

to utilize the new technologies and algorithms that will result.

Having the pleasure to represent the great State of Illinois, I have been able to witness how an ecosystem of innovation can best be fostered. For our Nation to reap the greatest yields from our research, our research facilities must be open to the public when it makes sense and does not interfere with the core missions of our Federal agencies and the labs.

The user facilities in our national labs already serve over 30,000 researchers every year, with university researchers taking precedence over others. And other user facilities, such as the Advanced Photon Source at Argonne, Illinois, have given a tremendous research capability to industry partners, such as pharmaceutical companies, where research that once took weeks is now done in hours, with samples spending more time in overnight mail.

Mr. Speaker, the computing capabilities this legislation will help bring about will similarly have tremendous application in health care and drug development. We are just now getting to the point where computer simulations are giving us higher resolution images at the molecular level than we can get with microscopes when trying to understand how diseases, our bodies, and new treatments interact. And the modeling simulations these systems make available also allow manufacturers to build better prototypes that have already been tested thousands of times virtually before they come off the line.

But perhaps most importantly, these capabilities will keep America competitive on the global scale. And the graduate students and postdocs that learn on these machines will take what they know wherever they decide to go, whether it be business or the Department of Defense.

□ 1745

He said the best form of technology transfer wears shoes. That is why I thank my colleagues for helping me bring this similar legislation to the floor again this Congress, and I recommend all my colleagues support this bill.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire, does the gentleman from Texas have any more speakers on this bill?

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers on this side, so I am prepared to yield back the balance of my time after the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close here.

I want to thank Mr. HULTGREN again. He represents Fermilab. I represent part of Argonne National Laboratory. It is good to work with him on this legislation and others to advance science in the United States. Even though there are few people who really understand what this means, we will all see the results of it.

I thank the chairman for moving this bill forward. I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 874.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SCIENCE PRIZE COMPETITIONS ACT

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1162) to make technical changes to provisions authorizing prize competitions under the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1162

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 "Science Prize Competitions Act".

SEC. 2. 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"; 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."; 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 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"; and

(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"; and

(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 purse"; and

(11) in subsection (p)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking "cash prizes" both places it occurs and inserting "cash prize purses"; and

(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.".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1162, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 1162, the Science Prize Competitions Act, promotes increased utilization of prize competitions within the Federal Government.

I want to thank the ranking member of the Oversight Subcommittee, Mr. BEYER, for introducing this legislation. I also thank the bipartisan cosponsors, which include the vice chair of the Oversight Subcommittee, Mr. BILL JOHNSON, as well as the full committee ranking member, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON.

Prize competitions help spur innovation. They give innovators incentives to produce groundbreaking, outside-the-box ideas. Used effectively, prize competitions can be a tool to generate revolutionary results that wouldn't happen otherwise.

For example, after the Deepwater Horizon explosion, the X Prize Foundation sponsored a competition to elicit new oil removal technologies that needed to be better than state of the art. With the incentive of a million-dollar prize for first place, the winning team designed technology capable of extracting 89 percent of the oil from the water.

Thanks to the incentives provided by the competition, the winner, in a few months, blew the competition and the then best available oil skimmers out of the water.

Another example of a novel idea for a prize involves the Head Health Challenge. This is a joint effort by the National Football League, Under Armour, General Electric, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology to produce "viable materials that will result in increased safety and protection for athletes, the warfighter, and civilians."

This is a competition that could yield a solution that would benefit a diverse section of the population, from athletes to soldiers.

H.R. 1162 makes important changes to the prize competitions section of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980. It better defines the role of the private sector in various aspects of prize competitions. H.R. 1162 will have a positive impact on science prize competitions, which have bipartisan support.

A letter from the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy proclaims the values of such competitions by stating:

This report details the remarkable benefits the Federal Government has reaped from more than 400 prize competitions and challenges implemented by over 72 agencies to date, the steps the administration has taken to establish a lasting foundation for use of the COMPETES prize authority, and detailed examples from fiscal year 2014 of how the COMPETES prize authority is increasing the number of agencies that use prizes to achieve their missions more efficiently and effectively.

Again, I want to thank Mr. BEYER of Virginia and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio for introducing this bill.

I urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank two Texans, Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member

JOHNSON, for their leadership on this important issue and remind them that Samuel Houston and Stephen Austin were both born in Virginia. I also would like to thank my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) for cosponsoring.

The 2010 COMPETES reauthorization granted all Federal agencies the authority to hold prize competitions as an incentive for scientific and technological innovations.

This authority supports agencies' increased use of prizes to incentivize more high-risk, high-reward research and reach out to a new audience of researchers and innovators across all areas of science and technology.

Prize competitions go back at least 300 years, to the 1714 Longitude Prize offered by the British Government to develop a practical method to precisely measure a ship's longitude. The 1919 Orteig Prize spurred Charles Lindbergh to make the first transatlantic flight. Of course, it took 8 years from the prize to the flight itself.

In more recent years, prize competitions have accelerated technological development for space exploration, public health, automobiles, lighting, and much more. Many of these competitions have been privately sponsored, but several have been sponsored by our Federal agencies, including NASA, DARPA, and the Department of Energy.

Prize competitions have also proven to be an effective tool to invigorate our Nation's brightest innovators from all corners. They allow our science agencies to case a wide net to draw in new talent.

I think one of the most interesting facts is that NASA found that over 80 percent of NASA prize competitors have never before responded to NASA or other government requests for proposals. We are bringing in our best and brightest to solve these problems.

If we are to continue leading the world in science and technology, we must draw up on all of our Nation's talent, whether they are researchers in a university lab, owners of a technology start-up, or independent innovators working in their own garages.

Imagine if more of our Federal science agencies took full advantage of the potential of prizes to address some of our Nation's most pressing technological challenges. How might the world be changed in 2025 from a prize offered today?

Private organizations have spent years perfecting the design of prize competitions to address big challenges. We hope that our science agencies will see this same success, and we must continue to support Federal agencies as they implement this authority.

The legislation we are considering today addresses some real and some perceived hurdles in the 2010 authority that were identified once agencies began to implement prize competitions.

It also aligns the terminology with the industry standard to eliminate any

confusion in the interpretation of the law. These are technical amendments, which should make it easier for all agencies to make full use of the 2010 authority. In trying to rebalance our Federal budget, we have had to make very hard choices about where to cut funding, including in R&D programs.

While prize competitions should never be used as an excuse to cut our investments in R&D, prizes do allow the Federal Government to continue to fund high-reward research with minimal risk to the taxpayer. They are another valuable tool for agencies to deploy to meet their critical mission responsibilities.

I am proud to cosponsor this bill and ask my colleagues for their support. I am very grateful for the chairman for his bipartisan leadership on this issue.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia for reminding me that Stephen Austin and Samuel Houston were born in Virginia, and I have to confess, I have a number of ancestors who came from Virginia as well, and I am told one of them may have even been the Governor of Virginia, but that is as much as I am going to say about the great Commonwealth tonight.

I will say that I have no other requests for time; and I, again, reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I believe I misspoke. I would love to acknowledge my colleague from Illinois.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Virginia ask unanimous consent to reclaim his time?

Mr. BEYER. Yes, Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I just was going to say I concur and agree to yield to the gentleman from Illinois as well.

Mr. BEYER. As I slowly develop my mastery of this parliamentary procedure, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. BEYER for yielding and for his introduction, his authorship of this bill on prize competitions.

I want to add my voice in strong support of this bill. I have long been a strong supporter of prize competitions to spur innovation not as a substitute for Federal grants in other aid, but as an additional tool.

Back in 2007, I wrote language in the Energy Independence and Security Act that directed DOE to create a hydrogen energy prize, a competition now called the H-Prize that is currently ongoing and, hopefully, will yield some results

in innovation in using hydrogen as a transportation fuel.

In the 2010 COMPETES bill, I added language to that bill that authorized prize competitions at the National Science Foundation. I believe that these prize competitions are an excellent way to unlock the innovative potential of researchers, the private sector, and even hobbyists working in a garage, all while protecting taxpayer dollars.

This bill will clarify prize competition authority so that more agencies of the Federal Government will be able to run competitions. It is a good bill. I thank Mr. BEYER, again, for introducing it; I thank Chairman SMITH for moving it and Ranking Member JOHNSON for moving it.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1162, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT EFFICIENCY ACT

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1119) to improve the efficiency of Federal research and development, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1119

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 "Research and Development Efficiency Act".

SEC. 2. 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).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1119, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK), the Science Committee's Research and Technology Subcommittee chairwoman and the sponsor of this legislation.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 1119, the Research and Development Efficiency Act, which I introduced with the chairman and ranking member of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, as well as the rank-

ing member of the Research and Technology Subcommittee earlier this year.

H.R. 1119 requires the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy to establish a working group under the National Science and Technology Council to review Federal regulations that affect research and research universities.

The working group is tasked with making recommendations on how to harmonize, streamline, and eliminate duplicative Federal regulations and reporting requirements and make recommendations on how to minimize the regulatory burden on research institutions.

□ 1800

Mr. Speaker, there is a long history to support the need for this legislation. In 2012, the National Academies issued a report that included a key recommendation to "reduce or eliminate regulations that increase administrative costs, impede research productivity, and deflect creative energy without substantially improving the research environment."

Last year, the National Science Board referenced the results of two Federal Demonstration Partnership surveys on faculty workload—one in 2005 and one in 2012—that, on average, researchers spend 42 percent of their time on meeting administrative requirements. This drain on researchers' time and resources to answer Federal regulatory and reporting requirements leaves less time for researchers to spend on actual scientific work.

To be clear, H.R. 1119 does not eliminate reporting requirements, because there is a need for such information for the purposes of oversight and transparency. Instead, the bill would initiate the process that should ultimately help researchers and research universities by reducing redundant regulations. This is accomplished by promoting efficiencies and getting the most out of our research investments.

The National Academies is currently conducting a study of Federal regulations and reporting requirements, paying particular attention to those directed at research universities. H.R. 1119 would ensure that more of our Federal research dollars are spent on research and not on regulatory requirements. I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 1119, the Research and Development Efficiency Act.

I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this bill, and I want to thank Congresswoman COMSTOCK and Ranking Member JOHNSON for their leadership in introducing the bill.

Mr. Speaker, we all agree that administrative requirements serve an important purpose. They ensure transparency, the protection of human and animal subjects, and the wise use of Federal resources. But sometimes they