

with, that the Senate should have absolutely no opposition to or excuse why they will not take up.

With that, I again ask my colleagues to pass this particular bill, H.R. 5461, and look forward to its passage here soon.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2115

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5461.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 124, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2015

Mr. COLE (during consideration of H.R. 5461), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-600) on the resolution (H. Res. 722) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 124) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REVITALIZE AMERICAN MANUFACTURING AND INNOVATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2996) to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish the Network for Manufacturing Innovation and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2996

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) In 2012, manufacturers contributed \$2.03 trillion to the economy, or 1/3 of United States Gross Domestic Product.

(2) For every \$1.00 spent in manufacturing, another \$1.32 is added to the economy, the highest multiplier effect of any economic sector.

(3) Manufacturing supports an estimated 17,400,000 jobs in the United States—about 1 in 6 private-sector jobs. More than 12,000,000 Americans (or 9 percent of the workforce) are employed directly in manufacturing.

(4) In 2012, the average manufacturing worker in the United States earned \$77,505

annually, including pay and benefits. The average worker in all industries earned \$62,063.

(5) Taken alone, manufacturing in the United States would be the 8th largest economy in the world.

(6) Manufacturers in the United States perform two-thirds of all private-sector research and development in the United States, driving more innovation than any other sector.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.

The National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 271 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 34 as section 35; and

(2) by inserting after section 33 (15 U.S.C. 278r) the following:

“SEC. 34. NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish within the Institute a program to be known as the ‘Network for Manufacturing Innovation Program’ (referred to in this section as the ‘Program’).

“(2) PURPOSES OF PROGRAM.—The purposes of the Program are—

“(A) to improve the competitiveness of United States manufacturing and to increase the production of goods manufactured predominantly within the United States;

“(B) to stimulate United States leadership in advanced manufacturing research, innovation, and technology;

“(C) to facilitate the transition of innovative technologies into scalable, cost-effective, and high-performing manufacturing capabilities;

“(D) to facilitate access by manufacturing enterprises to capital-intensive infrastructure, including high-performance electronics and computing, and the supply chains that enable these technologies;

“(E) to accelerate the development of an advanced manufacturing workforce;

“(F) to facilitate peer exchange of and the documentation of best practices in addressing advanced manufacturing challenges;

“(G) to leverage non-Federal sources of support to promote a stable and sustainable business model without the need for long-term Federal funding; and

“(H) to create and preserve jobs.

“(3) SUPPORT.—The Secretary, acting through the Director, shall carry out the purposes set forth in paragraph (2) by supporting—

“(A) the Network for Manufacturing Innovation established under subsection (b); and

“(B) the establishment of centers for manufacturing innovation.

“(4) DIRECTOR.—The Secretary shall carry out the Program through the Director.

“(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—As part of the Program, the Secretary shall establish a network of centers for manufacturing innovation.

“(2) DESIGNATION.—The network established under paragraph (1) shall be known as the ‘Network for Manufacturing Innovation’ (referred to in this section as the ‘Network’).

“(c) CENTERS FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, a ‘center for manufacturing innovation’ is a center that—

“(A) has been established by a person or group of persons to address challenges in advanced manufacturing and to assist manufacturers in retaining or expanding industrial production and jobs in the United States;

“(B) has a predominant focus on a manufacturing process, novel material, enabling

technology, supply chain integration methodology, or another relevant aspect of advanced manufacturing, such as nanotechnology applications, advanced ceramics, photonics and optics, composites, biobased and advanced materials, flexible hybrid technologies, and tool development for microelectronics;

“(C) as determined by the Secretary, has the potential—

“(i) to improve the competitiveness of United States manufacturing, including key advanced manufacturing technologies such as nanotechnology, advanced ceramics, photonics and optics, composites, biobased and advanced materials, flexible hybrid technologies, and tool development for microelectronics;

“(ii) to accelerate non-Federal investment in advanced manufacturing production capacity in the United States; or

“(iii) to enable the commercial application of new technologies or industry-wide manufacturing processes; and

“(D) includes active participation among representatives from multiple industrial entities, research universities, community colleges, and such other entities as the Secretary considers appropriate, which may include industry-led consortia, career and technical education schools, Federal laboratories, State, local, and tribal governments, businesses, educational institutions, and nonprofit organizations.

“(2) ACTIVITIES.—Activities of a center for manufacturing innovation may include the following:

“(A) Research, development, and demonstration projects, including proof-of-concept development and prototyping, to reduce the cost, time, and risk of commercializing new technologies and improvements in existing technologies, processes, products, and research and development of materials to solve precompetitive industrial problems with economic or national security implications.

“(B) Development and implementation of education, training, and workforce recruitment courses, materials, and programs.

“(C) Development of innovative methodologies and practices for supply chain integration and introduction of new technologies into supply chains.

“(D) Outreach and engagement with small and medium-sized manufacturing enterprises, including women and minority owned manufacturing enterprises, in addition to large manufacturing enterprises.

“(E) Such other activities as the Secretary, in consultation with Federal departments and agencies whose missions contribute to or are affected by advanced manufacturing, considers consistent with the purposes described in subsection (a)(2).

“(3) ADDITIONAL CENTERS FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The National Additive Manufacturing Innovation Institute and other manufacturing centers formally recognized as manufacturing innovation centers pursuant to Federal law or executive actions, or under pending interagency review for such recognition as of the date of enactment of the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014, shall be considered centers for manufacturing innovation, but such centers shall not receive any financial assistance under subsection (d).

“(B) NETWORK PARTICIPATION.—A manufacturing center that is substantially similar to those established under this subsection but that does not receive financial assistance under subsection (d) may, upon request of the center, be recognized as a center for manufacturing innovation by the Secretary for purposes of participation in the Network.

“(d) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO ESTABLISH AND SUPPORT CENTERS FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the Program, the Secretary shall award financial assistance to a person or group of persons to assist the organization in planning, establishing, or supporting a center for manufacturing innovation.

“(2) APPLICATION.—A person or group of persons seeking financial assistance under paragraph (1) shall submit to the Secretary an application therefor at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require. The application shall, at a minimum, describe the specific sources and amounts of non-Federal financial support for the center on the date financial assistance is sought, as well as the anticipated sources and amounts of non-Federal financial support during the period for which the center could be eligible for continued Federal financial assistance under this section.

“(3) OPEN PROCESS.—In soliciting applications for financial assistance under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall ensure an open process that will allow for the consideration of all applications relevant to advanced manufacturing regardless of technology area.

“(4) SELECTION.—

“(A) COMPETITIVE, MERIT REVIEW.—In awarding financial assistance under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall use a competitive, merit review process that includes peer review by a diverse group of individuals with relevant expertise from both the private and public sectors.

“(B) PARTICIPATION IN PROCESS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—No political appointee may participate on a peer review panel. The Secretary shall implement a conflict of interest policy that ensures public transparency and accountability, and requires full disclosure of any real or potential conflicts of interest on the parts of individuals that participate in the merit selection process.

“(ii) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘political appointee’ means any individual who—

“(I) is employed in a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code, (relating to the Executive Schedule);

“(II) is a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code; or

“(III) is employed in a position in the executive branch of the Government of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of part C of title 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

“(C) PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT, TRANSPARENCY, AND ACCOUNTABILITY.—For each award of financial assistance under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

“(i) make publicly available at the time of the award a description of the bases for the award, including an explanation of the relative merits of the winning applicant as compared to other applications received, if applicable; and

“(ii) develop and implement metrics-based performance measures to assess the effectiveness of the activities funded.

“(D) COLLABORATION.—In awarding financial assistance under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall, acting through the National Program Office established under subsection (f)(1), collaborate with Federal departments and agencies whose missions contribute to or are affected by advanced manufacturing.

“(E) CONSIDERATIONS.—In selecting a person who submitted an application under paragraph (2) for an award of financial as-

sistance under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consider, at a minimum, the following:

“(i) The potential of the center for manufacturing innovation to advance domestic manufacturing and the likelihood of economic impact, including the creation or preservation of jobs, in the predominant focus areas of the center for manufacturing innovation.

“(ii) The commitment of continued financial support, advice, participation, and other contributions from non-Federal sources, to provide leverage and resources to promote a stable and sustainable business model without the need for long-term Federal funding.

“(iii) Whether the financial support provided to the center for manufacturing innovation from non-Federal sources significantly exceeds the requested Federal financial assistance.

“(iv) How the center for manufacturing innovation will increase the non-Federal investment in advanced manufacturing research in the United States.

“(v) How the center for manufacturing innovation will engage with small and medium-sized manufacturing enterprises, to improve the capacity of such enterprises to commercialize new processes and technologies.

“(vi) How the center for manufacturing innovation will carry out educational and workforce activities that meet industrial needs related to the predominant focus areas of the center.

“(vii) How the center for manufacturing innovation will advance economic competitiveness and generate substantial benefits to the Nation that extend beyond the direct return to participants in the Program.

“(viii) Whether the predominant focus of the center for manufacturing innovation is a manufacturing process, novel material, enabling technology, supply chain integration methodology, or other relevant aspect of advanced manufacturing that has not already been commercialized, marketed, distributed, or sold by another entity.

“(ix) How the center for manufacturing innovation will strengthen and leverage the assets of a region.

“(x) How the center for manufacturing will encourage the education and training of veterans and individuals with disabilities.

“(5) LIMITATIONS ON AWARDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—No award of financial assistance may be made under paragraph (1) to a center of manufacturing innovation after the 7-year period beginning on the date on which the Secretary first awards financial assistance to that center under that paragraph.

“(B) MATCHING FUNDS AND PREFERENCES.—The total Federal financial assistance awarded to a center of manufacturing innovation, including the financial assistance under paragraph (1), in a given year shall not exceed 50 percent of the total funding of the center in that year, except that the Secretary may make an exception in the case of large capital facilities or equipment purchases. The Secretary shall give weighted preference to applicants seeking less than the maximum Federal share of funds allowed under this paragraph.

“(C) FUNDING DECREASE.—The amount of financial assistance provided to a center of manufacturing innovation under paragraph (1) shall decrease after the second year of funding for the center, and shall continue to decrease thereafter in each year in which financial assistance is provided, unless the Secretary determines that—

“(i) the center is otherwise meeting its stated goals and metrics under this section;

“(ii) unforeseen circumstances have altered the center’s anticipated funding; and

“(iii) the center can identify future non-Federal funding sources that would warrant a temporary exemption from the limitations established in this subparagraph.

“(e) FUNDING.—

“(1) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no funds are authorized to be appropriated by the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014 for carrying out this section.

“(2) AUTHORITY.—

“(A) NIST INDUSTRIAL TECHNICAL SERVICES ACCOUNT.—To the extent provided for in advance by appropriations Acts, the Secretary may use not to exceed \$5,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2015 through 2024 to carry out this section from amounts appropriated to the Institute for Industrial Technical Services.

“(B) ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY ACCOUNT.—To the extent provided for in advance by appropriations Acts, the Secretary of Energy may transfer to the Institute not to exceed \$250,000,000 for the period encompassing fiscal years 2015 through 2024 for the Secretary to carry out this section from amounts appropriated for advanced manufacturing research and development within the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy account for the Department of Energy.

“(f) NATIONAL PROGRAM OFFICE.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish, within the Institute, the National Office of the Network for Manufacturing Innovation Program (referred to in this section as the ‘National Program Office’), which shall oversee and carry out the Program.

“(2) FUNCTIONS.—The functions of the National Program Office are—

“(A) to oversee the planning, management, and coordination of the Program;

“(B) to enter into memorandums of understanding with Federal departments and agencies whose missions contribute to or are affected by advanced manufacturing, to carry out the purposes described in subsection (a)(2);

“(C) to develop, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014, and update not less frequently than once every 3 years thereafter, a strategic plan to guide the Program;

“(D) to establish such procedures, processes, and criteria as may be necessary and appropriate to maximize cooperation and coordinate the activities of the Program with programs and activities of other Federal departments and agencies whose missions contribute to or are affected by advanced manufacturing;

“(E) to establish a clearinghouse of public information related to the activities of the Program; and

“(F) to act as a convener of the Network.

“(3) RECOMMENDATIONS.—In developing and updating the strategic plan under paragraph (2)(C), the Secretary shall solicit recommendations and advice from a wide range of stakeholders, including industry, small and medium-sized manufacturing enterprises, research universities, community colleges, and other relevant organizations and institutions on an ongoing basis.

“(4) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Upon completion, the Secretary shall transmit the strategic plan required under paragraph (2)(C) to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives.

“(5) HOLLINGS MANUFACTURING EXTENSION PARTNERSHIP.—The Secretary shall ensure that the National Program Office incorporates the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership into Program planning to

ensure that the results of the Program reach small and medium-sized entities.

“(6) **DETAILS.**—Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the National Program Office without reimbursement. Such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

“(g) **REPORTING AND AUDITING.**—

“(1) **ANNUAL REPORTS TO THE SECRETARY.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall require each recipient of financial assistance under subsection (d)(1) to annually submit a report to the Secretary that describes the finances and performance of the center for manufacturing innovation for which such assistance was awarded.

“(B) **ELEMENTS.**—Each report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include—

“(i) an accounting of expenditures of amounts awarded to the recipient under subsection (d)(1); and

“(ii) consistent with the metrics-based performance measures developed and implemented by the Secretary under this section, a description of the performance of the center for manufacturing innovation with respect to—

“(I) its goals, plans, financial support, and accomplishments; and

“(II) how the center for manufacturing innovation has furthered the purposes described in subsection (a)(2).

“(2) **ANNUAL REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not less frequently than once each year until December 31, 2024, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress that describes the performance of the Program during the most recent 1-year period.

“(B) **ELEMENTS.**—Each report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include, for the period covered by the report—

“(i) a summary and assessment of the reports received by the Secretary under paragraph (1);

“(ii) an accounting of the funds expended by the Secretary under the Program, including any temporary exemptions granted from the requirements of subsection (d)(5)(C);

“(iii) an assessment of the participation in, and contributions to, the Network by any centers for manufacturing innovation not receiving financial assistance under subsection (d)(1); and

“(iv) an assessment of the Program with respect to meeting the purposes described in subsection (a)(2).

“(3) **ASSESSMENTS BY GAO.**—

“(A) **ASSESSMENTS.**—Not less frequently than once every 2 years, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress an assessment of the operation of the Program during the most recent 2-year period.

“(B) **FINAL ASSESSMENT.**—Not later than December 31, 2024, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a final report regarding the overall success of the Program.

“(C) **ELEMENTS.**—Each assessment submitted under subparagraph (A) or (B) shall include, for the period covered by the report—

“(i) a review of the management, coordination, and industry utility of the Program;

“(ii) an assessment of the extent to which the Program has furthered the purposes described in subsection (a)(2);

“(iii) such recommendations for legislative and administrative action as the Comptroller General considers appropriate to improve the Program; and

“(iv) an assessment as to whether any prior recommendations for improvement made by the Comptroller General have been implemented or adopted.

“(h) **ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES.**—

“(1) **APPOINTMENT OF PERSONNEL AND CONTRACTS.**—The Secretary may appoint such personnel and enter into such contracts, financial assistance agreements, and other

agreements as the Secretary considers necessary or appropriate to carry out the Program, including support for research and development activities involving a center for manufacturing innovation.

“(2) **TRANSFER OF FUNDS.**—Of amounts available under the authority provided by subsection (e), the Secretary may transfer to other Federal agencies such sums as the Secretary considers necessary or appropriate to carry out the Program. No funds so transferred may be used to reimburse or otherwise pay for the costs of financial assistance incurred or commitments of financial assistance made prior to the date of enactment of the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014.

“(3) **AUTHORITY OF OTHER AGENCIES.**—In the event that the Secretary exercises the authority to transfer funds to another agency under paragraph (2), such agency may accept such funds to award and administer, under the same conditions and constraints applicable to the Secretary, all aspects of financial assistance awards under this section.

“(4) **USE OF RESOURCES.**—In furtherance of the purposes of the Program, the Secretary may use, with the consent of a covered entity and with or without reimbursement, the land, services, equipment, personnel, and facilities of such covered entity.

“(5) **ACCEPTANCE OF RESOURCES.**—In addition to amounts appropriated to carry out the Program, the Secretary may accept funds, services, equipment, personnel, and facilities from any covered entity to carry out the Program, subject to the same conditions and constraints otherwise applicable to the Secretary under this section and such funds may only be obligated to the extent provided for in advance by appropriations Acts.

“(6) **COVERED ENTITY.**—For purposes of this subsection, a covered entity is any Federal department, Federal agency, instrumentality of the United States, State, local government, tribal government, territory, or possession of the United States, or of any political subdivision thereof, or international organization, or any public or private entity or individual.

“(i) **PATENTS.**—Chapter 18 of title 35, United States Code, shall apply to any funding agreement (as defined in section 201 of that title) awarded to new or existing centers for manufacturing innovation.”.

SEC. 4. NATIONAL STRATEGIC PLAN FOR ADVANCED MANUFACTURING.

Section 102 of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 6622) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following: “In furtherance of the Committee’s work, the Committee shall consult with the National Economic Council.”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following:

“(7) develop and update a national strategic plan for advanced manufacturing in accordance with subsection (c).”; and

(3) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

“(c) **NATIONAL STRATEGIC PLAN FOR ADVANCED MANUFACTURING.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall submit to Congress, and publish on an Internet website that is accessible to the public, the strategic plan developed under paragraph (2).

“(2) **DEVELOPMENT.**—The Committee shall develop, and update as required under paragraph (4), in coordination with the National Economic Council, a strategic plan to improve Government coordination and provide long-term guidance for Federal programs and activities in support of United States manufacturing competitiveness, including advanced manufacturing research and development.

“(3) **CONTENTS.**—The strategic plan described in paragraph (2) shall—

“(A) specify and prioritize near-term and long-term objectives, including research and development objectives, the anticipated time frame for achieving the objectives, and the metrics for use in assessing progress toward the objectives;

“(B) describe the progress made in achieving the objectives from prior strategic plans, including a discussion of why specific objectives were not met;

“(C) specify the role, including the programs and activities, of each relevant Federal agency in meeting the objectives of the strategic plan;

“(D) describe how the Federal agencies and Federally funded research and development centers supporting advanced manufacturing research and development will foster the transfer of research and development results into new manufacturing technologies and United States-based manufacturing of new products and processes for the benefit of society to ensure national, energy, and economic security;

“(E) describe how such Federal agencies and centers will strengthen all levels of manufacturing education and training programs to ensure an adequate, well-trained workforce;

“(F) describe how such Federal agencies and centers will assist small and medium-sized manufacturers in developing and implementing new products and processes;

“(G) analyze factors that impact innovation and competitiveness for United States advanced manufacturing, including—

“(i) technology transfer and commercialization activities;

“(ii) the adequacy of the national security industrial base;

“(iii) the capabilities of the domestic manufacturing workforce;

“(iv) export opportunities and trade policies;

“(v) financing, investment, and taxation policies and practices;

“(vi) emerging technologies and markets;

“(vii) advanced manufacturing research and development undertaken by competing nations; and

“(viii) the capabilities of the manufacturing workforce of competing nations; and

“(H) elicit and consider the recommendations of a wide range of stakeholders, including representatives from diverse manufacturing companies, academia, and other relevant organizations and institutions.

“(4) **UPDATES.**—Not later than May 1, 2018, and not less frequently than once every 4 years thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress, and publish on an Internet website that is accessible to the public, an update of the strategic plan submitted under paragraph (1). Such updates shall be developed in accordance with the procedures set forth under this subsection.

“(5) **REQUIREMENT TO CONSIDER STRATEGY IN THE BUDGET.**—In preparing the budget for a fiscal year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the President shall include information regarding the consistency of the budget with the goals and recommendations included in the strategic plan developed under this subsection applying to that fiscal year.

“(6) **AMP STEERING COMMITTEE INPUT.**—The Advanced Manufacturing Partnership Steering Committee of the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology shall provide input, perspective, and recommendations to assist in the development and updates of the strategic plan under this subsection.”.

SEC. 5. REGIONAL INNOVATION PROGRAM.

Section 27 of the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3722) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 27. REGIONAL INNOVATION PROGRAM.

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary shall establish a regional innovation program to encourage and support the development of regional innovation strategies, including regional innovation clusters.

“(b) **CLUSTER GRANTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—As part of the program established under subsection (a), the Secretary may award grants on a competitive basis to eligible recipients for activities relating to the formation and development of regional innovation clusters.

“(2) **PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES.**—Grants awarded under this subsection may be used for activities determined appropriate by the Secretary, including the following:

“(A) Feasibility studies.

“(B) Planning activities.

“(C) Technical assistance.

“(D) Developing or strengthening communication and collaboration between and among participants of a regional innovation cluster.

“(E) Attracting additional participants to a regional innovation cluster.

“(F) Facilitating market development of products and services developed by a regional innovation cluster, including through demonstration, deployment, technology transfer, and commercialization activities.

“(G) Developing relationships between a regional innovation cluster and entities or clusters in other regions.

“(H) Interacting with the public and State and local governments to meet the goals of the cluster.

“(3) **ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term ‘eligible recipient’ means—

“(A) a State;

“(B) an Indian tribe;

“(C) a city or other political subdivision of a State;

“(D) an entity that—

“(i) is a nonprofit organization, an institution of higher education, a public-private partnership, a science or research park, a Federal laboratory, or an economic development organization or similar entity; and

“(ii) has an application that is supported by a State or a political subdivision of a State; or

“(E) a consortium of any of the entities described in subparagraphs (A) through (D).

“(4) **APPLICATION.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—An eligible recipient shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require.

“(B) **COMPONENTS.**—The application shall include, at a minimum, a description of the regional innovation cluster supported by the proposed activity, including a description of—

“(i) whether the regional innovation cluster is supported by the private sector, State and local governments, and other relevant stakeholders;

“(ii) how the existing participants in the regional innovation cluster will encourage and solicit participation by all types of entities that might benefit from participation, including newly formed entities and those rival existing participants;

“(iii) the extent to which the regional innovation cluster is likely to stimulate innovation and have a positive impact on regional economic growth and development;

“(iv) whether the participants in the regional innovation cluster have access to, or contribute to, a well-trained workforce;

“(v) whether the participants in the regional innovation cluster are capable of attracting additional funds from non-Federal sources; and

“(vi) the likelihood that the participants in the regional innovation cluster will be able to sustain activities once grant funds under this subsection have been expended.

“(C) **SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.**—The Secretary shall give special consideration to applications from regions that contain communities negatively impacted by trade.

“(5) **SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.**—The Secretary shall give special consideration to an eligible recipient who agrees to collaborate with local workforce investment area boards.

“(6) **COST SHARE.**—The Secretary may not provide more than 50 percent of the total cost of any activity funded under this subsection.

“(7) **OUTREACH TO RURAL COMMUNITIES.**—The Secretary shall conduct outreach to public and private sector entities in rural communities to encourage those entities to participate in regional innovation cluster activities under this subsection.

“(8) **FUNDING.**—The Secretary may accept funds from other Federal agencies to support grants and activities under this subsection.

“(c) **REGIONAL INNOVATION RESEARCH AND INFORMATION PROGRAM.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—As part of the program established under subsection (a), the Secretary shall establish a regional innovation research and information program—

“(A) to gather, analyze, and disseminate information on best practices for regional innovation strategies (including regional innovation clusters), including information relating to how innovation, productivity, and economic development can be maximized through such strategies;

“(B) to provide technical assistance, including through the development of technical assistance guides, for the development and implementation of regional innovation strategies (including regional innovation clusters);

“(C) to support the development of relevant metrics and measurement standards to evaluate regional innovation strategies (including regional innovation clusters), including the extent to which such strategies stimulate innovation, productivity, and economic development; and

“(D) to collect and make available data on regional innovation cluster activity in the United States, including data on—

“(i) the size, specialization, and competitiveness of regional innovation clusters;

“(ii) the regional domestic product contribution, total jobs and earnings by key occupations, establishment size, nature of specialization, patents, Federal research and development spending, and other relevant information for regional innovation clusters; and

“(iii) supply chain product and service flows within and between regional innovation clusters.

“(2) **RESEARCH GRANTS.**—The Secretary may award research grants on a competitive basis to support and further the goals of the program established under this subsection.

“(3) **DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.**—Data and analysis compiled by the Secretary under the program established in this subsection shall be made available to other Federal agencies, State and local governments, and nonprofit and for-profit entities.

“(4) **REGIONAL INNOVATION GRANT PROGRAM.**—The Secretary shall incorporate data and analysis relating to any grant under subsection (b) into the program established under this subsection.

“(d) **INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure that

the activities carried out under this section are coordinated with, and do not duplicate the efforts of, other programs at the Department of Commerce or other Federal agencies.

“(2) **COLLABORATION.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall explore and pursue collaboration with other Federal agencies, including through multi-agency funding opportunities, on regional innovation strategies.

“(B) **SMALL BUSINESSES.**—The Secretary shall ensure that such collaboration with Federal agencies prioritizes the needs and challenges of small businesses.

“(e) **EVALUATION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014, the Secretary shall enter into a contract with an independent entity, such as the National Academy of Sciences, to conduct an evaluation of the program established under subsection (a).

“(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The evaluation shall include—

“(A) whether the program is achieving its goals;

“(B) any recommendations for how the program may be improved; and

“(C) a recommendation as to whether the program should be continued or terminated.

“(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **REGIONAL INNOVATION CLUSTER.**—The term ‘regional innovation cluster’ means a geographically bounded network of similar, synergistic, or complementary entities that—

“(A) are engaged in or with a particular industry sector and its related sectors;

“(B) have active channels for business transactions and communication;

“(C) share specialized infrastructure, labor markets, and services; and

“(D) leverage the region’s unique competitive strengths to stimulate innovation and create jobs.

“(2) **STATE.**—The term ‘State’ means one of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, or any other territory or possession of the United States.

“(g) **FUNDING.**—

“(1) **GENERAL RULE.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no funds are authorized to be appropriated by the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014 for carrying out this section.

“(2) **AUTHORITY.**—To the extent provided for in advance by appropriations Acts, the Secretary may use not to exceed \$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2015 through 2019 to carry out this section from amounts appropriated for economic development assistance programs.”

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2996, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 2996, the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014, or RAMI Act, strengthens a critical sector of America's economy: advanced manufacturing.

Thanks to Congressman TOM REED from New York for his diligent work on this legislation and to the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE KENNEDY. I also want to acknowledge the leadership of Science Committee Chairman LAMAR SMITH who worked with Mr. REED and Mr. KENNEDY and members on both sides of the aisle on our committee in order to reach a bipartisan consensus on this legislation.

A strong manufacturing base is fundamental to U.S. economic success and national security.

Manufacturing supports more than 17 million direct and indirect American jobs. This includes 12 million Americans—almost 10 percent of the workforce—who work directly for small, medium, or large manufacturing companies.

For the millions of Americans who are employed in manufacturing fields, what matters most is that the manufacturing creates good-paying, family-supporting, community-sustaining jobs.

Manufacturing is especially important to Indiana, as it makes up just over 28 percent of our gross State product, the highest in the country. Indiana also leads the Nation in manufacturing employment. In Indiana's Eighth Congressional District that I represent, I have seen firsthand the work being done at manufacturers such as Berry Plastics, Toyota Motor, and Alcoa.

The thriving manufacturing industry in the Eighth District is also thanks to universities like Vincennes University, the University of Evansville, and the University of Southern Indiana producing a talented and well-trained workforce through degrees related to advanced manufacturing and working closely with the manufacturing employers in the district. Ivy Tech statewide also supports this effort.

My district is also home to every coal mine in Indiana. Affordable energy from sources such as coal and natural gas are vital components in boosting production for American manufacturers and attracting others from across the globe.

The United States continues to have one of the largest, strongest manufacturing sectors in the world and has demonstrated its ability to adapt and innovate time and time again. But our leading position is not guaranteed. Competing nations have been ramping up their investments in research and development and taking decisive steps to equal and surpass the United States. For instance, the World Bank reports that China already has forged ahead in high technology exports, with about 28 percent of the global market, compared to 18 percent for the United States.

We need to take steps now to emphasize the strengths of American industry and shore up its weaknesses. With a limited government role, we can help our manufacturers to be competitive and ensure that American workers and their families reap the benefits of high-paying advanced manufacturing jobs.

This bill will help our advanced manufacturers to accelerate the pace at which new technology is converted into better manufacturing processes and improved products.

This legislation will help America remain globally competitive in manufacturing. It will ensure that new and innovative projects come equipped with "Made in America" on their labels.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking my colleague and friend, TOM REED, for being a partner as we built momentum and support for this bill from the very beginning.

I would also like to thank the chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, Chairman LAMAR SMITH, and Ranking Member EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON for their leadership as we worked out this bill through our committee.

By many metrics the economic picture in this country continues to improve. Unemployment rates are down, businesses are growing, and innovation is occurring at a breathtaking pace. But there is a flip side to that coin that we cannot ignore: our economic recovery to date has left far too many behind.

In my district, proud industrial cities like Fall River, Taunton, and Attleboro are working tirelessly in the face of stubborn unemployment rates to adapt their workforce, infrastructure, and industry to the realities of a modern, global economy.

Our manufacturing sector is a critical vehicle for bringing industrial cities and working-class communities across the country into the fold of the innovation economy, providing a critical link between our middle class workforce and fast-growing fields like biotech, robotics, or clean energy.

The resurgence in American manufacturing has already reaped enormous economic gains, currently supporting over 17 million jobs with an average annual salary of over \$77,500.

There is a lot more potential on that table, and that is the idea behind RAMI. This bill creates a National Network for Manufacturing Innovation to improve our competitiveness, stimulate R&D, spread the risk of investment to bring new products and ideas to market, educate the next-generation workforce, and facilitate peer-to-peer exchange and best practices.

These public-private centers for manufacturing innovation will leverage limited and targeted government funding matched dollar for dollar with private sector investment and expertise.

Each center will be based on a new technology.

Partnerships will include large and small businesses, universities, community colleges, career and technical schools, Federal labs, and nonprofits.

Centers will leverage the regional assets to overcome communal challenges.

Groups will apply for funding, putting the reins back where they belong: in the hands of industry and researchers facing the next big manufacturing challenge.

Each application will go through an open, transparent peer and merit review process, minimizing conflicts of interest and ensuring the best practices and best proposals move forward.

It is a model that we have already seen proven successful across the country, where institutes are creating jobs and bringing products to market in diverse fields such as 3D printing, clean energy, semiconductors, and digital design.

I urge my colleagues to help propel this growth by supporting the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act.

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time for me to address you this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act that we have authored and submitted for consideration today.

But as we speak about the details and before we speak about the details, I want to take a moment to thank a few people. I would like to thank my good friend from Massachusetts, JOE KENNEDY and I started on this effort many months ago. We went through the process, and we are here tonight after lengthy negotiations, deliberations, and input from many stakeholders from all across America. With his diligent hard work standing with us, I am proud to call him a friend this evening as we consider this legislation for passage.

I would like to thank Chairman SMITH of the Science Committee for standing firm and leading on this issue, as well, as well as the subcommittee chairman, my good friend from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), as well as the ranking members, JOHNSON and LIPINSKI, of the Science Committee and the Appropriations Committee, and Chairman HAL ROGERS.

Mr. Speaker, I am excited about this legislation. When I came here to Washington, D.C., in 2010, I came here to do something. This is the kind of legislation—bringing parties together, Democrats, Republicans standing together in a concerted, directed effort—to get policy adopted that will grow the American economy and put people back to work.

We hear the term many times, and heard it tonight again: jobs. Well, Mr.

Speaker, this legislation will accomplish that. But on top of that, this legislation is designed to the heart of advanced manufacturing in the United States of America. These are the great innovations of tomorrow that we are taking from the concept phase and putting into the commercial phase.

And how are we doing that? With a united vision, a united plan, Democrats, Republicans, coming together to stand for workforce development, for identifying those technologies that are emerging that we can put as a priority on the national stage to create the jobs of today and tomorrow, because at the end of the day that is what this is all about. This is about building it here to sell it there. It is about building those products that generations before us envisioned but just couldn't get to the finish line. This is a concerted effort that will take that technology innovation from the shelf and put it in Main Street America so that hardworking taxpayers will have an opportunity for this generation and the generations to come.

I applaud this legislation, I applaud this effort. As we do this, let us recognize that we came together to pay for this legislation tonight, fully offset, the program and priority that we are putting together through this RAMI legislation.

Now, I look forward to the Senate and their efforts to hopefully take this legislation up. Things I hear today and tonight are very positive on that front. I encourage my colleagues in the Senate to act quickly to create and pass this legislation that will provide for generations to come.

We have created an opportunity here to create American jobs. It is time for us, as we did many times before, to come together, solve America's problems, and put this type of legislation on the President's desk—which all indications are that he will accept and sign—and get American manufacturing back on its feet so that it builds products for generations to come.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2996, the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014.

When it comes to job-creating bills, many of our promises these days can seem empty. But the bill before us today will deliver results, not just rhetoric. This bill, if enacted and funded, will do more than any other measure this Congress has recently debated to revitalize American manufacturing and create high-skill, high-paying jobs in communities across the country.

The decline in U.S. manufacturing has been a threat to middle class jobs and to our entire economy for decades. Many of those jobs, however, were low-skilled jobs, never to return. But we have also seen a large number of high-

er-skilled jobs move offshore, along with the supply chain that supports manufacturing.

The good news is we experience a rebound in good-paying, high-skilled jobs as our economy continues to recover and manufacturers realize the advantages of remaining close to the world's greatest scientific and technological talent.

□ 2130

However, these gains remain modest. In the meantime, our international competitors are busy implementing and funding policies that will further threaten the American manufacturing base and send our best talents overseas.

I am deeply concerned that we could reach a tipping point beyond which it will be nearly impossible to rebuild a vibrant manufacturing sector here in the U.S. We must act now to ensure that American companies and factories maintain their capacity to be the most sophisticated in the world and that American colleges and universities graduate the workforce to fill advanced manufacturing jobs on our shores.

The Revitalize American Manufacturing Innovation Act, or RAMI, is a critical step toward this goal. This bill makes strategic investments in advanced manufacturing research, development, and education across our Nation. In keeping with our entire history of innovation, this bill creates partnerships involving the public sector, the private sector, and our great research institutions for the benefit of Americans.

However, even if this bill gets enacted this month, our job is not done. Specifically, I am concerned about an unnecessary obstacle we have added to the bill that could make it difficult to stand up and sustain this program. To meet majority rules about offsetting all new authorizations, the bill that passed out of committee contained language that by some subsequent interpretations looked like appropriating on an authorization bill. I want to assure my appropriations colleagues that if I had my way, we would have written a straightforward authorization as we have always done throughout this committee's history.

Clarifying language has been added to the bill, but we now look to the appropriators to take the next step necessary of standing up for this program in fiscal year 2015. In that regard, I look forward to working with my appropriations colleagues to ensure that this program gets funded next year and for the duration of the authorization.

I would like to thank my colleagues, Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. REED, for their bipartisan work to develop this legislation and determination in moving it forward. I would also like to thank Chairman SMITH for his efforts to bring this bill to the floor.

Finally, I am also pleased that this legislation includes the manufacturing strategy introduced by Mr. LIPINSKI

and the reauthorization of the Regional Innovation program introduced by Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. KILMER. These are important steps in the right direction.

I strongly support this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) and to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) that I appreciate all their time, effort, and work that has gone into this piece of legislation. It is because of their patience and diligence and persistence that we arrived at this particularly important place tonight and are considering this legislation.

I also wanted to point out that this bill will, with every expectation that we have, create thousands of manufacturing jobs in the United States. The fact that New York and Massachusetts will benefit from these jobs is an important consideration, but the jobs that are created are going to be across the country. And so the gentlemen from New York and Massachusetts are doing an immense favor to our economy and to our economic growth in America.

Mr. Speaker, advanced manufacturing is fundamental to future U.S. economic success and national security. America has led the world since World War II, but our global leadership is not guaranteed. Competing nations have increased their investments in advanced manufacturing to surpass the United States. The World Bank reports, for example, that China now leads the U.S. in high-tech exports with 28 percent of the global market versus 18 percent for the United States.

In order to be competitive, our advanced manufacturers, large, medium, and small, must accelerate R&D, develop next generation products, develop new manufacturing processes, retrain their workforce, and introduce new technology to supply chains.

This legislation, the Revitalize American Innovation Act of 2014, by Representatives REED and KENNEDY authorizes up to \$300 million for fiscal years 2015 through 2024 for the Commerce Department, NIST, to develop the Network for Manufacturing Innovation, or NMI.

The NMI will not increase spending because \$250 million will come from annual appropriations from the Department of Energy's Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy and \$50 million from annual appropriations for Industrial Technical Services. NMI will accelerate private investment, commercialization of technology, and co-operation among multiple industrial entities, research universities, and other stakeholders to increase competitiveness and innovation in U.S. advanced manufacturing.

Also included in the legislation is a bill developed by Mr. LIPINSKI which requires the President to submit a quadrennial advanced manufacturing strategic plan to Congress, a comprehensive assessment of the global competitive situation, and recommendations for strengthening the competitiveness of U.S. advanced manufacturing.

In the latter category, for instance, three obvious steps stand out right now. Two of these steps are highlighted by the just-released 2014 International Tax Competitiveness Index, which ranks the overall U.S. tax system as 32nd worst among the 34 developed nations. We would go a long way toward reinvigorating our economy and putting Americans back to work if we first reduce the U.S. corporate tax rate from highest in the developed world, and second, encourage more business investment in new technology by making the R&D tax credit permanent.

The third crucial step to bolster U.S. manufacturing is to recognize the importance and take advantage of abundant, affordable domestic natural gas. Shale gas is a major revolution contributing to the manufacturing renaissance taking place in America.

Manufacturing accounts for 30 percent of natural gas consumption in the U.S. and represents more than one-third of some manufacturers' costs. Not only does affordable, abundant natural gas benefit our entire manufacturing sector, the coproducts of natural gas are primary feedstocks for the production of chemicals, fertilizers, and plastics.

An industry expert recently reported that U.S. chemical manufacturers have surpassed \$100 billion in investments related to shale gas, with an anticipated \$81 billion in new annual chemical industry output and more than 600,000 permanent new jobs in the U.S. In Texas alone, there have been nearly 30 projects announced in the petrochemical manufacturing sector.

Finally, included in the bill before us is a provision authored by Mr. HULTGREN and cosponsored by Mr. KILMER to support regional innovation efforts to make U.S. manufacturers and businesses more competitive. Funding for this 5-year program will come from annual appropriations for the Commerce Department's economic development programs.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the bipartisan cooperation that has gone into moving this legislation through the Science Committee and to the House floor. To all of my colleagues on the committee, to the Research and Technology Subcommittee chair and ranking member, Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. LIPINSKI, and to the ranking member of the Science Committee, Ms. JOHNSON, the gentlewoman from Texas, thank you for your good work that has brought us to the point of passage of the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014.

Rhode Island, the birthplace of the industrial revolution, with a very strong and long manufacturing history, is seeing the benefits of investing in rebuilding manufacturing, and this bill will create exciting opportunities to do more.

This important legislation will establish the Network for Manufacturing Innovation program and a grant program to support domestic production, drive innovation, and leverage private funding and commercialization to develop sustainable business strategies.

Across the United States, industry experts and economists are increasingly optimistic about a resurgence in American manufacturing. This is a critical time for Congress to help Federal, State, and local entities leverage existing resources, spur regional collaboration, and support economic recovery and job creation in high-growth advanced manufacturing sectors.

In particular, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), and the entire committee for the inclusion of a provision to reauthorize the Regional Innovation program for 5 years. I particularly want to compliment both of my colleagues Mr. REED and Mr. KENNEDY for their work on this bill and for approaching this important issue with a spirit of real bipartisanship and genuine collaboration.

In an effort to promote innovation and regional collaboration, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 established a Regional Innovation program within the Economic Development Administration. The program is designed to encourage and support the development of regional innovation strategies, including regional innovation clusters and science and research parks. Funding for the Regional Innovation program supports the EDA's interagency effort to build regional innovation clusters such as the Jobs and Innovation Accelerator Challenge and the Make it in America Challenge.

Through the Regional Innovation program local leaders are empowered to maximize existing assets and are provided resources to ensure that historically underrepresented communities, including those hardest hit by employment and economic decline, are able to participate and benefit from growth in a regional cluster.

To close, this bill recognizes that manufacturing and innovation are critically important to America's ability to compete in a 21st century global economy. To compete in the 21st century and win, America must invest in scaling up promising technology and innovative ideas. Supporting the development of regional innovation clusters

strengthens our capacity to sustain and grow our economic recovery. This legislation will help do just that.

Again, I want to urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I compliment my friends Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. REED for their great work.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to recognize the ranking member of the Research and Technology Subcommittee. Mr. LIPINSKI has worked on this issue for many years, including the Manufacturing Competitiveness Act that is included in this bill.

At this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), a member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, who is another sponsor of the bill.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, Mr. BUCSHON from Indiana. I also want to recognize the important leadership of Chairman SMITH. I want to thank him for his great work on this. I also want to thank the sponsors who really did so much of the heavy lifting on this. Congressman REED and Congressman KENNEDY did great work on a wonderful bill.

Manufacturing is a vital component of my district's economy. There are 554 manufacturing facilities in the 14th Congressional District with 10 or more employees in them. Manufacturing facilities employ also more than 27,000 workers across my district alone.

The workers at manufacturing facilities in the 14th Congressional District of Illinois have felt the economic downturn disproportionately as Federal and State governments have failed to change outdated or unneeded policies that keep my constituents from regaining full employment. Later this week, the House will vote on a package of bills to help alleviate these problems, but there are more ways we must act to help ensure our manufacturers have the tools they need to remain competitive on the world stage.

This legislation gives needed direction to the administration for funding a national network for manufacturing innovation. These programs would bring together our country's vast research capabilities and help align our institutions with industry partners. Our universities and colleges must know what industry needs in order to provide valuable research as well as train our next workforce. This legislation would also help to remove some of the barriers that keep industry from working together and innovating in a 21st century economy.

I am also very glad to see authorization for the Regional Innovation program. This is a smart, targeted program that allows local regions to pool their resources and work together. Industry clusters are one of the most effective ways to compile and share best practices, and the fact that these programs give preference to bids involving Local Workforce Investment Boards is another reason to support this bill.

These boards are doing all they can to help my constituents find work, and this is the cooperative federalism that will ensure taxpayer dollars are not wasted.

I would like to commend the gentleman from New York for introducing this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

□ 2145

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Representatives KENNEDY and REED for working across the aisle to develop legislation that will encourage the growth of innovative technologies and the creation of a manufacturing workforce that will be able to compete on the global playing field.

I also want to thank the Representatives for working with Representative HULTGREN and myself to include the reauthorization of the Regional Innovation program.

The Regional Innovation program provides needed support to innovative initiatives that accelerate technology commercialization, job creation, and economic growth in the United States. It acknowledges something important, that innovation and job growth don't happen in large marble buildings in our Nation's Capitol; rather, it happens on the ground in communities throughout our Nation.

It happens in Tacoma where world-class research on clean water is happening in a collaboration between our companies and our university. It is happening on the Olympic Peninsula of Washington where innovative companies and innovative people are developing composite technology in partnership with the local college.

If the United States is going to be a global economic competitor in the 21st century, we need to focus on growing a high-skilled workforce in our communities.

I spent a decade working in economic development. We had a sign up on the wall in our office that said, "We are competing with everyone, everywhere, every day, forever."

Bills like this will help us compete. It will help us make things here in the United States; and, as the dad of two little girls, I am hopeful it will provide opportunity for future generations to make things here in America.

I think the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Bill is a sign we are moving in the right direction.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quickly address an issue of future appropriations for the network of manufacturing innovation. As recently as the fiscal year 2014 omnibus appropriations act, Congress included language in the explanatory statement, pointing out that the appropriations bill did not address a manufacturing network as Congress

had not considered or approved a legislative proposal.

Well, the bill before us today solves that problem. It would authorize agencies to use funds to spur innovation and boost domestic manufacturing.

Even more recently, the fiscal year 2015 Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations Bill that passed the House on May 30, 2014, included report language on this topic showing an openness to further funding. Congress had been waiting for this bill to come to the floor to formally authorize this important program.

After we pass this bill, I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to provide much-needed funding for the network of manufacturing innovation.

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds again to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, before we conclude debate on this bill, I just wanted to thank senior staff who have worked long months in developing this legislation and in refining it and getting it to the point where it is bipartisan, and we believe that the prospects for passage in the Senate are good as well.

Now, the senior staff on our side, the majority side, include Chris Wydler, Cliff Shannon, and Katy Crooks; and, if I may be presumptuous to do so, on the minority side, they include Dahlia Sokolov and John Piazza. We appreciate their support and many other members of the staff who have contributed to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this bill, I rise in enthusiastic support of H.R. 2996, the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act. The public-private partnerships created by this bill will help rebuild our Nation's manufacturing capacity and grow private sector investments in manufacturing.

I hail from Silicon Valley, the Nation's epicenter of technology and innovation. Right now, Silicon Valley is experiencing a manufacturing resurgence. Companies see the benefit of locating their manufacturing in areas with R&D and a high-tech workforce. Nearly 18 percent of Silicon Valley jobs are in manufacturing, and these advanced manufacturing jobs are high paying.

This bill will replicate some of the important qualities of Silicon Valley across this Nation. It will build partnerships between government, academia, and industry to address targeted manufacturing challenges.

I applauded President Obama when he first proposed a network of manufacturing innovation institutes, and I thank the cochairs of the Manufacturing Caucus, Mr. REED and Mr. KENNEDY, for authoring this legislation to authorize such a network.

I have worked with my Silicon Valley constituents to help build strong bipartisan backing of this bill, and I am glad we are on the floor considering it tonight. Hopefully, once this bill is enacted, we can win one of these hubs for Silicon Valley to focus on important challenges like developing the next generation of semiconductor manufacturing tools.

This bill is an important step for countering the incentives that other countries are offering American innovators and manufacturers to relocate overseas. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2996 because it will help revitalize American manufacturing. It is a game-changer.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, with cosponsors and supporters in every corner of the country and each side of the aisle, we must pass this bill and move forward with a national manufacturing policy.

We are here today as part of a process that involved many, many people. Last month, we held a markup in the full Science Committee, adopting several amendments and addressing concerns from members on both sides of the aisle.

Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, this bill represents how Congress is designed to work, ideas from across the country coming together in open, honest discussion to formulate policy that will move our country forward.

I would like to mention the significant staff work of the House leadership offices and the Science Committee for their tireless efforts for bringing us to this point and echo some of the names that Chairman SMITH already mentioned.

From the Science majority, if I may, Jamie Brown, Cliff Shannon, Kirsten Duncan, Chris Shank, Chris Weigel. From the minority staff, Dick Obermann, Dahlia Sokolov, Marcy Gallo, Kim Montgomery, John Piazza. From Congressman REED's office, former staffer Laura Ringdahl and Drew Wayne. From Senator BROWN's office, Chris Slevin and Nora Todd. From Senator BLUNT's office, John Smedile and Tracy Henke. And from the National Institute of Standards and Technology, Jim Schufreider.

Mr. Speaker, through the revitalization of our manufacturing industry, we can provide access to a modern economy for millions of Americans. Our

manufacturing industries these days make far more than just the cheapest widget and Cheetos.

By supporting partnerships between the private sector, government, and academia, we can capitalize on the opportunity offered through growing industry such as life sciences, biotech, precision manufacturing, and many, many others.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill.

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, a strong manufacturing base is fundamental to U.S. economic success and national security. Again, manufacturing supports millions of good-paying American jobs; and, for the millions of Americans who are employed in the manufacturing field, that is what matters most, good-paying, family-supporting, community-sustaining jobs.

I urge my colleagues all to support this legislation.

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2996, the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act, a bipartisan bill to boost American manufacturing, of which I am a cosponsor and original supporter.

Not only do I support the intent of H.R. 2996, which would establish a Network of Manufacturing Innovation and enable public-private partnerships through Centers for Manufacturing Innovation, but it also includes the text of a bill I introduced, the American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act, H.R. 2447.

I believe that both measures are necessary to the continuing revitalization of manufacturing in the United States, and I'm pleased to see the House considering them today. Manufacturing is a linchpin of our Nation's economy. It provides the American middle class with a source of quality jobs making everything from the goods we rely on for everyday needs, to the equipment that we need for national security.

But in the first decade of the century, American manufacturing took a hard hit. Almost one-third of American manufacturing jobs disappeared. After over 110 years as the world's top manufacturing Nation, America got knocked off its perch by China.

I have seen the devastation in my district and across northeastern Illinois. And I get frustrated, just like countless other Americans do, when I go to the store and I cannot find the words "made in the U.S.A." on any product.

The Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act would authorize a network of centers for manufacturing innovation, based upon the concept of the National Network of Manufacturing Innovation (NNMI) proposed the Administration. I have been a strong supporter of the NNMI proposal from the outset, and am pleased Congress is taking action to authorize these centers.

In fact, just a few months ago I was pleased to join in the announcement of the Digital Manufacturing and Design Innovation Institute in Chicago. This public-private initiative, hosted by the University of Illinois offshoot UI Labs, has leveraged a \$70 million federal in-

vestment to achieve a commitment of \$250 million from industry, academia, government and community partners that will harness expertise and facilities to improve manufacturing processes and innovation and design capabilities to a wide range of stakeholders. One of the greatest attributes of these institutes will be the openness of the system, allowing small- and medium-sized enterprises the opportunity to use novel and often capital-intensive capabilities, such as 3D printing and high-performance computing, to improve their product lines, develop new innovations and make their factories more efficient.

Moreso, I believe that the deployment of these centers of manufacturing innovation will help improve the competitiveness of manufacturing across the nation. Using these high-tech facilities will help attract more students to manufacturing and STEM careers, enable a greater range of research and development on manufacturing processes and products, and improve commercialization opportunities for firms small and large. Other competing nations are making their own serious investments in next-generation institutions and facilities in support of their domestic industries, and it makes competitive sense for the U.S. to leverage our capabilities, in concert with private and other public entities, to make similar investments.

In addition and of particular note to me is Section 4 of this Act, which includes the text of a bill I had introduced, the American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act. This legislation would establish a public-private process for assessing the current competitive state of manufacturing in the United States, compare this against the policies and status of manufacturing in competing nations, and propose measures for the government and stakeholders to take in order to promote manufacturing in the U.S. Based on the Quadrennial Defense Review, the Pentagon's policy planning process, the bill proposes that a group of manufacturing experts from the private and the public sectors would be convened every four years to reassess the progress of American manufacturing, and make new recommendations.

While I agree that manufacturing is by-and-large a private, market endeavor, few can disagree that manufacturing intersects with government policy in countless ways. From tax and trade, to regulation, to research, education, and workforce development, government policies have a significant effect on our manufacturers. It is essential that the U.S. join many of its competing nations in assessing these policies in a comprehensive fashion, rather than a silo-ed, piecemeal approach.

That is why we need a comprehensive, coordinated strategy promoting American manufacturing. While many other countries—China, India, Germany, to name a few—have developed and implemented manufacturing strategies, the United States manufacturing policy is uncoordinated and largely ad hoc. If we want American manufacturing to compete and succeed in a global economy, it is vital that we develop a strategy to coordinate our policies that impact manufacturers. And that is exactly what this bill does.

After a couple of tough decades, I still have a number of small- and medium-size manufacturers in my district in northeastern Illinois. One of these is Atlas Tool & Die of Lyons, Illinois, a 94-year-old family-owned business.

The director of development for the company, Zach Mottl, said this about this legislation:

As a business owner, I know planning is critical. When an organization doesn't operate with a plan, what occurs is a plan to fail. Right now, the United States is operating without a manufacturing strategy in a world where other countries are intensely focused on helping their manufacturers to compete. The American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act will bring all sides and stakeholders together to forge a strategy with broad support and the momentum needed to produce action?

I share Zach's view that we need an overarching plan, and I believe that that the American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act will achieve that. This bill has garnered the endorsement of a wide range of industry, labor and manufacturing organizations, indicating to me that they share our view that a national manufacturing strategy will be essential to moving American manufacturing competitiveness forward.

I would like to thank the numerous colleagues who have helped shepherd my manufacturing strategy legislation along the way, helping it to pass by overwhelming margins in the House during two prior sessions. I appreciate the leadership of Congressmen REED and KENNEDY in introducing this bill, and I'm pleased to have worked with them on it. Congressman ADAM KINZINGER has been a great partner in introducing the manufacturing strategy legislation, while Chairman LAMAR SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON were crucial to this bill moving through the Science, Space and Technology Committee.

I am hopeful that we'll be able to achieve House and Senate passage of H.R. 2996 before the end of this year, so that the Network of Manufacturing Innovation and the manufacturing strategy process will soon become reality. I strongly believe both will lead to greater success of manufacturing in America, and with it, a better outlook for our nation's middle class.

I thank my colleagues for the time and opportunity to speak on this important legislation, and urge Members to support the passage of H.R. 2996.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in enthusiastic support of H.R. 2996, the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act. As a proud cosponsor of this bill, I am pleased that the House is considering it today.

The Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act (RAMI) will help rebuild our nation's manufacturing capacity by creating public-private partnerships that will foster an environment in which the private sector is willing to invest in the strengths of our nation and American manufacturing will grow.

I applauded President Obama when he first proposed the creation of a National Network for Manufacturing Innovation to improve the competitiveness of U.S. manufacturing, stimulate research and development, and increase domestic production. I supported his call for additional centers beyond those he initially proposed, worked in the Appropriations Committee to find funding for some centers, and have suggested to the President that at least one institute should be located in my Silicon Valley district.

Silicon Valley is known as the epicenter of technology and innovation in the United States. What is not as widely recognized is the extent to which Silicon Valley is also experiencing a manufacturing resurgence. Nearly

18 percent of Silicon Valley's jobs are in manufacturing, and that number is growing—the local manufacturing sector is projected to grow by 5 percent by 2018. These advanced manufacturing jobs are offering higher pay than nonmanufacturing jobs. By being co-located with the research and development Silicon Valley is known for, these manufacturers are both boosting R&D investments and experiencing the benefits of more control of their manufacturing processes, quicker turnaround from research to product realization, higher quality, and greater intellectual property security.

The Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act seeks to replicate some of the important lessons from Silicon Valley around the nation. RAMI will build public-private partnerships through Centers for Manufacturing Innovation between higher education institutions and community colleges, small and large manufacturers, and government to promote best practices and address targeted advanced manufacturing challenges. These advanced manufacturing hubs will also address the skills gap by producing a next generation talent pool of skilled production workers and engineers by focusing on education, workforce training, research and development, and commercialization.

Despite its manufacturing successes, Silicon Valley still continues to experience higher than average unemployment, partly a result of the past outsourcing of manufacturing jobs due to low wages overseas and incentives offered by foreign competitors. With the passage of the RAMI Act, we can we look forward to hosting an advanced manufacturing hub, potentially focused on enabling the transition to the next-generation 450 mm silicon wafer semiconductor manufacturing tools, which would enable Silicon Valley to take advantage of its R&D excellence and bolster its manufacturing sector in new ways, helping us to recover some of those jobs lost to past outsourcing.

Over the past few years, I've been proud to work with House Manufacturing Caucus Co-chairs Reps. TOM REED and JOE KENNEDY on this authorization effort, along with Silicon Valley tech leaders and university stakeholders. I appreciate the willingness of some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who were key to building bipartisan support for this effort, particularly my Chairman on the Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations Subcommittee FRANK WOLF, to talk with us about this legislation and to join as cosponsors of this important bill.

Our competitors around the world are offering American innovators and manufacturers a wide range of incentives to relocate overseas. The RAMI Act will ensure that American innovation and technology development remain at the top of the manufacturing sector, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2996, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE HOUSE PASSED JOBS BILLS, BUT THE SENATE FAILED TO ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, over the past 2 years, the House of Representatives has advanced bill after bill to grow our economy.

The House has passed legislation to keep our small businesses growing through smarter regulations. We have passed legislation to increase wages and expand job opportunities. The Senate has failed to act.

The House has passed legislation to make energy more affordable for American families and to keep the country on a path to energy security. The Senate has failed to act.

The House has passed legislation to require the U.S. Forest Service to increase timber production on national forest lands and better manage those national treasures.

We have also advanced legislation to modernize the Endangered Species Act, promoting science-based decision-making and improving species recovery while protecting our economy. The Senate has failed to act.

The House has passed a series of reforms to improve the President's health care law, including a repeal of the harmful 2.3 percent medical device tax. The Senate has failed to act.

The American people deserve better, Mr. Speaker.

THE COALITION OF THE UNWILLING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized until 10 p.m. as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, the President had made a speech last Thursday night, and it is amazing that he is ready to go after ISIS or ISIL and that the Islamic State is not Islamic as they say they are.

It is amazing because, from what I have seen in the beheadings, those who were doing the beheadings always think that they are being religious; so, apparently, the President and his advisers are the only ones that think otherwise because they certainly believe it is a religion.

I wanted to hit some key facts very quickly here. President Obama talks about this great coalition. After all those criticisms of President George W. Bush and the 48 countries or so that actually did participate in the war in Iraq, President Obama's coalition of the unwilling is a better way to talk about his coalition.

NATO ally Turkey announced last week they will not allow the U.S. to conduct air strikes against ISIS from Turkish air bases. So much for their real cooperation.

Germany said it is not going to join U.S. air strikes against ISIS. The United Kingdom has their Foreign Minister announce they will not join air strikes only to be later contradicted by Prime Minister Cameron.

Ten Arab countries signed a communique last week in Jeddah agreeing to qualified cooperation with the U.S. but without any specifics. The State Department claims the Arab nations will conduct air strikes against ISIS but refuses to identify which Arab nations will participate.

Top Islamic cleric Yusuf al-Qaradawi has criticized U.S. attacks on ISIS, and the Syrian Muslim Brotherhood refuses to back any U.S. anti-ISIS efforts because it might circumvent Islamist-dominated structures of the Syrian National Council.

It is also important to note that this administration has admitted they are using back channels to cooperate with Iran. Gee, that would have been like, say, maybe Roosevelt saying we are working with Hitler because Japan attacked us when they all want to kill us.

Vetted moderates are losing U.S. weapons. It is important that people know, September 2013, The Wall Street Journal reported that ISIS raided a Free Syrian Army weapons depot taking small arms ammunition that the CIA provided.

In December 2013, the Free Syrian Army weapon warehouses in Bab al-Hawa—that is near the Syria-Turkey border—was seized by the Islamic Front, prompting the U.S. and the U.K. to stop weapons shipments to the FSA.

In April, the Syrian rebel groups began using heavy weapons including TOW antitank missiles provided by the United States. It is a good thing our southern border is not porous, or they might be bringing them to our border.

June of 2014, the Syrian Military Council official expresses concern that the U.S. is providing weapons directly to the FSA, potentially creating Afghan-Somali-style warlords.

September, we see more reports.

For heaven's sake, Mr. Speaker, this is no time to be helping people who want to cooperate with ISIS to help us take out ISIS. We need better than that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. CAPITO (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a death in the family.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of official business.

Ms. BROWN of Florida (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of prior commitment in district.

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. LOWENTHAL (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.