisputably caused by lack of funding or maintenance to discuss that funding is dangerous, irresponsible, and, frankly, unacceptable: dangerous because millions of Americans every day are driving across dilapidated bridges, riding on outdated trains, and stuck in endless traffic when traveling to work, to school, and medical care; irresponsible because news coverage and the looming highway trust fund depletion have made transportation infrastructure a national focus; unacceptable because transportation infrastructure has traditionally been a bipartisan issue that affects how every single one of our constituents gets where they need to go. Still we stand here today waiting for the House majority to bring forth a good-faith, comprehensive surface transportation reauthorization that makes investments to give us the transportation system—rail, car, air, and sea—that we need.

Transportation infrastructure is critical for the businesses and employers in our district that ship goods to consumers across the globe. Transportation infrastructure creates good-paying jobs here, jobs that can't be outsourced, and jobs that will actually

give working Americans a chance to climb into the middle class and beyond.

But like I mentioned earlier, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would rather have us wait until an accident that we can attribute to infrastructure decay to invest in our roads, our bridges, and our railways. In fact, a Los Angeles Times report recently noted that the last time Congress significantly increased Amtrak funding was 2008, following the 2008 Union Pacific-Metrolink crash in California that killed 25 people.

This year, the day following the Philadelphia crash, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted to cut Amtrak funding by one-fifth. That is wrong; it is just plain wrong. It is insane, and it is out of touch.

Earlier this year, my Congressional Progressive Caucus colleagues and I introduced the People's Budget, a budget that would fix our economy so that it will once again provide opportunity for everyday working class Americans. A key provision in the People's Budget was an investment of \$820 billion to close our Nation's infrastructure gap, funded by raising the gas tax by just 15 cents for the first time in more than two decades so that we can maintain and improve our Nation's infrastructure.

Unfortunately, instead of the People's Budget, Congress passed a far more dangerous Republican budget; and unfortunately, our infrastructure continues to crumble. Our roads are frequently congested, limiting productivity for millions of American workers; our airports appear run down compared to their competitors in Europe and Asia; and rail speeds around the world have long eclipsed even Amtrak's fastest trains.

Our bridges continue to deteriorate and present real safety hazards, and our ports are in terrible disrepair, having negative economic impact. In fact, a report last week in The New York Times noted that while the train that derailed was traveling well above the speed limit, at 106 miles per hour, its speed was about half of the average speed of a French train from Paris to Marseille.

Federal and State investments in infrastructure have plunged in recent years, even as economists have repeated over and over and over again that infrastructure spending would bring massive economic benefits and overhaul our transportation networks. This has to change before it is too late, Mr. Speaker.

The Congressional Progressive Caucus is here on the floor today to implore our colleagues to put transportation spending front and center. I know that the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) agrees with me. I want to thank her for her leadership as a member of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), who shares our

passion about the importance of funding a comprehensive transportation bill.

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, for well over a decade we have failed to adequately invest in transportation infrastructure. According to DOT, there is an \$808 billion backlog of investment needs on highways and bridges, including \$480 billion in critical repair work. Public transit has an \$86 billion backlog of critical maintenance and repair needs, which increases by \$2.5 billion each year as bus and rail infrastructure ages.

The American Society of Civil Engineers has given U.S. infrastructure an overall grade of D-minus because 54 percent of our major roads are rated poor or mediocre. One out of every four bridges in the United States, or 147,000 bridges, is structurally deficient or functionally obsolete, and 45 percent of Americans do not have access to transit.

Federal land management agencies need over \$11 billion to address deferred maintenance needs on our roads and bridges. The Federal Highway Administration estimates that the cost of upgrading and repairing our deteriorating bridges is over \$106 billion. An investment of \$20 billion annually by all levels of government is needed through 2030 to draw down the backlog.

Bringing existing transit assets just up to a state of good repair will require an annualized investment level of \$18.5 billion through the year 2030, an amount far in excess of current funding levels. An additional \$4.3 billion over current spending levels from all levels of government is needed annually to eliminate the current backlog by 2030.

To accommodate future transit ridership growth and preserve transit systems, as much as \$24.5 billion per year would need to be invested compared to only \$14.2 billion currently invested, a gap of \$10 billion a year.

The cost to our economy of not meeting our infrastructure needs is great. According to the 2013 American Society of Civil Engineers report, 42 percent of America's major urban highways remain congested. Congestion costs commuters \$121 billion a year in wasted time and fuel, or an average of \$818 per commuter. I would guarantee you each commuter would rather spend the equivalent amount in taxes than waste that money sitting on a clogged highway.

In 2011, congestion caused urban Americans to travel 5.5 billion hours more and to purchase an extra 2.9 billion gallons of unnecessary fuel. Without existing transit services in place in 2011, travelers would have suffered an additional 865 million hours of delays and consumed 450 million more gallons of fuel.

Despite the condition of our infrastructure system caused by years of underinvestment, we are spending way too little today on roads, bridges, transit, and rail. The highway trust fund

currently collects about \$35 billion per year for the highway account and \$5 billion for the transit account. According to CBO, the highway trust fund faces a shortfall of about \$170 billion over the next 10 years. By 2020, the highway trust fund's purchasing power will have dropped by nearly half since 1990 because of inflation at a time when the country's population will have increased 30 percent.

We currently spend about \$50 billion a year on highways and transit, and most of the recent fights over revenue for the transportation bill have been merely to fill the gap to maintain current funding levels. The discussion should be much broader. It should be about how we can fund the program at a higher level to eliminate the backlog, increase capacity, meet a state of good repair, and eliminate the congestion in this country.

Today, this country spends about 1.7 percent of GDP of the entire economy on infrastructure. We used to spend almost 4 percent on infrastructure. Europe is spending 4 to 5 percent, and China is spending 9 percent. Who do you think, 30 years from now, is going to have a competitive economic system which depends on adequate up-to-date competitive transportation infrastructure and broadband?

In particular, for example, we have been underinvesting in our rail infrastructure as well. The passenger rail system needs at least \$52 billion, or \$2.5 billion per year for 20 years, just to meet ridership demands such as capacity improvements, such as tunnels to New York and to bring the system into a state of good repair. Of that amount, \$21 billion is necessary for the backlog of projects on the Northeast corridor.

The Northeast corridor serves 51 million people and is the major corridor for Amtrak in the country. The \$21 billion for the backlog of projects includes \$13.8 billion in major infrastructure project backlog and \$7.2 billion in basic infrastructure backlog.

□ 2015

Some of these major project needs include \$1.5 billion to replace the Baltimore and Potomac Tunnel, which dates back to 1873; \$950 million to replace the Gunpowder and Bush River Bridges; \$850 million to replace the Susquehanna River Bridge; \$350 million to replace the Highline Bridge and add a fourth track between Newark and New York; \$750 million to replace the Portal Bridge, which can stop the entire Northeast corridor if it should fail; \$1 billion for catenary, communication, and signal upgrades and bridge replacements near New Haven; \$2.8 billion in upgrades to other movable bridges; \$1.8 billion in additional catenary upgrades from Washington, D.C., to New York.

All this is basic backlog, just to make sure that the current system continues to operate and doesn't fail. Additional funding over and above the \$21 billion backlog, for a total of \$64

billion, is needed for service improvements and projected increases in capacity on the Northeast corridor; yet Amtrak gets just \$1.4 billion in the annual appropriations bill—or less than 2 percent of Federal transportation funding.

The Appropriations Committee recommended the other day that this be reduced to \$1.1 billion, with a \$64 billion backlog.

The fiscal year 2016 transportation appropriations bill, just marked up in committee the day after the accident north of Philadelphia, cuts capital funding for Amtrak by \$290 million, providing only \$1.1 billion in FY 2016, \$1 billion below the President's request.

The President's request for this year's budget includes \$5 billion for rail. Half of that is for Amtrak, to bring the system to a state of good repair, including \$550 billion for the Northeast corridor.

As we await the results of the full investigation, the tragedy of Amtrak train 188 shows the importance of a reliable rail system to the Northeast region of this country. We cannot continue the decades of neglect that have left our system desperately underfunded and resulted in a multibillion-dollar backlog to bring the system to a state of good repair.

It should not require a tragedy to spur action to address the glaring deficiencies in our transportation and infrastructure network. We should act before accidents occur.

Rail safety is not a luxury; it is of fundamental importance to our citizens and our economy. Thousands of businesses and commuters in the Northeast depend on the rail for commerce and transportation every day. Congress must finally provide the resources necessary for ensuring the safety and reliability of our transportation and infrastructure system.

While this Congress has failed to make transportation funding a priority, the administration has taken the lead and proposed a long-term surface transportation reauthorization bill.

The GROW AMERICA Act provides a total of \$478 billion over 6 years, a 45 percent increase for highways, bridges, public transportation, highway safety, and rail programs. It provides \$317 billion for programs under the Federal Highway Administration, an increase of 29 percent over current levels. It allocates \$18 billion for a new dedicated multimodal freight system. How is our economy supposed to operate without an efficient freight transportation system?

It provides \$115 billion for programs under the Federal Transit Administration, an increase of 76 percent over current levels, and significantly boosts New Starts funding.

It provides \$28 billion for programs under the Federal Railroad Administration, \$6 billion for vehicle safety programs under the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, \$4.7 bil-

lion for truck and bus safety programs, and \$16 billion for the Highway Safety Improvement Program.

It provides \$7.5 for TIGER grants and \$6 billion for TIFIA that could support \$60 billion in loans. It provides \$3.5 billion to leverage research and innovation to move people.

Several of the members of the Transportation Committee just introduced the GROW AMERICA Act in the House. Not all of us agree with everything in that bill.

For example, the Transportation Committee's Special Panel on Freight, which I was the ranking Democrat on, made several unanimous bipartisan recommendations, including providing dedicated guaranteed funding for projects of national and regional significance. Reauthorizing this program is a top priority for many of us on the committee and should be included in any final bill.

It is important to start moving a long-term bill, where we can have an opportunity to shape these policy provisions, and the GROW AMERICA Act would serve as a good starting point.

The last surface transportation bill, MAP-21, expired last fall. The President first proposed the GROW AMERICA Act last spring to provide an alternative for MAP-21 before it expired.

Unfortunately, we failed to reauthorize MAP-21 on time and passed an extension until the end of this month, to give us more time to work on a long-term bill. We just passed another 2-month extension, the 33rd extension, to take us to the end of July.

We have known for months that this day was coming; yet we have made no progress in finding a solution to funding highways, transit, and other important surface transportation programs.

MAP-21 itself was only a 2-year bill, breaking the tradition of Congress passing 5- or 6-year bills to provide the reliable funding necessary to complete long-term capital plans and projects that require a commitment beyond 1 fiscal year.

The last time we passed a long-term bill was 10 years ago, in 2005, in SAFETEA-LU. That bill was underfunded because of a resistance to raising the gasoline tax and identifying new revenue sources.

House and Senate leadership couldn't come up with the additional \$60 billion needed to fill the gap in the highway trust fund just to do a long-term bill at current levels, but this week, they put on the floor a tax extender that will cost \$182 billion over 10 years, completely unpaid for.

The priorities of this Congress are completely out of whack. Our infrastructure is crumbling around us, and the majority continues to spend hundreds of billions of dollars on tax cuts for corporations and the wealthy, while leaving transportation funding to wither on the vine.

I am concerned we will be back here in July having this same conversation. We must demand now that this Con-

gress spend the next 2 months, once and for all, making transportation funding a priority.

We must realize that what we have based our transportation program on since 1955, the gasoline tax, is a wasting asset. It is down 30 percent since 1993 because of inflation, and every year, we use fewer gallons because of an intelligent policy of energy conservation, of higher mileage per gallon; but that means fewer gallons of gasoline. We must either raise the gasoline tax or bring in a new source of revenue or both.

Finally, let me say that interest rates are at negative rates now. When interest rates are at negative rates, when you can borrow money and pay it back more cheaply, that is the time to borrow money to invest so that our children inherit not a great debt, but inherit an efficiently functioning economy and an investment in the country that makes the economy function.

We have always known this. The Republican Party and their precursor, the Whigs, have always known this. They were the party in the 19th century of the American systems. What was the American system? Henry Clay's system to invest public funds in internal improvements in roads and canals and bridges and railroads, rather than the European system of letting the private sector do it.

Abraham Lincoln continued that tradition with the transcontinental railroad at a time of civil war, and Dwight Eisenhower did the Interstate Highway System, which we are still living with. These were Republican Party projects. I only wish the Republican Party wasn't completely turning its back on its own heritage.

We have, for the last century, a bipartisan heritage of funding our infrastructure so that the country can grow and the economy can prosper, but the Republican Party seems to have turned this back on this. I urge you to reconsider.

Stop turning your back. Join us in the Democratic Party in continuing our tradition of making this an economy that can function for all our people, where people can move and not waste their time sitting in traffic jams, where goods can move and the economy can function, businesses can flourish. That is what is at stake.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. NADLER, first of all, I want to thank you for your comprehensive information about transportation infrastructure.

In my home State of Florida, we bring many visitors to Florida through Amtrak through the Auto Train. We have colleagues on the other side that want to privatize that system, and I want to know how that will affect New York, privatizing that Northeast corridor.

Mr. NADLER. Well, you have to remember the reason why Amtrak was created in the first place. We didn't have public railroads in the 19th century. We didn't have public railroads in

the first half of the 20th century, but by 1960 and 1970, many of the freight railroads were going bankrupt, and certainly, the passenger lines could no longer pay for themselves. They were all going bankrupt.

Congress faced the reality in 1970 that if it didn't create something called Amtrak—it was named Amtrak—but something as a public corporation or publicly funded corporation, there would be no passenger rail in the United States.

The States did the same thing. What became various commuter rail agencies, like MTA in New York or SEPTA in Philadelphia and others, were created out of the bankrupt passenger operations of the private rail lines. No one could make money at it.

Amtrak has survived and has flourished in the sense of attracting more and more passengers, and it now has 77 percent of the market against the airlines in the Northeast corridor; and, thank God, it saves energy and time and congestion, despite the fact that it has been grossly underfunded by Congress.

The only section of Amtrak that makes money is the Northeast corridor from Washington to Boston. It subsidizes everything else. There would be no rail lines outside the Northeast corridor—not to Florida, not to Chicago, not to Denver, not to any place outside the Washington to Boston corridor—if they had to pay for themselves.

We, the Northeast corridor, subsidize the rest of Amtrak. From my point of view as a New Yorker, I would rather that weren't the case; but I am an American. I think everybody ought to have the ability to travel and the ability to have an economy that functions, and so we cross-subsidize.

It would be better if Congress put money in and other sections of the country could become self-sustaining in rail, but the fact is the history is that is very difficult.

I am not aware of any rail system or public transit system in the world that isn't publicly subsidized. We subsidize every transportation system in this country. We subsidize the highway; we subsidize the airlines with the air traffic control, and we do it because we know the country has to move.

If we want an economy that generates goods and services for people, it has to move. Freight has to move. It has to move by rail. It has to move by barge, by boat. We have to invest in it.

If Amtrak stops funding the line to Florida, that line wouldn't exist anymore; everything would be on the road. The roads would be more congested; people would waste more time. The one exception to that right now is the Northeast corridor. We are willing, because we are Americans, to participate in a national system, and the rest of the country should be willing, too.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. NADLER, when I travel to different countries, they always ask us about our freight rail. We are the caboose when it comes

to funding Amtrak, and we started the rail system, and they don't use cabooses any more.

I don't understand why it is that we, as Members of Congress, don't understand the importance of having a safe, efficient transportation system. Rail has to be a part of it.

When I think about Katrina and I think about over 3,000 people died because they couldn't move out of harm's way, that is a reason why we need a comprehensive transportation system in this country.

Our competition in Florida is not Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi—nothing personal to the people here from Georgia. We are competing with people from other countries, and we must develop an efficient rail system in conjunction with all of our other transportation needs.

Mr. NADLER. You are obviously completely right, and that is why I quoted the figures I did earlier in my remarks.

Prior to 1980, roughly, we used to spend about 4, 4½ percent of GDP on infrastructure. Now, we are spending 1.7 percent of GDP on infrastructure. Of course, we are underinvesting, and our infrastructure is decaying. By infrastructure, I mean roads, highway, bridges, rail, airports, broadband—you name it.

China is spending 9 percent of GDP on infrastructure. We are competing with China. We are competing with other countries. If they can move goods and people more efficiently, that means their economy is going to be more efficient; their economy is going to be more competitive; they are going to be able to sell things more cheaply, generate things more cheaply, and out-sell us.

We have to compete in a world economy. We can't be insulated. If we are going to compete in a world economy and have an economy that can generate the jobs, we can only compete if we have a transportation system. We also need an efficient energy system and other things, too, but an efficient transportation system. We are eating our seed corn. We benefited from prior generations' investment, and now, we are not doing that investment.

I hear rhetoric on this floor all the time that we shouldn't leave a debt. We have to have a balanced budget, and we shouldn't leave a debt to our children.

Frankly, I would rather leave a debt to our children if we use that debt to build up the investments in this country so that there are roads for our children to travel on, rails to ride on, airports to land in, schools to attend. That is an investment.

□ 2030

We have to make a distinction. It is one thing to waste money or spend it on something ephemeral. But to invest it so that our children inherit a country with a functioning economy and with assets that we give them that they can use to make a more functioning economy, that is worth it.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, Congresswoman WATSON COLEMAN, and Members of the House, it amazes me that the House practices what I call "Reverse Robin Hood." In other words, robbing from transportation to give tax breaks to their friends.

Recently, they passed close to \$300 billion for tax breaks. But, yet, we can't pass a comprehensive transportation bill that will put people to work.

Yesterday, in the House, we passed another extension of surface transportation programs, once again, failing in our duties to provide a world-class transportation system for our country.

Transportation programs are much too critical to our economy to be delayed any longer. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership in Washington continue its long-running failure to fund surface transportation infrastructure programs.

While our international competition is investing heavily in transportation and infrastructure to move people, goods, and services, the leadership of this House is passing tax cuts for their wealthy contributors, while Congress sticks their heads in the sand and passed another continuing resolution.

Just a few weeks ago, House Republicans passed a bill cutting taxes by \$269 billion for the richest 1 percent of Americans, with no offsets. But we have failed to pass a real transportation reauthorization bill since 2005 because they can't find the money.

Clearly, this Nation's transportation infrastructure is not a priority for the Republican leadership in this House.

Transportation infrastructure funding is absolutely critical to this Nation and, if properly funded, serves as a tremendous economic boost and job creator. In fact, the Department of Transportation statistics show that for every billion dollars that we invest in transportation infrastructure, it creates 44,000 permanent jobs, along with \$6.2 billion in economic activity.

Mr. Speaker, the traveling public is pleading with you to make transportation infrastructure a priority. When this happens, we can put millions of hard-working Americans back to work fixing our Nation's crumbling infrastructure, and preparing our country for the future.

In the words of Transportation Secretary Anthony Foxx: "All of us have a role to play in shaping our Nation's infrastructure."

And as we saw during the last tragic train derailment in Philadelphia, Congress urgently needs to increase funding for our Nation's passenger rail systems to make them safe for the traveling public and prevent future tragedies on our Nation's rail system.

Madam COLEMAN, I understand that the gentleman from New Jersey wants to join us. And as he joins us, I would like for him to answer that question, as he makes his remarks, How would prioritizing Amtrak affect New Jersey?

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Before the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) begins, I really think I want to share something that I think is very germane to where the gentleman may be going.

Both of us live on and travel the Northeast corridor on the train back and forth to New Jersey, and we depend upon an efficient and a safe train ride to get us back to our homes and to get us back down here to do the people's business.

I did mention that I lost a constituent because that train was on its way to Trenton, and it was letting off people in my district, and that train would have ultimately gone on up to Newark and then on to New York.

I know that the Congressman has been tremendously impacted by the tragedy that took place, and knowing how important it is for us to be able to move back and forth efficiently, effectively, and safely in the Northeast corridor. And I just wanted to sort of preface the introduction of your coming to the microphone with sort of remembering that this is really close to home for you and me.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida and the gentlewoman from New Jersey for affording me this opportunity to discuss a tragedy, as the gentlewoman from New Jersey stated, that has hit very close to home.

And the reason I say that is, as stated by the gentlewoman from New Jersey, the Northeast corridor is the way we are able to travel back and forth from our home to Washington, D.C., to do the people's business. And so it is not uncommon that I could have been on train 188. I have taken it on numerous occasions.

My thoughts and prayers are with the victims of this horrific Amtrak train derailment and their families at this difficult time.

I am grateful for the first responders who put themselves in harm's way to rescue passengers, and I wish all those injured a full and speedy recovery.

This tragedy, as we stated, has hit so close to home. Sometimes weekly, I travel, as do many of my constituents and colleagues, on this rail line. I have taken Amtrak's 188 and had my wife and children on that specific train leaving here going back home.

As a Member of Congress, we have a responsibility to ensure and enhance the public safety.

The derailment of Amtrak train 188 serves as an important reminder that if we are to meet this responsibility, we need to invest in our infrastructure.

There is no doubt that our Nation's infrastructure is crumbling. The American Society of Civil Engineers has rated it as a D-plus

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know all of us find education important. If you were given a D-plus on the work that you do, on the quality of your service, what would that say?

There is no doubt that we are falling behind other nations in the quality of our infrastructure. Long-term investments in our Nation's infrastructure are essential for achieving economic growth and competitiveness throughout the world.

Yet, Republicans refuse to address this very real crisis. This only compounds the problem, costing American jobs and undermining our economy.

We don't need shortsighted thinking. We need to stay competitive, boost commerce, invest in economic growth and job creation, and protect our communities. These are the benefits of modernizing our Nation's infrastructure.

One day after the derailment of Amtrak train 188, my Republican colleagues voted to cut Amtrak funding. While the Amtrak investigation remains ongoing, we know that slashing funding will hamper safety improvements and upgrades.

We shouldn't stand in the way of this wise infrastructure investment. Let's commit to ensuring modern, safe, and reliable infrastructure that reflects the greatness of this Nation.

And as I go to my seat, I just want to, once again, thank the gentlewomen from Florida and New Jersey respectively for giving me the opportunity to have several moments to discuss what is an issue that impacts the safety, the productiveness, the competitiveness of our Nation and our infrastructure.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit more about Amtrak, because I am the past chair and ranking member of the Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials Subcommittee, and I think Amtrak is more and more important.

As more Americans are turning to rail as their preferred mode of transportation, Amtrak is building the infrastructure and organization to meet that demand.

Amtrak carried a record total of 31.6 million passengers in 2013. Their ridership has been growing across the system for over a decade, with last year's ridership being the largest in the history.

Currently, they serve more than 500 destinations in 46 States and provide the only public transportation option for millions of people in rural areas.

Let me repeat. Amtrak is the only mode of transportation for people in certain rural areas.

Amtrak has increased their revenue, reduced debt, has new passengers, improved their infrastructure, and purchased trains that are built 100 percent in America. That is where those parts are made, 100 percent in America.

Amtrak reduces congestion and improves our energy independence and plays a vital role in emergency preparation.

And I often talk about 9/11. Amtrak was moving. It was the only way people could move in this country. And Katrina.

So Amtrak plays a very important part in making sure that we can con-

tinue to move people, goods and services.

Madam, I want to thank you for your leadership in this area.

THIS IS OUR WATCH

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Before you close out, I want to mention something about veterans because we are getting ready to have a recess, and I have to thank all of the veterans for their service.

This morning at 9 a.m. we went over to the Women's Memorial Wall. And it is what we have done for 18 years to honor women veterans who have served in this country.

I want to thank all who have served America. We have the freedoms because of their service. I want to, once again, thank them.

But I must mention the fact that on the 24th of this month, if the House does not move, the project in Denver will shut down, and it will cost over \$20 million to shut down. In addition, it will be \$2 million a month. We are talking about the VA facility in Denver, Colorado.

Now, we want to blame the VA, but this is our watch. The Denver hospital has been a political hot potato for over 10 years; different secretaries, different administrations.

But the point is, this is our watch, and it is unacceptable that we shut down this project.

One of the slogans of the Army is, "Failure is not an option." We need to get it done.

□ 2045

We appreciate the service that the men and women have provided for our freedom, but we need to do our part in making sure that we take care of them.

I want to paraphrase the comments of the first President of the United States, George Washington. He said, No matter how justified we think a war may be, what is important is how we treat the veterans.

Now, this is our watch. This is our responsibility. And we have to make sure that we take care of the veterans.

With that, I want to thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey for her leadership and for providing this opportunity to discuss transportation infrastructure, Amtrak, and also to thank the veterans for their service.

A lot of us talk the talk, but we need to walk the walk and roll the roll for the veterans.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for everything that she has brought before us this evening. I thank my colleagues for raising the issues regarding the significance, the importance of, and the economic benefits, as well as the safety and security needs, of an efficient, effective, and safe transportation system.

I want to also thank the gentlewoman for reminding us that we are having our Memorial Day holiday, and it gives us an opportunity to thank those who have made the ultimate sacrifice to keep us safe and to keep the freedoms that we hold so dear.

And at the end of this, Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to simply remind us that the transportation needs of our community both represent safety and security that we hold very sacred in our communities, but it also provides an economic benefit that we all can benefit from. Irrespective of Republican or Democrat, rural, urban, or suburban, there is a benefit to a transportation system that moves people, goods, and supplies where they are needed.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, Congresswoman BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN and Congresswoman CORRIE BROWN for organizing this Congressional Progressive Caucus Special Order Hour on Transportation Infrastructure Spending.

Last night, the House passed H.R. 2353 to extend the federal surface transportation programs for two months, through July 31st. If these programs had been allowed to expire, all federal transportation funding to states and local governments would have stopped on May 31st, and numerous construction jobs on highways, bridges and transit systems could have been cancelled. According to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, this needless crisis brought uncertainty to 6,000 critical construction projects across the country, and left 660,000 good-paying construction jobs hanging in the balance.

I voted for this bill, but I did so reluctantly because what we really need is a multi-year transportation bill that will bring our nation's transportation system into the 21st century. A multi-year transportation bill with robust funding for highway, bridge and transit construction will create thousands of good jobs and provide certainty to states and local governments.

Federal investment in our nation's transportation system is essential. The American Society of Civil Engineers gave the public infrastructure of the United States a grade of "D+" in 2013 and estimated that we will need to invest \$3.6 trillion by 2020 in order to improve the condition of our infrastructure.

Rebuilding our nation's transportation infrastructure creates jobs that are desperately needed throughout the country. The economy is still struggling to recover from the recession. The unemployment rate is 5.4 percent nationwide and is significantly higher in some minority and disadvantaged communities. Transportation funding is clearly good for the economy.

Congressional Republicans have had months to prepare a multi-year transportation bill. Unfortunately, all they did last night is punt the deadline two months deeper into the critical summer construction season. I urge my Republican colleagues to work with us over the next two months so we can finally pass a multi-year transportation bill before the July 31st deadline.

Congressional Republicans are further jeopardizing our nation's transportation system by slashing funding for TIGER. TIGER—formally known as Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery—is a nationwide competitive grant program that creates jobs by funding investments in transportation infrastructure by states, local governments, and transit agencies. TIGER funds innovative projects that generate economic development

and improve access to safe, reliable, and affordable transportation alternatives.

Earlier this year, the President requested \$1.25 billion for TIGER in fiscal year 2016, as part of an expanded TIGER program that would provide \$7.5 billion for TIGER over 6 years. This expanded TIGER program will create jobs, encourage innovation, and modernize transportation infrastructure for the 21st century.

I sent a letter to the Appropriations Committee urging full funding of the President's \$1.25 billion request for TIGER in FY 2016, and a total of 146 Members of Congress signed my letter.

Nevertheless, the House Republicans' version of the FY 2016 Transportation and Housing Appropriations (THUD) bill provides only \$100 million for TIGER. That's an 80 percent cut from FY 2015 and a small fraction of the President's request. This kind of drastic cut in TIGER will needlessly cripple highway and transit construction plans that are already struggling due to the uncertainty surrounding the future of the transportation bill.

We need more federal investment in transportation infrastructure, and we need it now! That is why I am introducing the TIGER Grants for Job Creation Act. This bill will provide an emergency supplemental appropriation totaling \$7.5 billion dollars over the next six years for job creation through investments in transportation infrastructure. This emergency supplemental appropriation will fully fund the President's proposal for an expanded TIGER.

Passage of an emergency supplemental appropriation will provide funding for TIGER free from sequestration and without reducing funding for other important domestic priorities. It will also allow states, local governments, and transit agencies to begin immediately to plan projects and prepare grant applications. Thus, it will ensure an efficient use of funds and timely job creation.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the TIGER Grants for Job Creation Act and fully fund the President's request for TIGER, and I urge my colleagues to pass a multi-year transportation bill to bring our highways, bridges and public transit systems into the 21st century.

#### HR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia (during the Special Order of Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

#### REAPPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 4412, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Trustees of the Institute of Amer-

ican Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development:

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN, New Mexico

#### APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS TO COMMISSION ON CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 202(a) of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-146), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following individuals on the part of the House to the Commission on Care:

Mr. David P. Blom, Columbus, Ohio  
Mr. Darin Selnick, Oceanside, California  
Dr. Toby Cosgrove, Cleveland, Ohio

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group:

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ, California  
Mr. GENE GREEN, Texas  
Mr. POLIS, Colorado  
Ms. JACKSON LEE, Texas  
Mrs. TORRES, California

#### CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) for 30 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appear here tonight to talk about police and community relations throughout our country. The purpose of this Special Order is to talk about how the relationship between police and local communities can be repaired.

Over the last year, we have witnessed tensions rise between local law enforcement officers and local communities. The events we have witnessed across the country have highlighted the need for mending the strained relationships between police and communities across the country.

This week, the Judiciary Committee in the House held a hearing entitled, Policing Strategies for the 21st Century. The purpose of this hearing was to look at how law enforcement is trained and how it is received in our communities across the country.

The Senate also held a hearing this week. Their focus was on the use of body cameras.

I applaud my colleagues for holding hearings on criminal justice reform this week, but I hope that this is just the beginning and not the end of the hearings that need to be held on so many different and very important and fundamental issues on the topic of

criminal justice reform. All of these issues scream out for public attention and for new solutions by this Congress.

There are many conversations that need to be had about the best ways to improve policing practices, including ways to curb the use of excessive force, the use of body cameras, and mental health evaluations for law enforcement. The list goes on and on.

I would like to start out by talking about three of my bills: the Grand Jury Reform Act, the Police Accountability Act, and the Stop Militarizing Law Enforcement Act.

Police militarization is an important subject that President Obama even weighed in on yesterday with the issuance of an executive order that incorporates my Stop Militarizing Law Enforcement Act. Both my bill and the President's executive order call for a ban on the transfer of certain surplus military-grade weaponry and both impose strict oversight and transparency measures to ensure that the equipment that is transferred is used properly.

President Obama's Law Enforcement Equipment Working Group called for law enforcement agencies to "embrace a guardian—rather than a warrior—mindset" to build trust and legitimacy both within agencies and with the public.

This statement is at the very core of what we need to change in our country. Military-grade weapons are made for one purpose, and that is to conduct war.

When we see tanks and grenade launchers and this type of equipment being used by police, it enforces a message that we are at war in the streets of our very own country, the same way that we are at war in the streets of other countries. This has to change because our streets are not war zones, and we should not allow the unbridled proliferation of military weaponry onto our streets.

When we allow our streets to be flooded with surplus weaponry from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, we set the stage for a military mindset to take hold throughout the law enforcement community. We should not allow things to get twisted. There is a big difference between the law enforcement mentality and the military mindset.

The creed of an Army soldier is to "deploy, engage, and destroy the enemies of the United States of America in close combat."

Conversely, the classic police motto is "to protect and serve."

So when we start flooding our streets with military-grade weaponry, we start to allow the creeping in of a different mindset. And when we factor in the fact that many of our law enforcement officers have actually had to be deployed to war zones during the last 12 or 13 years because the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have been fought by a volunteer Army, with a healthy dose of deployment of Reserve and National Guard units to the battle—when we

consider that, we consider the fact that many law enforcement officers are also reservists or National Guardsmen or -women, and they have been deployed to war zones. Then they come back to their jobs in the Nation, and sometimes they could get it twisted in terms of what their actual goal and mission should be.

On the streets of America, the mission is not to deploy and to engage the enemy and destroy the enemy in close combat. That is not what law enforcement officers should be about. And we don't need to let that mindset creep into law enforcement.

When you have the experience and when you have the equipment and when you have inherent biases and prejudices that exist in the mindset of all Americans, regardless of whether or not it is law enforcement or civilian, then you get a situation where your minority communities can then be at severe risk. And that, I am afraid, is what has occurred in this country because so many of our young people have lost confidence in our police departments and in our law enforcement community. And that, ladies and gentlemen, is definitely unhealthy. It is not good for our democracy. We need to try to do something to change it. And we can't make effective changes without understanding the problem.

Now some would say that we need a military solution on the streets of America because the streets have become so lawless, but I would beg to differ. I would beg to differ strongly, as a matter of fact. We are dealing with citizens who still need to be protected.

By the way, most people in America are law-abiding citizens. There are some who become criminals, who stray and commit criminal acts. Sometimes those criminal acts actually place people's lives at risk. And police and law enforcement are there to make sure that we keep people safe.

All people want to be safe and secure in their homes and walking down the streets and in doing their business, in their life, work, and play pursuits. All of us want to be safe, and all of us realize that we must have law enforcement enforce the laws. All of us should have a responsibility to each other to stay within the boundaries of the law, and we are partners in that regard. We, the citizens, partner among ourselves; and then we must partner with our law enforcement community to enable law enforcement to do the job that we need them to do.

So it is a relationship that is built on trust, and it is built on communication because law enforcement can only be as effective in enforcing the law as it is with respect to the relationships that it has among people in the community.

That is why community-oriented policing is so important, to get police officers involved in the communities within which they serve; for them to get out of the car, go meet people, go develop relationships, and start the flow of dialogue. The citizens are who

enable law enforcement to be most effective because that is where they get most of their information.

I will admit that people don't communicate with law enforcement as much as they should, and it hurts us all. The reasons for that are this breakdown in trust, which is exacerbated by the military equipment and by the military mindset, both of those going hand in hand.

□ 2100

Now, how do we stop it?

First, by stopping the flow of that free military equipment onto our streets. We must cap that. I am not here to say that law enforcement should not have what it needs in order to do what it is supposed to do, and that is to protect and serve, but it should not have a pipeline directly between the Department of Defense and law enforcement which supplies equipment to law enforcement, leaving out the civilian authority to make the determination of whether or not the equipment is needed.

So that is what the 1033 program does. That is what President Obama's executive order, which tracks the language of the Stop Militarizing Law Enforcement Act, does, and that is to stop that flow and return control of the process of acquisition of law enforcement equipment back to the hands of the civilian authority. So that is the first thing that we need to do.

Mr. Speaker, the second thing we need to do is to ensure good analysis of the personnel that we have doing the law enforcement, because as I said, if you have been to a war zone, the statistics show that many of those who return from the battle suffer from post-traumatic stress and other illnesses that affect the mental health of the people. So we must take better care of the mental health of our law enforcement personnel, having been deployed or not. Being involved in law enforcement is very stressful, and sometimes that mental health can break down and people start making bad decisions. So we really must get a handle on that in this country.

Then once we get a handle on the militarization, there are some structural issues that need to be dealt with. One is the loss of confidence in the criminal justice process, i.e., the grand jury, the secret grand jury process as it relates to law enforcement officers, because what has become clear is that whenever there has been a killing of a civilian by law enforcement officer, it often results—or it most often results—in a finding of justifiable homicide. Indeed, most killings by law enforcement are justifiable; there is no question about that. But there is also no question about the fact that some of the killings are unjustifiable. When they are unjustifiable, they need to be dealt with in accordance with the law, which means prosecution.

The problem that we get with law enforcement officers who have acted outside of the law and have committed a

killing, what we get is a finding that the killing was justified despite the clear evidence to the contrary. I am not going to cite any specific cases, but I will say that these cases are well-known to the public. They appear on video. Even if your eyes deceive you and the killing was justified, you are certainly justified in not having confidence in the process by which the finding that the killing was justified was rendered through. Basically I am talking about a secret grand jury process. That is why I filed the Grand Jury Reform Act, to get at this secret grand jury process and to bring transparency into the process.

Now, what usually happens, or what is the course of conduct in a police killing case, is that the killing itself will be investigated first, and often-times only by the very law enforcement agency that employed the officer involved in the incident. So what you have are friends and coworkers investigating each other.

So when that happens, it tends to not be impartial. It tends to be biased in favor of the accused. What usually happens is, despite what may be clear about the facts, the decision always comes down as a justifiable homicide by the law enforcement agency that is rendering the decision against its own.

Then the case goes to the local grand jury or to the local prosecutor, who is well-known and knows well the law enforcement agents involved who may be the subject of the investigation. They know each other. They work together regularly to bring cases before the grand jury.

So when an officer is brought before the grand jury, often that officer is known to and by the district attorney. And even if not known, the fact that they are law enforcement gives them an inherent benefit; it gives them credibility; it gives them an edge, a positive edge, with the prosecution.

So the prosecutor then takes the investigation by the law enforcement agency that knows and loves the officer, takes that investigation before a grand jury in a secret proceeding. No one is in there from the public to understand the quality of the evidence being presented, whether or not there is any evidence being presented. We have to just simply rely on the result that comes out of the grand jury proceeding because the grand jury proceedings are secret by law. Nothing that happens inside can be revealed.

So it is a process that usually results in what we all are awaiting, and that is an exoneration of the police officer despite the clear evidence to the contrary. Once you have that determination, it is a closed case. So when you have that happening repeatedly over and over again over the course of time, it erodes public confidence in the criminal justice process.

So my legislation, the Grand Jury Reform Act, would simply mandate that whenever there is a killing during the course of a policeman's use of his

or her authority in the line of work, in the line of duty, whenever there is a killing, then there would have to be appointed an independent law enforcement agency, the top law enforcement agency of that particular State, to take over the investigation and to perform the investigation. That would give it a little more sense of being impartial.

Once that impartial investigation has concluded, then the matter would be presented to a judge in open court by a special prosecutor appointed by the Governor, who would then be charged with presenting that independent investigation to a judge in a probable cause hearing in open court. And that judge could then make a determination of whether or not probable cause existed; and if it did or if it did not, that judge would then issue a written finding of fact and deliver the case back to the local prosecutor who would then, in accordance with existing State law, proceed through the secret grand jury process or whatever other process was available to that district attorney—who is elected by the people, by the way.

So this probable cause hearing would enable there to be some transparency so that the public would understand, hear the evidence and see the evidence. Then there would be accountability that would be established on behalf of the people based on what the elected prosecutor decided to do with the case.

So it is hard to hold a local prosecutor accountable after a secret grand jury process, and the only thing you can rely upon is the earnest presentation in a press conference by the prosecutor that we did our best, we presented the evidence, and the grand jury came back finding that the killing was justified.

We need more than that. We saw that in the case of Michael Brown in Ferguson where they did release the grand jury transcripts, and you could see where the evidence, a boatload or a truckload, a dump truck of evidence was just dumped on the confused grand jury members who were charged on a law that was not even applicable, given bad law upon which to decide the case.

So we saw what happened in the grand jury proceeding in that case, and that, ladies and gentlemen, is not the only time I am sure that there has been abuse within the grand jury room. But we will never know because it is secret.

Lastly, I have filed a bill which is called the Police Accountability Act. What it would do would be to provide another tool for Federal prosecutors to be able to prosecute law enforcement officers for the offense of murder and all of the lesser included offenses should it appear that the process within the State did not work.

So those three bills I have discussed. Now I see my colleague has arrived, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, who, out of Houston, Texas, has ascended to the top spot, the ranking membership on the

Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, upon which I also serve along with her. So with that, I will yield to the gentlewoman from Houston.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has approximately 4 minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

He is right. We serve on the Judiciary Committee. He serves with great distinction as the ranking member on the Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law Subcommittee, and I have the privilege of working and serving with him on the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee.

Although we have been working on these issues for any number of years, he is a practicing lawyer, a graduate of the distinguished Thurgood Marshall School of Law, which I have the privilege of representing. We know that we are now in a significant moment of history, and that is, if I might use language that is not particularly legislative, we can't fool around.

There are issues that the American public, I believe, want remedies for, and that is persons who are civilians and persons who are law enforcement officers.

□ 2115

The police accountability hearing that we just held, Mr. Speaker, held in front of the Judiciary Committee on Tuesday—and we thanked Chairman GOODLATTE and we thanked Ranking Member CONYERS for heeding our voices asking for this hearing. It was a hearing of information, but I think it did evidence that there is a divide that must be bridged.

Today, I stand on the floor to acknowledge and honor, Mr. Johnson, a fallen officer in my district. None of us want to consent to actions against law enforcement officers in the line of duty protecting our communities and our Nation.

At the same time, I believe that we have the opportunity to confront serious issues developing a roadmap for better police community relations. In addition to the legislation that I know Mr. JOHNSON has already elaborated on—and I support him in his efforts—we will be looking at legislation that deals with holding the standard matrix to provide a roadmap of training for police officers and law enforcement officers from deescalation, to ideas of interaction with community, professional training, educational training.

We will also, hopefully, pass the CADET bill, which talks about gathering the appropriate data related to excessive force being used by civilians or police officers and using that material to be able to formulate the right kind of approach to protect all.

In addition, I just introduced today the Private Prison Information Act, which indicates that the same requirements for the Federal prison system should be for the private, nonpublic prison system providing reports of injuries or behavior that should be reported, and we hope that bill will move quickly.

We have also introduced a good time, early release bill that argues for the early release dealing with incarcerated persons responding to mass incarceration, which we believe is very important. This deals with a certain age.

I am also introducing, Mr. JOHNSON, a bill that indicates 1 day for 1 day; if you have 54 days of good time, then you get 54 days. Now, it is not the case.

Let me just say this, as I yield back to you, we will not pass legislation unless we can all understand each other's pain. The horrific pain of losing law enforcement officers and them not going home to their families, I mourn—the horrific pain of a Michael Brown or Eric Garner and a Tamir Rice and a Walter Scott and any number of others—and, of course, Freddie Gray.

What we need to do is, in understanding that pain, not be accusatory and get bills before the Judiciary Committee to make our system the best justice system in the world. That is what I would like to see happen. I know that you, as a practicing lawyer and who have addressed these issues, would like to see that happen as well.

I would like to join you on the floor over and over again for these kinds of Special Orders, to speak to our colleagues about getting something done, passing comprehensive criminal reform, getting it done to answer the pain of all Americans.

We honor those who have lost their lives, and we honor the men and women in uniform who wear the uniform on our behalf, to be able to walk alongside us in dignity.

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

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CURBELO of Florida) at 10 p.m.

#### TO CORRECT THE ENROLLMENT OF S. 178

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 47

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of S. 178, an Act to provide justice for the victims of trafficking, the Secretary of the Senate shall—*

(1) in section 702(b)(2), insert “pilot program” after “identified by the”; and

(2) strike section 1002 and insert the following:

#### SEC. 1002. PROTECTIONS FOR HUMAN TRAFFICKING SURVIVORS.

Section 1701(c) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd(c)), as amended by section 601 of this Act, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) from an applicant in a State that has in effect a law—

“(A) that—

“(i) provides a process by which an individual who is a human trafficking survivor can move to vacate any arrest or conviction records for a non-violent offense committed as a direct result of human trafficking, including prostitution or lewdness;

“(ii) establishes a rebuttable presumption that any arrest or conviction of an individual for an offense associated with human trafficking is a result of being trafficked, if the individual—

“(I) is a person granted nonimmigrant status pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(T)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(T)(i));

“(II) is the subject of a certification by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under section 107(b)(1)(E) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(1)(E)); or

“(III) has other similar documentation of trafficking, which has been issued by a Federal, State, or local agency; and

“(iii) protects the identity of individuals who are human trafficking survivors in public and court records; and

“(B) that does not require an individual who is a human trafficking survivor to provide official documentation as described in subclause (I), (II), or (III) of subparagraph (A)(ii) in order to receive protection under the law.”

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. COHEN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for May 18 for the first vote.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.),

under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, May 21, 2015, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1529. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Department of Energy, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, as required by 31 U.S.C. 1351; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1530. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Admiral Samuel J. Locklear III, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of Admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1531. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Charles T. Cleveland, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1532. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility; Iowa: Buchanan County, Unincorporated Areas [Docket ID: FEMA-2015-0001] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8383] received May 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1533. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received May 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1534. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report prepared by the Department of Commerce's Bureau of Industry and Security on the national emergency declared by Executive Order 13222 of August 17, 2001 and continued through August 7, 2014, to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States caused by the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979, consistent with Sec. 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(c)), Sec. 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1641(c)), and Sec. 1(d) of Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1535. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on gifts given by the United States to foreign individuals in FY 2014, pursuant to 22 U.S.C.A. Sec. 2694; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1536. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a letter regarding commitments in the Joint Plan of Action, pursuant to the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012, the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, and Sec. 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1537. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-004; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1538. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State,

transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-036; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1539. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-020; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1540. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 14-144; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1541. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 14-145; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1542. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1543. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-007; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1544. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1545. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1546. A letter from the Federal Liaison Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to the Rules of Practice for Trials Before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board [Docket No.: PTO-P-2015-0032] (RIN: 0651-AD00) received May 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1547. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report on Assistance Provided to Foreign Aviation Authorities for FY 2014, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 40113(e)(4) and the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, Pub. L. 112-95; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1548. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report on Assistance Provided to Foreign Aviation Authorities for FY 2013, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 40113(e)(4) and Sec. 207 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, Pub. L. 112-95; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 2461. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to, and utilization of, bone mass measurement benefits under part B of the Medicare program by establishing a minimum payment amount under such part for bone mass measurement; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 2462. A bill to restore the application of the Federal antitrust laws to the business of health insurance to protect competition and consumers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERA (for himself and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 2463. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to provide grants for drug disposal sites; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BENISHEK (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 2464. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to the Inspector General of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOLLY (for himself and Mr. LOEBACK):

H.R. 2465. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements to the monthly housing stipend payable under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 2466. A bill to require the President to submit a plan for resolving all outstanding claims relating to property confiscated by the Government of Cuba before taking action to ease restrictions on travel to or trade with Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEARCE (for himself, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. STEWART):

H.R. 2467. A bill to clarify that the Secretary of Homeland Security may undertake law enforcement and border security activities within the Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 2468. A bill to improve minority inclusion in clinical trials; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 2469. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish within the Environmental Protection Agency a Columbia River Basin Restoration Program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr.

JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. NADLER, Mr. COHEN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 2470. A bill to require non-Federal prisons and detention facilities holding Federal prisoners under a contract with the Federal Government to make available to the public the same information pertaining to facility operations and to prisoners held in such facilities that Federal prisons and detention facilities are required to make available; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 2471. A bill to cap noninterest Federal Spending as a percentage of potential GDP to right-size the government, grow the economy, and balance the budget; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri):

H.R. 2472. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a National Organ and Tissue Donor Registry Resource Center, to authorize grants for State organ and tissue donor registries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself and Mr. NEUGEBAUER):

H.R. 2473. A bill to include credit unions as community financial institutions under the Federal Home Loan Bank Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 2474. A bill to require the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to impose fees and assessments to recover the cost of appropriations to the Commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FINCHER (for himself and Mr. HECK of Washington):

H.R. 2475. A bill to provide for a one-year extension of the extended period of protections for members of uniformed services relating to mortgages, mortgage foreclosure, and eviction under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada:

H.R. 2476. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to facilitate the transition to Medicare for individuals enrolled in group health plans, to establish a 3-month open enrollment period under Medicare Advantage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. BLUM, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. ROYCE):

H.R. 2477. A bill to amend securities, commodities, and banking laws to make the information reported to financial regulatory agencies electronically searchable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in

each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2478. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that ITIN applicants submit their application in person at taxpayer assistance centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 2479. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the issuance of up-to-date regulations and guidance applying to the dissemination by means of the Internet of information about medical products; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 2480. A bill to increase research, education, and treatment for cerebral cavernous malformations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself and Mr. HOLDING):

H.R. 2481. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make certain contract research eligible for the research credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 2482. A bill to amend the Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act of 1990; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 2483. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide standards for determining employment status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER (for himself, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. JONES, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 2484. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that certain aliens who are pregnant are ineligible to receive visas and ineligible to be admitted to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. TORRES (for herself, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 2485. A bill to establish in the Department of the Treasury an infrastructure accelerator program to facilitate investments in and financing of certain infrastructure projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ):

H.R. 2486. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to disallow deductions for the payment of compensatory and punitive damages to a government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAT:

H.J. Res. 55. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution to correct the enrollment of S. 178; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Vietnam War; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GRAYSON (for himself, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. LIPINSKI):  
H. Res. 279. A resolution urging respect for freedom of expression and human rights in Turkey; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

28. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 8008, asking the Congress to support the Conversion of the 81st Armored Brigade Combat Team of the Washington National Guard into a Stryker Brigade Combat Team with brigade units stationed in Washington, Oregon, and California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

29. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 29, memorializing the Congress to require the Department of Defense to ensure that replacement aircraft are assigned to Selfridge Air National Guard Base to compensate for the proposed elimination of the A-10 fleet; to the Committee on Armed Services.

30. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to Senate Memorial 866, expressing profound disagreement with the decision of the President of the United States to restore full diplomatic relations with Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

31. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, relative to House Enrolled Joint Resolution No. 3, requesting the Congress and federal agencies to adequately fund and support all efforts to manage free-roaming feral horses on rangelands in the West at the appropriate management level, utilizing all management and control methods authorized by Sec. 3(d) of the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

32. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Maine, relative to Joint Resolution 933, requesting the President and the Congress to direct the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service to expand hatchery operations to rivers in Maine by partnering with the State and with the many non-government organizations that are focused on restoring Atlantic salmon to their historic natal rivers; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

33. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, relative to House Enrolled Joint Resolution 5, requesting Congress to amend the United States Constitution to authorize congressional votes to approve or disapprove proposed federal regulations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

34. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 8013, requesting Congress expedite appropriation of funds to significantly enhance monitoring and prevention efforts and to implement the intent of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

35. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, relative to House Enrolled Joint Resolution No. 2, urging Congress to lift the freeze on longer commercial vehicles for the affected Western states in order to take advantage of new transportation strategies to improve highway efficiency; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 2461.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Congress' legislative powers under Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution. Under this provision, Congress has the authority to regulate "commerce among the several states" and "To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises."

By Mr. DeFAZIO:

H.R. 2462.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. BERA:

H.R. 2463.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BENISHEK:

H.R. 2464.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 2465.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 2466.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8—to regulate commerce with foreign nations, among the several states with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 2467.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 2468.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 2469.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitution of the United States provides clear authority for Congress to pass legislation to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Article I of the Constitution, in detailing Congressional authority, provides that "Congress shall have Power to provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States. . . ." This legislation is introduced pursuant to that grant of authority.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 2470.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 2471.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the authority to borrow money on the credit of the United States.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 2472.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 2473.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce Clause Article I, Section 8

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 2474.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 2475.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. HECK of Nevada:

H.R. 2476.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII: "The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States."

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 2477.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 Clause 3

The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2478.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 2479.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, which states "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof"

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 2480.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 2481.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 2482.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 2483.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 2484.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mrs. TORRES:

H.R. 2485.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2486.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BRAT:

H.J. Res. 55.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution states that "The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution . . ." This joint resolution is submitted for Congress to consider whether it is necessary to amend the Constitution to include it.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 156: Mr. HOLDING.  
 H.R. 160: Mr. CAPUANO.  
 H.R. 167: Mr. PALAZZO.  
 H.R. 232: Mr. PASCRELL.  
 H.R. 271: Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. TAKANO.  
 H.R. 356: Mr. CARNEY.  
 H.R. 358: Mr. NOLAN.  
 H.R. 381: Mr. POCAN, Ms. BASS, and Ms. LOFGREN.  
 H.R. 425: Mr. SARBANES.  
 H.R. 467: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 512: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. MEEHAN.  
 H.R. 540: Mrs. LAWRENCE.  
 H.R. 546: Mr. CUELLAR and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.  
 H.R. 550: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.  
 H.R. 578: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.  
 H.R. 592: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. WOMACK.  
 H.R. 605: Mr. WALZ.  
 H.R. 632: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. CLEAVER.  
 H.R. 649: Mr. WELCH and Mrs. BEATTY.  
 H.R. 662: Mr. DOLD.  
 H.R. 690: Mr. LONG.  
 H.R. 699: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. MACARTHUR.  
 H.R. 702: Mr. LONG, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. PITTS.  
 H.R. 721: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. COURTNEY.  
 H.R. 766: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. UPTON.  
 H.R. 767: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. PASCRELL.  
 H.R. 784: Ms. HAHN and Ms. MENG.  
 H.R. 787: Mr. MACARTHUR.  
 H.R. 799: Mr. KILDEE.  
 H.R. 800: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. WELCH.  
 H.R. 825: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. RIGELL.  
 H.R. 842: Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. DESAULNIER.  
 H.R. 868: Mr. RUSH and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 915: Mr. SCHIFF.  
 H.R. 921: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WALZ, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. ROKITA.  
 H.R. 923: Mr. PALMER.  
 H.R. 985: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. BOST.  
 H.R. 986: Mr. BARTON, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. MARINO.  
 H.R. 995: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.  
 H.R. 1002: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. VIS-CLOSKY.  
 H.R. 1019: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.  
 H.R. 1027: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
 H.R. 1057: Mr. JOYCE.  
 H.R. 1062: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Ms. ESTY.  
 H.R. 1096: Mr. WITTMAN.  
 H.R. 1101: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. KILMER.  
 H.R. 1190: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BOST, and Mr. LAUDERMILK.  
 H.R. 1211: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
 H.R. 1233: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. LONG, Mr. YOHO, and Mrs. BLACK.  
 H.R. 1247: Mr. WITTMAN.  
 H.R. 1266: Mr. ASHFORD.  
 H.R. 1289: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. MCGOVERN.  
 H.R. 1299: Mr. SABIN, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. PALMER, and Mr. WITTMAN.  
 H.R. 1300: Mr. GALLEGO.  
 H.R. 1301: Mr. HINOJOSA.  
 H.R. 1309: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. BUCSHON.  
 H.R. 1331: Mr. TAKANO.  
 H.R. 1344: Mr. RIGELL.  
 H.R. 1378: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico and Mr. LYNCH.  
 H.R. 1389: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. JOLLY.  
 H.R. 1399: Mr. MEEKS.  
 H.R. 1427: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. LOWENTHAL.  
 H.R. 1462: Mr. PIERLUISI and Mrs. BLACK.  
 H.R. 1475: Ms. EDWARDS.  
 H.R. 1486: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mr. CRENSHAW.  
 H.R. 1555: Mr. PALAZZO, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. SIMPSON.  
 H.R. 1567: Mr. DOLD and Ms. JACKSON LEE.  
 H.R. 1568: Mr. TONKO.  
 H.R. 1599: Mr. TIBERI.  
 H.R. 1600: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. CRENSHAW.  
 H.R. 1602: Ms. NORTON and Mr. HASTINGS.  
 H.R. 1608: Mr. POLIS, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. NEAL, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. RUIZ.  
 H.R. 1610: Mr. HARDY.  
 H.R. 1624: Mr. TIBERI, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.  
 H.R. 1627: Mr. DEUTCH.  
 H.R. 1635: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Mr. GROTHMAN.  
 H.R. 1655: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.  
 H.R. 1661: Mr. RIBBLE.  
 H.R. 1674: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. JEFFRIES.  
 H.R. 1684: Mr. HUFFMAN.  
 H.R. 1706: Mr. QUIGLEY.  
 H.R. 1721: Mr. MCNERNEY and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.  
 H.R. 1733: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
 H.R. 1734: Mr. NUGENT.  
 H.R. 1737: Mr. VARGAS.  
 H.R. 1739: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. SALMON.  
 H.R. 1752: Mr. PALMER and Mr. MARCHANT.  
 H.R. 1769: Mr. ELLISON and Ms. BORDALLO.  
 H.R. 1817: Mr. FLEMING, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. TIBERI.  
 H.R. 1853: Mr. FLORES, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

- H.R. 1910: Ms. TSONGAS.  
H.R. 1932: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. LONG, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. ISSA.  
H.R. 1935: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.  
H.R. 1942: Ms. TITUS and Mr. JOYCE.  
H.R. 1943: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BASS, and Mr. KENNEDY.  
H.R. 1964: Mr. ZELDIN and Ms. DELBENE.  
H.R. 1974: Mr. GALLEGO.  
H.R. 1976: Mr. LEWIS.  
H.R. 1986: Mr. ALLEN.  
H.R. 1989: Mr. HURD of Texas and Mr. MULVANEY.  
H.R. 1994: Mr. HILL and Mr. YOHO.  
H.R. 1996: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.  
H.R. 2025: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 2031: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.  
H.R. 2044: Mr. GRIFFITH.  
H.R. 2061: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. CONAWAY.  
H.R. 2067: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. BENISHEK, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.  
H.R. 2072: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. BEYER.  
H.R. 2109: Mr. CRAMER.  
H.R. 2111: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 2114: Mr. MCDERMOTT.  
H.R. 2132: Mr. HONDA, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Miss RICE of New York.  
H.R. 2150: Mr. POLIS.  
H.R. 2170: Mr. KEATING and Mr. MCDERMOTT.  
H.R. 2191: Ms. JACKSON LEE.  
H.R. 2207: Mr. NEWHOUSE.  
H.R. 2213: Mr. POSEY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. BLUM, Mr. TROTT, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. PERRY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.  
H.R. 2233: Mr. POLIS, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. HANNA.  
H.R. 2246: Mr. FARENTHOLD.  
H.R. 2247: Mr. WOMACK.  
H.R. 2258: Mr. PALMER.  
H.R. 2290: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. LAMBORN.  
H.R. 2306: Mr. MOOLENAAR and Mr. RIBBLE.  
H.R. 2315: Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. LAMALFA, and Ms. DELBENE.  
H.R. 2321: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 2323: Mr. LOWENTHAL.  
H.R. 2330: Mr. FOSTER.  
H.R. 2331: Mr. GROTHMAN.  
H.R. 2350: Mr. KING of New York.  
H.R. 2393: Mr. TIBERI, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. REED, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. MACARTHUR.  
H.R. 2400: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BURGESS, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.  
H.R. 2403: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.  
H.R. 2404: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.  
H.R. 2410: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
H.R. 2412: Mr. HONDA and Mr. POCAN.  
H.R. 2429: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. COURTNEY.  
H.R. 2434: Mr. BEYER.  
H.R. 2450: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mr. HIMES.  
H.J. Res. 25: Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. VALADAO.  
H. Con. Res. 33: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.  
H. Res. 12: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. LEWIS.  
H. Res. 54: Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LYNCH, and Mrs. LUMMIS.  
H. Res. 56: Mr. PERRY.  
H. Res. 154: Mr. COURTNEY.  
H. Res. 193: Mr. COOK and Mr. MCKINLEY.  
H. Res. 207: Mr. SALMON and Mr. CICILLINE.  
H. Res. 208: Mr. JEFFRIES.  
H. Res. 209: Mr. WESTERMAN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.  
H. Res. 227: Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MENG, and Mr. CONNOLLY.  
H. Res. 256: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H. Res. 263: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. MCGOVERN.