

understand why girls are encouraged or discouraged from participating in STEM activities.

It also ensures that the National Science Foundation grants are awarded to entities that are working in partnership, such as research universities with local education agencies, to increase participation in computer science education.

Computer science is particularly struggling to recruit and retain women, who make up less than 18 percent of the computer science workforce. The number is trending down, not up.

□ 1415

This has a ripple effect on our country's ability to fill the high-skilled jobs of today and tomorrow. We need the next generation of young women to pursue STEM degrees, and we are not seeing the numbers we need.

It is critical that we continue to work on STEM opportunities for middle-school-aged children and older, but we also need to ensure our Federal resources start at the beginning and support research on STEM education of younger students, starting at the beginning of their educational career.

We know this all too well in Michigan. We know the structural and cultural barriers that exist for women interested in STEM from a very young age. Lack of support, unconscious or conscious gender bias, and stereotype threats are just a few.

In several studies, when children were asked to draw a mathematician or a scientist, girls were twice as likely to draw a man as they were a woman, while boys almost universally drew men, often in a lab coat.

The science is clear that children who engage in scientific activities from an early age, before middle school, develop positive attitudes toward science and are more likely to pursue STEM experiences and career opportunities later on.

We need to be working toward interventions to increase the number of girls and women in these fields, and that is why I am so proud to sponsor this bill.

I thank Chairwoman JOHNSON for her leadership on the House Science Committee toward increasing STEM opportunities for women, particularly for women of color.

I introduced this bipartisan legislation with my colleague, Congressman JIM BAIRD, along with our counterparts in the Senate, Senators JACKY ROSEN and SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in both Chambers of Congress to support this bill and send this important legislation swiftly to the President's desk.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1665, the Building Blocks of STEM Act.

I was proud to join my colleague, the chair of the Research and Technology Subcommittee, Representative HALEY STEVENS, in introducing this legislation.

As one of only two Members of Congress with a Ph.D. in science, I understand how important it is to start children off on the right foot by teaching STEM concepts and principles at an early age. Research shows that kids as young as 1, 2, or 3 are capable of absorbing STEM concepts. Children have a natural curiosity that can be fostered into an interest in science, technology, engineering, math, and computer science.

Equally important is ensuring that we get more girls involved in the STEM fields so that we can have as many people as possible contributing to the knowledge base of our society.

H.R. 1665 directs the NSF to fund research and studies that focus on early childhood and young women in STEM at the K-12 level. Investing in children early ensures that we are laying the groundwork to develop young innovators in STEM.

Hoosiers know that to grow our Nation, we need everyone involved. This bill helps ensure that we are preparing students to fill the jobs of the future, continuing America's global leadership in science and technology.

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no more requests for time. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The love of learning starts young, and the Building Blocks of STEM bill promotes this by prioritizing a focus on early childhood STEM education. It gives us the opportunity to encourage girls to get and stay engaged in STEM, helping us to improve our educational programs and diversify the STEM workforce.

I, again, thank Representative BAIRD and Representative STEVENS for reintroducing this bipartisan bill.

As the House did in 2015, I encourage this body to support and pass this legislation unanimously.

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member and the Members on both sides of the aisle for their support of this bill. I urge its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1665.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN MANUFACTURING LEADERSHIP ACT

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2397) to amend the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act to make changes to the implementation of 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. 2397

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "American Manufacturing Leadership Act".

SEC. 2. CHANGES IN IMPLEMENTATION OF MANUFACTURING USA.

Section 34 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278s) is amended—

(1) in the section heading by striking "NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION" and inserting "MANUFACTURING USA NETWORK";

(2) by striking "centers for manufacturing innovation" each place it appears in subsections (a)(3)(B), (b)(1), (d), (g), and (i) and inserting "Manufacturing USA institutes";

(3) by striking "center for manufacturing innovation" each place it appears in subsections (d)(1), (d)(4)(E), (g), and (h)(1) and inserting "Manufacturing USA institute";

(4) by striking "center" each place it appears in subsection (d)(2), (d)(4)(E), and (d)(5) and inserting "Manufacturing USA institute";

(5) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking "NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION PROGRAM" and inserting "MANUFACTURING USA PROGRAM";

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking "Network for Manufacturing Innovation Program" and inserting "Manufacturing USA Program";

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (G), by striking "and" at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (H), by striking the period at the end and inserting ";" and"; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

"(I) to contribute to the development of regional manufacturing innovation clusters across the Nation.;" and

(D) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking "Network for Manufacturing Innovation" and inserting "Manufacturing USA Network";

(6) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking "NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION" and inserting "MANUFACTURING USA NETWORK"; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking "Network for Manufacturing Innovation" and inserting "Manufacturing USA Network";

(7) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking "CENTERS FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION" and inserting "MANUFACTURING USA INSTITUTES";

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "center for manufacturing innovation" is a center" and inserting "Manufacturing USA institute" is an institute";

(ii) by striking "Secretary" each place it appears in subparagraph (C) and (D) and inserting "agency head";

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "center for manufacturing innovation" and inserting "Manufacturing USA institute";

(ii) by striking subparagraph (E);
 (iii) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) as clauses (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv), respectively, and moving the margins of such clauses (as so redesignated) two ems to the right;
 (iv) in the matter preceding clause (i) (as so redesignated), by striking “Activities of a Manufacturing USA institute may include” and inserting the following:
 “(A) REQUIRED ACTIVITIES.—Activities of a Manufacturing USA institute shall include”;
 (v) in clause (i), as so redesignated, by striking “cost, time, and risk” and inserting “cost, time, or risk”;
 (vi) in clause (ii), as so redesignated, by inserting before the period at the end the following: “addressing workforce needs through training and education programs at all appropriate education levels, including programs on applied engineering”;
 (vii) in clause (iii), as so redesignated, by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, as appropriate”;
 (viii) in clause (iv), as so redesignated, by striking “women and minority owned” and inserting “women, minority, and veteran owned”;
 (ix) by inserting after clause (iv) (as so redesigned) the following:
 “(v) Development of roadmaps or leveraging of existing roadmaps with respect to technology areas being pursued by that Manufacturing USA institute that take into account the research and development undertaken at other Manufacturing USA institutes and Federal agencies with respect to such areas.”; and
 (x) by adding at the end the following:
 “(B) PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES.—Activities of a Manufacturing USA institute may include such other activities as the agency head, 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).”; and
 (D) in paragraph (3)—
 (i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “centers for manufacturing innovation” and inserting “Manufacturing USA institutes”;
 (ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “center for manufacturing innovation” and inserting “Manufacturing USA institute”; and
 (iii) by adding at the end the following:
 “(C) APPLICATION.—Effective beginning on the date of the enactment of the American Manufacturing Leadership Act, an institute shall be subject to subsections (a)(2), (c), and (d) in the same manner and to the same extent as such provisions apply to a Manufacturing USA institute established pursuant to this section if such institute—
 “(i)(I) is, as of such date of enactment, considered a Manufacturing USA institute under subparagraph (A) or recognized as a Manufacturing USA institute under subparagraph (B); and
 “(II) as of such date of enactment, receives Federal financial assistance under subsection (d) or otherwise consistent with the purposes of this section; or
 “(ii) is under pending agency review for such recognition as of such date of enactment.”;
 (8) in subsection (d)—
 (A) in paragraph (1)—
 (i) by striking “Secretary” and inserting “agency head”; and
 (ii) by inserting “for a period of not less than 5 and not more than 7 years” after “financial assistance”;
 (B) in paragraph (2), by striking “Secretary” each place it appears and inserting “agency head”;
 (C) by striking paragraph (3);
 (D) in paragraph (4)—
 (i) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:
 “(A) COMPETITIVE, MERIT REVIEW.—In awarding financial assistance under paragraph (1), the agency head shall—
 “(i) 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; and
 “(ii) ensure that the technology focus of a Manufacturing USA institute does not substantially duplicate the technology focus of any other Manufacturing USA institute.”;
 (ii) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “Secretary” and inserting “agency head”;
 (iii) by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows:
 “(C) PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT, TRANSPARENCY, AND ACCOUNTABILITY.—For each award of financial assistance under paragraph (1), the agency head shall develop and implement metrics-based performance standards to assess the effectiveness of activities funded in making progress toward the purposes of the Program, including the effectiveness of Manufacturing USA institutes in advancing technology readiness levels or manufacturing readiness levels.”;
 (iv) in subparagraph (D), by striking “the Secretary shall” and all that follows through “collaborate” and inserting the following: “the agency head, in coordination with the National Program Office, as appropriate, shall collaborate”; and
 (v) in subparagraph (E)—
 (I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “Secretary” and inserting “agency head”; and
 (II) in clause (x), by striking “center for manufacturing” and inserting “Manufacturing USA institute”; and
 (E) in paragraph (5)—
 (i) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:
 “(A) TERM OF AWARD.—
 “(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), an award made to a Manufacturing USA institute may be renewed for an additional period not to exceed the duration of the original funding award, subject to a rigorous merit review. In awarding additional funds, the agency head shall consider the extent to which the institute has made progress in achieving the purposes described in subsection (a) and carrying out the activities specified in subsection (c)(2).
 “(ii) EXISTING INSTITUTES.—Notwithstanding clause (i), an institute already in existence or undergoing a renewal process on the date of enactment of the American Manufacturing Leadership Act—
 “(I) may continue to receive support for the duration of the original funding award beginning on the date of establishment of that institute; and
 “(II) shall be eligible for renewal of that funding pursuant to clause (i).”;
 (ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “Secretary” each place it appears and inserting “agency head”; and
 (iii) by striking subparagraph (C);
 (9) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:
 “(e) GRANT PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC SERVICE ACTIVITIES FOR MANUFACTURING USA INSTITUTES WITHOUT FEDERAL FUNDING.—The Secretary may award grants on a competitive basis to Manufacturing USA institutes that are no longer recognized as such under subsection (c)(3)(C) to carry out workforce development, outreach to small- and medium-sized manufacturers, and other activities that—
 “(1) are determined by the Secretary to be in the national interest; and
 “(2) are unlikely to receive private sector financial support.”;
 (10) in subsection (f)—
 (A) in paragraph (1), by striking “Network for Manufacturing Innovation Program” and inserting “Manufacturing USA Program”;
 (B) in paragraph (2)—
 (i) in subparagraph (E), by striking “and” at the end;
 (ii) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;
 (iii) by adding at the end the following:
 “(G) to work with non-sponsoring Federal agencies to explore and develop options for sponsoring Manufacturing USA institutes at such agencies;
 “(H) to work with sponsoring Federal agencies to develop and implement network-wide performance goals with measurable targets and timelines;
 “(I) to help develop pilot programs that may be implemented by the Manufacturing USA institutes to address specific purposes of the Program, including to accelerate technology transfer to the private sector; and
 “(J) to identify and disseminate best practices for workforce education and training across Manufacturing USA institutes and further enhance collaboration among Manufacturing USA institutes in developing and implementing such practices.”; and
 (C) by amending paragraph (5) to read as follows:
 “(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—
 “(A) significant outreach to, participation of, and engagement of small- and medium-sized manufacturers in Manufacturing USA institutes across the entirety of the manufacturing supply chain; and
 “(B) that the results of the Program, including technologies developed by the Program, reach small- and medium-sized manufacturers and that such entities have access to technical assistance, as appropriate, in deploying those technologies.”;
 (11) in subsection (g)—
 (A) in paragraph (1)(A)—
 (i) by striking “The Secretary” and all that follows through “report to the Secretary” and inserting the following: “Each agency head shall require each recipient of financial assistance from that agency under subsection (d)(1) and any other institutes considered to be Manufacturing USA institutes pursuant to subsection (c)(3) to annually submit to the appropriate agency head a report”; and
 (ii) by adding at the end the following: “Each agency head shall submit such reports to the Secretary.”; and
 (B) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:
 “(3) ASSESSMENTS BY GAO.—
 “(A) ASSESSMENTS.—Not less frequently than once every 3 years, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress an assessment of the operation of the Program during the most recent 3-year period, including an assessment of the progress made towards achieving the goals specified in the national strategic plan for advanced manufacturing required under section 102(b)(7) of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 6622(b)(7)).
 “(B) ELEMENTS.—Each assessment submitted under subparagraph (A) 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.”;

(12) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “subsection (e)” and inserting “subsection (k)”;

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) COLLABORATIONS WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Secretary shall collaborate with Federal agencies whose missions contribute to, or are affected by, advanced manufacturing to identify and leverage existing resources at such Federal agencies to assist Manufacturing USA institutes in carrying out the purposes of the program specified in subsection (a)(2). Such existing resources may include programs—

“(A) at the Department of Labor relating to labor and apprenticeships;

“(B) at the Economic Development Administration relating to regional innovation, such as the Regional Innovation Strategies program;

“(C) at the Department of Education relating to workforce development, education, training, and retraining;

“(D) at the Department of Defense relating to procurement and other authorities of the Department of Defense;

“(E) at the Food and Drug Administration relating to biopharmaceutical manufacturing;

“(F) at the National Science Foundation, including the Advanced Technological Education program;

“(G) at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration relating to procurement, workforce development, education, training, and retraining; and

“(H) additional programs that the Secretary determines are appropriate to support the activities of existing Manufacturing USA institutes.”;

(13) by adding at the end the following:

“(j) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) AGENCY HEAD.—The term ‘agency head’ means the head of any Executive agency (as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code), excluding the Department of Defense, that is providing financial assistance for a Manufacturing USA institute, including the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Energy.

“(2) REGIONAL INNOVATION CLUSTER.—The term ‘regional innovation cluster’ has the meaning given such term in section 27(f)(1) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3722(f)(1)).

“(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) NIST.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.

“(2) RESERVATION.—Of the amount made available under paragraph (1) the Secretary shall reserve not less than \$5,000,000 for the National Office of the Manufacturing USA Program established under subsection (f).

“(3) DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.—For Manufacturing USA institutes operated by the Department of Energy, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Energy—

“(A) \$70,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020, 2021, and 2022; and

“(B) \$84,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 and 2024.”.

SEC. 3. INCREASED EMPHASIS ON REGIONAL INNOVATION WITHIN AND EXTENSION OF REGIONAL INNOVATION PROGRAM.

Section 27 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3722) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(I) Developing relationships at the local level to build supply chains and use existing capabilities of entities operating on that level to bring economic growth to suburban and rural areas.”; and

(2) in subsection (g)(2) by striking “2019” and inserting “2024”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2397, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 2397, the American Manufacturing Leadership Act.

I thank Ms. STEVENS for her leadership in introducing this bipartisan bill and for her commitment to developing legislation that will help strengthen America’s manufacturing base.

I also thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have worked with us to develop and advance this important legislation.

Back in 2014, I was proud to support the original Revitalize American Manufacturing Innovation Act that established the Manufacturing USA program. That bipartisan bill was sponsored by TOM REED and JOE KENNEDY and was signed into law by President Obama.

Since its inception 5 years ago, the Manufacturing USA program has grown to support 14 manufacturing institutes focused on a variety of technology areas, ranging from 3D printing to groundbreaking energy-saving manufacturing processes.

H.R. 2397 would ensure the continued success of the Manufacturing USA program by reauthorizing the program for another 5 years and by allowing agencies to renew funding for institutes after reviewing the institutes’ progress on clear performance goals.

This bill also strengthens the ability of the institutes to leverage existing programs all across the Federal Government to improve their role in regional innovation, education and training, defense technology procurement, and other activities.

Today, manufacturing remains a vital component of our Nation’s econ-

omy and national security. H.R. 2397 will help to grow our manufacturing industry and to bring along with it many good-paying jobs for our workforce.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 2397, the American Manufacturing Leadership Act. This legislation reauthorizes and amends the bipartisan Revitalize American Manufacturing Innovation Act of 2014.

Nationally, manufacturing supports nearly 13 million American jobs, or roughly 9 percent of the workforce, and represents about 11 percent of the American economy. Most of these firms are small manufacturers, supporting local economies by providing well-paying jobs.

Technology will continue to change this sector dramatically. Today’s manufacturing floor looks far different from the assembly lines of the past, and the skills needed by manufacturing workers will continue to change.

Innovative processes, such as additive manufacturing, are transforming the future of manufacturing. It is essential that these technologies are transferred to and adopted by all U.S. manufacturers so that we remain globally competitive and the number one destination for companies looking to carry out advanced manufacturing.

With manufacturers in the United States performing 64 percent of all private sector R&D in the Nation, it is important that we capitalize on these investments and reauthorize the network of public-private partnerships established in this act, which bolster manufacturing innovation.

This bill includes important reforms to better coordinate centers for manufacturing innovation funded by all relevant agencies and incorporates recommendations made by the Government Accountability Office to improve management. This bill also prioritizes manufacturing workforce development and outreach to small and medium-sized manufacturers.

I thank Representative STEVENS and Representative BALDERSO for introducing this legislation and for their work in ushering it through the Science Committee on a bipartisan basis. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

I would note to my colleague that I have no other speakers so, as I reserve my time, when the gentlewoman is prepared, I will close.

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have been joined by my colleagues to introduce H.R. 2397, the American Manufacturing Leadership Act. I thank Chairwoman JOHNSON,

Ranking Member LUCAS, Representatives BALDERSO and GONZALEZ, and the sponsors of the original Revitalize American Manufacturing Innovation Act, Representatives KENNEDY and REED, for their partnership in leading this legislation and for being such great champions for advanced manufacturing.

Today is a great day. It is a great legislative day and a great day for American manufacturing, for innovation, for our workforce, and for the effective utilization of our Federal Government to advance, grow, and compete.

Today, the American Manufacturing Leadership Act reauthorizes the Manufacturing USA program through bipartisan support and the willpower of our Federal Government.

What began in Youngstown, Ohio, as a pilot initiative, the vision of a lab that would usher in 3D printing applications, workforce training programs, and the transfer of new technologies across the country and into the supply chain, is now one of the 14 institutes encompassing various research concentrations. Those include Lightweight Innovations for Tomorrow Institute located in Detroit; REMADE Institute in Rochester, New York; Digital Manufacturing Institute in Chicago; and PowerAmerica in North Carolina for battery technology.

This work is in my blood, and it is part of why I came to Congress. It is also imperative for our role in global competition and for the investment in industrial policy and strategy vis-a-vis sound economic policy.

We will ensure that Manufacturing USA can continue to contribute to the growth of our domestic advanced manufacturing base and an advanced manufacturing workforce to fill the high-skilled jobs of the future.

AMLA authorizes agencies to renew their institutes for an additional period of funding following a fair review of the institutes' progress. It also strengthens the important partnership between Manufacturing USA and the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program, as well as other relevant programs across the Federal Government.

Finally, the bill authorizes funding to allow the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, and the Department of Energy to continue funding their current institutes and stand up at least one additional institute in fiscal year 2020 and each year thereafter.

The real strength of these institutes lies in the consortium model, with the private partners contributing at least 50 percent of the funding.

In 2017 alone, Manufacturing USA raised almost \$180 million in investments from the private sector from nearly 1,300 manufacturers, universities, community colleges, government labs, and NGOs.

They are only able to do this because the Federal Government sets the table and provides support in the planning,

development, management, and operation of each institute.

Manufacturing USA institutes provide critical U.S. global leadership in advanced manufacturing.

□ 1430

The institutes serve as a unique collaborative platform for industry and academia to engage in best-in-class expertise to solve challenges and usher in new innovations.

The program is making, I believe, incredible strides in workforce development for the future and existing workforce. For example, in 2017, the LIFT institute in Detroit reached over 160,000 students across the country through innovative web-based curricula, as well as in-person training programs. And the Manufacturing Institute in Chicago, the digital manufacturing lab, has used a taxonomic approach to codifying job roles specific to the changing nature of advanced manufacturing brought on by the Internet of Things.

The United States will never be able to compete by bringing back the manufacturing of yesterday. We can celebrate our milestones—50 years since we landed on the Moon—as we usher in the innovations to improve the lives and outcomes of our manufacturing base for the next 50 years.

The American Manufacturing Leadership Act has already been endorsed by the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, the American Society for Mechanical Engineers, the Bipartisan Policy Center, and the American Association of Manufacturers.

To the small and midsized manufacturers, to the suppliers, to the complex web of craftsmanship, to the future engineer, to the computer programmer, to the student dreaming in Livonia, Michigan, about what they are going to do, this one is for you.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for her extraordinary leadership on this issue for years, for the effort that she led on getting this passed in Congress several years ago, and her entire staff, the staff on both sides of the aisle when this bill was initially passed.

I also want to thank Congresswoman STEVENS for her incredible enthusiasm and dedication to workers across Michigan, across her district, but for never losing sight of what manufacturing means for this country, what this country was built on, and the men and women who make it all possible.

Mr. Speaker, a few years ago, when I introduced the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act, it was guided by one thing: the people in my district. They were workers from Fall River to Taunton, to Milford, to Newton, who built more than just prod-

ucts on factory floors. They built entire companies; they built communities; and they built families.

Those same workers have made this legislation, this national manufacturing network, successful over the past 5 years because they have brought their ideas, their determination, and their passion and pushed our manufacturing industry forward. They have refused to leave anyone behind.

Centers like the Advanced Functional Fabrics of America, based at MIT, the research now is focused on defense and health but has consequences in a broad variety of additional innovations, has over 100 members from various States across this country pioneering new technologies that will make their way into American homes and make our soldiers and troops safer along the way.

By collaborating with local academia, especially with community colleges and vocational-technical schools, those workers are passing their skills, their expertise and experiences to a new generation of men and women who will follow in their footsteps.

As the roots of these institutes continue to expand deep into communities, from Cambridge to Youngstown to Detroit and San Jose, American workers will build new companies, stronger communities, and secure families from the abundant resources that we produce together.

Above all else, the workers who lift our economy to great heights on factory floors deserve an economy that works just as hard for them as they do for our Nation. I urge all my colleagues to support this reauthorization.

I congratulate Ms. STEVENS for work well done, and I thank the chairwoman again.

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

I rise again in support of H.R. 2397, the American Manufacturing Leadership Act. This bipartisan legislation takes important steps to reform the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014.

It requires greater coordination among the centers for manufacturing innovation and incorporating GAO recommendations on the management of these centers. Most importantly, this bill prioritizes manufacturing workforce development and outreach to small- and medium-sized manufacturers.

These public-private partnerships combine the technical knowledge base supported by our excellent universities and research institutions with innovation leadership supported by our private industries, both large and small. These centers provide the U.S. with the opportunity to lead the world in advanced manufacturing competitiveness.

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I simply urge all Members on both sides of the aisle to support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2397, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill to amend the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act to make changes to the implementation of the Manufacturing USA Network, and for other purposes.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPANDING FINDINGS FOR FEDERAL OPIOID RESEARCH AND TREATMENT ACT

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3153) to direct the Director of the National Science Foundation to support research on opioid addiction, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3153

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; FINDINGS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Expanding Findings for Federal Opioid Research and Treatment Act” or the “EFFORT Act”.

(b) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) research gaps currently exist in the prevention and treatment of opioid addiction;

(2) the National Science Foundation’s research on opioid addiction has increased understanding of the neuroscience of addiction, substance abuse intervention, the role of illicit supply networks, the secondary effects on families, the use of technology to address the opioid epidemic, and options for alternative, non-addictive therapeutics for pain; and

(3) the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health have recognized that fundamental questions in basic, clinical, and translational research would benefit greatly from multidisciplinary approaches and collaboration.

SEC. 2. NSF SUPPORT OF RESEARCH ON OPIOID ADDICTION.

The Director of the National Science Foundation, in consultation with the Director of the National Institutes of Health, shall support merit-reviewed and competitively awarded research on the science of opioid addiction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to

include extraneous material on H.R. 3153, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 3153, the EFFORT Act.

The effect of the opioid epidemic on communities across our country is clear. Research from the CDC shows that, on average, 130 Americans die every day after overdosing on illegal opioids. In 2017, approximately 1.7 million Americans had a substance abuse disorder related to opioids. Those statistics are staggering, and the effects of this problem on our communities is heartbreaking.

While past and ongoing research conducted by the National Science Foundation has greatly increased our knowledge of opioid addiction, more work, of course, is needed. The basic research authorized in H.R. 3153 will extend and expand our understanding of opioid addiction and its impact on our communities and allow us to develop more effective evidence-based policies to address this epidemic.

I commend my colleagues, Representative WEXTON and Representative BAIRD, for their leadership on this good, bipartisan legislation and urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time

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

H.R. 3153, the Expanding Findings for Federal Opioid Research and Treatment, or EFFORT, Act identifies gaps that exist in research of the prevention and treatment of opioid addiction and authorizes the National Science Foundation to support research grants in these areas.

This legislation will help drive research to understand one of the most important issues facing our country: How do we stop the opioid addiction crisis?

Congress must do all we can to combat opioid abuse and the continuing increase in opioid-related deaths.

In 2017, more than 70,000 people died from drug overdoses, and approximately 68 percent of those deaths involved opioids. With my home State of Oklahoma being one of the leading States in opioid prescriptions, I believe supporting programs intended to improve our understanding of the science of addiction and combat this crisis is just common sense.

I thank Representative JENNIFER WEXTON and Representative JIM BAIRD for their bipartisan work on this bill. Opioid addiction affects too many in our communities, and I applaud this effort to support more basic research in the science of addiction.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all the Members of this body to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. WEXTON).

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for yielding and for her leadership on the very fine bills we have before the House here this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of my bill, H.R. 3153, the bipartisan EFFORT Act, which would expand Federal research on opioid addiction.

Since 2011, more than 200 people in the northern Shenandoah Valley of Virginia have lost their lives due to an opioid overdose. Some of the highest numbers of children being born in Virginia with neonatal abstinence syndrome have been from my district.

But these numbers don’t tell the heartbreaking devastation the opioid crisis has wrought for families who have lost their mother, their father, their brother, their sister, or their child. Meanwhile, our law enforcement officers and first responders are struggling with the trauma and burnout that comes from being on the front lines of so many tragic and needless deaths of their friends and neighbors.

Tens of thousands of Americans and more than 1,000 Virginians are dying every year from overdoses. Addiction is an illness, and fighting the crisis effectively requires adequate research and funding. The EFFORT Act will help to do this by directing the National Science Foundation to support research on the science of opioid addiction.

The NSF has done an exceptional job in establishing some of the foundational understanding on opioid addiction, including research regarding the use of technology to address the crisis, the secondary effects on families, and options for alternative therapeutics for pain. And while this research has significantly increased our understanding of addiction, research gaps remain in a wide range of disciplines, including, for example, social and behavioral issues such as stigma, socioeconomic status, or treatment accessibility.

The NSF has a unique ability to help us close some of these gaps and, in turn, to help us develop solutions. By expanding the NSF’s research on opioid addiction both within the agency, as well as jointly with the National Institutes of Health when needed, we can more effectively integrate clinical and basic research, obtain a broader understanding of the science of opioid addiction and its impact, and have a more comprehensive approach to tackling the crisis.

As a founding member of the bipartisan Freshmen Working Group on Addiction, I have worked to be a strong advocate for addiction prevention and recovery efforts, and I am pleased to have introduced this legislation with my fellow freshman colleague from Indiana, Dr. BAIRD. I thank him for his leadership on this issue, as well.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bipartisan legislation.