

and all Americans deserve represents Washington at its worst. It's also a sober reminder to all of us that the fight to strengthen border security is not over.

□ 1030

#### MAKE IT IN AMERICA

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

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Democrats' Make it in America initiative.

In my home State of Missouri, we make things. Manufacturing has always been a source of enormous pride and good-paying jobs for Missourians, particularly in the part of the State surrounding St. Louis that I represent.

It's no secret that American manufacturing has had some hard times, but with Make it in America, we are reinvigorating that spirit of making things of American entrepreneurship. We are working to promote American jobs and put an end to policies that ship our jobs overseas. That is why we need to close tax loopholes that allow for outsourcing of U.S. jobs. We can use that savings to fund hometown tax credits to help small businesses expand American manufacturing. We are already strengthening the rules, ensuring the U.S. and its contractors buy American when building our transportation, energy and communications infrastructure.

We must keep going and fulfill the Make it in America agenda to ensure a new prosperity by promoting the competitiveness and innovation of the American people.

#### WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, there is one question. The question is: Where are the jobs?

We are at 9.5 percent unemployment and nearly 15 million people out of work. Since President Obama has been elected, we've spent over \$6.1 trillion in just these 18 months.

Why are there no jobs? Because there is uncertainty displayed by this administration and this Congress—there is uncertainty on energy costs, there is uncertainty about health care costs, there is uncertainty about taxes. Like a businessman told me just yesterday, you can't raise our taxes and expect us to hire more people and create new jobs.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules

on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

#### NATIONAL MANUFACTURING STRATEGY ACT OF 2010

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4692) to require the President to prepare a quadrennial National Manufacturing Strategy, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4692

*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 "National Manufacturing Strategy Act of 2010".*

#### SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

*It is the sense of Congress that—*

(1) *the United States Government should promote policies related to the Nation's manufacturing sector that are intended to promote growth, sustainability, and competitiveness; create well-paying, decent jobs; enable innovation and investment; and support national security; and*

(2) *the President and Congress should act promptly to pursue policies consistent with a National Manufacturing Strategy.*

#### SEC. 3. NATIONAL MANUFACTURING STRATEGY.

(a) *STRATEGY REQUIRED.*—Not later than the first day of July of the second year of each Presidential term, the President shall submit to Congress, and publish on a public website, a National Manufacturing Strategy.

(b) *DEADLINE FOR FIRST NATIONAL MANUFACTURING STRATEGY.*—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the President shall issue the first National Manufacturing Strategy not later than the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 4. PRESIDENT'S MANUFACTURING STRATEGY BOARD.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The President shall establish, within the Department of Commerce, the President's Manufacturing Strategy Board.

(b) *PUBLIC SECTOR MEMBERS.*—The President's Manufacturing Strategy Board shall include the following individuals:

(1) *The Secretary or head (or the designee of the Secretary or head) of each of the following organizations:*

(A) *The Department of the Treasury.*

(B) *The Department of Defense.*

(C) *The Department of Commerce.*

(D) *The Department of Labor.*

(E) *The Department of Energy.*

(F) *The Office of the United States Trade Representative.*

(G) *The Office of Management and Budget.*

(H) *The Office of Science and Technology Policy.*

(I) *The Small Business Administration.*

(J) *Other Federal agencies the President determines appropriate.*

(2) *The Governors of two States, from different political parties, appointed by the President in consultation with the National Governors Association.*

(c) *PRIVATE SECTOR MEMBERS.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The President's Manufacturing Strategy Board shall further include 9 individuals from the private sector, appointed by the President after consultation with industry and labor organizations, including individuals with experience in the areas of—

(A) *managing manufacturing companies;*  
(B) *managing supply chain providers;*  
(C) *managing labor organizations;*  
(D) *workforce development;*  
(E) *conducting manufacturing-related research and development; and*  
(F) *the defense industrial base.*

(2) *BALANCE IN REPRESENTATION.*—In making appointments of private sector members to the President's Manufacturing Strategy Board under paragraph (1), the President shall seek to ensure that the individuals appointed represent a balance among and within regions, sizes of firms, and industries of the manufacturing sector.

(3) *TERMS.*—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—Each member appointed under this subsection shall be appointed for a term of 6 years, except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C).

(B) *TERMS OF INITIAL APPOINTEES.*—As designated by the President at the time of appointment, of the members first appointed—

(i) 3 shall be appointed for a term of 2 years; and  
(ii) 3 shall be appointed for a term of 4 years;

and

(iii) 3 shall be appointed for a term of 6 years.

(C) *VACANCIES.*—Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which the member's predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of that term. A member may serve after the expiration of that member's term until a new member has been appointed.

(d) *CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR.*—

(1) *CHAIR.*—The Secretary of Commerce (or the designee of the Secretary) shall serve as the Chair of the President's Manufacturing Strategy Board.

(2) *VICE CHAIR.*—The President shall appoint the Vice Chair of the President's Manufacturing Strategy Board from among the private sector members appointed by the President under subsection (c).

(e) *SUBGROUPS.*—The President's Manufacturing Strategy Board may convene subgroups to address particular industries, policy topics, or other matters. Such subgroups may include members representing any of the following:

(1) *Such other Federal agencies as the Chair determines appropriate.*

(2) *State, local, tribal, and Territorial governments.*

(3) *The private sector, including labor, industry, academia, trade associations, and other appropriate groups.*

(f) *MEETINGS.*—

(1) *TIMING OF MEETINGS.*—The President's Manufacturing Strategy Board shall meet at the call of the Chair.

(2) *FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS.*—The President's Manufacturing Strategy Board shall meet not less than 2 times each year, and not less than 4 times in a year preceding the issuance of a National Manufacturing Strategy required under section 3(a).

(3) *PUBLIC MEETINGS REQUIRED.*—The President's Manufacturing Strategy Board shall convene public meetings to solicit views on the Nation's manufacturing sector and recommendations for the National Manufacturing Strategy.

(4) *LOCATIONS OF PUBLIC MEETINGS.*—The locations of public meetings convened under paragraph (3) shall ensure the inclusion of multiple regions and industries of the manufacturing sector.

(g) *APPLICATION OF FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.*—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.), other than section 14 of such Act, shall apply to the President's Manufacturing Strategy Board, including any subgroups established pursuant subsection (e).

#### SEC. 5. DUTIES OF THE PRESIDENT'S MANUFACTURING STRATEGY BOARD.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The President's Manufacturing Strategy Board shall—

(1) *advise the President and Congress on issues affecting the Nation's manufacturing sector;*

(2) conduct a comprehensive analysis in accordance with subsection (b);

(3) develop a National Manufacturing Strategy in accordance with subsection (c);

(4) submit to the President and Congress an annual report under subsection (d); and

(5) carry out other activities determined appropriate by the President.

(b) **COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS.**—In developing each National Manufacturing Strategy under subsection (c), the President's Manufacturing Strategy Board shall conduct a comprehensive analysis of the Nation's manufacturing sector that addresses—

(1) the value and role, both historic and current, of manufacturing in the Nation's economy, security, and global leadership;

(2) the current domestic and international environment for the Nation's manufacturing sector, and any relevant subset thereof;

(3) Federal, State, local, and Territorial policies, programs, and conditions that affect manufacturing;

(4) a comparison of the manufacturing policies and strategies of the United States relative to other nations' policies and strategies;

(5) the identification of emerging or evolving markets, technologies, and products for which the Nation's manufacturers could compete;

(6) the short- and long-term forecasts for the Nation's manufacturing sector, and forecasts of expected national and international trends and factors likely to affect such sector in the future; and

(7) any other matters affecting the competitiveness, growth, stability, and sustainability of the Nation's manufacturing sector, including—

- (A) levels of domestic production;
- (B) productivity;
- (C) the trade balance;
- (D) financing and investment;
- (E) research and development;
- (F) job creation and employment disparities;
- (G) workforce skills and development; and
- (H) adequacy of the industrial base for maintaining national security.

(c) **NATIONAL MANUFACTURING STRATEGY.**—

(1) **DEVELOPMENT.**—The President's Manufacturing Strategy Board shall develop a National Manufacturing Strategy, based on—

(A) the results of the comprehensive analysis conducted under subsection (b);

(B) the studies carried out by the National Academy of Sciences pursuant to section 7; and

(C) any other information, studies, or perspectives that the President's Manufacturing Strategy Board determines to be appropriate.

(2) **GOALS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.**—

(A) **GOALS.**—The President's Manufacturing Strategy Board shall include in each National Manufacturing Strategy short- and long-term goals for the Nation's manufacturing sector, taking into account the matters addressed in the comprehensive analysis conducted under subsection (b).

(B) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—The President's Manufacturing Strategy Board shall include in each National Manufacturing Strategy recommendations for achieving the goals provided under subparagraph (A). Such recommendations may propose—

(i) actions to be taken by the President, Congress, State, local, and Territorial governments, the private sector, universities, industry associations, and other stakeholders; and

(ii) ways to improve Government policies, coordination among entities developing such policies, and Government interaction with the manufacturing sector.

(3) **REPORT.**—

(A) **DRAFT.**—Not later than 90 days before the date on which the President is required to submit to Congress a report containing a National Manufacturing Strategy under section 3, the President's Manufacturing Strategy Board shall publish in the Federal Register and on a public website a draft report containing a National Manufacturing Strategy.

(B) **PUBLIC COMMENT; REVIEW AND REVISION.**—A draft report published under subparagraph (A) shall remain available for public comment for a period of 30 days from the date of publication. The President's Manufacturing Strategy Board shall review any comments received regarding such draft report and may revise the draft report based upon those comments.

(C) **PUBLICATION.**—Not later than 30 days before the date on which the President is required to submit to Congress a report containing a National Manufacturing Strategy under section 3, the President's Manufacturing Strategy Board shall submit to the President for review and revision a final report containing a National Manufacturing Strategy, and shall publish such final report on a public website.

(D) **ESTIMATES.**—The final report submitted under subparagraph (C) shall include—

(i) when feasible, an estimate of the short- and long-term Federal Government outlays and revenue changes necessary to implement the National Manufacturing Strategy and an estimate of savings that may be derived from implementation of the National Manufacturing Strategy;

(ii) a detailed explanation of the methods and analysis used to determine the estimates included under clause (i); and

(iii) detailed recommendations regarding how to pay for the cost of implementation estimated under clause (i), when feasible.

(d) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not later than the date that is one year after the date on which the first National Manufacturing Strategy is published under section 3, and annually thereafter, the President's Manufacturing Strategy Board shall submit to the President and Congress a report that includes—

(1) views on the current state of manufacturing in the United States;

(2) an assessment of the implementation of previously issued National Manufacturing Strategies;

(3) recommendations for furthering the implementation of previously issued National Manufacturing Strategies; and

(4) any suggested revisions to the estimate required under section 5(c)(3)(D)(i) to implement the recommendations included under paragraph (3).

(e) **CONSULTATION.**—In order to gain perspectives and avoid duplication of efforts, the President's Manufacturing Strategy Board shall consult on manufacturing issues with the Defense Science Board, the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, the Manufacturing Council established by the Department of Commerce, and the Labor Advisory Committee for Trade Negotiations and Trade Policy, and may consult with other relevant governmental entities or the private sector.

#### **SEC. 6. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REVIEW OF NATIONAL MANUFACTURING STRATEGY.**

Not later than the first day of April in calendar years 2013, 2017, and 2021, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report regarding the National Manufacturing Strategy published under section 3. The report shall include—

(1) an assessment of whether the recommendations from such National Manufacturing Strategy, and any preceding National Manufacturing Strategies, were implemented;

(2) an analysis of the impact of such recommendations, to the extent data are available;

(3) a review of the process involved in developing such National Manufacturing Strategy and any preceding National Manufacturing Strategies; and

(4) recommendations for improvements in developing the next National Manufacturing Strategy.

#### **SEC. 7. STUDIES.**

(a) **QUADRENNIAL STUDY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In developing each National Manufacturing Strategy, the President, acting

through the Secretary of Commerce, shall enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study in accordance with this subsection.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The study shall examine the following:

(A) The current state of manufacturing in the United States.

(B) Federal programs and activities related to manufacturing systems.

(C) The ways in which Federal policies affect manufacturing, and likely future trends in manufacturing if such policies remain unchanged.

(D) Various possible approaches for evaluating the implementation of the National Manufacturing Strategy.

(E) An assessment of the trends and short- and long-term forecasts of manufacturing.

(F) A review of the trends and short- and long-term forecasts of manufacturing relied upon in previous National Manufacturing Strategies as compared with actual events and trends.

(3) **REPORT.**—The agreement entered into under paragraph (1) shall provide that not later than the first day of April of the first year of each Presidential term, the National Academy of Sciences shall submit to Congress and the President a report containing the findings of the study.

(4) **DEADLINE FOR FIRST REPORT.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (3), the first agreement entered into under this subsection shall provide that the National Academy of Sciences shall submit to Congress and the President a report containing the findings of the study not later than 2 years after the date such agreement is entered into.

(5) **DEADLINE FOR SUBSEQUENT AGREEMENTS.**—After the first agreement entered into under this subsection, all subsequent agreements under this subsection shall be entered into not later than 18 months before the deadline for submission of the corresponding report under paragraph (3).

(b) **DISCRETIONARY STUDIES.**—The President, acting through the Secretary of Commerce, may enter into further agreements with the National Academy of Sciences as necessary to develop studies to provide information for future National Manufacturing Strategies.

#### **SEC. 8. REQUIREMENT TO CONSIDER NATIONAL MANUFACTURING STRATEGY IN 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 National Manufacturing Strategy covering that fiscal year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

#### **GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4692, the National Manufacturing Strategy Act of 2010, introduced by my dear friend from Illinois, Congressman DAN LIPINSKI. I commend

him for his leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the U.S. to revise our manufacturing policy. This bill under consideration has gained strong bipartisan support from Members of Congress because it speaks to the level of leadership in the manufacturing arena that our Nation seeks to assert once again on the global stage.

America's manufacturing sector is an essential foundation of our Nation's economy. Consider the fact that in 2009 the manufacturing sector employed more than 11.5 million people. Ladies and gentlemen, that number, though significant, is not as good as it could be when you consider that 10 years ago America's manufacturing sector employed 17.3 million people, meaning that our Nation actually lost 5.8 million manufacturing jobs between the years 1999 and 2009.

The National Manufacturing Strategy Act of 2010 will make a significant difference in helping to restore and reposition our Nation's manufacturing capacity so that American workers can compete in today's global economy.

Today, we are still fighting our way through a global financial crisis, and we are facing aggressive competition from industrialized nations as well as emerging countries. Some of our manufacturing competitors have designed and implemented 5- or 10-year strategic plans to allow their economies to not only compete globally, but also to exploit their goods to our markets here in the U.S. The sad fact of the matter is that these international markets are not reciprocating. Mr. Speaker, by welcoming our U.S. goods to their marketplace.

In recent years, the U.S. has actually lost market share to growing export countries like China, regional areas like Southeast Asia, and countries like India. If we do not act now, this steady decline will continue to exist and it will also persist. We simply cannot allow that to happen.

This bill requires the President to undertake a deep and broad analysis of the Nation's manufacturing sector, including the international economic environment, related technological development, workforce elements, the impact of governmental policies, and other relevant issues affecting domestic manufacturers.

I also added a provision requiring analysis on the trade imbalance, job creation, employment disparities, and workforce development. Based on this analysis, Mr. Speaker, the President, in collaboration with key Cabinet officials within his administration, as well as Governors, State and local elected officials and other key stakeholders in the public and private sectors, will develop a 4-year national strategy that identifies goals and makes recommendations to improve our Nation's economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and to help our manufacturing sector become bigger, become

bolder, and become better than it was in the distant past.

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

□ 1040

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITFIELD. First of all, I do want to thank Congressman LIPINSKI of Illinois for introducing this legislation on the National Manufacturing Strategy Act.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all recognize in America today that our manufacturing sector, while still one of the strongest in the world, has lost a lot of manufacturing jobs. In fact, we have lost way too many. This legislation, while providing additional studies to look at the problems for our manufacturing sector, I firmly believe does not go far enough and does not address the real problems with manufacturing in America today.

One issue that we certainly need to look at, in my view, is the American tax policy. It is my understanding that the United States has the second-highest corporate tax rate in the developed world and will soon move into the No. 1 slot because Japan, evidently, is getting ready to drop its corporate income tax rate.

We also know that, already in the Federal Government, there are many task forces that are looking at this manufacturing issue. For example, there is an Interagency Working Group on Manufacturing Competitiveness. The Commerce Department has a manufacturing council. The Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program is in existence, and the Interagency Working Group on Manufacturing Research and Development is operating today. Additionally, both the Department of Commerce under the Bush administration and the White House under President Obama has issued reports and recommendations on the state of domestic manufacturing.

Then just recently, in June of this year, the National Manufacturers Association issued an extensive report on what was needed in America to make manufacturing in America more competitive. One of the things that I pointed out was tax policy and a more aggressive trade policy to have tariffs lowered in other countries. Then the ability to compete in the global marketplace is vitally important.

One of the reasons I have been very much concerned about some of the energy policies of this administration, particularly as they relate to cap-and-trade, is that, if that kind of legislation is adopted, it is going to increase electricity costs and make manufacturing in America less competitive in the global marketplace.

The CEO of CSX Railroads was in my office 2 weeks ago. He said the railroads are moving more coal to the

ports for export to China today than they ever have in the past. He also said the same thing is happening in Australia. The reason for that is that the Chinese are depending more and more upon coal to produce electricity. A delegation of them came to Washington, and said one of the reasons they were doing it was that they wanted the lowest electricity costs in order to be more competitive in the global marketplace and to encourage more manufacturing plants to move to China.

So I think we need to take concrete action. We know the problems. I will say that this legislation will provide an additional study, and that may be important.

I would like to commend Chairman RUSH and Mr. LIPINSKI, because I think they improved this bill a great deal when they eliminated the task force and created one strategy board so that there would be less repetitiveness on the studies that this legislation calls for.

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the author of the legislation, my friend and an outstanding Member of this House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4692, the National Manufacturing Strategy Act.

Over the past decade, almost one-third of American manufacturing jobs have disappeared. After 110 years as the world's top manufacturing country, the United States is about to lose that perch to China. We all know how hard it is when we go anywhere to buy toys, tools—whatever it is, we know how hard it is to find “made in the USA” on a label, but American manufacturing job loss is not inevitable, and I do not accept the notion that there is nothing that we can do. Clearly, another decade like the last one would dramatically undermine the American middle class and our national security.

That is why I introduced the National Manufacturing Strategy Act. I worked with business, labor, and trade organizations to make this a bipartisan bill with broad support, and I submit for the RECORD letters of this support from some of these organizations.

The Strategy Act requires the President to appoint a board composed of government and private-sector personnel to conduct an in-depth analysis of American manufacturing. Then they must produce a strategy that includes short-term and long-term goals for creating jobs, improving domestic production, investment, international competitiveness, and for assuring an adequate defense industrial base.

Finally, the President and the board must deliver specific recommendations for accomplishing these goals. Like America's Quadrennial Defense Review, the manufacturing strategy will be updated every 4 years, enabling us to build upon successful initiatives

while correcting course as necessary. The Government Accountability Office will have to produce an analysis of progress on the implementation of the strategy. All of this is designed to make sure that the board is producing something and that we are following through on it.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of the National Manufacturing Strategy Act will ensure that American manufacturing remains on the national agenda. Numerous other countries already have manufacturing strategies, including not only China and India, but the United Kingdom, Canada, Brazil, Japan, and Germany. It is about time that America does the same before it is too late for middle class Americans and for our national security.

Some may say that the time for American manufacturing has passed. I don't believe this. I know that American manufacturers can compete with anyone in the world if we have a level playing field and if we are planning ahead. In my district, from Atlas Tool & Die, to Corey Steel, to Archer Wire, to West Bend, to ODM, they are just a few of the manufacturers who are making it and are having a difficult time, but they can do it. All American manufacturers can do it because America has the greatest manufacturers in the world.

I would like to thank Majority Leader HOYER and Caucus Chairman LARSON for bringing this bill to the floor. I would like to thank Congressman BRALEY for his work on this, along with Chairman BOBBY RUSH and Ranking Member WHITFIELD for the work that they did in improving this bill. Thank you for your comments.

I wanted to make sure that we made this a strong bipartisan bill that we could agree upon. There are a lot of issues that are out there, and I believe we must continue to promote policies to help create jobs immediately. We are not going to agree on all of those, but I think this is something that we can agree upon. The National Manufacturing Strategy Act establishes a process for strengthening American manufacturing over the long term, and it is something that we must do.

I ask my colleagues today to support this important legislation. Pass this bill.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR  
AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,

Washington, DC, July 15, 2010.

Hon. DANIEL LIPINSKI,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LIPINSKI: On behalf of the ten million working men and women of the AFL-CIO, I write in support of the National Manufacturing Strategy Act of 2010 (NMSA), H.R. 4692.

The quickest road to economic recovery and reversing high unemployment is boosting domestic production and creating good paying jobs right here at home. The best way to pursue this is by developing a comprehensive strategy to pursue these goals.

The NMSA provides a road map to do just that by requiring the President to conduct a

thorough analysis of the U.S. manufacturing sector and prepare a quadrennial report to Congress. This report must include short and long-term recommendations as well as plans for improving domestic production, investment and competitiveness.

This important work would be conducted by a governmental Manufacturing Strategy Task Force comprised of federal officials and governors and convened by the President. The task force would be assigned with soliciting public views; holding public meetings, assessing manufacturing policy; and supporting the President's overall manufacturing strategy.

Over the past decade too many investors and domestic businesses focused on short-term profits and outsourcing of jobs. It is time to refocus and recommit the United States to a long-term strategy of domestic prosperity and sustainability. The NMSA is a key component to starting that process.

The National Manufacturing Strategy Act has bipartisan sponsorship and is supported by the AFL-CIO.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL,  
Director,  
Government Affairs Department.

THE ASSOCIATION FOR  
MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY,  
McLean, VA, March 1, 2010.

Hon. DANIEL LIPINSKI,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LIPINSKI: I am writing on behalf of AMT—The Association For Manufacturing Technology—to applaud your leadership in introducing the National Manufacturing Strategy Act (H.R. 4692). AMT supports your efforts to strengthen America's manufacturing sector and ensure that its competitiveness remains a top priority of the U.S. government.

AMT represents U.S.-based manufacturing technology companies. Our members provide the tools that enable production of all manufactured goods. The recession has hit capital intensive industries, like ours, particularly hard; but we remain committed to forging a strong and prosperous future. Our national security and economic growth depend on it.

AMT welcomes the opportunity to work with you and your colleagues in advancing manufacturing to the top of our national agenda. We recognize that it will take a coordinated effort from all stakeholders—our government, business leaders and their workers, communities, and academia—to regain our competitive position. H.R. 4692 takes the important step of calling for a formal strategy to address our short and long term challenges. American manufacturers need a cohesive public policy plan that will encourage and support our ventures in creating innovative products, diversifying into new industries and capturing emerging markets. That is the path to worldwide leadership.

I have taken the liberty of letting AMT members in Illinois know of your efforts to rebuild and strengthen this critical sector of the U.S. economy. Thank you again for your support.

Best regards,

DOUGLAS K. WOODS,  
President.

PRECISION METALFORMING ASSOCIATION AND NATIONAL TOOLING & MACHINING ASSOCIATION,  
March 9, 2010.

Hon. DANIEL LIPINSKI,  
Longworth House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LIPINSKI: On behalf of One Voice, the joint effort between the Na-

tional Tooling and Machining Association (NTMA) and the Precision Metalforming Association (PMA), and our nearly 3,000 metalworking member companies, thank you for your leadership and continued efforts to address the issues facing businesses manufacturing in America. Your introduction of H.R. 4692, the National Manufacturing Strategy Act of 2010, is an important step in developing a cohesive national manufacturing strategy to support the growth and improvement of manufacturers across the country.

Manufacturing businesses employ nearly 12 million Americans and represent more than 10 percent of our entire economy, and is vital for the future of our economic and national security. In order to revitalize American manufacturing, we need our own national pro-manufacturing strategy to advance policies that will enhance U.S. industrial competitiveness. The National Manufacturing Strategy Act will put in place a process to promote policies to support a strong, vibrant national manufacturing base. It is a crucial first step to revitalize American manufacturing.

Thank you for your consideration and your leadership on behalf of the metalworking industry.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. GASKIN,  
PMA President.  
ROBERT AKERS,  
NTMA Chief Operating Officer.

THE COLD FINISHED STEEL  
BAR INSTITUTE,  
Washington, DC, July 14, 2010.

Hon. BOBBY L. RUSH,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade and Consumer Protection, Energy & Commerce Committee, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RUSH: The Cold Finished Steel Bar Institute (CFSBI) commends you for holding a hearing on H.R. 4692, the "Manufacturing Strategy Act of 2010" and requests that this letter be included in the official record of the hearing. Cold finished steel bar is incorporated into a wide range of consumer, industrial, aerospace, medical, and military products. The ultimate consumers of cold finished steel bars are small and medium-size independently owned precision machining companies across the country. The U.S. cold finished steel bar industry produces high-quality products on an efficient and cost-competitive basis, using highly-trained workers under environmentally sound conditions. The CFSBI is a trade association of these producers who account for over 85 percent of all U.S. cold finished steel bar production.

The CFSBI supports this legislation and included a strong statement of support for it in its 2010 White Paper, "Strong Medicine for Manufacturing." This paper recommended a number of actions the Congress and the Administration should take to support U.S. manufacturers. Our first recommendation on behalf of a stronger and more stable manufacturing sector in the United States was passage of H.R. 4692: Pass the "Manufacturing Strategy Act." On February 25, 2010, Congressman Dan Lipinski (D-IL) introduced a bill that directs the President, every four years, to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the nation's manufacturing sector and submit to Congress a National Manufacturing Strategy (Strategy). The bill requires the President, in developing each Strategy, to convene an inter-agency U.S. government Manufacturing Strategy Task Force and a private-sector Manufacturing Strategy Board to make recommendations regarding specific issues to be incorporated into the Strategy, including short- and long-term

goals for the manufacturing sector. This bill will not solve the problems facing U.S. manufacturers, but it is an excellent first step. Congressman Lipinski recognizes that a sound manufacturing strategy cannot be developed agency-by-agency. A successful solution will require an integrated approach across multiple agencies in the U.S. government, working in partnership with the private sector. The Administration is using a similar approach to address problems with health care, financial markets, and energy; manufacturing also deserves a comprehensive focus.

The CFSBI and its member companies applaud Congressman LIPINSKI for authoring this important legislation. We hope that this hearing is the first step in successful consideration of H.R. 4692 in the House of Representatives and that the Senate will follow suit.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. KENEFICK,  
CHAIRMAN, COLD FINISHED STEEL BAR  
INSTITUTE.

AEROSPACE INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION,  
Arlington, VA, March 15, 2010.

Hon. DANIEL LIPINSKI,  
Longworth House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LIPINSKI: Thank you for the opportunity to provide the aerospace and defense industry's comments on the National Manufacturing Strategy Act of 2010. As you may know, the Aerospace Industries Association (AIA) represents nearly 300 manufacturing companies with over 644,200 high-wage, high skilled aerospace employees across the civil aviation, space systems, and national defense. Our member companies export nearly 40 percent of their total output, and we routinely post the nation's largest manufacturing trade surplus, \$56 billion in 2009. Aerospace indirectly supports 2 million middle class jobs and 30,000 suppliers from all 50 states. The aerospace industry continues to look to the future, investing heavily in R&D, spending well more than \$100 billion over the last 15 years.

The aerospace industry commends you for the hard work and interest you have shown to the nation's manufacturing capability. We share many of the same goals outlined by your legislation including the creation of high-quality jobs; increased productivity, exports, and global competitiveness; increased domestic manufacturing capacity; and expanded research and development activities to encourage innovation. The requirement for a detailed analysis of the U.S. manufacturing base and creation of an interagency task force will certainly help improve the government's understanding of the challenges faced by this vital industry.

We also appreciate the requirement for a detailed review of tax, federal procurement, workforce development, and export control reform policies. AIA has issued a number of reports in these areas and would be pleased to work with the task force in an effort to share the perspective of the aerospace industry. With the creation of the Manufacturing Strategy Board, we hope that the President will also consider a strong representation from the aerospace sector given our role as one of the leading manufacturing industries.

Thank you again for your interest, hard work, and efforts to address the needs of our nation's manufacturing sector.

Best regards,

MARION C. BLAKEY.

NATIONAL DEFENSE  
INDUSTRIAL ASSOCIATION,  
Arlington, VA, March 16, 2010.

Hon. DANIEL LIPINSKI,

Longworth House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. LIPINSKI: The National Defense Industrial Association (NDIA) offers its strong support for H.R. 4692, the National Manufacturing Strategy Act of 2010. NDIA, with just over 1,700 corporate members and nearly 80,000 individual members, is America's leading Defense Industry association promoting national security. As such, we understand the importance of a strong U.S. manufacturing base and the need for a national manufacturing strategy.

A vibrant industrial base is critical to U.S. national security, for both economic and materiel supply reasons. The U.S. industrial base represents a critical element of the economic power of our country. Although about 12 percent of total U.S. GDP is generated directly by the industrial base, it is responsible for a much larger portion, as much as one third of total GDP, when considering the commodities and services that manufacturers consume. Further, over 60 percent of total U.S. exports are manufactured goods and about 10 percent of total employment is within the industrial base.

The national security is also dependent upon the uninterrupted supply of critical materials, systems and logistics support. This is especially true for the needs of our armed forces and homeland security. To guarantee this supply we must ensure the continued viability of the production capabilities of the U.S. industrial base. We simply cannot rely on developing or potentially adversarial nations for these critical supplies.

A national manufacturing strategy, such as proposed by H.R. 4692, provides the U.S. with an understanding of critical industrial base issues and their impact on our nation. It will also provide a common direction for future government, academia and industrial programs and a focus for these organizations to leverage each other's efforts for the common good. A national manufacturing strategy will also put the U.S. on an equal strategic footing with many other countries that have had national strategic plans in place for some time.

Mr. Lipinski, NDIA strongly supports H.R. 4692, the National Manufacturing Strategy Act of 2010 and encourages all members of Congress to consider the significant contribution that such a strategy will have on the U.S. industrial base, we ask that they endorse the passage of this critical bill.

Sincerely and Respectfully,

LAWRENCE P. FARRELL, JR.,  
Lieutenant General, USAF (Ret.),  
President and CEO, NDIA.

COALITION FOR A  
PROSPEROUS AMERICA,  
Sheffield, MA, April 27, 2010.

Hon. DANIEL LIPINSKI,  
Longworth House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LIPINSKI: The Coalition for a Prosperous America is pleased to announce that we have endorsed your National Manufacturing Strategy Act, H.R. 4692.

The United States is the only major country that does not have an industrial strategy. Every one of our trading rivals has a plan that considers their industrial sector in terms of many factors including national security, economic growth, full employment, and geopolitical competition. The fact that the U.S. has no such plan is a key component in our economic problems.

Your National Manufacturing Strategy Act requires the creation of a process to devise a national manufacturing strategy. Such a plan will consider the role of manufacturing in national security, achieving full

employment, increasing global competitiveness, and other important factors. We would suggest strengthening the bill with more action steps beyond procedural items already listed, and would be pleased to work with you accordingly.

Today, too many disparate agencies lay claim to portions of what would otherwise be a national manufacturing strategy. Some in Washington call this the "silo" approach. We need government to break down these silos. Tax, trade, currency valuation, innovation, infrastructure, government procurement and other important topics should be considered in a cohesive plan.

We retooled our country to successfully fight and win World War II. We need to be able to do this again today. CPA is pleased to offer our support and thanks for your efforts.

Respectfully,

BRIAN O'SHAUGHNESSY,  
Chief Co-Chair, Man-  
ufacturing Co-Chair.  
JOE LOGAN,  
Agriculture Co-Chair.  
ROBERT BAUGH,  
Labor Co-Chair.

AMERICAN MANUFACTURING TRADE  
ACTION COALITION,  
Washington, DC, June 8, 2010.

Rep. DANIEL LIPINSKI,  
Longworth House Office Building,  
Washington DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LIPINSKI: I write on behalf of the American Manufacturing Trade Action Coalition (AMTAC) endorsing H.R. 4692, the National Manufacturing Strategy Act. We thank you for introducing H.R. 4692 in an effort to reinvigorate the manufacturing sector of the U.S. economy.

Our first Secretary of Treasury, Alexander Hamilton, understood the need for a national manufacturing strategy. His "Report on Manufactures" provided President Washington, and all subsequent presidents and Congresses a blueprint for encouraging the development of a vibrant manufacturing sector in the United States. One of the great stories of the history of the United States during the 19th and 20th centuries was that of the rise of our manufacturing sector. Unfortunately, the story of U.S. based manufacturing during the last twenty or thirty years has been one of disinvestment, off-shoring and decline. And, of course, this has meant the loss of many jobs—usually good, high paying jobs. In fact, over the past ten years the United States has lost some 4 million manufacturing jobs.

H.R. 4692 would help begin the reinvigoration of the domestic manufacturing sector by directing the President to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the nation's manufacturing sector. More importantly, H.R. 4692 recognizes that analysis alone will do nothing to jump-start our manufacturing sector. Therefore, it directs that the President use the information gleaned from that analysis and submit to Congress a national manufacturing strategy.

These and other provisions of the bill are salutary reforms that, if implemented, can help ignite a rebirth of the American manufacturing sector and AMTAC welcomes and supports these changes.

Sincerely,

AUGGIE TANTILLO,  
Executive Director, American  
Manufacturing Trade Action Coalition.

AMERICAN IRON AND STEEL  
INSTITUTE,*Washington, DC, February 23, 2010.*Hon. DANIEL LIPINSKI,  
*House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LIPINSKI: I write today, on behalf of the members of the American Iron and Steel Institute (AISI), to thank you for introducing legislation that would require the President to develop a quadrennial national manufacturing strategy.

The domestic steel industry strongly supports implementation of a national pro-manufacturing strategy and your bill takes an important step towards achieving this goal. As you know, in the current global economy, overall cost factors play a decisive role in how and where companies choose to invest and locate their facilities. As such, it is critical that the U.S. government address these cost factors and provide industry with a level playing field on which to compete globally. This means minimizing burdensome regulations and taxes, investing in transportation and energy infrastructure and promoting exports while enforcing trade laws, trade agreements and Customs rules.

Consequently, we appreciate that your bill creates a process for the U.S. government to develop a national manufacturing strategy and identifies key policy goals for such a strategy. We also support the creation of a Manufacturing Strategy Board consisting of individuals from the private sector, from a broad range of industries and regions, who are to provide the President with the needs of and opportunities for the nation's manufacturing sectors. The President will be well served in gaining advice and suggestions from industry experts who live and work in their respective fields each and every day.

U.S. manufacturing is critical to the future of our economy and security and we appreciate your efforts on behalf of manufacturing with the introduction of this important legislation. We look forward to working with you on this bill and on future efforts to put in place policies that promote a strong, vibrant national manufacturing base.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. GIBSON.

UNITED STATES BUSINESS AND  
INDUSTRY COUNCIL*Washington, DC, July 12, 2010.*Hon. DANIEL LIPINSKI,  
*Longworth House Office Building,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR REP. LIPINSKI: On behalf of the 2,000 domestic manufacturing companies comprising the U.S. Business and Industry Council, I am writing to thank you for introducing H.R. 4692, the National Manufacturing Strategy Act of 2010, and to offer our strong support for this legislation. Your legislation will create the policy framework urgently needed by the nation to revitalize its dramatically weakened domestic manufacturing sector, and thereby help achieve genuine recovery from the ongoing economic crisis. We strongly urge its prompt passage by Congress and enactment into law.

Although most of Washington remains uneducated as to the centrality of domestic manufacturing for a strong economy, the paramount lesson of the current economic crisis is that the United States needs a completely new strategy to deal with the so-called globalization of our economy and to revitalize our industrial base.

For decades, most of our political and multinational business establishment has promulgated the falsehood that American prosperity could be based on borrowing, spending, and importing. Creating real wealth—the historical foundation of national suc-

cess—and creating the appropriate policy environment for it were totally ignored. The U.S. housing and financial sectors were coddled (with artificially low interest rates and the abandonment of successful oversight in laws like Glass-Steagall), while manufacturing—which has been the dominant factor in domestic wealth creation since the nation industrialized—was neglected and even scorned. Typical was former Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan's remark that manufacturing is "something we were terrific at fifty years ago . . . essentially a nineteenth- and twentieth-century technology." A worldwide financial meltdown, painful recession, and mammoth long-term U.S. debt burden have been the inevitable results.

Your introduction of the National Manufacturing Strategy Act demonstrates convincingly that you and your cosponsors understand that restoring our nation's economic health requires producing not consuming our way out of recession, and that expanding our industrial output is the biggest key to success. But without swift Congressional and presidential action, the U.S. economy may deteriorate past the point of no return.

America's massive manufacturing job loss and factory closings over the past decade are well known. But even more serious signs of the sector's distress abound. Despite trillions of dollars of government stimulus spending, tax breaks, and industry bailouts, the U.S. economy has shrunk in real terms by 1.14 percent during the recession. But manufacturing output, though now higher than its recession trough, is still down 9.72 percent—and recent scholarly research indicates that even this figure may significantly understate the devastation.

In addition, industrial capacity has fallen during this recession for only the second time since the end of World War II. A new report by the U.S. Business and Industry Council shows that, in 2008, imports captured 36.23 percent of America's domestic markets for advanced manufactured goods like semiconductors, aircraft, construction equipment, machine tools, and pharmaceuticals. In 1997, the figure was only 21.36 percent.

To make matters worse, many in the political leadership class seem determined to recreate the borrowing, spending, and importing bubble that just burst so disastrously. For example, the same Wall Street firms whose crackpot lending and compensation policies, and especially their phony financial instruments, helped trigger the crisis received an enormous bailout, and the new financial regulation bill generally preserves their too-big-to-fail status and license to speculate recklessly. The Fed's loose-money policies have become free-money policies, and outright spending and lending subsidies. Finally, too much of the economic stimulus package was simply unproductive spending.

Meanwhile, here's the "help" that genuinely productive industries like manufacturing have gotten: a miserly auto rescue package that has helped reduce GM to its 1920s dimensions; auto and appliance rebate programs that spurred the purchase of at least as many imports as domestically produced goods; buy American stimulus bill provisions shot through with loopholes; vague rhetoric about "green manufacturing" that ignores the need to ensure these industries remain onshore; and the continued pursuit of outsourcing-focused trade agreements sure to send more productive American jobs abroad.

Largely as a result of misguided policies, personal consumption is even higher today than at its dangerous pre-crisis levels, the trade deficit in the first quarter of this year

grew more than 10 times faster than the economy, and the manufacturing trade deficit is up by more than 19 percent on an annual basis—with manufacturing exports continuing to grow more slowly than total goods exports despite 15 years worth of free-trade agreements touted as foreign market-opening bonanzas.

No wonder the unemployment rate remains sky high, and only the federal government and heavily subsidized sectors, like health care and education, are creating meaningful numbers of jobs.

The National Manufacturing Strategy Act will help replace this failed binge-spending and borrowing approach with a strategy aimed at promoting the production- and earnings-based prosperity that only a much stronger manufacturing sector can create.

The U.S. Business and Industry Council is especially heartened by the following features of the bill:

1. It would encourage a long overdue explicit acknowledgment by Congress of domestic manufacturing's central role in generating and preserving American prosperity, technological progress, and national security.

2. It recognizes that a sweeping and concerted federal government-wide effort is instrumental for domestic manufacturing's revival.

3. It would require several federal studies to assess domestic manufacturing's strengths and weaknesses rigorously and comprehensively. Similarly, it would foster detailed government study of manufacturing trade and off-shoring flows, and federal procurement of manufactures imports in the civilian and defense sectors. These provisions would fill much of the knowledge vacuum that currently hamstring U.S. manufacturing policymaking. In the process, the legislation would end the monopoly currently enjoyed by outsourcing-happy multinational companies over too much crucial manufacturing and national security-related data.

4. It recognizes the scale of the challenges facing domestic manufacturing by setting a deadline of February, 2011, for publication of the first annual White House National Manufacturing Strategy blueprint.

5. It recognizes that expanding manufacturing employment requires expanding manufacturing production—that only healthy industries can create new jobs and preserve existing positions.

6. It understands that active efforts are needed to ensure that more of America's wealth and investment capital gets channeled to productive activities like manufacturing.

7. It would mandate that the Executive Branch and Congress examine the often make-or-break impact of the range of federal policies on manufacturing's fortunes.

8. It recognizes the special importance of small and medium-sized manufacturing companies, which through their production of precision parts and components in particular generate so much of America's value-added and innovation.

9. It gives these companies meaningful representation on the proposed President's Manufacturing Strategy Board.

10. It promotes follow-through and accountability in domestic manufacturing policy by requiring a Comptroller General's evaluation of the President's manufacturing strategy blueprint—including progress in implementation—and a presidential report on "the consistency of the budget with the goals and recommendations included in the blueprint."

America's economic and industrial success has always resulted first and foremost from its free-enterprise system. But government has consistently played a major role, too,



from the publication of Alexander Hamilton's Report on Manufactures to the National Institutes of Health's support for pharmaceutical research to the Defense Department's nurturing of the aviation and information technology sectors. And this government role will surely expand as competition intensifies from foreign countries whose leaders vigorously support their industries in a host of overt and covert ways.

Your National Manufacturing Strategy Act will boost the odds of America's getting manufacturing policy right. Thank you again for introducing this vital legislation. The U.S. Business and Industry Council looks forward to working with you to help it attract the strong support and quick passage it deserves.

Sincerely,

KEVIN L. KEARNS,  
PRESIDENT,  
U.S. Business and Industry Council.

MOTOROLA, INC.,  
Washington, DC, July 12, 2010.

For more than 80 years Motorola has been committed to innovation in communications and electronics. We developed the first mobile police car radio, the first mobile backpack radio systems for World War II, the first cellular network and phone. The first words spoken from the moon were carried over Motorola equipment. We are a company born in America and now operating around the globe, drawing on the diversity of perspectives and talents from different parts of the globe.

American manufacturers, like Motorola, have long spurred economic growth and technological advancement in America and abroad. That said, we wholeheartedly support the spirit H.R. 4692, the National Manufacturing Strategy Act, sponsored by Representative DANIEL LIPINSKI that expresses a sense of Congress that the United States Government should promote policies related to the Nation's manufacturing sector that would foster economic growth, create jobs, improve the workforce, increase productivity, and maintain and improve national security, among other improvements. Specifically, H.R. 4692 requires the President to conduct an analysis of factors affecting manufacturing competitiveness, and devise a strategy to pursue policies and improve government coordination in support of domestic manufacturing. We believe that such an analysis will foster more innovation and competitiveness for U.S. manufacturers.

We look forward to working with Representative DANIEL LIPINSKI and his staff as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

YARDLY POLLAS-KIMBLE,  
Senior Director,  
Global Government Affairs.

MOTOR & EQUIPMENT  
MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, DC, July 19, 2010.

Hon. DANIEL LIPINSKI  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LIPINSKI: The Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association (MEMA) represents over 600 companies that manufacture motor vehicle parts for use in the light vehicle and heavy-duty original equipment and aftermarket industries. Motor vehicle parts manufacturers are the nation's largest manufacturing sector, directly employing nearly 686,000 U.S. workers and contributing to over 3.29 million jobs across the country. In fact, parts manufacturers are the largest manufacturing employer in eight states: Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, Oklahoma, South

Carolina and Tennessee. The economic impact of this industry is felt not only by motor vehicle manufacturers, but also in the millions of other jobs that are dependent on parts suppliers.

MEMA is pleased to support H.R. 4692, the National Manufacturing Strategy Act of 2010. Parts manufacturers believe a national manufacturing strategy will help focus resources on important manufacturing initiatives. In addition, MEMA hopes that the process will provide all manufacturers with a forum to discuss the wide range of policies necessary to provide for a secure and strong manufacturing base.

Thank you for your leadership on this important issue.

Sincerely,

ROBERT MCKENNA,  
President and CEO.

AMERICAN FOUNDRY SOCIETY,  
Schaumburg, IL, July 23, 2010.

Congressman DAN LIPINSKI,  
Longworth HOB,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LIPINSKI: On behalf of the American Foundry Society, we commend you for introducing the National Manufacturing Strategy Act of 2010 (H.R. 4692). We strongly support this measure which would require the President to develop a quadrennial national manufacturing strategy and identify key policy goals critical to the future of U.S. manufacturing. This represents the first step in restoring our manufacturing competitiveness.

Over the last decade, America has lost one-third of all its manufacturing jobs, including thousands of jobs in the metalcasting industry. Metalcasters face the most intense global competition in history from companies operating in countries that enjoy government trade protections, fixed currency levels and a variety of subsidies.

The U.S. metalcasting industry is critical for the future of our economic and national security. More than 90 percent of all manufactured goods and capital equipment use castings as engineered components or rely on castings for their manufacture. In fact, foundries supply millions of castings a year for use in our military's jets, helicopters, ships, tanks, weapon systems and other vital components.

AFS serves as the voice of the North American metalcasting industry. Our association is comprised of more than 7,000 members representing more than 700 U.S.-based metalcasting firms, students, industry suppliers and customers in every state in the country. Our members produce thousands of different types of metal castings ranging from aircraft and automobile components to cookware and surgical equipment.

There are over 2,000 metal casting facilities in the U.S. employing more than 200,000 workers. Foundries are predominantly small businesses, with 80 percent having less than 100 employees. Many of these shops are still family-owned.

The time is now for the U.S. to develop its own national pro-manufacturing strategy to advance policies that will enhance U.S. industrial competitiveness. Again, thank you for your leadership and support of American manufacturing.

Sincerely,

JERRY CALL,  
Executive Vice President.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), who is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for

yielding. I also thank my colleague from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) for bringing forward this bill, H.R. 4692, the National Manufacturing Strategy Act of 2010, as it is formally called.

□ 1050

And I also, of course, thank the subcommittee chair, Mr. RUSH, as well. I think they should be commended. It's a nice thing to do. It's a nice statement to make, this National Manufacturing Strategy Act. And, as Mr. LIPINSKI just said, Mr. Speaker, it would assure, hopefully, that manufacturing remains on our national agenda. And that's about all it can do, in my humble opinion. Mr. Speaker, that's just about all it can do if it's 100 percent successful. It will assure that manufacturing remains on our national agenda.

When we're sitting here in this country with 10 percent, nearly 10 percent unemployment and 16 million people out of work, many of them for more than 6 months—indeed, that's the reason we wanted to extend unemployment coverage for 99 weeks—it's time, I think, that we need to act, and act very positively, very aggressively.

And you just heard, Mr. Speaker, from the ranking member of the committee, Mr. WHITFIELD, talk about these trade agreements that have been negotiated, in fact, 2 or 3 years ago, with South Korea, with Colombia, with Panama. And yet, the Democratic leadership of this House refuses to bring those trade agreements to the floor for an up-or-down vote.

It's just amazing to me that we're spending time on a bill that's going to study the issue more and come forward with a report when we have information that says the free trade agreements with South Korea and Colombia alone would lead to a decline of \$40.2 billion—the failure to implement, I should say, the failure to implement those trade agreements will lead to a decline of \$40.2 billion in U.S. exports of goods and services. Failure to act would also leave \$44.8 billion in missed opportunities for U.S. companies, while also resulting in roughly another 400,000 jobs going elsewhere, that is, offshore.

So, again, there's no finer gentleman in this House than Representative LIPINSKI. I have great respect for him. And I think he's trying to do the right thing because it's the only thing that his majority will let him do, Mr. Speaker.

What we need to do is approve these free trade agreements. We need to lower the corporate tax rate. OECD countries have done that, except us, and we're sitting here with a 35 percent corporate tax rate. And we're doing nothing, really we're doing nothing but creating another study group, and that's about as duplicative as you could get. God knows how many study groups, Mr. Speaker, we have already created.

I, too, like Mr. LIPINSKI, meet with my manufacturers in the 11th District

of Georgia, and I just did that last week. And we talked about these things, these free trade agreements that have been negotiated, how much it would improve our exports and our positive trade balance and create manufacturing jobs, and do it now. We talked about the tax structure. We talked about overregulation and the burdens that this government is placing on our manufacturers.

And then, you know, just like we stand up and honor the troops once a week, I guess at least once a month we stand up and honor the manufacturing industry in the Rust Belt, all the while suffering, 16 million unemployed and a 10 percent unemployment rate. We're not doing anything except studying it to death, as the ship continues to sink.

So I say, the bill, I'm going to support it, sure, but this is the wrong approach. And I don't mean any disrespect to my colleagues. It's a good bipartisan effort, and I'm glad that we've finally taken an opportunity to do something in a bipartisan way. But we need to move much quicker, much faster, and much further, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO).

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, today we have a unique opportunity to lend a hand to American manufacturers. I'm proud to join my good friend and colleague from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) in being an original cosponsor of this legislation. And, in fact, when I chaired the Small Business Committee, we had field hearings in both his district and Mr. DAVIS' centered on the issue of manufacturing in America.

As the cofounder and cochair of the House Manufacturing Caucus, I can't overstate the importance of manufacturing to America. One in six jobs in America is directly related to manufacturing, and one in four in the congressional district that I represent.

Manufacturing drives innovation by conducting nearly half of all research and development and creating the bulk of technology in our Nation. Nearly 60 percent of exported goods are manufactured goods.

Every \$1 in final sales of manufactured goods supports \$1.40 in output, which is higher than any other economic sector. If we don't make things in America, then even those service jobs, however, will disappear.

I spent probably two-thirds of my time in Congress studying and working on manufacturing issues, from raw materials and minerals all the way through to export controls. In fact, within the past Congress, working with Congressmen BLUMENAUER, CROWLEY, and SHERMAN, all Democrats, we were able to amend section 17(c) of the Export Administration Act, which has resulted in the additional billions of dollars more of aircraft parts being exported. In fact, I'm probably the only Member of Congress who's ever gone to

warehousing school to study the flow of manufactured items to the floor of sales.

Every few years, the manufacturing sector in the U.S. experiences a crisis. The last report that was issued was in 2004. This chart right here represents probably 12 or 14 years of work in my office. We tried to identify the numerous Federal programs and agencies that support manufacturing. People will come to the office, we would add in hand exactly what those are.

It's still difficult to have a central focus point to know who's manufacturing and who's doing research in a particular area. For example, if somebody wants to do research on machining titanium or Inconel, there's no central portal through which that person can go to determine exactly what programs or who's doing that research. That's one of the beauties of the bill that Congressman LIPINSKI has introduced.

Why is it necessary to have a study? Because Americans need to know the importance of manufacturing. If we don't have manufacturing, agriculture, and mining in this country, we become a Third World nation. If we can't make things with our hands, then we become hindered in maintaining our status as a world leader.

The whole purpose of having a comprehensive strategy in manufacturing is, as Mr. LIPINSKI said, to call the Nation's importance to the fact that young people need to go into manufacturing, need to go to our community colleges to learn how these sophisticated machines are made.

I've probably been in 500 to 700 factories all over the world studying and analyzing exactly what America needs.

This bill has, as its purpose, to show Americans, but more importantly to bring to the attention of fellow Members of Congress, the absolute importance of protecting manufacturing in this country. It is a great bill because what it will do is it will help identify those programs that exist, those that are working, and those that should be eliminated.

If we pass the National Manufacturing Strategy Act into law, a new Manufacturing Strategy Board will help the President to conduct an in-depth analysis of the Nation's manufacturing sector and develop a comprehensive strategy for enhancing its competitiveness and promoting its success in the global economy.

So I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4692.

We have a unique opportunity today to boost the U.S. economy and lend a hand to American manufacturers.

The bipartisan National Manufacturing Strategy Act (H.R. 4692) will help American manufacturing rebound from recent economic turmoil to ensure that both our workers and our factories are equipped to thrive in the 21st Century.

The 16th District of Illinois, which I am so proud to represent, is one of the most heavily industrialized Congressional districts in the na-

tion. Winnebago County, in the center of the district I represent, is second only to Wayne County, Michigan, in terms of per capita concentration of manufacturing as a percentage of the local economy. And Rockford, Illinois, is in the center of Winnebago County. There, we make everything from nuts and bolts to the advanced electrical system for the new Boeing 787, the Dreamliner.

I simply cannot overstate the importance of manufacturing not only to northwest Illinois but to the America. The United States has the largest manufacturing economy in the world, producing \$1.6 trillion in value annually—that's 11 percent of U.S. gross domestic product (GDP). One in six U.S. jobs is tied directly or indirectly to manufacturing, and strides in productivity have held down inflation and contributed to higher standards of living for hard-working Americans. Manufacturing drives innovation by conducting nearly half of all research and development and creating the bulk of technology in our nation. Nearly 60 percent of all exported goods from the U.S. originate from the manufacturing sector.

In the United States, every \$1.00 in final sales of manufactured goods supports \$1.40 in output from other sectors of the economy. That multiplier effect on our investment dollars is higher than any other economic sector.

Manufacturing is the lifeblood of the American economy and its continued strength is key to putting Americans back to work. For too long, manufacturing has received second-class treatment from our government. While Washington hesitates to act, American industries are withering under intense global competition and jobs have gone overseas. It's time for the federal government to get serious and implement an agenda to strengthen American manufacturing and restore American jobs, and that's exactly what this legislation will require.

There are numerous existing federal programs to support American manufacturing, but our national manufacturing policy is disjointed and reactionary. Other nations proactively support their industrial base through programs and policies. If we pass the National Manufacturing Strategy Act into law, a new Manufacturing Strategy Board will help the President to conduct an in-depth analysis of the nation's manufacturing sector and develop a comprehensive strategy for enhancing its competitiveness and promoting its success in the global economy.

The aim of the strategy and the quadrennial review is to harmonize manufacturing policy across the government and ensure that it is unified, innovative, and results-oriented.

As noted in recent committee testimony from AAM president Scott Paul, Alexander Hamilton himself constructed America's first industrial policy in 1791. Our founding fathers recognized that a robust industrial base is vital to both our national security and a flourishing economy.

Instead of wallowing in anxiety over the fate of our economy, Congress needs to demand action that will produce results. America's manufacturers are among the most innovative and productive in the world, but they aren't getting the support they need from their government. By developing a long-term plan with input from a wide range of stakeholders and experts, the National Manufacturing Strategy Act will ensure that we are doing absolutely all that we can to help this vital industry.



□ 1100

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and honor to yield 1 minute to our great majority leader, Congressman HOYER of Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am pleased to follow my friend, Congressman MANZULLO, in speaking about the importance of making it in America. Making it in America is not just about manufacturing in America, it's about succeeding in America, making sure that America continues to be the vibrant engine of our economy and the international economy, making things not only for Americans, but for all the world. And I thank Mr. MANZULLO for his comments.

Americans have always looked to the manufacturing sector as a source of economic vitality and as a source of pride. I want to thank my friend from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), who has been such an outstanding leader in this Congress on behalf of growing our economy, jobs for Americans, good pay and good benefits for all Americans.

America has long prided itself on being a country that makes things. And Democrats, and I know my Republican friends, are committed to making sure that is true in the future. America agrees on the importance of manufacturing to our economy. You just ask them and they will tell you we need to make it in America. Fifty-seven percent of Americans believe it is one of the most important factors in our economic strength, and 85 percent of Americans believe that creating manufacturing jobs is important to our economic recovery. We need to make it in America.

It's true that manufacturing has taken a severe hit in this recession. In fact, it's been taking hits for quite some time, particularly under the previous administration. Over the past decade, America lost one-third of its manufacturing jobs. These three bills are designed to turn that status around.

If we want American manufacturing to be strong again, if we want to emerge from these hard times with a more competitive, job-creating economy, we need to get serious about our manufacturing strategy. That is the impulse behind the Democrats' Making it in America agenda: creating incentives for investments in industry, strengthening manufacturing infrastructure and innovation, strengthening our workforce, and helping to level the playing field for American companies. That's what our focus is going to be. That's what Mr. MANZULLO was talking about.

So far, the Make it in America agenda has resulted in the passage of the U.S. Manufacturing Enhancement Act. It passed the House just a few days ago on an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote, passed the Senate by unanimous consent, and is at the White House. This helps American companies get the affordable materials they need. And it's

passed the Senate and is on the way to becoming law, as I said.

The House has also passed the SECTORS Act, which invests in 21st-century workforce training, to make sure that our people have the skills to make it in America. Bills like these build on the success we have already in rallying America's manufacturing sector under the Obama administration. Since the beginning of the year, our private sector has actually created 136,000 new manufacturing jobs.

This bill, the National Manufacturing Strategy Act, can contribute to that job creation. It directs the President to develop a national manufacturing strategy every 4 years, with input from the private sector, from manufacturing leaders, Federal officials, and State governments. They will analyze all of the factors affecting American manufacturing, from financing to trade barriers, and recommend actions that industry and Federal and State and local governments can take to boost manufacturing and create good-paying jobs.

I spoke about this the other day at the Center for American Progress. And a representative of the National Association of Manufacturers, Mr. Speaker, stood and congratulated us on this effort. And I told her that we were looking to work with the National Association of Manufacturers and others to build manufacturing capacity and to create these good-paying jobs with good benefits and making America work better.

The bill's sponsor, Congressman LIPINSKI, from the heartland of America, your State, Mr. RUSH, Illinois, points out that similar national strategies are widespread. China, India, the UK, Brazil, Canada, and Germany all have manufacturing strategies; and we need one if we want to stay competitive with them.

And as has been true in the past, the "Made in America" label will be sought and admired throughout the world. This bill is an important way to take our industries' struggles seriously and begin responding to them constructively.

I urge my colleagues to pass this bill and the two that will follow to make America a more competitive, growing economy. Make it in America, an agenda that the House will consider this week and the 4 weeks when we return from our break: the Clean Energy Technology Manufacturing and Export Assistance Act, which will ensure that clean energy technology firms have the information and assistance they need to stay competitive; and the End the Trade Deficit Act, all on the agenda, sponsored by Congresswoman MATSUI, which will develop strategies to combat the trade deficit. Through steps like these we can begin to restore America's pride in its manufacturing and in the solid jobs it creates for middle class families.

Make it in America is not simply a slogan; it is a commitment, a commit-

ment to reestablish a dynamic engine for job creation. Make it in America is a commitment to ensuring that America's future is one in which America competes successfully and profitably in the new global marketplace. Make it in America is a psychology of excellence, a level playing field in trade relations, and the creation of an environment that facilitates manufacturing projects, expansion, and the sale of American products to the world.

America's innovative abilities and the talent and work ethic of our workers have historically led our country to extraordinary economic growth and success. The Make it in America agenda is a commitment, a commitment to making that success not only a proud part of our history, but a reality for our future. We're going to make it in America, and we're going to make it in America.

Mr. WHITFIELD. May I ask how much time we have remaining on this side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 7 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I come in support of H.R. 4692, the National Manufacturing Strategy Act. I was pleased to support, actually, my two great colleagues from Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. RUSH. I appreciate them bringing it down to the floor.

Basically, I think what can occur from this is a reevaluation of things that we know. When we are at 9.5 percent unemployment, 15 million Americans unemployed, 1.5 percent increase since the failed stimulus bill was passed at a cost of \$1.2 trillion, what do businesses need to create jobs? And what does the manufacturing sector need to create jobs? They need certainty.

As I said in my 1-minute this morning, a businessman talked to me, You can't ask us to create new jobs when you raise our taxes. You can't ask us to create more jobs when you raise our taxes. That's issue one. I think that will come out of the national manufacturing strategy.

You can't expect us to create jobs when you raise our energy costs. The cap-and-trade energy bill passed through this House raises energy costs. It is a tax on carbon. Carbon is a fossil fuel. That raises manufacturing costs. We cannot create more jobs when we add costs to the manufacturing sector.

We cannot create jobs when there is regulatory uncertainty. When we've got EPA and OSHA and all these people poking around trying to protect the workers, which they do, it's that old saying: I'm from the government and I'm here to help you.

They are not here to help you under this administration. They're here to penalize. They're here to fine. They're

here to create uncertainty, which makes it very difficult to create jobs.

□ 1110

And the last one is the health care law. Additional uncertainty. "We have to pass the bill before we know what's in the bill." What do you think the manufacturing companies are doing? They're trying to figure out what we just did to them.

So I hope this national manufacturing strategy, which I am a cosponsor of, will say: Reduce the tax burden, ease the regulatory burden, lower energy costs, make a competitive, vibrant market. That's how we create jobs in America.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the author of the legislation, Mr. LIPINSKI, once again.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) was just down here. I wanted to thank him again for really putting forward this make it in America, sell it to the world. That is what we need to do. You ask any American. They know that is what we need to do to keep this recovery going and really get us out of this recession.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) for all of the work that he has done. We've worked closely together since I have been in Congress on manufacturing. And I think the chart he had up here was one of the best reasons why we need this strategy.

The government is doing a lot on manufacturing; it's just disjointed. It's oftentimes ad hoc. We need to bring that together. So I thank Mr. MANZULLO for his work on that, and that's just a great example.

And those who say maybe the government shouldn't be doing anything on manufacturing, we are already doing a lot. Let's get it together and let's do it right.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make some concluding remarks.

All of us on this side of the aisle support Mr. LIPINSKI's effort. We believe that this legislation is good and we commend Mr. RUSH and Mr. LIPINSKI.

But we reiterate that this administration is not doing enough to improve manufacturing in America. The majority leader said we want more products produced in America. But in order to do that, we need a tax policy that encourages investment, not making it more expensive to do business in America. We need a policy to provide incentives for more research and development to be more competitive in the global marketplace. We need a strong program to defend and protect intellectual property developed by our manufacturers. We need a strong international trade policy that encourages more American products to be sold abroad.

And as the gentleman from Illinois said, we need an energy policy that does not raise energy costs. And every

objective analysis of the Obama administration's cap-and-trade system indicates that that bill would dramatically increase electricity costs making American manufacturers less competitive, not more competitive. I have already talked about China and the steps that they're taking to decrease their electricity costs.

So we support this bill, but we need to do more. And we call upon the administration to do more than just talk about these issues.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, what we don't need is more excuses. What America doesn't need is more excuses that have been heard on this floor for many years now. We don't need any more excuses, Mr. Speaker. We need action. This bill that we are deliberating on today will go a long ways toward making America much more viable and making America's manufacturing center much more robust.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the Members of this House that manufacturing has been the engine that drives the American economy for more than 100 years and it will continue to well into the 21st century. America's future growth, security, and leadership in the global economy will depend on the strength and viability of our manufacturing base. That's why it's so important to reverse the current ebb.

The U.S., Mr. Speaker, has lost more than 5 million manufacturing jobs since 2000—almost 17 percent of all manufacturing jobs in the Nation. We can maintain our leadership position in the global economy but only if we strengthen the core of our economy, which is manufacturing.

America's economy depends on manufacturing. Manufacturing in the U.S. generates about \$1.4 trillion, or 12 percent of our gross domestic product. Manufacturing is responsible for nearly two-thirds of private sector research and development in the U.S. Over the past two decades manufacturing productivity has increased at twice the rate of the rest of the private sector.

America's economy depends on manufacturing. America's economy depends on manufacturing for good jobs. Manufacturing directly employs 14 million Americans and supports 8 million more. Each manufacturing job supports as many as four other jobs, providing a boost to local economies. For example, every 100 steel or every 100 auto jobs create between 400 and 500 new jobs in the rest of the economy. This contrasts with the retail sector, where every 100 jobs generate 94 new jobs elsewhere, and in contrast with the personal and service sectors where every 100 jobs create 147 new jobs.

This multiplier effect reflects how manufacturing's linkages run deep into the overall economy and means improvements in manufacturing productivity translate broadly into the economy as a whole.

America's economy depends on manufacturing. America depends on manufacturing for good jobs. And across this Nation, our States depend on manufacturing. Manufacturing is a vital part of the economies of most States. As a share of gross State product (GSP), in 2001 manufacturing was among the three largest private-industry sectors in all but 10 States. Manufacturing is the largest sector in 10 States and in the Midwest region as a whole, the region that I love and I live in. It's the second largest in nine States and the third largest in 21 other States.

Mr. Speaker, manufacturing is important. This is not just some kind of pipe dream. This is not just a study. This is a roadmap to recovering America's position in terms of manufacturing in the world. Make manufacturing real for America. Make manufacturing robust for America. Make manufacturing jobs reachable for all Americans.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4692, the National Manufacturing Strategy Act of 2010.

Across America, and especially in Ohio, people are hurting. The national unemployment rate is hovering near 10%—that's 15 million people out of work. Sixteen states and the District of Columbia have double-digit unemployment. In my home state of Ohio, which is home to over 20,000 manufacturing companies, unemployment is even higher—10.5%. Almost half of all unemployed workers have been out of work for over six months. There are simply not enough jobs, and if we are to change that, the key is to better support and enhance our manufacturing sector. With this bill, we are taking a first step toward creating a coordinated federal policy that puts the manufacturing sector back in its rightful place as an engine of the American economy.

There are some encouraging signs: More than 135,000 manufacturing jobs were created in the last six months. Americans understand that creating manufacturing jobs should be among the highest priorities for government. In a recent poll 87 percent said they believed it is time we had a national manufacturing strategy.

Where it is necessary, so-called "legacy industries"—such as steel, automotive, aerospace and shipping industries—within our nation's manufacturing sector are adjusting to meet new economic realities. The government must do all that it can to make sure it does not get left behind countries like China who are rapidly growing their green manufacturing economies.

Americans who were surveyed about our manufacturing economy rejected the idea that we can only rely on other sectors to keep the United States in its position as a world leader. They said that manufacturing is central to our economic strength. And they are right. With this bill we will take a vital and tangible step toward reinvigorating our manufacturing base.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4692, the "National Manufacturing Strategy Act of 2010". This legislation provides a pragmatic and forward-looking means to enhance, develop, and secure our nation's manufacturing industry for the future. Its contributions to our economy and the sheer size of this industry make it imperative that we take the necessary steps to

ensure its continued growth and success. I commend my colleague, Representative DANIEL LIPINSKI, for introducing this legislation to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, as you may know, the manufacturing industry generates  $\frac{2}{3}$  of U.S. exports, employs over 11 million American workers, and serves as an industrial base to assure that our national defense remains strong and to sustain infrastructure. This bill addresses the growing importance of the manufacturing sector to our nation's health and economy. It directs the President, every four years, to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the nation's manufacturing sector and to submit to Congress a National Manufacturing Strategy. It also requires the President, in developing each strategy, to convene a Manufacturing Strategy Task Force to make recommendations regarding specified matters for incorporation into the Strategy, including short- and long-term goals for the manufacturing sector. Furthermore, the bill directs the National Academy of Sciences to conduct quadrennial studies concerning U.S. manufacturing and to report each study's results to Congress and the President. Finally, the bill requires the President, in preparing each annual budget, to include information regarding that budget's consistency with the goals and recommendations included in the latest Strategy.

The enactment of this bill would express that it is the view of Congress that policies should be promoted to support and secure the growing manufacturing industry. We should support efforts that seek to create sustainable economic growth, increase employment, productivity, exports, and global competitiveness, and that improve our national and homeland security. As other countries, including the United Kingdom, Canada, India, and China, have already engaged in similar strategic development plans for manufacturing, it is only fitting that the world's largest manufacturing nation do the same. I have supported for a long time America moving back to making products and creating jobs. It is long overdue.

Furthermore, as this bill does not call for mandatory action, its benefit is purely inherent in the positive effects of information and pre-emptive planning. Therefore, the door remains open for governmental action that may need to be taken in order to promote growth and provide efficient outcomes in the manufacturing industry. I strongly believe that more information and strategic planning in the immense manufacturing sector can only put the nation's economy in a better position for the future.

For these reasons I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4692.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4692, the National Manufacturing Strategy Act of 2010, of which I am an original co-sponsor. I wish to commend my friend, Congressman LIPINSKI of Illinois for his fine work in authoring this important piece of legislation.

In light of the pressing need to create and maintain good-paying jobs in this country, it is imperative we pass H.R. 4692. This bill will mandate that the President develop a national manufacturing strategy and update it every four years. It is crucial that the federal government support domestic manufacturing, which has been a traditional driver of middle-class growth. I am particularly glad that H.R. 4692 includes a requirement that the President con-

sult with organized labor in appointing members to the advisory group that will help him draft the strategy.

Further, I view this legislation as part and parcel to the federal government's ongoing efforts to create much-needed jobs and adapt the country's economy to the future. I am quite gratified to see that H.R. 4692 rightly directs that the manufacturing strategy it mandates include an examination of the detrimental effect of unfair trade practices on domestic manufacturing. I firmly believe the federal government must do all it can to ensure our trading partners play by the rules in order to foster sustainable employment growth at home.

In conclusion, I note this bill comes at a time when my home state of Michigan continues to endure record unemployment levels, largely due to the hemorrhaging of manufacturing jobs caused by a decade of unfair trade policies. I believe H.R. 4692 will serve to right past failed policies and, as such, I very passionately support its expedited consideration and adoption.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4692, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. RUSH. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1120

#### CLEAN ENERGY TECHNOLOGY MANUFACTURING AND EXPORT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2010

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5156) to provide for the establishment of a Clean Energy Technology Manufacturing and Export Assistance Fund to assist United States businesses with exporting clean energy technology products and services, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5156

*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 "Clean Energy Technology Manufacturing and Export Assistance Act of 2010".

#### SEC. 2. CLEAN ENERGY TECHNOLOGY MANUFACTURING AND EXPORT ASSISTANCE FUND.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) the term "clean energy technology" means a technology related to the production, use, transmission, storage, control, or conservation of energy that will contribute to a stabilization of atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations through reduction, avoid-

ance, or sequestration of energy-related emissions and—

(A) reduce the need for additional energy supplies by using existing energy supplies with greater efficiency or by transmitting, distributing, or transporting energy with greater effectiveness through the infrastructure of the United States; or

(B) diversify the sources of energy supply of the United States to strengthen energy security and to increase supplies with a favorable balance of environmental effects if the entire technology system is considered; and

(2) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a Clean Energy Technology Manufacturing and Export Assistance Fund, to be administered through the International Trade Administration. The Secretary shall administer the Fund to promote policies that will reduce production costs and encourage innovation, investment, and productivity in the clean energy technology sector, and implement a national clean energy technology export strategy. The purpose of the Fund is to ensure that United States clean energy technology firms, including clean energy technology parts suppliers and engineering and design firms, have the information and assistance they need to be competitive and create clean energy technology sector jobs in the United States.

(c) ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary, consistent with the National Export Initiative, shall provide information, tools, and other assistance to United States businesses to promote clean energy technology manufacturing and facilitate the export of clean energy technology products and services. Such assistance shall include—

(1) developing critical analysis of policies to reduce production costs and promote innovation, investment, and productivity in the clean energy technology sector;

(2) helping educate companies about how to tailor their activities to specific markets with respect to their product slate, financing, marketing, assembly, and logistics;

(3) helping United States companies learn about the export process and export opportunities in foreign markets;

(4) helping United States companies to navigate foreign markets; and

(5) helping United States companies provide input regarding clean energy technology manufacturing and trade policy developments and trade promotion.

(d) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

(1) Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to the Congress a report indicating how the funds provided under this section will be used to—

(A) focus on small and medium-sized United States businesses;

(B) encourage the creation and maintenance of the greatest number of clean energy technology jobs in the United States; and

(C) encourage the domestic production of clean energy technology products and services, including materials, components, equipment, parts, and supplies related in any way to the product or service.

(2) Not later than January 1, 2015, the Secretary shall transmit to the Congress a report assessing the extent to which the program established under this section—

(A) has been successful in developing critical analysis of policies to reduce production costs and promote innovation, investment, and productivity in the clean energy technology sector;

(B) has been successful in increasing the competitiveness of United States clean energy technology firms in emerging markets;