

WORKFORCE GLOBALIZATION FINAL DRAFT REPORT

APRIL 7, 2006.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. BOEHLERT, from the Committee on Science,
submitted the following

R E P O R T

together with

MINORITY VIEWS

[To accompany H. Res. 717]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Science, to whom was referred the resolution (H. Res. 717) directing the Secretary of Commerce to transmit to the House of Representatives a copy of a workforce globalization final draft report produced by the Technology Administration, having considered the same, report without recommendation.

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| I. Purpose of the Bill | 2 |
| II. Background and Need for the Legislation | 2 |
| III. Summary of Hearings | 2 |
| IV. Committee Actions | 2 |
| V. Summary of Major Provisions of the Bill | 2 |
| VI. Committee Views | 3 |
| VII. Compliance with Public Law 104-4 (Unfunded Mandates) | 3 |
| VIII. Committee Oversight Findings and Recommendations | 3 |
| IX. Statement on General Performance Goals and Objectives | 3 |
| X. Constitutional Authority Statement | 3 |
| XI. Federal Advisory Committee Statement | 3 |
| XII. Congressional Accountability Act | 3 |
| XIII. Committee Recommendations | 3 |
| XIV. Minority Views | 4 |
| XV. Proceedings of Full Committee Markup | 9 |

I. PURPOSE OF THE BILL

House Resolution 717 directs the Secretary of Commerce to transmit to the House of Representatives, not later than 14 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution, a copy of the final draft report, produced by the professional staff of the Technology Administration, entitled: "Six-Month Assessment of Workforce Globalization In Certain Knowledge-Based Industries".

II. BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

House Resolution 717 is a resolution of inquiry, which, pursuant to rule XIII, clause 7, of the Rules of the House of Representatives, directs the Committee to act on the resolution within 14 legislative days, or a privileged motion to discharge the Committee is in order.

Under the rules and precedents of the House, a resolution of inquiry is the means by which the House requests information from the President of the United States or the head of an executive department. According to "Deschler's Precedents," it is a "simple resolution making a direct request or demand of the President or the head of an executive department to furnish the House of Representatives with specific factual information in the possession of the executive branch."

III. SUMMARY OF HEARINGS

The Committee held no hearings on the resolution.

IV. COMMITTEE ACTIONS

On March 9, 2006, Congressman Bart Gordon of Tennessee introduced H. Res. 717, which was referred to the Committee on Science.

On March 29, 2006, the Committee on Science met to consider H. Res. 717. No amendments were offered. The resolution failed on a recorded vote of 19 yeas and 14 nays.

Mr. Ehlers moved that the Committee adversely report the resolution to the House with the recommendation that the resolution not be agreed to and that the staff be instructed to prepare the legislative report and make necessary technical and conforming changes. The motion was not agreed to by a recorded vote of 17 yeas and 17 nays.

On April 5, 2006, the Committee on Science met to consider a motion to report H. Res. 717 without recommendation.

Mr. Ehlers moved that the Committee report the resolution to the House without recommendation and that the staff be instructed to prepare the legislative report and make necessary technical and conforming changes. The motion was agreed to by voice vote.

V. SUMMARY OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

House Resolution 717 directs the Secretary of Commerce to transmit to the House of Representatives, not later than 14 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution, a copy of the final draft report, produced by the professional staff of the Technology Administration, entitled: "Six-Month Assessment of Workforce Globalization In Certain Knowledge-Based Industries."

VI. COMMITTEE VIEWS

The resolution seeks a pre-clearance draft of a report that was released in 2005 by the Technology Administration of the Department of Commerce entitled, “Six-Month Assessment of Workforce Globalization In Certain Knowledge-Based Industries.”

The Committee notes that the report has been superseded by a far more extensive report on outsourcing being prepared by the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA), at the request of the same House Appropriations subcommittee that had requested the Commerce Department report.

VII. COMPLIANCE WITH PUBLIC LAW 104–4

H. Res. 717 contains no unfunded mandates.

VIII. COMMITTEE OVERSIGHT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee held no oversight activities with respect to clause 3(c)(1) of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

IX. STATEMENT ON GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The rule requiring a statement of performance goals and objectives is inapplicable.

X. CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority for H. Res. 717.

XI. FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE STATEMENT

H. Res. 717 does not create any advisory committees.

XII. CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

The Committee finds that H. Res. 717 does not relate to the terms and conditions of employment or access to public services or accommodations within the meaning of section 102(b)(3) of the Congressional Accountability Act (Public Law 104–1).

XIII. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

On April 5, 2006, the Committee on Science reported H. Res. 717 without recommendation by voice vote.

XIV. MINORITY VIEWS

A CNN report in early March 2006 noted that 500,000 American jobs have migrated to India in recent years. That number is expected to triple in the next two years as American companies seek to cut costs and streamline business. India is but one example of a country that seems to be gaining employment at the expense of American workers. Over the last six years, the U.S. has lost just under 3 million manufacturing jobs—many of them lost to off-shoring. Noted economist Alan Blinder is estimating that the services sector may see between 28 and 42 million jobs outsourced in coming years. While there is a raging debate in professional economic policy circles about the long-term net consequences of outsourcing, there is no debate that there are devastating consequences for working Americans, and sometimes entire communities, of jobs, plants and offices moving offshore.

We believe that all Members of the Committee would agree that anything we can learn about what is causing firms to invest in facilities abroad, as opposed to modernizing or expanding operations domestically, may be useful in shaping policies to attract or retain jobs here. We want to have every bit of information at our disposal, especially as we work through the complicated elements of a competitiveness initiative that will cut across multiple Committee jurisdictions.

As a consequence of report language included in the FY2004 Consolidated Appropriations Act, the Department of Commerce Technology Administration directed its analysts to produce a report on “the extent and implications of workforce globalization in knowledge-based industries such as life sciences, information technology, semiconductors and financial services.” That report was due by June 23, 2004. \$335,000 was earmarked for this study.

At least five analysts at TA immediately began work on the report in January 2004, ultimately producing 4 draft chapters on semiconductors, information technology, pharmaceuticals and education and workforce preparation that totaled approximately 200 pages in length. The analysts were told, in May 2004, to produce a summary of findings of their draft papers.

The analysts were told to remove all citations and sourcing in their analytical reports. Those summaries were submitted to a “team leader,” (who has moved to another agency). The team leader then further edited the summary chapters and wrote an introduction. The total length of the report at that point was approximately 45 pages.

This version of the report appears to have gone into the inter-agency and intra-agency clearance process. By March 2005, after having gone through undetermined edits in Commerce, it was just 14 pages in length. By September 2005, after “final clearance,” the Department of Commerce released a 12 page “summary” of the report. Democratic Committee staff were told that the 12 page summary was actually composed during the late summer of 2005 and “back-dated” to June 23, 2004 to comply with the original report language from Appropriations. That summary was titled: “Six-Month Assessment of Workforce Globalization in Certain Knowledge-Based Industries.”

Subsequent to the release of the 12 page summary, analysts at TA, in varying degrees, indicated to Committee staff that the contents of the report did not accurately or completely reflect their findings. Further, of the 12 pages, 5 pages are occupied with a summary of general policy observations that no staff member at TA would identify as a TA work product.

Democratic Members of the Science Committee have been interested in seeing this report for some time. In May 2005, Democratic Staff of the Science Committee asked the Commerce Department for the status of the off-shoring report and a briefing. Commerce Legislative Affairs never responded to the request (nor to subsequent requests during the summer).

On August 3, 2005, Reps. Gordon, Costello and Wu sent a letter to Secretary Gutierrez asking him to release the report—now more than a year overdue—and also asking questions regarding why the report was so late. The Secretary did not respond.

On October 11, 2005, Reps. Gordon, Costello and Wu sent a second letter to Secretary Gutierrez once again requesting a copy of the original draft report produced by TA analysts. No timely response was forthcoming.

On December 23, 2005, then Deputy Assistant Secretary for Technology Policy, Dan Caprio, sent a response to Mr. Gordon, Mr. Costello and Mr. Wu. That response thanked them for their “FOIA request,” identified 157 documents that would be responsive and then claimed that not one page of those materials could be released to the Members due to predecisional exclusionary exemptions under FOIA. We do not consider a request by members of Congress to be a FOIA, but we note that this appears to have been an imperfect application of FOIA, or response to a FOIA request, in any case.

On January 26, 2006, Rep. Gordon asked Chairman Boehlert to sign a document request to the Commerce Department requesting a copy of the draft report and other materials. Initially, the Chairman’s staff asked us to withdraw the request pending their effort to simply call over to Commerce to get a copy of the draft report. In the spirit of compromise, we accepted their offer. Subsequently, the Republican staff communicated that Commerce did not want to give us the report, much less anything else, and Chairman Boehlert declined to sign the letter.

On February 8, 2006 Reps. Gordon and Wu wrote to Subcommittee Chairman Ehlers, whose Subcommittee has direct jurisdiction over the Technology Administration, asking that he sign a request for the final draft report. Chairman Ehlers also declined.

Finally, having exhausted all remedies, on March 9, 2006, Rep. Gordon introduced a Resolution of Inquiry (H. Res. 717) directing the Secretary of Commerce to deliver a copy of the final draft TA report/chapters, as prepared by the professional staff of the TA, to Congress. Our goal was to force the Department to divulge the draft “chapters” produced by the analysts. The Resolution was referred to the House Science Committee.

The Committee’s consideration of H. Res. 717 was flawed. One key claim of the Majority was that nothing could be learned from receiving the report since all of the data had been provided to the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) and NAPA

was tasked with writing a definitive report on out-sourcing. While NAPA had a series of meetings with TA staff, everyone at Commerce that our staff interviewed agreed that no documents, no data, no analysis was ever provided to NAPA by TA.

Further, even the NAPA report on off-shoring that appeared in January 2005 does not indicate that TA is a source for any of their materials, other than identifying them as a source for interviews. The NAPA report is interesting because it indicates that they could not find enough data to come to reliable conclusions about off-shoring, hardly the definitive study that the Members were told they were/had produced. While it is true that NAPA is to turn out two more reports in coming months, those studies are likely to focus on the wage effect of raising immigration levels in high technology fields and whether there is a shortage of scientists and engineers in the American workforce. In addition, in a letter to the Chairman, IEEE-USA stated, "We believe that the report (Commerce) contains excellent indicators of trends that are not contained in any other government-funded study." That would include the National Academy of Public Administration's work.

In the mark-up that occurred on March 29, 2006, the motion to adopt the Resolution failed on a party-line vote: 19–14. However, on a motion to report the Resolution adversely to the House, the motion failed on a 17–17 party-line tie. The Committee recessed subject to the call of the Chair.

During the intervening days, Mr. Gordon made an offer to Mr. Boehlert that if the Chairman would commit to seeking the final, draft report/draft chapters as produced by the professional staff of TA, the Ranking Member would give up filing further Resolutions of Inquiry or FOIA's on this matter during this Congress. A copy of that letter is attached to this report.

During the mark-up, the Ranking Member stated he would oppose any Resolution of Inquiry or document request pertaining to this TA report if one would come to the Committee. Mr. Boehlert made representations to Mr. Gordon that he would accept that offer. Questions remain regarding what the nature of the document request language should be, but the Members agreed in a discussion prior to mark-up that they would work that out amicably.

Following the conversation between the Chairman and Ranking Member, the Committee was brought back into session by the Chairman. After a brief exchange of views, the Committee reported H. Res. 717 by voice vote without recommendation. At the time of the voice vote, the Committee obviously lacked a quorum. Mr. Gordon refrained from making a point of order regarding a lack of a quorum to allow the Chairman to dispense with the H. Res. 717 in light of the representations made by the Chairman that a document request would be forthcoming if specific language could be developed.

The Minority remain convinced that the process of scrubbing the original analysis out of subsequent drafts is a subject worthy of review by the Committee. This Administration has been dogged by accusations that expert reports raising facts and questions about preferred policy positions are often suppressed or edited to provide a more pleasing story. Scientific integrity questions apply to the social sciences as much as the physical or medical sciences.

In the agreement offered by the Ranking Member, the Minority will set aside filing further Resolutions or a FOIA in this Congress regarding these issues in return for getting the richest set of information on outsourcing that we can get. Our Members are more interested in trying to understand how to help Americans keep jobs than in fixing blame for why this study has been suppressed. However, both questions are important and both worthy of a Committee to pursue in an effort to improve the transparency and honesty of government.

BART GORDON.
 JERRY F. COSTELLO.
 EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON.
 LYNN C. WOOLSEY.
 DARLENE HOOLEY.
 MARK UDALL.
 DAVID WU.
 MICHAEL M. HONDA.
 BRAD MILLER.
 LINCOLN DAVIS.
 DANIEL LIPINSKI.
 SHEILA JACKSON-LEE.
 BRAD SHERMAN.
 BRIAN BAIRD.
 JIM MATHESON.
 JIM COSTA.
 AL GREEN.
 CHARLIE MELANCON.
 DENNIS MOORE.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
 COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE,
 Washington, DC, April 3, 2006.

Hon. SHERWOOD BOEHLERT,
Chairman, Committee on Science,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BOEHLERT: In the interest of working together on the growing problem of offshoring of America's high tech jobs, I want to offer a compromise solution that, I believe, addresses the objections you raised at the March 29 markup.

Without arguing whether or not the National Academy of Public Administration actually received the data and analysis done by the Technology Administration, it seems to me that it is reasonable for our Committee to request and receive information that you indicate the Administration provided to an unelected third party.

As to your principle concern that providing the 200-page draft report to the committee would simply trigger a "fishing expedition" on the part of the minority, I am offering not to initiate a Minority request for any further documents from the Department of Commerce during the 109th Congress relating to this report, provided a written request is jointly made by the Chairman and Ranking Member and the report is promptly provided pursuant to our request. The objection raised by you as to this being the * * * "beginning of a prolonged fishing expedition that will raise all sorts

of disputes related to Congressional access to Executive Branch deliberations," can then be set aside.

To avoid further Committee disagreement and disharmony, I am agreeing not to initiate any further document requests on this matter as previously referenced. Therefore, the pending resolution, H. Res. 717, could be dispensed with in a bipartisan fashion and we could "be working together to come up with ways to keep jobs in this country . . ." as you stated March 29.

Mr. Chairman, you stated in your remarks to the Committee that . . . "if we were just going to ask for the report and be done with it, I might not object . . ." Well, Mr. Chairman, that is just what I am proposing.

I am hopeful that I can join you in signing a document request for the report so we can all see just what is contained in this body of work. My hope is that the analysis in the 200-page draft will provide some insight and certainly some useful information on the problem we all agree is robbing America of some of the best jobs available to our citizens. Perhaps then we can come together and discuss strategies and solutions to this growing phenomenon that troubles us all.

I hope to hear from you before Wednesday, April 5.

Sincerely,

BART GORDON,
Ranking Member.

XV. PROCEEDINGS OF THE FULL COMMITTEE MARKUP ON
H. RES. 717, DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE
TO TRANSMIT TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES A
COPY OF A WORKFORCE GLOBALIZATION FINAL DRAFT
REPORT PRODUCED BY THE TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATION

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 29, 2006

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE,
Washington, DC.

The Committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:30 a.m., in Room 2318 of the Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Sherwood L. Boehlert [Chairman of the Committee] presiding.

Chairman BOEHLERT. Good morning. The Science Committee will come to order. Pursuant to notice, the Committee on Science meets today to consider the following measure, H. Res. 717, *Directing the Secretary of Commerce to transmit to the House of Representatives a copy of a workforce globalization final draft report produced by the Technology Administration*. I ask unanimous consent for the authority to recess the Committee at any point during consideration of these matters and without objection that it so ordered.

We will now proceed with a markup beginning with opening statements. And I will begin, and then I will recognize Mr. Gordon for his comments and we will go from there. Let me welcome everyone here for what I hope will be a brief markup. Hope springs eternal. Or more accurately a brief interlude of partisan distraction in what is usually a bipartisan focused and very productive committee.

I do not think we are dealing with a serious issue today, and I wish we did not have to spend any time on it but the Minority is prosecuting its rights under the House rule, and I jealously guard the rights of the Minority and we have no choice but to comply. I am going to speak for a while now to lay out my position clearly, which I hope will shorten the debate later.

Let me start by pointing out what today's proceedings are not about. Today's debate is not about outsourcing, whether it is good or bad or what to do about it. First of all, there isn't a Member of Congress on either side of the aisle who would not like to see more jobs created and retained in this country. And in this committee we have taken many steps and will take more this year to try to accomplish that. The whole innovation debate is about finding ways to counter or compensate for outsourcing.

But there is no policy at stake in the resolution before us today. It has nothing, I repeat, it has nothing to do with taking action in

response to outsourcing. It is about, sad to say, personal point of view. It is about scoring political points related to a report. The release of that report would not create a single new job although its sponsors may hope to debate over it creates new jobs for some Democrat candidates.

But it gets even more absurd. A release of this report not only wouldn't help us take action on outsourcing, it wouldn't even help us learn more about outsourcing. Everyone involved in preparing the report agrees that data on outsourcing was hard to come by given the resources and time that were available to prepare the document. Moreover, every bit of data, every bit of data that was gathered from the report was provided to the National Academy of Public Administration for its much more extensive probe into exactly the same questions.

The first volume of the NAPA report has been released and two more are coming. The NAPA report was requested by exactly the same people who requested the Commerce Department report, and it will cover the same questions only with greater care and thoroughness so no one is being denied information about outsourcing. So what would be gained by seeking the Commerce Department documentation?

Well, we have already ruled out either action or information so then what? Well, maybe we could raise questions about the judgment of the people who headed up the technology administration and oversaw the report. I question their judgment sometimes myself. But guess what? None of those people are still in government. There is nothing at stake in reviewing their actions. But someone could reasonably ask, okay, we don't gain anything by seeking the report but what is the harm?

Why not just ask for it anyway? That is a fair question. And if we were just going to ask for the report and be done with it, I might not object, but this is a politically motivated request, and it is not going to stop with seeking this document. Indeed, the letters that the Minority has previously sent to the department show that this is just the beginning of a prolonged fishing expedition that will raise all sorts of disputes related to congressional access to executive branch deliberations.

Now I am perfectly willing to challenge executive branch legal claims. We have done it successfully on this committee on both document and witness requests. But one does not get into such a dispute lightly. Real concerns need to be at stake, and you have to have a good case because any misstep becomes a precedent that can weaken future congresses. Here we don't have real concerns, so I am not willing to get into a drawn out legal dispute that could make it more difficult for Congress to get documents in the future on issues that really matter.

One last point that is critical. The Minority may claim that what is at stake here is a pattern of suppression of information. That is a red herring. First of all, no information has been suppressed. It has all gone to NAPA. Moreover, the analysts have been available for interviews by those preparing the NAPA report. Second, this is not a case of a scientist reaching an uncomfortable conclusion and not being able to talk to the press. This is was a case of Congress

requesting analysts to pull some data together. There are no conclusions that are being suppressed.

Indeed, the Commerce Department has made, as I said earlier, the analysts available to not only NAPA but to the Minority staff as well as the Majority staff of this committee. Most of them even say that the short public report accurately captured their work. I don't think anyone can question my willingness to be vocal when an official in the Administration or the Congress tries to squelch the scientific inquiry or expression.

As a matter of fact, I am in the front line defending those people who are scientists and want to speak out on their scientific inquiry and share with us and the world their thoughts. But that is not the case here. The public is not being denied the chance to hear about any information or theory. Now that does not mean that the Commerce Department does not bungle—did not bungle this whole thing. As a matter of fact, there is some evidence that it has not been handled in a way that all of us would consider to be the best.

Exactly how or why the bungling occurred, I do not know. What I do know is that there are no consequences to that bungling. The debate on outsourcing has not been constrained or stifled, and no one who was directly involved is still in office. This resolution could have consequences. It could weaken future Congresses by forcing us to get into a document fight with the executive branch over nothing.

So as I said at the outset, I hope we will defeat this quickly and put this political gamesmanship behind us. It is very clear in numerous ways that the Minority leader has instructed her Members to be more aggressive and obstructionists. When that is in pursuit of some real policy goal, I think it is fine. We need healthy debates around here. But when it is about spurious efforts to score political points, efforts that interfere with accomplishing real progress, that is inexcusable.

The public ought to be offended that when we should be working together to come up with ways to keep jobs in this country we are instead fermenting needless fights across party lines that will make it harder to work together. I have opposed those kinds of tactics throughout my career, whatever their source, and I will oppose them today. I have been around this Floor a long time. I came to it 42 years ago as a young staffer, and for the past 24 it has been my privilege to be a Member.

I have never seen the level of tolerance seek to lower depths. I have never seen partisanship rear its ugly head as much as it has in this current climate. I think the Nation and the institution loses under those circumstances. I do not want this great institution to lose. Mr. Gordon.

[The prepared statement of Chairman Boehlert follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN SHERWOOD L. BOEHLERT

Let me welcome everyone here for what I hope will be a brief markup, or more accurately, a brief interlude of partisan distraction in what is usually a bipartisan, focused and productive Committee. I don't think we're dealing with a serious issue today, and I wish we didn't have to spend any time on it, but the minority is prosecuting its rights under the House rules, and we have no choice but to comply.

I'm going to speak for a while now to lay out my position clearly, which I hope will shorten the debate later.

Let me start by pointing out what today's proceedings are not about. Today's debate is not about outsourcing—whether it's good or bad, or what to do about it. First, there isn't a Member of Congress on either side of the aisle who would not like to see more jobs created and retained in this country. And in this committee, we've taken many steps—and will take more this year—to try to help accomplish that. The whole innovation debate is about finding ways to counter or compensate for outsourcing.

But there's no policy at stake in the resolution before us today. It has nothing to do with taking action in response to outsourcing. It's only about scoring political points related to a report. The release of that report wouldn't create a single new job—although its sponsors may hope the debate over it creates new jobs for some Democrat candidates.

But it gets even more absurd. The release of this report not only wouldn't help us take action on outsourcing, it wouldn't even help us learn more about outsourcing. Everyone involved in preparing the report agrees that data on outsourcing was hard to come by, given the resources and time that were available to prepare the document.

Moreover, every bit of data that was gathered for the report was provided to the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) for its much more extensive probe into exactly the same questions. The first volume of the NAPA report has been released and two more are coming. The NAPA report was requested by exactly the same people who requested the Commerce Department report, and it will cover the same questions with greater care and thoroughness. So no one is being denied information about outsourcing.

So what would be gained by seeking the Commerce Department document? Well, we've already ruled out either action or information, so then what? Well, maybe we could raise questions about the judgment of the people who headed up the Technology Administration and oversaw the report. But guess what? None of those people is still in the government. There is nothing at stake in reviewing their actions.

But someone could reasonably ask, "Okay, we don't gain anything by seeking the report, but what's the harm? Why not just ask for it anyway?"

That's a fair question. And if we were just going to ask for the report and be done with it, I might not object. But this is a politically motivated request, and it's not going to stop with seeking this document. Indeed, the letters that the minority has previously sent to the Department show that this is just the beginning of a prolonged fishing expedition that will raise all sorts of disputes related to Congressional access to Executive Branch deliberations.

Now I am perfectly willing to challenge Executive Branch legal claims. We've done it successfully on this Committee on both document and witness requests. But one doesn't get into such a dispute lightly.

Real concerns need to be at stake and you have to have a good case because any misstep becomes a precedent that can weaken future Congresses. Here, we don't have real concerns, so I'm not willing to get into a drawn out legal dispute that could make it more difficult for Congress to get documents in the future on issues that matter.

One last point that is critical. The minority may claim that what is at stake here is a pattern of suppression of information. But that is a "red herring." First of all, no information has been suppressed; it has all gone to NAPA. Second, this is not a case of a scientist reaching an uncomfortable conclusion and not being able to talk to the press. This was a case of Congress requesting analysts to pull some data together. There are no conclusions that are being suppressed. Indeed, the Commerce Department has made the analysts available to the minority and majority staffs of this Committee. Most of them even say that the short, public report accurately captured their work.

I don't think anyone can question my willingness to be vocal when an official—in the Administration or the Congress—tries to squelch scientific inquiry or expression. But that's not the case here. The public is not being denied the chance to hear about any information or theory.

Now that doesn't mean that the Commerce Department didn't bungle this whole thing. Exactly how or why, I don't know. What I do know is that there are no consequences to that bungling. The debate on outsourcing has not been constrained or stifled. And no one who was directly involved is still in office.

But this resolution could have consequences. It could weaken future Congresses by forcing us to get into a document fight with the Executive Branch over nothing.

So as I said at the outset, I hope we will defeat this quickly and put this political gamesmanship behind us. It's very clear, in numerous ways, that the Minority Leader has instructed her Members to be more aggressive and obstructionist. When that's in pursuit of some real policy goal, that's fine; we need healthy debate around

here. But when it's about spurious efforts to score political points—efforts that interfere with accomplishing real progress—that's inexcusable.

The public ought to be offended that, when we should be working together to come up with ways to keep jobs in this country, we're instead fomenting needless fights across party lines that will make it harder to work together. I've opposed those kinds of tactics throughout my career, whatever their source. And I will oppose them today.

Mr. Gordon.

Mr. GORDON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, let me thank you for scheduling this hearing for 10:30 this morning. Everyone here knows I start most of my remarks by saying I concur with the Chairman. Unfortunately, I cannot do that today. But nevertheless I do want to say that Sherwood Boehlert has served his country, his district and this Congress extraordinarily well for the last 42 years. We used to talk about Tip O'Neill being a man of the House. You are truly a man of the House.

I have served in the Majority and I have served in the Minority, and I have never had a better relationship with the Chairman. I have never felt that I have been treated more fairly by a chairman. You are going to be missed. When you talk about the level of civility, your leaving does not improve it. I can assure you of that. So I just want to say thank you for a job well done.

Chairman BOEHLERT. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, if I could, I would make one more request, and that is to be able to address the panel from the witness stand.

Chairman BOEHLERT. You are on.

Mr. GORDON. Thank you.

Chairman BOEHLERT. The Chair recognizes the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORDON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I really wanted to come down here because I do not consider this a partisan issue, and I want to talk about it just a moment. And I feel I need to start, and this is not a criticism, but it is a correction of an oversight, I think, that you were not aware of. In your testimony you said that more-over every bit of the data that was gathered for the report was provided to the National Academy of Public Administration for their much more extensive probe using the exact same information.

We talked with the five preparers. They did not turn over the information. We talked with two political appointees. They said they did not turn over the information. If you look at the NAPA report, it was not sub-marked or whatever the term is. So anyway we need to get that corrected from the start. So why are we here? We are here today because of American jobs. And the Chairman made it very clear, and I agree with him, that all of us, Democrats and Republicans, are concerned about American jobs. We want to keep jobs here. Unfortunately, as Alan Binder mentioned the other day, he is the former Vice-Chairman of the Federal Reserve, he estimates that between 28 million and 42 million American jobs, service sector jobs, are going to be off-shored in the next few years.

That is on top of all manufacturing jobs that have left this country. And so what I hope this report will do is the same thing that we did with the Augustine report. When we received the Augustine report, it had some bad news. We were not afraid of it. We did not think it was a partisan jab. We embraced it. Two-thirds of the

Members of the Senate took the Augustine report and made it into legislation.

Here in the House I have introduced bipartisan legislation for the Augustine report. I think that is really what we are here about. And we are concerned about these jobs. Frank Wolf, in 19—or 2004, Frank Wolf, he did not request, he demanded really that the Commerce Department do a study. He provided and earmarked \$335,000, and here is what he requested from the Commerce Department. Do a study on the extent and implications of workforce globalization and knowledge-based industries such as life science, information technology, semiconductors and financial services, and he asked that that report be made available by June 23, 2004.

I am not going to take the time today to go through the chronology. With your permission, we will put it on your desk and it has been given to your staff. But we have a chronology going back to May, 2005. We have requested over and over and over this information. Most of the time we are not even given a courtesy of a no. We do not get anything. Finally, there was a 12-page summary that was provided that said something to the effect there are some good things and some bad things about outsourcing. That is all we have, and NAPA—and, again, I know it is not intentional but NAPA did not receive this information according to the folks that we have talked to.

Now what about embarrassing the President? The President was in India two weeks ago and said what we already know, that there is outsourcing going on. I mean there is no embarrassment to this. The Augustine report was not an embarrassment. It was an effort to try to do something positive. I do not think we are going to see anything shocking here.

I was talking to a Member of your committee, I am not going to embarrass by mentioning him now, who told me the other day, you know, your request is very reasonable and I intend to vote for it unless it is political. Well, I am here to plead guilty. My request is political but the politics is not Democrats versus Republicans. The politics is this. I think the legislative branch ought to be an equal branch and I think that when we request information and use taxpayers dollars to pay for it, we ought to be able to get that information.

Now you might just keep one thing in mind. It is not unreasonable that within your lifetime there might be a democratic administration, and you might want some reasonable information that the taxpayer paid for that you requested. I think this is a bad precedent. And I will tell you, and I am going to plead guilty again, it is political. It is political with me because in my district at home we have lost a lot of jobs, and folks at home, they do not want me to say it is the President's fault, it is the Republicans' fault. They want me to give them some solutions. They want me to talk about what I am doing.

That is the reason I took the Augustine report and tried to make it into legislation that we can do something. I am hoping that we are going to find some similar suggestions within this report so that I can show my constituents that I am trying to do something. That is the politics, and I think you would want to be in those politics too. And so then the real question goes back, well, this all

sounds pretty reasonable but there is always two sides, and so what is going on here.

I am trying to figure that out too. I tell you the best thing that I can figure out, and I may be wrong and I will welcome someone telling me differently, I think what is going on here is the same thing that we saw in NASA a while back. You had some middle level political hack that thought he was doing the Administration a favor by censoring information from the scientists that he thought was not consistent with the White House Message.

Well, once that got out there was a lot of hubbub. Director Griffin did exactly what he should. He said that is not what we are here for. The guy is out of here. The issue has gone away. I think you have got some middle level guy over there who thinks he is doing somebody some favor because this report will probably mention there is outsourcing going on. And if anyone is going to be shocked about that, you know, you must be shocked. I mean I am not particularly.

So we need to get this issue behind us. And let me say this too. I know you wish that we could take this vote today and it would be over with. I can tell you honestly, Nancy Pelosi or anybody else in leadership has not asked me to do anything about this. I doubt she even knows that this report exists. But this is not going away today. We are going to bring this more again here. We are going to make a motion to recommit because I really—first of all, I will just say the P word, that anybody much like Branch would be treated this way. This is information that we need to do our job, and I intend to try to get that information.

So with that, again, Mr. Chairman, thank you for the courtesy. I bet I run over my five minutes and you did not say a word. You are fair and honest and good, and I appreciate the opportunity to make this presentation to you this morning.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Gordon follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE BART GORDON

We all care about American jobs. Since the beginning of 2001, this country has lost almost three million manufacturing jobs. When a manufacturing plant is closed or down-sized, scientists and engineers lose their job too. Over 50 percent of the engineers employed in America work in manufacturing facilities.

So as this committee prepares to move legislation addressing what we should do about American competitiveness and how do we attract young people to engineering and science, it seems absolutely essential that we have all the information at our disposal to guide our work.

I suppose some might say that they are not worried about jobs moving overseas. But I know that for communities in Michigan and New York and Texas, where half a million manufacturing jobs have been lost, or in my home State of Tennessee, which has seen 62,000 jobs blow away, it is a very real problem.

If you are not worried, I think you should be. Up to now, we have all thought about off-shoring being largely confined to manufacturing. But Alan Blinder, the former Vice Chairman of the Federal Reserve, has estimated that between 28 and 42 million American jobs in the service sector may be off-shored in the next few years.

In 2004, the Commerce Department's Technology Administration (TA) produced a report on what is happening to the workforce as a result of changes in information technology and services, pharmaceuticals and semiconductors. They also produced an analysis of the education and training programs in other countries for "knowledge" workers. That report, as produced by the TA analysts, was approximately 200 pages in length. Fifteen months after it was due, the Department finally released a 12-page report summary.

My staff has interviewed the staff of TA who worked on the original report. Some of the analysts feel that the report does not accurately reflect their case study findings. None of the analysts even know where the five page introduction came from.

The analysts have never been able to show their original chapters to anyone outside the department, not even NAPA which is supposed to pick up where the TA staff left off. It is hard to see how they could pick up where TA left off when TA wasn't allowed to give them their original research. Further, lest you believe the quiet whispers from some Commerce Department appointees that the report was badly done, Members should know that analysts received a performance bonus after completing it.

I have been trying to get the original draft report for almost a year through every means available to me, but I have not been able to get the Chairman of this committee or the Subcommittee of jurisdiction to join me. It was with some reluctance that I filed a Resolution of Inquiry about this report to force the Committee to face up to its responsibility to learn as much as we can about what is happening to American jobs.

This committee has jurisdiction over the Technology Administration. We know they spent \$335,000 producing their report. The American public, and this committee, deserve to see the full results of their work.

It is hard to see how we can be serious as a committee about saying we want to address our competitive position if, in the next breath, we say we don't want to see the most sophisticated analysis done by the government about what is happening with American jobs in high-tech fields.

The Chairman has claimed he has determined that this matter is not of high priority for the Committee. I can't speak for others, but for my constituents, jobs is their number one issue. Last week a national poll found that outsourcing of jobs is the number one concern for people around the country, out-polling even the war in Iraq as an issue of concern. All I ask of the Chairman is to sign a letter asking for this report in its fullest draft form. How can the Committee be so busy that signing a letter is too burdensome? Why don't we want to learn everything we can, from any source, about trends that are driving Americans to worry about the future of their employment chances?

The Chairman claims that the NAPA study will answer all our questions so examining the work of Commerce is unnecessary. Well, as I said, NAPA was not privileged to get access to the work of Commerce and so they are unaware of the research findings of TA. Further, NAPA put out their first report in January and concluded they didn't have enough data to say anything conclusive about off-shoring and more research is needed.

NAPA has promised at least two more reports, but according to their staff these are likely to focus more on whether the U.S. has a shortage of scientists and engineers and whether H-1B/L-1 scientists and engineers depress wages for American technical workers rather than delve more deeply into off-shoring. Finally, even if NAPA were to do this work, why would that be an argument not to see what our own government's analysts, using tax dollars, found when they investigated the issue? I don't know how else to say it, but what NAPA is or isn't doing is a red herring in this argument.

We should get a copy of the full report. This is a necessary step to inform our legislative record and to carry out our oversight responsibility over the Executive branch.

If you care about keeping good, high-paying jobs in the U.S. and believe we need to base policy on as much information as possible, then please join me in supporting this resolution. If you think the loss of jobs is not something to worry about then oppose my amendments.

If you care about protecting the right of Congress to stand up to the Executive and ask for documents and accountability for tax-dollars spent, you should support this resolution. If you just want to trust someone who whispers in our ear that you don't really need to know what government experts have to say—from the same folks who brought you the Dubai ports deal, have refused Republican Senators information related to Hurricane Katrina and have refused to stay at Senate hearings to answer questions—then oppose this resolution.

Chairman BOEHLERT. Thanks very much, Mr. Gordon. Just let me respond with a couple of thoughts to your message. First of all, the analyst in the Department of Commerce within the Technology Administration has been interviewed not once, not twice, not three times, but at least four times by the people developing the NAPA report. There is nothing that they asked for that they did not get.

They tell us they have all the information they need to advance with this three-volume report that they are going to produce, the first volume of which is now public.

Secondly, this is not about outsourcing. Guess what? I am opposed vigorously to so much of the outsourcing that has taken place, and one of the reasons we have worked so well in this committee and so well with the authors of the academies rising above the gathering storm is because we want to enhance our competitive position in the global marketplace. And the jobs that you are talking about going overseas are jobs that concern each and every Member of this panel. Mr. Costello has been particularly vociferous about that.

So I want to make sure everyone understands this is not about whether or not you are for outsourcing. This is about how one department, one section of one department, handled or mishandled the internal flow of paperwork and draft documents, and that is what it is about, sum and substance. If your concern is about outsourcing, you should be as enthused as I am about the NAPA report and anxiously waiting volumes two and three of their total report. It is something that is difficult to deal with to pinpoint exactly precise information. GAO says the same thing. NAPA says the same thing. I think we all can acknowledge that.

We all want to get our arms around it and be able to clearly define the problem. But that is not what this is all about today. This is about the internal workings of one agency of the Federal Government and how they handled or mishandled the request from the Hill. So with that, is there anyone else who seeks recognition?

[The prepared statement of Mr. Costello follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JERRY F. COSTELLO

Thank you Mr. Chairman. As you may know, Ranking Member Gordon is on his way to the markup and I am pleased to have this opportunity to preside until he arrives. Today our committee will have the opportunity to discuss and vote on a very important issue that affects my congressional district in Southern Illinois and every congressional district in the country. The issue I speak of is *job stability and employment prospects*. Over the last five years, 158,800 manufacturing jobs have been lost in Illinois, adding to the national total of nearly three million manufacturing jobs lost since 2001. Many additional jobs have been lost in the service industry, just look at the growth of IT help desks in India for an example of this. The future employment in America and the current experiences of our workers and families is a high priority for me. We need to have a better understanding of why are jobs going off-shore? Why are manufacturing jobs declining? Why is our workforce losing its competitive edge in the global marketplace?

As a matter of fact, Congress has asked for specific details and information from federal experts on this alarming trend. As you may recall, Congress passed a Consolidated Appropriations bill in fiscal year 2004 that directed the Technology Administration to undertake a study on "the extent and implications of workforce globalization in knowledge-based industries such as life science, information technology, semiconductors and financial services." The report was due by June 23, 2004, and a 200-page report that represents the most sophisticated examination yet by federal experts on the trend of jobs moving off-shore *was completed, with taxpayer money*. However, the Department of Commerce refuses to hand over the draft report. Instead, they have released a 12-page summary that reportedly scrubs out "bad news" observations from the larger report. We want to see the original 200-page draft Technology Administration report to better understand why American jobs are moving off-shore. For almost a year, Democrats have been asking for the Commerce report at the staff level and then sent a letter to the Secretary of Commerce asking for the report. *Commerce did not respond*. Ranking Member Gordon, Congressman Wu, and myself have asked Chairman Boehlert and Congressman Ehlers to cosign a letter asking for the release of the final Commerce report—they

were not willing to sign. The resolution of inquiry is the final effort to get the report released. It is not meant to embarrass anyone, just to let us have access to a report funded by taxpayer dollars. The resolution simply asks the Secretary of Commerce to transmit a copy of the workforce globalization final draft report produced by the Technology Administration to the House of Representatives. This is an issue of Congressional versus Executive Branch authority. Why can't we simply examine a report done by Commerce Department analysts? Why should we show such deference to the Administration in their refusal to provide us with the report? This is exactly the kind of work the committees are supposed to engage in. Let's do our jobs for the American people. As Congress works to improve America's competitive position globally, information is our best weapon. Uncovering the driving forces pushing American jobs to foreign countries is information Congress must have as we push for solutions to help hardworking Americans. Mr. Chairman, my constituents deserve to know the facts on an issue where data is sorely lacking. As we work toward a smarter, sharper and more competitive workforce, it only makes sense that we have access to the best information. The Technology Administration report is the most complete analysis by any government agency of this phenomenon. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution of inquiry.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Johnson follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member.

The House Committee on Science has had a long-standing interest in directing policies that grow and sustain a high-technology workforce.

High-tech jobs foster a better quality of life for Americans and offer higher pay, better benefits and greater job stability.

In recent years, numerous reports have asserted that America is losing jobs—both blue collar and high-tech positions. Outsourcing has greatly diminished our manufacturing sector. Nations such as India have surpassed us in the information technology service industry.

No states have felt the pinch of the loss of outsourced high-tech jobs as acutely as the states of California and my home State of Texas.

Last year the American Electronics Association released a report saying that all but four states experienced a loss of high-tech jobs. The biggest losers were California, which cut 67,800 jobs in 2003, followed by Texas, which lost 32,900 high-tech jobs due to outsourcing.

Congress has asked for credible information as to the true situation regarding outsourcing of jobs. The Department of Commerce, a federal agency funded by the American public, has performed an investigation as to this very issue.

At a cost of \$335,000 taxpayer dollars, the Department of Commerce Technology Administration assigned at least five analysts for six months to produce a report on the status of U.S. employment in knowledge-intensive industries.

Mr. Chairman, the American public has paid for a study on high-tech job outsourcing, but for some reason, the Technology Administration will not release this report.

While it is unfortunate that the Committee will not work in a bipartisan fashion to request this report, I support Ranking Member Gordon's premise that \$335,000 in taxpayer dollars should not be wasted. I will support this Resolution of Inquiry on principle.

My constituents, and every Member's constituents in this room, deserve access to the Technology Administration's report.

The data in that report can help Members of Congress enact well-informed policies to bring high-tech jobs back home—where they belong.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back the remainder of my time.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Wu follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE DAVID WU

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. It amazes me that a simple request for a report, that we rightfully have jurisdiction over, can come up against such fierce opposition. The United States is losing jobs to off-shoring as we speak, and this report sheds light on the reasons why. It also may not provide any more information than what we already know, but isn't the point that we get a chance to find out?

This is a matter of good governance. We need to be able to stay informed with the most up-to-date and in-depth information out there. We also need the chance

to judge for ourselves whether the importance of certain data is valid. Any less would be neglecting our duties.

It also troubles me to learn about the process in which a detailed, thorough 200-page report gets chopped down to a 12-page summary. Who or what was the impetus of this action? And who had oversight to what information was omitted or retained? What is in there that is so important to hide and for us not to see? There is no way to know until we see the original draft.

As I have stated before, I am very disturbed by the continuing reports of *manipulation of science advisory committees, suppression of information, and censorship of federal scientists*. These reports are not restricted to one agency or department and they encompass a wide-range of topic areas. Although the Administration claims these events are random, the sheer number and distribution of complaints across the Federal Government suggests an overall political agenda to science. It is unfortunate that we seem to be facing a similar situation today under our own roof, our own jurisdiction.

I have spoken in Committee with witnesses concerning the issue of scientific integrity including Mr. Jeff Ruch from Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility on March 16th. He spoke of reports languishing in the Environmental Protection Agency, and other agencies, for many years. Why does that withholding or delaying problem seem oddly resonant with this current report about off-shoring?

A more egregious example of how this intimidation can affect research for policy is with the graduate student at Oregon State University who was basically persecuted for telling the truth with his findings. His research showed conclusions that went against established practice of the Bureau of Land Management. In return the BLM decided to freeze the grant behind that particular OSU study. After a national firestorm of protest, the BLM reinstated the funding, but this shows how politically motivated research funding has become.

It is time that we end this big brother choke-hold on science and scientists. It is time for the truth to come out unfettered. We have a job to do here in this committee. So let us do it. I urge my colleagues to vote to report this resolution of inquiry favorably to the House.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Honda follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE MICHAEL M. HONDA

Ordinarily I would thank the Chairman for holding this hearing today, but I know that he would rather not be doing, that we are here today only because the Rules of the House dictate that the Committee must act on this resolution.

I cannot understand why the Chairman has taken this position, however. All we are asking for with this resolution is to read a report paid for by the American taxpayers, that was written by United States government employees, at the request of Member of Congress.

The report pertains to a vitally important topic, the outsourcing of U.S. jobs. In my congressional district, many manufacturing and high tech workers have lost their jobs since President Bush took office, and many of those jobs are believed to have been moved overseas. Many questions remain about the number of jobs that have been outsourced, why jobs are being outsourced, and what we might do in terms of policy to reverse this disturbing trend. The report by the Department of Commerce's Technology Administration we are seeking access to, "*Six-Month Assessment of Workforce Globalization in Certain Knowledge-Based Industries*," can provide valuable insight into this issue.

As we develop legislation to ensure U.S. competitiveness in a global economy, we should gather information from every source possible, especially one prepared by our own government using taxpayer funds at the request of this body. The Department of Commerce must have thought highly of the work, since it gave those who worked on it bonuses. And yet for some reason we find our Chairman failing to do the oversight we are charged with as part of our job as Members of Congress and not seeking a report prepared by a federal agency.

I am baffled at how any Member of this committee could vote against this resolution, which simply seeks to ensure that we have access to all of the information possible as we develop legislation to address the problem highlighted in this report. To do so is to ignore our responsibility as Members of Congress to exert oversight over the Executive Branch.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Jackson Lee follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE SHEILA JACKSON LEE

Chairman Boehlert, Ranking Member Gordon, thank you for organizing this important hearing to discuss this bill, H. Res. 717, *Directing the Secretary of Commerce to transmit to the House of Representatives a copy of a workforce globalization final draft report produced by the Technology Administration*.

This committee has gathered today because the Administration is so fearful of isolationism and protectionism that they won't even release a completed report on the subject that has already been conducted. We have only seen 12 pages of the final 200-page report that cost taxpayers \$335,000. I do not understand the motivation behind keeping Congress in the dark as it relates to the American economy and American jobs. This committee has not gathered to debate a legislative response to off-shoring; we are only asking that we be allowed to be fully educated on the issue so that our future course of action is based upon good and full information. I feel that we deserve the full truth about this issue.

Specifically, the report is the most thorough examination to date by the U.S. Government examining the factors driving U.S. jobs "off-shore." We do not have more information on what those factors are, because we have not seen the report.

President Bush recently said in a press conference "we shouldn't allow isolationism and protectionism to overwhelm us." This statement, which echoed the President's statements in the State of the Union address, should be agreed upon by Members from both sides of the aisle. Few believe that America should shut its doors to the great tide of globalization and all the prosperity it offers. But globalization can often come at a price, and the actions that Congress takes must be carefully weighed in order to ensure fairness in the process. For example, globalization must never be allowed to take precedent over American security, and U.S. companies should not be given extra incentive for relocating jobs abroad. Further, the United States policy should never encourage developing nations to destroy their land through irresponsible environmental action, or abuse their population by subjecting them to child-slave labor or inhumane working conditions.

As it relates to the report in question, some U.S. policies are reported to actually encourage and reward overseas investments. For example:

- The relatively weak requirements for U.S. firms, compared with European counterparts, to pay severance or negotiate with unions over plans to move jobs overseas.
- Overseas Private Investment Corporation insurance for corporations investing abroad.
- Treaties that protect U.S. investors against host-government actions—including public interest laws—that diminish profits.

As Congress works to improve America's competitive position globally, information is our best weapon. Uncovering the driving forces pushing American jobs to foreign countries is information Congress must have as we work toward solutions to help hardworking Americans.

Job stability and employment prospects affect every single American. My constituents, indeed, ALL AMERICANS, deserve to know the facts on an issue where data is sorely lacking. As we continue to evolve into a smarter, sharper and more competitive American workforce, it only makes sense that we have access to the best information. I urge my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to put aside our partisan differences and vote to compel the Secretary of Commerce to release the full draft report. Thank you, and I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman BOEHLERT. Yes, Mr. Costello.

Mr. COSTELLO. I move to strike the last word.

Chairman BOEHLERT. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, thank you. Mr. Chairman, I have to tell you that I take issue with the spin put on this that this is partisan, that we are doing this for political reasons. We have had both private conversations and we have had amendments here in committee and on the Floor concerning the issue of outsourcing. We are not attempting to blame this Administration or any one administration but to try and gather facts, figures and reasons as to why we are losing jobs in the United States to other countries.

This Congress, in fact, ordered the Department of Commerce to prepare a report concerning specific issues concerning outsourcing. The Appropriations Committee and my friend, Mr. Gordon, referred to an appropriation of \$335,000. The Appropriations Committee set aside, earmarked \$335,000 for the Department of Commerce to prepare this report. They put together a 200-page report, and they have refused to turn that report over to the Appropriations Committee, this committee, or to the Congress of the United States.

So the issue is really not about outsourcing. It is about getting the information that this Congress has requested and the American taxpayers have paid for, information that was put together by a federal agency and paid for by the taxpayers. It is incredible to me, Mr. Chairman, that either you or anyone in the Congress would say that it is okay for a federal agency to stonewall and to refuse to release a report to the Congress that ordered the report and was paid for with taxpayers money to say that, well, they have turned the information over to NAPA, which we believe they have not.

They turned a 12-page summary of that report over to NAPA. Our staff has interviewed a number of people, analysts and others over at NAPA. They have told us that the report in its entirety was not turned over to NAPA, that in fact they got a 12-page summary, the same summary that we received. So it is incredible to me that any Member of this committee or the Congress would say, first of all, we are taking \$335,000 of the taxpayers money, ordering a federal agency to put together a report. After the report is completed, they refuse to turn the report over to this Congress or this committee of jurisdiction.

And I would also say, Mr. Chairman, and ask that the letter directed to you yesterday, the 28th of March, 2006, by the IEEE, the Institute for Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Incorporated where they are supporting this resolution, and I would read excerpts from their letter to every Member of this committee. The IEEE USA supports this resolution requesting that the Commerce Department release the draft report.

And then I would refer to another paragraph where it says all the information the government has collected on this matter should be released. The report is indeed a valuable resource for our Members who need to make informed choices on their continuing education and career paths. We believe the report contains excellent indicators of trends that are not contained in any other government-funded study.

Let me repeat that. We believe that the report contains excellent indicators of trends that are not contained in any other government-funded study, including the recent National Academy of Public Administration reports. Mr. Chairman, I would ask that this letter be placed into the record, and I would urge my colleagues to support this resolution, to vote in favor of the resolution that merely says to a federal agency under the jurisdiction of this committee to release a report that they have been stonewalling for a number of months now paid for by the taxpayers and ordered by the Congress of the United States.

Chairman BOEHLERT. Without objection, so ordered.

[The information follows:]



28 March 2006

The Honorable Sherwood Boehlert
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Chairman Boehlert:

We understand the House Science Committee will be taking up H.Res. 717 during its mark-up session on 29 March 2006. IEEE-USA supports this resolution requesting that the Commerce Department release the draft report entitled, "Six-Month Assessment of Workforce Globalization In Certain Knowledge-Based Industries."

At a time when the offshoring of high-skilled tasks continues to increase in scale and scope, we believe that all of the information the government has collected on this matter should be released. The report, an advance portion of which was highlighted in PowerPoint slides on the Business Week website, is indeed a valuable resource for our members who need to make informed choices on their continuing education and career paths. We believe that the report contains excellent indicators of trends that are not contained in any other government-funded study, including the recent National Academy of Public Administration report.

Sincerely,

Ralph W. Wyndrum, Jr., Eng.Sc.D.
President, IEEE-USA

The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc. - United States of America
1828 L Street, N.W., Suite 1202, Washington, D.C. 20036-5104 USA
Office: +1 202 785 0017 • Fax: +1 202 785 0835 • E-mail: ieeetusa@ieee.org • Web: <http://www.ieeetusa.org>

Chairman BOEHLERT. Let me respond in a couple of ways. One, I want everyone to understand that there is no indication that \$335,000 was spent. The language actually said of the monies appropriated no more than \$335,000 could be spent on the preparation of some sort of a report. Secondly, all the analysts were already on the job working within the Technology Administration at the Department of Commerce so there wasn't any outside hires or anything else.

Third, and very important, \$2 million was made available for the NAPA report. The NAPA once again, I want to emphasize this, in the preparation of its three-volume report was able to interview all

the analysts that work on this internal document floating around the Commerce Department, incidentally, 200 pages of raw data. A draft report was 45 pages, and then that was sent out for vetting as the normal process within the executive branch, and people looked at it and said, wait a minute, this isn't right or, wait a minute, that is not right.

So they had some legitimate questions so there was never a final report produced. There was an executive summary. And the person who initiated the whole action because he is as concerned about outsourcing as you, as Mr. Gordon, as I am. Mr. Wolf is fully satisfied that the NAPA report is going to give him all the information he needs, and he is the one that generated the whole thing. So that is where we are. Is there anyone else? Mr. Rohrabacher.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I move to strike the last word.

Chairman BOEHLERT. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Well, first of all, let me note that I will be supporting the request of the Chairman and following his lead, but I do so reluctantly and as a matter of obligation, I would say, as a loyal Member of this side of the aisle. But with that said, let me note that I find the request that is being made and the debate that is taking place gives me a lot of sympathy with people on the other side of the aisle.

I would say that the argument—if I was just going by the arguments, I would be voting with the other side of the aisle on this question. But there is—when I first came to Congress 18 years ago the Speaker of the House at that time, Jim Wright, came to the freshmen Members and said, you know, those of you who think you can separate politics from democracy have got a lot to learn. And I was outraged, of course, when I heard that but over the years I have come to realize that that was a true analysis, and he was trying to be sincere with us when he suggested that.

And that is nothing that we should be ashamed of. The fact is that democracy and politics are tied, and perhaps that is one of the flaws of democracy. That still doesn't mean that we are not the best system. You know, democratic government is not the best system in the world as compared to the alternatives but perhaps the fact that there are politics so tied to it that there is a flaw. But politics also gives an energy to a democratic system that perhaps simply the search for responsible government decision making wouldn't give that same energy to this process.

So I don't think that just a claim of political gamesmanship or partisanship over a request is enough to negate the validity of a request because there is political partisanship and gamesmanship on both sides of the aisle. And I happen to find this Administration be somewhat more arrogant and restrictive than I feel comfortable with, quite frankly. In some of the areas of national security, I know that we have got to be a little bit more restrictive, and we got to make sure we overpower the instincts for political gamesmanship to make sure that our national security isn't hurt.

In areas beyond national security, I think that the Administration has been overly restrictive, and I think that this request—the denial of this request and this reaction to this request indicates that there is something wrong on our side of this debate. I look

at—let me just note. Maybe it was, and I will say to Mr. Gordon and I am sure he understands why I will be supporting the Chairman, some day I am sure he would like to be chairman and have his people support him on his request as well.

I, of course, hope that isn't the case but that is all part of the process that we all are participating in. But it may not be that the mid-level political hack tried to censor something. It might be that a scientist who was a liberal left scientist or analyst or economist produced something, some kind of report, based on politics on that individual, and that were trying to negate a political move that way. Whatever the motives, that is not what is the question here. What the question is what the process will be, and whether or not when requests are made, as Mr. Gordon has said, when requests are made in the future will we as Republicans when we are in the Minority expect to get information that we need in order to make it part of the public debate, and I think we will.

And that is why if I was making this decision, I would not have made the same decision as the Chairman. So with all of that sort of scattered logic, I will be supporting the Chairman. I don't believe—let me just say one thing about globalization, one last thought here. And I saw the map, and I think it is something we need to be concerned about when we are talking about this outsourcing because it too is a byproduct of globalization, which I think our country has rushed into without regard to what kind of effect it will have on the prosperity or the rights, economic and political rights, of our own people.

And I think it deserves a lot more examination than it is been given. And finally let me just note that that is not the only issue that at times have been ignored for political reasons. I think the illegal immigration issue is something that has been ignored by both parties but especially my friends on the other side of the aisle have ignored illegal immigration, and that has a far worse economic consequence than outsourcing to the pay level and the jobs available to American working people. And with that said, I yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman BOEHLERT. Thank you, Mr. Rohrabacher. It is very obvious that we have under consideration H. Res. 717. Before proceeding, I should ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as open—read and open to amendment at any point, and without objection so ordered. So we will continue. Mr. Moore.

Mr. MOORE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to join Mr. Gordon in commending you on your service to our country and this committee over the years, and you have been extremely fair although I do disagree with you on this particular issue and Mr. Rohrabacher as well, whom I have tremendous respect for. And I just want to say this. When we get down to political positions, I think absent national security concerns we should any time taxpayers money is used in the production of a report, we should first and foremost always respect the right of taxpayers to know what that money was used for and see a copy of that report.

And I think political considerations should be put aside here and for the reason that taxpayers money was used, whether it was \$335,000 or \$3,000. I think the public—transparency is important here. The light should shine in, and the public should be entitled

including Members of Congress to know what was in that report. And for that reason, I respectfully disagree with the Chairman's ruling. Thank you.

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

Chairman BOEHLERT. The gentlelady is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record being very sorry that you are leaving. We need your ideas. We need your vision. We need your genuine concern for our environment and the science that supports protecting it. And given just how much I respect you, I am really totally surprised that this issue today was not taken up voluntarily, that Ranking Member Bart Gordon had to actually force the debate.

Listen to the facts. According to a recent study by the University of California-Berkeley, the United States is at risk of losing as many as 14 million jobs over the next ten years as a result of the new outsourcing trends. The types of jobs at risk include those in accounting, business processing outsourcing, information technology, strategy consulting, asset management, investment banking, commercial banking, retail banking, et cetera, et cetera, and the jobs that do remain in the United States the studies find will suffer from the pressures of decreased wages and benefits in order to keep pace with low wage countries.

Another study by Input Research addressed outsourcing at the State and local levels. This study projected that the outsourcing of State and local government technology contracts will grow from \$10 billion in 2005 to \$23 billion in 2008. It is with these facts in mind that I support the effort of my colleague, Ranking Member Bart Gordon, to obtain the as yet unreleased outsourcing report produced by analysts of the Department of Commerce's Technology Administration in 2004. This report is the most comprehensive study to date analyzing the factors that have led the U.S. jobs—led U.S. jobs to other countries.

The original report produced by the Technology Administration came to nearly 200 pages in length, \$335,000 in production cost maximum, as you said, yet all that was released to the public is a 12-page summary that seems to have mischaracterized the actual findings of the full report. Mr. Chairman, if we are not going to spend—if we are going to spend nearly a half a million dollars on a book-length report about American jobs the least we can do is make the information publicly available. They paid for it, for heaven's sake, and let every American know exactly how and why their jobs are going overseas. Let's do our job. Let's bring the information to light. I yield back.

Chairman BOEHLERT. Thank you. Let me once again emphasize something. I am almost tempted to say I have an amendment at the desk. The amendment would outlaw outsourcing. All in favor say aye. There would be no ayes. Opposed. Give me a break. We are all concerned about outsourcing. This is not a debate about whether or not the United States of America is witnessing the outsourcing of too many jobs. We all agree to that. We all are part of trying to provide solutions to the very real problem. What this is about is 200 pages of raw data being circulated in one section of one agency and then being condensed into a 45-page draft re-

port, and then as all agencies do, they send it out to various sections. Before we put out informata on there let us examine it and people look at it and say, wait a minute, this is questionable. Wait a minute, I don't know about the documentation there. And that is what it is all about.

What we are really interested in is the NAPA report. That is a \$2 million report. NAPA is an independent agency, not a part of any government, independent. NAPA has made available to it and to its people preparing the report all the analysts within the Department of Commerce who worked on it. They said they haven't been denied any information at all. They have everything that they needed to prepare a much more comprehensive report and therefore much more valuable report to all of us who are legitimately concerned about outsourcing.

So I just want to disabuse anybody who might have the misunderstanding what we are talking about outsourcing, whether or not we are for or against outsourcing. That is not what it is all about at all.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Would the gentleman yield?

Chairman BOEHLERT. I would be glad to yield to the distinguished gentlelady.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Okay, now I am going to get a little political. Mr. Chairman, there is a lot of reports that have come out in this country in the last few years, they have been scrubbed, on the environment, on the war. We want to make sure this information is not scrubbed before we get it. That is what we are asking for.

Chairman BOEHLERT. I am going to tell you something. You are looking—and I have got the scars to prove it, you are looking at someone who has often been very critical of actions by this Administration. As Mr. Gordon mentioned, the misguided activities of some middle level guy in NASA trying to stifle dissent, a contrary opinion. I was the first one as Chairman of this committee acting on behalf of all of us to express outrage at that, got on the phone to call the NASA administrator and say what in the hell are you doing. And NASA is now turning out to be a model agency.

It is saying to its scientists that we are not going to be interfering with scientific inquiry. There are some people around this town rather than being informed by science they want to intimidate scientists. Not me. So we are on the same wave length on that issue. And then another committee of this Congress, Mr. Rohrabacher—he is gone, where another committee of this Congress, the Energy and Commerce Committee, wanted to discuss global climate change. They didn't discuss it. They didn't have an open hearing. They started investigating scientists who came to a politically inconvenient conclusion from their standpoint.

And I stood up for this committee, all of us, Republicans and Democrats, and challenged a fellow Republican and said you are wrong, that is not the way to proceed. And so I am just concerned that this is being—you are making a mountain out of a mole hill, quite honestly. We are hearing in this exchange here like we are talking about whether or not we are for outsourcing. Hell, no, we are not for outsourcing. And we are trying our darndest to make sure America is more competitive and retains more jobs and we have the economic growth we want right here.

With that, who seeks recognition? Ms. Hooley.

Ms. HOOLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I too, as you know, I talked to you earlier, am very sorry that you are leaving. I really appreciate your leadership. I know you have stood up when scientists have been asked to change their reports. I know you have been there time and time again. And I guess that is why I am a little surprised on this whole issue because I suspect that whatever raw data is in that 200 pages is minor compared to our not knowing what is in those 200 pages.

And I don't know if anyone has seen the 45 pages but to get 12 pages out of a 200-page raw data report, I think is—I don't think we are asking for too much. And I know this is about outsourcing. You have talked about outsourcing. My question has always been outsourcing has happened. What are we going to devote our time to and what do we need in this country to make sure that people that are out of work have a job and what direction do we want to go.

This committee is in a position to help those workers who are making that shift from manufacturing to working in the high tech industry by increasing funds for technical and vocational education. I applaud the work being done by Mr. Gordon on this issue especially in light of the findings and recommendations of the Augustine report. I have also been working on legislation that focuses on improving technical education in this country by investing more money to strengthen education programs being conducted by the National Science Foundation, creating scholarships for students who choose to pursue a post-secondary degree in science or engineering, and expanding NSF initiatives that provide technology training to students in two and four-year colleges.

This is an effort that needs to be done by this committee. We have a lot to do with it. I see this as the future of our country to make sure that we have well-educated students, that we have students that are educated in the newest and latest technical information. I hope our committee would continue to push for that. And again I hope that again when people pay money for—that we ask them to give us information that they are not afraid of that information, that we want transparency and this should be—you know, they talk about a new story and sometimes if you don't like what is coming out if you just say, fine, it is a one-day story. Well, because we haven't put this out it seems to me it is going to be a story over and over and over again, so I hope that we would do that. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman BOEHLERT. Thank you very much for your contribution. Here is the drill. We are told that we can expect a vote on the Floor within the next ten minutes or so. Mr. Gordon advises that there are no amendments so we would like to wrap it up, but I don't want to stifle anyone. So is there anyone who seeks recognition from the Chair?

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

Chairman BOEHLERT. Yes. Mr. Lipinski.

Mr. LIPINSKI. I move to strike the last word. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you for your service to your constituents, to this Congress, to America, and for your courage that you have shown in sometimes rising above partisanship. I know how difficult

that is. And this is a partisan institution, and we need to rise above that as much as we can. We can never get rid of the partisanship, we know that, but let me for this moment step into my old shoes as a social scientist.

Every day I have people coming up to me in my district talking about outsourcing, what are we going to do, we are losing jobs. They are concerned about where America is going. They are concerned about the future of their jobs, their family, and the one thing that we really need is more information because the next question always is what are you going to do about it. And so that is what I work on and that is what we work on here, and I am glad that we have been able to do some things in a bipartisan fashion on this committee to address some of these issues about the future of American jobs especially in technology and in regard to education.

I hope that we can move forward in an even more bipartisan fashion on this. And I think this report in getting this information all comes down to we need to know more. What can we do in order to make sure that in the future we are prepared, our children are prepared through education. We do what we can in terms of research and development and everything else that we can do in order to preserve and create more good jobs for Americans.

As a social scientist I look at it and say I just want more information. The more information we can get the better off we will be because we can make a better decision. We won't have to be shooting in the dark or going by limited information. The more we know the better off we are. The more data points we have the better we understand what is going on. And that is why I think there really is no reason not to ask for this report to get this information.

I assume that the information was in the whole report. I assume it was done very professionally. And in the end we just need to decide that we need to have the information. If Congress does not have information, we cannot make good policies. Thank you.

Chairman BOEHLERT. Thank you very much. And let me comfort you by inviting you to get the NAPA report. The first volume is out. It is going to be very comprehensive about a subject that you and I agree is extremely important. Is there anyone else who seeks recognition? Mr. Gordon, I will give you the opportunity. Mr. Gordon.

Mr. GORDON. Let me just because I know we are going to have a vote coming up soon. Let me stipulate, I want to stipulate for the record that there is no Democrat, Republican on this committee that wants to see jobs outsourced in their district. Let us get that off the table. I want to stipulate that is the case. So that is not what this is about. It is about doing our job. That is what this whole matter is about.

And our Chairman mentioned the example in NASA and how there was a problem, how he and the Committee stood up, cleaned it up, and NASA is better off. The Department of Commerce would be better off if we did the same thing here. Let me clear up a couple of facts, and then I want to make a suggestion. First of all, I cannot tell you that the full \$375,000 taxpayer dollars were spent on this report, but I don't think we ought to be arguing about how

much taxpayer dollars you can waste. That is not what we ought to be arguing about.

We also again—let me again mention very clear on this NAPA report we have heard about, that report, the first volume is out. They have 20 pages of footnotes, 20 pages of footnotes. This Commerce Department is not mentioned anywhere in these 20 pages of footnotes. Now they do have an additional appendix that talks about who they talked to, and apparently they did talk to these analysts but the analysts tell us they did not turn over the information. It was not provided.

So that also—you know, and as the Chairman learns more about it hopefully we will stipulate that too. So finally here is my suggestion. This issue is not going to go away. I suspect that we are not going to prevail today but the fact of the matter is that every media source that covers this issue says this is important and that we should have this information. They have written stories about it. They are going to continue to write stories about it.

My understanding, Lou Dobbs is getting Freedom of Information. This is not going to go away. We are going to come back and ask for it again. If we lose today, what I would suggest is that you all caucus, talk about this among yourselves, decide what you really think is right, and let us find a face saving way to come back later and do this so that we can, you know—everybody can be winners and we can move forward.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Certainly. Yes, Ms. Jackson Lee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Before—it looks like the Chairman is going to give you a positive answer, but I would just this. You mentioned Lou Dobbs. This document couldn't be more important as we are in the midst of a very tense debate on immigration. Why? Because one of the issues is about jobs, jobs in America and how we can protect American jobs.

And I would think this whole issue of a competitiveness report for scientists and Members of the Science Committee would certainly be the appropriate nonpartisan vehicle where this report could be issued, and we could try to find solutions because many of us are advocates of job creation. So I yield back to the gentleman, and it looks as if we may have a resolution. But I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. GORDON. I yield back my time, and I suggest unless there is other great wisdom that we go ahead and try to vote before this next vote.

Chairman BOEHLERT. I will show you how bipartisanship continues to prevail on the Committee. You will notice in his closing statement the distinguished Ranking Member outlined a strategy for the Majority, and I thank you for that suggestion. With that, the vote is on the resolution, H. Res. 717, *Directing the Secretary of Commerce to transmit to the House of Representatives a copy of a workforce globalization final draft report produced by the Technology Administration*. All those in favor, say aye. Opposed, no. The nos appear to have it.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, on that question I ask for a recorded vote pursuant to the Committee rules.

Chairman BOEHLERT. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Boehlert.
 Chairman BOEHLERT. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Boehlert votes no. Mr. Hall.
 Mr. HALL. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Hall votes no. Mr. Smith.
 [No response.]
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Weldon.
 Mr. WELDON. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Weldon votes no. Mr. Rohrabacher.
 Mr. ROHRABACHER. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Rohrabacher votes no. Mr. Calvert.
 [No response.]
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Bartlett.
 Mr. BARTLETT. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Bartlett votes no. Mr. Ehlers.
 Mr. EHLERS. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Ehlers votes no. Mr. Gutknecht.
 Mr. GUTKNECHT. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Gutknecht votes no. Mr. Lucas.
 Mr. LUCAS. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Lucas votes no. Ms. Biggert.
 [No response.]
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Gilchrest.
 [No response.]
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Akin.
 Mr. AKIN. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Akin votes no. Mr. Johnson.
 Mr. JOHNSON. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Johnson votes no. Mr. Forbes.
 [No response.]
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Bonner.
 [No response.]
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Feeney.
 [No response.]
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Inglis.
 Mr. INGLIS. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Inglis votes no. Mr. Reichert.
 Mr. REICHERT. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Reichert votes no. Mr. Sodrel.
 Mr. SODREL. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Sodrel votes no. Mr. Schwarz.
 Mr. SCHWARZ. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Schwarz votes no. Mr. McCaul.
 Mr. McCAUL. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. McCaul votes no. Mr. Gordon.
 Mr. GORDON. Aye.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Gordon votes yes. Mr. Costello.
 Mr. COSTELLO. Aye.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Costello votes yes. Ms. Johnson.
 [No response.]
 Mr. MAYORGA. Ms. Woolsey.
 Ms. WOOLSEY. Aye.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Ms. Woolsey votes yes. Ms. Hooley.
 Ms. HOOLEY. Aye.

Mr. MAYORGA. Ms. Hooley votes yes. Mr. Udall.
 [No response.]
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Wu.
 Mr. WU. Aye.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Wu votes yes. Mr. Honda.
 Mr. HONDA. Yes.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Honda votes yes. Mr. Miller.
 Mr. MILLER. Aye.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Miller votes yes. Mr. Davis.
 Mr. DAVIS. Aye.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Davis votes yes. Mr. Lipinski.
 Mr. LIPINSKI. Aye.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Lipinski votes yes. Ms. Jackson Lee.
 Ms. JACKSON LEE. Aye.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Ms. Jackson Lee votes yes. Mr. Sherman.
 Mr. SHERMAN. Aye.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Sherman votes yes. Mr. Baird.
 [No response.]
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Matheson.
 Mr. MATHESON. Aye.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Matheson votes yes. Mr. Costa.
 Mr. COSTA. Aye.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Costa votes yes. Mr. Green.
 Mr. GREEN. Yes.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Green votes yes. Mr. Melancon.
 [No response.]
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Moore.
 [No response.]
 Chairman BOEHLERT. Is Mr. Forbes recorded?
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Forbes is not recorded. Mr. Forbes votes no.
 Chairman BOEHLERT. Is Mr. Gilchrest recorded?
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Gilchrest is not recorded. Mr. Gilchrest votes
 no.
 Chairman BOEHLERT. Is Mr. Bartlett recorded?
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Bartlett is recorded as a no.
 Chairman BOEHLERT. Mr. Costa, did you get your vote in? How
 is Mr. Costa recorded?
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Costa is recorded as a yes.
 Chairman BOEHLERT. I would like to point out to my colleagues
 while it is being tallied, we have a new Clerk, a veteran of the
 Committee, David Mayorga. David, welcome. How is Mr. Calvert
 recorded?
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Calvert is not recorded.
 Chairman BOEHLERT. How is Mr. Feeney recorded?
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Feeney is not recorded. Mr. Feeney votes no.
 Chairman BOEHLERT. Does the Clerk have a tally?
 Mr. MAYORGA. 14 yes, 19 no.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE - ROLL CALL - 109th CONGRESS

DATE: 3/29/06 SUBJECT: Roll Call vote on motion to adopt the resolution, H. Res. 717

| Rm. | Phone | Member | Yes | No | Not Voting | Present | Absent |
|-------|-------|-----------------------|-----|----|------------|---------|--------|
| 2246 | 53665 | Mr. Boehlert, R-NY | | ✓ | | | |
| 2405 | 56673 | Mr. Hall, R-TX | | ✓ | | | |
| 2184 | 54236 | Mr. Smith, R-TX | | ✓ | | | |
| 2466 | 52011 | Mr. Weldon, R-PA | | ✓ | | | |
| 2338 | 52415 | Mr. Rohrabacher, R-CA | | ✓ | | | |
| 2201 | 51986 | Mr. Calvert, R-CA | | ✓ | | | |
| 2412 | 52721 | Mr. Bartlett, R-MD | | ✓ | | | |
| 1714 | 53831 | Mr. Ehlers, R-MI | | ✓ | | | |
| 425 | 52472 | Mr. Gutknecht, R-MN | | ✓ | | | |
| 2342 | 55565 | Mr. Lucas, R-OK | | ✓ | | | |
| 1317 | 53515 | Mrs. Biggert, R-IL | | ✓ | | | |
| 2245 | 55311 | Mr. Gilchrest, R-MD | | ✓ | | | |
| 117 | 52561 | Mr. Akin, R-MO | | ✓ | | | |
| 1229 | 52371 | Mr. Johnson, R-IL | | ✓ | | | |
| 307 | 56365 | Mr. Forbes, R-VA | | ✓ | | | |
| 315 | 54931 | Mr. Bonner, R-AL | | ✓ | | | |
| 323 | 52706 | Mr. Feeney, R-FL | | ✓ | | | |
| 330 | 56030 | Mr. Inglis, R-SC | | ✓ | | | |
| 1223 | 57761 | Mr. Reichert, R-WA | | ✓ | | | |
| 1508 | 55315 | Mr. Sodrel, R-IN | | ✓ | | | |
| 128 | 56276 | Mr. Schwarz, R-MI | | ✓ | | | |
| 415 | 52401 | Mr. McCaul, R-TX | | ✓ | | | |
| 2304 | 54231 | Mr. Gordon, D-TN | ✓ | | | | |
| 2269 | 55661 | Mr. Costello, D-IL | ✓ | | | | |
| 1511 | 58885 | Ms. Johnson, D-TX | ✓ | | | | |
| 2263 | 55161 | Ms. Woolsey, D-CA | ✓ | | | | |
| 2430 | 55711 | Ms. Hookey, D-OR | ✓ | | | | |
| 240 | 52161 | Mr. Udall, D-CO | ✓ | | | | |
| 1023 | 50855 | Mr. Wu, D-OR | ✓ | | | | |
| 1713 | 52631 | Mr. Honda, D-CA | ✓ | | | | |
| 1722 | 53032 | Mr. Miller, D-NC | ✓ | | | | |
| 410 | 56831 | Mr. Davis, D-TN | ✓ | | | | |
| 1217 | 55701 | Mr. Lipinski, D-IL | ✓ | | | | |
| 2435 | 53816 | Ms. Jackson Lee, D-TX | ✓ | | | | |
| 1030 | 55911 | Mr. Sherman, D-CA | ✓ | | | | |
| 1421 | 53536 | Mr. Baird, D-WA | ✓ | | | | |
| 1222 | 53011 | Mr. Matheson, D-UT | ✓ | | | | |
| 1004 | 53341 | Mr. Costa, D-CA | ✓ | | | | |
| 1529 | 57508 | Mr. Green, D-TX | ✓ | | | | |
| 404 | 54031 | Mr. Melancon, D-LA | | | | | |
| 1727 | 52865 | Mr. Moore, D-KS | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | 14 | 19 | | | |

Attest:  (Clerk)
David A. Mayorga

Chairman BOEHLERT. The resolution is defeated. The question is on the motion—I recognize who for a motion. Dr. Ehlers.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee adversely report H. Res. 717 to the House with a recommendation that the resolution not be agreed to. Furthermore, I move that staff be instructed to prepare the legislative report and make necessary technical and conforming changes.

Chairman BOEHLERT. The question is on the motion to report the resolution adversely. Those in favor of the motion will signify by saying aye. Opposed, no. The ayes have it, and the resolution is adversely reported.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, on that question I ask for a recorded vote pursuant to the Committee rules.

Chairman BOEHLERT. Clerk will call the role.

Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Boehlert.

Chairman BOEHLERT. Aye.

Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Boehlert votes yes. Mr. Hall.

[No response.]

Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Smith.

[No response.]

Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Weldon.

Mr. WELDON. Aye.

Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Weldon votes yes. Mr. Rohrabacher.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Yes.

Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Rohrabacher votes yes. Mr. Calvert.

Mr. CALVERT. Yes.

Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Calvert votes yes. Mr. Bartlett.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Bartlett votes yes. Mr. Ehlers.

Mr. EHLERS. Yes.

Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Ehlers votes yes. Mr. Gutknecht.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Yes.

Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Gutknecht votes yes. Mr. Lucas.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Lucas votes yes. Ms. Biggert.

[No response.]

Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Gilchrest.

Mr. GILCHREST. Aye.

Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Gilchrest votes yes. Mr. Akin.

Mr. AKIN. Yes.

Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Akin votes yes. Mr. Johnson.

[No response.]

Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Forbes.

Mr. FORBES. Yes.

Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Forbes votes yes. Mr. Bonner.

[No response.]

Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Feeney.

Mr. FEENEY. Yes.

Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Feeney votes yes. Mr. Inglis.

Mr. INGLIS. Yes.

Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Inglis votes yes. Mr. Reichert.

Mr. REICHERT. Yes.

Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Reichert votes yes. Mr. Sodrel.

Mr. SODREL. Aye.

Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Sodrel votes yes. Mr. Schwarz.
 Mr. SCHWARZ. Aye.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Schwarz votes yes. Mr. McCaul.
 Mr. McCAUL. Yes.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. McCaul votes yes. Mr. Gordon.
 Mr. GORDON. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Gordon votes no. Mr. Costello.
 Mr. COSTELLO. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Costello votes no. Ms. Johnson.
 [No response.]
 Mr. MAYORGA. Ms. Woolsey.
 Ms. WOOLSEY. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Ms. Woolsey votes no. Ms. Hooley.
 Ms. HOOLEY. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Ms. Hooley votes no. Mr. Udall.
 [No response.]
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Wu.
 Mr. WU. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Wu votes no. Mr. Honda.
 Mr. HONDA. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Honda votes no. Mr. Miller.
 Mr. MILLER. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Miller votes no. Mr. Davis.
 Mr. DAVIS. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Davis votes no. Mr. Lipinski.
 Mr. LIPINSKI. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Lipinski votes no. Ms. Jackson Lee.
 Ms. JACKSON LEE. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Ms. Jackson Lee votes no. Mr. Sherman.
 [No response.]
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Baird.
 Mr. BAIRD. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Baird votes no. Mr. Matheson.
 Mr. MATHESON. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Matheson votes no. Mr. Costa.
 Mr. COSTA. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Costa votes no. Mr. Green.
 Mr. GREEN. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Green votes no. Mr. Melancon.
 Mr. MELANCON. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Melancon votes no. Mr. Moore.
 Mr. MOORE. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Moore votes no. Mr. Sherman. Mr. Sherman,
 you are not recorded.
 Mr. SHERMAN. No.
 Mr. MAYORGA. Mr. Sherman votes no. Yes, 17, no, 17.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE - ROLL CALL - 109th CONGRESS

DATE: 3/29/06 SUBJECT: Roll Call vote on motion to adversely report the resolution, H. Res. 717

| Rm. | Phone | Member | Yes | No | Not Voting | Present | Absent |
|-------|-------|-----------------------|-----|----|------------|---------|--------|
| 2246 | 53665 | Mr. Boehlert, R-NY | ✓ | | | | |
| 2405 | 56673 | Mr. Hall, R-TX | | | | | |
| 2184 | 54236 | Mr. Smith, R-TX | | | | | |
| 2466 | 52011 | Mr. Weldon, R-PA | ✓ | | | | |
| 2338 | 52415 | Mr. Rohrabacher, R-CA | ✓ | | | | |
| 2201 | 51986 | Mr. Calvert, R-CA | ✓ | | | | |
| 2412 | 52721 | Mr. Bartlett, R-MD | ✓ | | | | |
| 1714 | 53831 | Mr. Ehlers, R-MI | ✓ | | | | |
| 425 | 52472 | Mr. Gutknecht, R-MN | ✓ | | | | |
| 2342 | 55565 | Mr. Lucas, R-OK | ✓ | | | | |
| 1317 | 53515 | Mrs. Biggert, R-IL | ✓ | | | | |
| 2245 | 55311 | Mr. Gilchrest, R-MD | ✓ | | | | |
| 117 | 52561 | Mr. Akin, R-MO | ✓ | | | | |
| 1229 | 52371 | Mr. Johnson, R-IL | ✓ | | | | |
| 307 | 56365 | Mr. Forbes, R-VA | ✓ | | | | |
| 315 | 54931 | Mr. Bonner, R-AL | | | | | |
| 323 | 52706 | Mr. Feeney, R-FL | ✓ | | | | |
| 330 | 56030 | Mr. Inglis, R-SC | ✓ | | | | |
| 1223 | 57761 | Mr. Reichert, R-WA | ✓ | | | | |
| 1508 | 55315 | Mr. Sodrel, R-IN | ✓ | | | | |
| 128 | 56276 | Mr. Schwarz, R-MI | ✓ | | | | |
| 415 | 52401 | Mr. McCaul, R-TX | ✓ | | | | |
| 2304 | 54231 | Mr. Gordon, D-TN | | | ✓ | | |
| 2269 | 55661 | Mr. Costello, D-IL | | | ✓ | | |
| 1511 | 58885 | Ms. Johnson, D-TX | | | ✓ | | |
| 2263 | 55161 | Ms. Woolsey, D-CA | | | ✓ | | |
| 2430 | 55711 | Ms. Hooley, D-OR | | | ✓ | | |
| 240 | 52161 | Mr. Udall, D-CO | | | ✓ | | |
| 1023 | 50855 | Mr. Wu, D-OR | | | ✓ | | |
| 1713 | 52631 | Mr. Honda, D-CA | | | ✓ | | |
| 1722 | 53032 | Mr. Miller, D-NC | | | ✓ | | |
| 410 | 56831 | Mr. Davis, D-TN | | | ✓ | | |
| 1217 | 55701 | Mr. Lipinski, D-IL | | | ✓ | | |
| 2435 | 53816 | Ms. Jackson Lee, D-TX | | | ✓ | | |
| 1030 | 55911 | Mr. Sherman, D-CA | | | ✓ | | |
| 1421 | 53536 | Mr. Baird, D-WA | | | ✓ | | |
| 1222 | 53011 | Mr. Matheson, D-UT | | | ✓ | | |
| 1004 | 53341 | Mr. Costa, D-CA | | | ✓ | | |
| 1529 | 57508 | Mr. Green, D-TX | | | ✓ | | |
| 404 | 54031 | Mr. Melancon, D-LA | | | ✓ | | |
| 1727 | 52865 | Mr. Moore, D-KS | | | ✓ | | |
| TOTAL | | | ✓ | ✓ | | | |

Attest:

David A. Mayorga

(Clerk)

Chairman BOEHLERT. The motion is now reported, 17 to 17. Counsel, what happens? It stays in committee. We have to have another mark-up. All right. We got to go vote. The vote has already been announced. Thank you. We are going to adjourn pending call of the Chair.

[Whereupon, at 11:45 a.m., the Committee was adjourned.]

Appendix:

H. RES. 717, BRIEF TIMELINE OF THE REPORT AND INFORMATIONAL REQUESTS

109TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. RES. 717

Directing the Secretary of Commerce to transmit to the House of Representatives a copy of a workforce globalization final draft report produced by the Technology Administration.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 9, 2006

Mr. GORDON (for himself, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WU, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. COSTA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. CARNAHAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Science

RESOLUTION

Directing the Secretary of Commerce to transmit to the House of Representatives a copy of a workforce globalization final draft report produced by the Technology Administration.

- 1 *Resolved*, That the Secretary of Commerce is directed
- 2 to transmit to the House of Representatives, not later
- 3 than 14 days after the date of the adoption of this resolu-
- 4 tion, a copy of the final draft report, produced by the pro-
- 5 fessional staff of the Technology Administration, entitled:

- 1 “Six-Month Assessment of Workforce Globalization In
- 2 Certain Knowledge-Based Industries”.

BRIEF TIMELINE OF THE REPORT AND INFORMATIONAL REQUESTS

- January, 2004: The FY 2004 Consolidated Appropriations report directed the Technology Administration (TA) to undertake a study on “the extent and implications of workforce globalization in knowledge-based industries such as life sciences, information technology, semi-conductors and financial services.” The report was due by June 23, 2004. \$335,000 was earmarked for this study.
- No less than five analysts at TA immediately began work on the report in January 2004, ultimately producing a draft of almost 200 pages in length. Just before submitting their drafts to TA management, the analysts were ordered to remove all citations and sourcing in their analytical report. However, neither the report nor a summary is ever released by Commerce.
- May, 2005: Democratic Staff of the Science Committee ask the Commerce Dept. for the status of the off-shoring report and a briefing. Commerce Legislative Affairs never responded to the request (nor to subsequent requests during the summer).
- August 3, 2005: Reps. Gordon, Costello and Wu sent a letter to Secretary Gutierrez asking him to release the report—now more than a year overdue—and also asking questions regarding why the report was so late. The Secretary did not respond.
- September 15, 2005: A report summary, 12 pages in length, was released by Commerce in response to pressure from the Committee letter and from a Freedom of Information Act request filed by “Manufacturing News.” The summary was 15 months late. Staff learned that it was actually composed during August of 2005 and “back-dated” to comply with the Appropriation’s direction.
- October 11, 2005: Reps. Gordon, Costello and Wu sent a letter to Secretary Gutierrez once again requesting a copy of the original draft report produced by TA analysts. No response.
- December 23, 2005: Dan Caprio, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Technology Policy denied Democratic Members’ request for the original draft report. His reply thanked them for their “FOIA request.”
- January 26, 2006: Rep. Gordon asked Chairman Boehlert to sign a document request to the Commerce Department requesting a copy of the draft report and other materials. Chairman Boehlert declined.
- February 8, 2006: Reps. Gordon and Wu wrote to Subcommittee Chairman Ehlers asking that he sign a request for the final draft report. Chairman Ehlers declined through his staff.
- March 9, 2006: Rep. Gordon introduced a Resolution of Inquiry (H. Res. 717) directing the Secretary of Commerce to deliver a copy of the final draft TA report to Congress. The Resolution was referred to the House Science Committee which has 14 legislative days to act.

XVI. PROCEEDINGS OF THE FULL COMMITTEE MARKUP ON
H. RES. 717, DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE
TO TRANSMIT TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES A
COPY OF A WORKFORCE GLOBALIZATION FINAL DRAFT
REPORT PRODUCED BY THE TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATION

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 5, 2006

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE,
Washington, DC.

The Committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:05 a.m., in Room 2318 of the Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Sherwood L. Boehlert [Chairman of the Committee] presiding.

Chairman BOEHLERT. The Committee on Science will now come to order.

Pursuant to notice, the Committee on Science meets to conclude unfinished business with respect to the following measure: H. Resolution 717, *Directing the Secretary of Commerce to transmit to the House of Representatives a copy of a workforce globalization final draft report produced by the Technology Administration*. I ask unanimous consent for the authority to recess the Committee at any point during consideration of these matters, and without objection, that is so ordered.

We will now begin with the opening statements, and I will go first, since I am sitting here.

I want to welcome everyone here for our second markup on the Democrat Resolution of Inquiry concerning the Department of Commerce outsourcing report. Last week, while we were discussing how hard it is to count the number of the jobs leaving and entering the country, we ended up demonstrating how hard it is for us to count the number of Members leaving and entering the room. Consequently, the result was a tie vote that left the Resolution in limbo, voted down, but not reported out.

So today, the matter before us is simply a motion to report out the Resolution. This time, for procedural reasons, the motion is to report out the Resolution without recommendation, rather than adversely. If the motion succeeds, the effect will be the same as last week's motion would have been: the House will take no further action on this Resolution.

I think we had a very full and open debate last week, and it was constructive and instructive. So I will just summarize our arguments today in a few sentences. There is nothing at stake in the matter of this report. No one has argued that it contains any unique insight or revelation. It has been superseded by a much

more thorough effort by the National Academy of Public Administration, requested by the same folks who asked for the Commerce report. And no one directly involved with the management of the Commerce report still works for the Department. So I continue to believe the whole debate is really much ado about nothing.

There is one point I would like to clarify from last week. Some people misinterpreted my comments, perhaps they were inartfully expressed, to mean that NAPA had received the documents from the Department of Commerce. This is obviously not the case; giving NAPA the documents would have made them public, which would have made the Resolution moot.

What I was saying, and what I continue to say, perhaps with a little more precision this time, is that all of the essential information related to the report was conveyed to NAPA. NAPA interviewed the analysts several times, and NAPA was given the list of all the sources that they had used. As far as we know, there is no idea or information that was in the report, and that is what I mean by "data" last week—meant by "data" last week, that was not conveyed to NAPA, and we have had them reaffirm that. So to repeat myself, the fact that the report itself has not been released is of no consequence.

Now I know none of this will convince my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They want the report, period, and no amount of argument is going to make that desire go away, and quite frankly, I can understand that.

And since last week, they have made a new offer to get the report, one designed to deal with my concerns that this report request is just the beginning of an endless "fishing expedition" that will lead to needless legal battles that could weaken the hand of future Congresses.

The offer is basically that if I agree to request the report, then they will agree not to request any further materials related to the report in this Congress, the "fishing expedition" that I fear. I think that is a good faith offer, quite honestly, and I feel it entices—it is enticing, because my hope is that actually reading the report will put this whole matter to bed.

Again, no one has suggested that there is anything explosive or even particularly revealing in it. My hope would be that the release of the report would lead to less politicking, not more. And then we could go back to having a genuine debate about what to do about outsourcing, a phenomenon we all want to address.

There are important details of that offer that need to be worked out, and Mr. Gordon and I, just prior to the onset of this hearing, were continuing our constructive dialogue. We want to get this offer, and we have got to work out some details before we can reach any agreement. And there is no need for the time—there is no time for that to—just right here and now. To take just one example, we have to be sure that we have a clear, unambiguous description of what is being requested, and we don't have that yet, but we are close. The staffs are trying to work out these matters and will report back to us. And Mr. Gordon and I, as always, have good dialogue back and forth. It is not contentious. It is not confrontational. It is constructive. I hope we can reach an accommodation. Nothing would make me happier than for this committee to be able to con-

tinue to spend its time in its usual more productive, more bipartisan ways.

So let us dispense with this motion quickly today. That is my hope.

Mr. Gordon.

[The prepared statement of Chairman Boehlert follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN SHERWOOD L. BOEHLERT

I want to welcome everyone here for our second markup on the Democrat Resolution of Inquiry concerning the Department of Commerce outsourcing report. Last week, while we were discussing how hard it is to count the number of jobs leaving and entering the country, we ended up demonstrating how hard it is to count the number of Members leaving and entering the room. And the result was a tie vote that left the Resolution in limbo—voted down, but not reported out.

So today, the matter before us is simply a motion to report out the Resolution. This time, for procedural reasons, the motion is to report out the Resolution without recommendation (rather than adversely). If the motion succeeds, the effect will be the same as last week's motion would have had—the House will take no further action on this Resolution.

I think we had a very full and open debate last week, so I will just summarize our arguments today in a few sentences: There is nothing at stake in the matter of this report. No one has argued that it contains any unique insight or revelation. It has been superseded by a much more thorough effort by the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA), requested by the same folks who asked for the Commerce report. And no one directly involved with the management of the Commerce report still works for the Department. So I continue to believe this whole debate is much ado about nothing.

There is one point I would like to clarify from last week. Some people misinterpreted my comments to mean that NAPA had received documents from the Department of Commerce. This is obviously not the case; giving NAPA the documents would make them public, which would have made the Resolution moot.

What I was saying, and what I continue to say—perhaps more artfully now—is that all the essential information related to the report was conveyed to NAPA. NAPA interviewed the analysts several times, and NAPA was given the list of all the sources they had used. As far as we know, there is no idea or information that was in the report—that's what I meant by "data" last week—that was not conveyed to NAPA. So, to repeat myself, the fact that the report itself has not been released is of no consequence.

Now I know none of this will convince my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They want the report, period, and no amount of argument is going to make that desire go away.

And since last week, they have made a new offer to get the report, one designed to deal with my concerns that this report request is just the beginning of an interminable "fishing expedition" that will lead to needless legal battles that could weaken the hand of future Congresses.

The offer is basically that if I agree to request the report, then they will agree not to request any further materials related to the report this Congress. I think that's a good faith offer, and I find it enticing because my hope is that actually reading the report will put this whole matter to bed.

Again, no one has suggested that there's anything explosive or even particularly revealing in it. My hope would be that the release of the report would lead to less politicking not more. And then we could go back to having a genuine debate about what to do about outsourcing, a phenomenon we all want to address.

There are important details of that offer that need to be worked out before we can reach any agreement, and there was no time to do that before today. To take just one example, we have to be sure that we have a clear, unambiguous description of what's being requested, and we don't have that yet. The staffs are trying to work out these matters and will report back to us. I hope we can reach an accommodation. Nothing would make me happier than for the Committee to be able to spend its time in its usual more productive, more bipartisan ways.

So let's dispense quickly with this motion today.

Mr. Gordon.

Mr. GORDON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And let me thank you for accepting our compromise. It was made in the spirit of civility that you mentioned at our last meeting, and I know it was accepted in that same spirit. As you have said, there may be a little bit of fuzziness right now, but there is no fussiness between you and I. We know what we want to try to get accomplished, and we are going to get it done, and I have no, you know, I have no concern about that.

Let me also say that the spirit of our request was made just the way Frank Wolf made the original request. Frank asked the Commerce Department to do a report on outsourcing of high-tech jobs. That is what we—you know, because he was interested, just like we were. My hope is we are going to see a report, probably not as extensive as the gathering above—or the “Rising Above the Gathering Storm,” but it was from that report that we got some bad news, but we also received some good suggestions on what to do about it. Because of that, two-thirds of the United States Senate, Democrats and Republicans alike, have gotten together and introduced legislation that I think is very positive. We have got bipartisan legislation here in the House that also reflected the “Rising Above the Gathering Storm.” And I welcome the Republican Members of this—of the House to join in that bipartisan effort, and I think—at least I hope that when this report comes forward, that we are going to find some things we can work together on and can continue that effort.

So let me be clear and—by saying that when we receive our—you know, the full, 200-page, or approximate 200-page report, with footnotes that we will seek no further production of information. We will have no further Resolution of Inquiry and no freedom of information. I know that the Majority would like to get a letter signed by all of the Members of our committee. And I—you know, on a short notice, we can't do that. I can't speak for, and I shouldn't be able to control our Members, but I have talked with most all of them or their staff. They are all in agreement with this. If some—you know, something—somebody comes from right field or left field, or whatever field it might be, from the House, I will oppose it when it comes here. Again, all we want to do is work together, try to come up with some good legislation that can deal with this problem that we all know we face.

Chairman BOEHLERT. That is a common interest. And just let me say that while we are not just there yet, we haven't agreed to that, we have agreed to further define exactly what we are asking for, and that will get us where we both want to be.

Mr. GORDON. Yeah, I have no doubt we will do that. I guess my only concern is—and when I am—we deal with good faith, we don't want to be “rope a doped” by the Department of Commerce, and if that ultimately happens, I hope that you will join in a subpoena to get this done.

Chairman BOEHLERT. I don't want to be “rope a doped” by anyone.

All right.

The unfinished business is H. Res. 717, *Directing the Secretary of Commerce to transmit to the House of Representatives a copy of a workforce globalization final draft report produced by the Technology Administration.*

I recognize Dr. Ehlers for a motion.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee report H. Res. 717 to the House without recommendation.

Chairman BOEHLERT. The question is on——

Mr. EHLERS. Furthermore, I move that staff be instructed to prepare the legislative report and make necessary technical and conforming changes.

Chairman BOEHLERT. The question is on the motion to report the Resolution without recommendation. Those in favor of the motion will signify by saying aye. Opposed, no. The ayes have it. The Resolution is reported without recommendation.

Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid upon the table. I move that Members have two subsequent calendar days in which to submit supplemental, minority, or additional views on the measure. Without objection, so ordered.

I want to thank my colleagues for coming to this meeting, and as we promised, truth in advertising, it has been brief and non-contentious. We are continuing to work together.

Thank you. This hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 10:20 a.m., the Committee was adjourned.]

Appendix:

H. RES. 717

109TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. RES. 717

Directing the Secretary of Commerce to transmit to the House of Representatives a copy of a workforce globalization final draft report produced by the Technology Administration.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 9, 2006

Mr. GORDON (for himself, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WU, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. COSTA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. CARNAHAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Science

RESOLUTION

Directing the Secretary of Commerce to transmit to the House of Representatives a copy of a workforce globalization final draft report produced by the Technology Administration.

- 1 *Resolved*, That the Secretary of Commerce is directed
- 2 to transmit to the House of Representatives, not later
- 3 than 14 days after the date of the adoption of this resolu-
- 4 tion, a copy of the final draft report, produced by the pro-
- 5 fessional staff of the Technology Administration, entitled:

- 1 “Six-Month Assessment of Workforce Globalization In
- 2 Certain Knowledge-Based Industries”.

○