

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to read a couple of the letters that have come into my office about the new health care law.

I'm a senior citizen working part time. I can no longer see my doctor of 14 years. I know of other people getting their hours cut and not being able to find a job, and they don't know what their health care will be.

The next one:

We have 24 employees and have been in business since 1982. We currently pay 100 percent of the premium health care insurance for our employees. After discussing this with our health care provider, we've determined that when ObamaCare is put in place, we will no longer be able to provide health care insurance.

The next one:

Higher premiums, higher deductibles, less coverage.

Next:

I have been paying insurance to Blue Cross/Blue Shield for 25 years now. A month and a half ago, I got a letter in the mailbox, saying, I am losing my coverage due to the Obama health care law. I thought Mr. Obama promised no one had to change insurance companies. Mr. Obama has told a lie, and there's no other way to say it.

Next one:

My insurance company is dropping my business. So much for being able to keep your insurance if you want to. Not. A small business owner like me is—up a creek.

Well, that's not exactly what he said.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

OPEN UP THE GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, the public has been witness to extraordinary divisiveness between the Republicans and Democrats in this House. But I think it's important that the public bear in mind that we have a law that was passed, passed substantially in the House and the Senate—granted, it was primarily by Democrats, of course. But it was signed by the President. And then we had a Presidential election. A major issue was the Affordable Care Act. That's why it was called ObamaCare. And President Obama won by 5 million votes, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the issue is the funding of the Federal Government. Virtually all the Democrats voted to fund the government. Virtually all of the other side, Mr. Speaker, voted not to.

So now, for the Republican majority to come up and try to open up different agencies, suggesting that we don't want to do that—they're the ones that

closed them, Mr. Speaker. We're the ones that voted to keep them open. What we want to do is to open up the government. And if we do it in bits and pieces, we create more dissension within the Federal workforce. We shouldn't do that. The American public deserves better from us.

CELEBRATING NATIONAL MANUFACTURING DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here to do a Special Order.

We are here, and I am here as a co-chair of the House Manufacturing Caucus, to celebrate and recognize National Manufacturing Day. We know there are a lot of divisive issues being talked about here in the Nation's Capitol. But I think one issue, as we start to lay some groundwork for what the world looks like after we shake this virus that's happening here in Washington, D.C., I think manufacturing, advanced manufacturing, additive manufacturing, three-dimensional printing, and all of the issues that surround rebuilding the United States of America, can happen. And we have an obligation, I think, as we have arguments about the issues of the day, also to lay that seed corn, that long-term investment in strategies that will help our country grow.

We have a group of men and women, Members of Congress here this evening, that would like to speak on that. And I would like to work quickly through that list. First, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts. Congressman KENNEDY, coming from New England, coming from Massachusetts, which obviously is a huge manufacturing State with a long history of manufacturing, beginning with the early stages of our country.

Mr. KENNEDY. To my colleague from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), the chairman of the House Manufacturing Caucus, I want to thank you for organizing this and for your leadership on this issue.

On October 1, just 2 days ago, the Institute for Supply Management reported the manufacturing index rose in September for the fourth straight month to a reading of 56.2. Any reading above 50 indicates growth, and it's the highest level we've seen since April of 2011.

Now a couple of monthly statistics about manufacturing: In 2011, manufacturing contributed over \$1.8 trillion to the Nation's economy and accounted for 47 percent of all U.S. exports. For every \$1 that we spend in manufacturing, another \$1.48 is added to the economy, the highest multiplier effect of any economic sector. Nine percent of the workforce, more than 11 million Americans, are employed in manufacturing. And two-thirds of the U.S. pri-

vate sector investment in research and development occurs in the manufacturing sector.

The value and potential for future growth in manufacturing in Massachusetts is a perfect example. The industry continues to be a critical segment of our economy. Yes, in the downturn, we were hurt. But what's remarkable is that the persistence and ingenuity of the manufacturing industry statewide continues to rank above the national average in terms of the concentration of manufacturing employment.

And after years of decline, in 2011, the total number of manufacturing firms actually increased. This means that companies and industries like aerospace, electronics, computers, pharmaceuticals, they're central to the success of the Massachusetts manufacturing economy. It's why I believe in advanced manufacturing in that it promises future growth, and it's essential to the public-private partnerships that are going to innovate and are going to be needed to commercialize and bring new products to market.

That's why I'm proud to have written and introduced the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act, RAMIA, of 2013, along with my Republican colleague TOM REED of New York, the fellow cochairman with you, Mr. Chairman.

The bill is designed to bring industry, universities and community colleges, Federal agencies, and State and local governments all under one roof to accelerate manufacturing innovation. It establishes public-private sectors for manufacturing innovation that will help bridge the gap between basic research and development and commercialization of novel technologies.

The centers will serve as a regional hub of manufacturing excellence and will provide access to cutting-edge capabilities and equipment, creating an unparalleled environment to educate and train the next generation of our workforce.

And as we've seen, Mr. Chairman, we've seen this model work right there in your hometown of Youngstown, Ohio, the area that you represent. There are great advancements that we have seen in additive manufacturing in 3-D printing.

Our bill is locally driven manufacturing policy that addresses the disconnect between research, commercialization, and workforce training. We've seen that back in my district in communities like Taunton, Fall River, and Attleboro, where industrial manufacturing and manufacturing has been and can be a key to economic development in the future. That's why I support this industry. That is why I am proud to support this bill. And I thank you for the opportunity to speak this evening.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman. And I would also like to thank him for his leadership on that particular bill. We do have the National Additive Manufacturing Institute in

downtown Youngstown, Ohio, and we're starting to see how that public-private partnership is beginning to light up not only downtown Youngstown but the entire tech belt region, from Cleveland to Akron, Youngstown down to Pittsburgh.

And there are multiple companies involved in that. We just had Siemens Corporation donate over \$400 million in software to Youngstown State University as we begin to create that pipeline for people to go into this new and what will be a transformational industry.

Our next speaker is the gentleman from Delaware, also a State that is crucial to our defense industrial base and our manufacturing base here in the United States. I yield to Congressman CARNEY.

Mr. CARNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the midst of this manufactured crisis here in the Capitol to join many of my colleagues on the Democratic side for something that we all can get behind, which is creating strong manufacturing jobs here in our great country.

One of the frustrations about the impasse that we have here in the House and in the Capitol is that we have some really serious issues that confront us as a country. And I think the most important among them is, where are the jobs of the future going to come from? We know that in our districts—Mr. RYAN of Ohio and some of the other speakers tonight, in my State of Delaware—that manufacturing has been the backbone, particularly of those jobs that provide middle class incomes for generations.

We've lost so many since 2008. My home State, we've lost both of our auto manufacturing plants, the General Motors plant at Boxwood Road and the Chrysler plant in Newark.

□ 1715

We've lost, over the past 10 years or so, Avon Products, a manufacturing facility in Newark. And for generations, downstate in the town of Seaford, the Dupont nylon plant provided a pathway to middle class for generations of families down there.

We know that the competition for those jobs, today and into the future, is going to define the success of our own ability to maintain a middle class here in the United States, and also, define the competition that we have with our neighbors around the world.

There's some hope on the horizon. In recent years, we've seen a new trend called insourcing. We're actually seeing companies moving back jobs here into the United States.

General Electric, one of the premiere manufacturing industrial conglomerates, international companies here in the U.S., has started to move appliance manufacturing to the States of Indiana and Ohio and other places in the Midwest from their plants that they moved some years ago to Mexico.

Apple just announced it'll start manufacturing a new laptop here in the United States.

But here's the thing. Not only do we have to attract and bring jobs back to the United States, but once we get them back here through this insourcing trend, we need to make sure that we keep them here.

Making things here at home, whether it's building new cars, the cars of the future, whether it's building the appliances or electronics that we're talking about, help create the strong economic foundation that we've enjoyed as a country and will do so for future generations.

So it's our job, as Members of Congress, to pass laws that will encourage innovation and job creation right here at home, and put hardworking Americans back to work. And that's why I've worked with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come up with ways to attract and keep U.S. manufacturing jobs here.

This summer, I joined my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) to introduce the Made in America Act. It's really a simple bill. It creates a labeling system called the America Star labels, much like Energy Star, that companies can use to identify the extent to which their products are made in America.

Just this past summer I had to go shopping for a new air-conditioner. My air-conditioner broke down. And it was difficult to determine what products were made here, how much they were made here, what kind of parts were made here.

Last year I bought a new front door, a new oak front door; spent a lot of time going around trying to find a door that was made here in the U.S., and found a wonderful product just over the line in Pennsylvania.

Made in America is something that people want to see, and they want to know what the products that they buy and that they see out there in stores, how much is foreign-made and how much is made here in the USA. And people, consumers, care about it, and that's why this piece of legislation is important because it provides people with the opportunity to know that.

I also got together with the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA), who's here in the Chamber, with the Scaling Up Manufacturing Act. I'm sure he'll talk about it. The bill creates a 25 percent tax credit for the cost of construction or lease of a company's first domestic manufacturing facility. Thank you, Mr. HONDA, for that, for the opportunity to join you on that.

I also introduced a bill to increase the research and development tax credit from 14 percent to 17 percent and, more importantly, to make it permanent, to create certainty for businesses to locate their research and development facilities here in this country. This will give those companies that certainty that they need to set up those operations.

These are just a few examples, Mr. Speaker, of the ways that Congress can do something to make it possible for us

to make things here in America again. We all believe, many of us here, frankly, on both sides of the aisle, believe that making things in America is the key to our economic recovery.

We need to get our house in order here, with the impasse that we're dealing with over the last week, and focus on these efforts, focus on the things that we can do to incentivize U.S. manufacturing.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Delaware, who obviously gets it, and is involved in, I think, a lot of initiatives that we're beginning to push here in a bipartisan way.

And as I said, I hope when we get through the next few weeks and this tough time that we're having here, that we can begin to push some of these initiatives.

Our next speaker is the gentlelady from Connecticut, another New England State that is deeply, deeply engaged in manufacturing in the United States from very, very early on, a key component to our defense industrial base, whether it's any branch, quite frankly, of the military, especially the Navy, and the technologies that spin out of a lot of the public investments that we make.

And I think when we talk about public/private partnerships, and when we talk about public investments, Connecticut's the kind of State that, if we make these investments, benefits a great deal. It has a very skilled workforce, a well-educated workforce, but also a great manufacturing workforce.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. I want to thank you for your leadership, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. REED, your bipartisan cochair of the Manufacturing Caucus, for all you have been doing in this Congress and in others, to promote manufacturing.

Today, we celebrate the rebirth of manufacturing in Connecticut and across America. My State is home to close to 5,000 manufacturing companies, employing nearly 168,000 men and women. Our State has a long tradition of manufacturing, dating back to Eli Whitney and the cotton gin, and I am proud to see that that tradition is being carried on to the next generation.

Tomorrow marks the Second Annual National Manufacturing Day, and in Connecticut, we are celebrating manufacturing through what we are calling the Dream It, Do It Initiative. Folks across the State will be showcasing the importance of American manufacturing. Hundreds of middle school students will participate in a Manufacturing Mania program, to learn how Connecticut-made products impact their lives.

Throughout the month, manufacturing facilities will be giving tours, and technical colleges and high schools will hold open houses to show young people and their parents how rewarding a career in manufacturing can be.

I've been meeting with manufacturers from across my district, and I've

seen firsthand the innovative work that they are doing. In New Britain, family-owned Peter Paul Electronics has been creating good jobs for three generations. They strive every day to expand training and hire new employees.

At Ward Leonard, in Thomaston, and Jonal Labs, in Meriden, employees and managers are working together seeking ways to manufacture quality products for customers across Connecticut, across the country, and across the world.

I'm proud of the innovative, dedicated men and women of manufacturing, and I want to make sure that they continue to succeed for generations to come.

I also know firsthand how important manufacturing is because I come from a family of manufacturers. My grandfather started a small manufacturing company 61 years ago that I'm proud to say is still in business today.

I know, from that experience, and from companies all across Connecticut, the importance of providing a supportive environment for manufacturing to grow and thrive and ensure that we are building jobs right here in America.

That is why I'm introducing two bills, the First STEP Act, and the STEM Jobs Act, that help students, employees, and small businesses succeed by ensuring that our students have the skills for the future. It's a need I've heard time and time again from manufacturers in my district.

We have to ensure that the next generation has the skills to be competitive in a global economy where manufacturing jobs pay those high wages that we need to rebuild the middle class here in America.

I know that there is a lot of bipartisan support in this Chamber for our efforts to promote American manufacturing, innovation, and competitiveness. Many of us, on both sides of the aisle, are committed to working together on this and many other issues to help the American people.

The time has come for us to pass some real jobs bills for manufacturers, for workers and for families across my district and across this country.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentlelady for her good work and good words.

Our next speaker is from the great State of California which, obviously, has one of the most diverse economies. But many people think California, and they don't necessarily think manufacturing. And the leadership that the gentleman has been providing here, a number of issues, a number of bills sponsored and pushed throughout his career here, and we're going to learn more about, I'm sure, what's going on in California.

So I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. I thank my friend for leading this group, and also providing the rest of the country the understanding and the idea that there's work

being done here. There are creative minds in Congress that are looking at the issue of manufacturing and creating jobs.

I dare say that the word "manufacturing" probably, for many people in this country, conjures up the old-fashioned traditional kinds of work. But today we've heard nothing but the upgraded, the high tech, the kind of manufacturing that requires many, many other States to cooperate with each other in order for something to happen.

So the American manufacturing renaissance is really essential for a full and sustainable economic recovery. National Manufacturing Day is an opportunity to highlight manufacturing's importance and outsized contributions to America's economy.

Manufacturing can generate 70 percent of exports in both advanced and emerging manufacturing, and up to 90 percent of business research and development spending.

Just in my home State of California, there are over 40,000 manufacturers that account for over 1.2 million jobs and \$230 billion of output. Small supplying contractor manufacturers like Cal Weld, in Fremont, California, which I was going to visit, but I think that our calendar is going to delay that visit. Cal Weld, in Fremont, California, plays a key role in the worldwide supply chain system.

The term "supply chain" is a concept that's not well understood nor well-discussed. But a supply chain is necessary for any manufacturer to be able to produce their products.

These manufacturing jobs are high-paying, and they are job multipliers, a term that's been used previously. High-paying and they are job multipliers. Each manufacturing job creates 47 additional non-manufacturing jobs in other industries like customer service, transportation and other service-oriented sectors.

Manufacturing outputs are almost 12 percent of our gross state product in California and account for 87 percent of our exports. So manufacturing has and continues to be the platform for building a solid middle class all across this country, the United States and abroad.

For these reasons and others, I remind my colleagues today that we have plenty of work to do to provide appropriate funding for innovation, appropriate funding for research and development to rebuild and educate a skilled manufacturing workforce, and to provide targeted tax incentives to protect and re-shore the manufacturing supply chain.

The term "re-shore": bringing back the manufacturing supply chain that has been decimated for over the 30-year period of outsourcing.

We can and must rebuild manufacturing capacity and leadership in the United States.

For those reasons, I'm very proud to be part of this caucus, the Manufacturing Caucus. And we shall work together to knit together all our ideas

and our bills to make sure that we have a network of supply chains and manufacturers that will provide all the jobs that we need to build a stronger middle class.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman. And that point of the supply chain, I think, is essential; to recognize that it's not just the General Motors plant, but it's all of the Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3 suppliers right down the line that are making component parts, that are providing good manufacturing jobs for Americans.

Those jobs, as has been stated here several times, pay a lot more. The average manufacturing worker makes about \$77,000 a year. The national average is \$60,000 a year.

So more patents, more innovation coming off the factory floors around the country, in the field of manufacturing, and so that happens in supply chains, the companies that are involved in the supply chains, and also the big manufacturers that we often think of.

One statistic I'd like to make, too, before I introduce the gentleman from Rhode Island, is we think of big companies like Boeing and like Facebook. And Facebook, which has a lot of prominence today, Facebook, they both have market values over \$50 billion.

Facebook employs about 5,000 workers. Boeing employs about 170,000 workers because you need the manpower, the woman power in these facilities to make that happen.

So I'd like to yield to my friend, a strong advocate for working-class people on the House Budget Committee, and it's always fun to be on that committee with him.

I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

□ 1730

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding and for your very powerful leadership of the Manufacturing Caucus here in the House.

As you know, tomorrow, October 4, we celebrate National Manufacturing Day, which is an opportunity to underscore and reaffirm our commitment to manufacturing and to remember that manufacturing helped build this country. It made this country a great and powerful Nation. It helped build a thriving middle class and has created good-paying jobs for hardworking men and women all across our country.

This is especially true in my home State of Rhode Island, which is, as you all know, the birthplace of the American Industrial Revolution, and has a very long and important history in American manufacturing—more than anyplace in the country—and I know the gentleman from Ohio will contest this a little. But Rhode Island understands the importance of a strong manufacturing sector; and if we want to get our economy back on the right track, it's critical that we start making

things again here in this country and support those companies that are already manufacturing things in America.

So I am really proud to stand with my colleagues today as we salute American manufacturing and to really underscore our commitment to helping rebuild and strengthen manufacturing in this country, and particularly to pay attention to the House Democratic Make It in America agenda, which is a very comprehensive set of bills that will help reinvigorate American manufacturing and put folks back to work in my home State of Rhode Island, and I think all across this country.

As part of that package is the Make It in America Manufacturing Act, which is legislation I introduced to help manufacturers buy new equipment, retrofit their factories, retrain their workers, and increase their exports, but really, help to jump-start what we're already seeing in this manufacturing renaissance.

As you know very well, market conditions are such that wages are starting to rise in Asia. Energy costs remain high, so the cost of transporting goods is expensive. So this is a real opportunity, a real moment to seize. And if we change some policies here in Washington and, instead of undermining American manufacturing, replace it with policies that support American manufacturing, we have a tremendous opportunity for additional job growth.

Earlier this week, we saw even more evidence that our manufacturing sector is growing stronger, again. In the September report, the Institute for Supply Management found that manufacturing was growing at its fastest pace in almost 2½ years. And as has been said—and we all know—manufacturing is a jobs multiplier. For every new manufacturing job we create, it results in an additional 4.6 jobs being created. Support it. Of course, with high-tech manufacturing, it adds an additional 16 jobs.

So this is very, very important in our ongoing effort to grow the economy and create jobs. I think it particularly is important to make note that in the area of manufacturing, we need to be very focused on job training and be sure our young people are prepared to compete for the kinds of jobs that are becoming available in advanced manufacturing.

I visit manufacturers in my district all the time and hear from them the importance of skills development and job training for the new workers in the manufacturing sector. It's not the case anymore that you can walk down to your neighborhood manufacturer and get the job your father or grandfather or mother or grandmother got. It requires a different set of skills, and it requires additional training.

So as part of our strategy, we have to focus on how do we ensure that young people and people entering the manufacturing sector have the skills necessary to compete successfully.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. CICILLINE. Of course.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think it's important and it's a critical point. We have legislative fixes and we have strategies down here, but much of this is cultural. As you said, these facilities are not your grandparents' manufacturing facilities. In Youngstown and Akron and in Rhode Island, we remember growing up and hearing about that long legacy of the steel mills blowing out soot. You've got to sweep your porch off two or three times during the course of the day because of the soot that's coming out. The mill was running and people said, That means we're working. It's gold dust, really.

Today, it's much different. You can eat your breakfast off the floor in some of these facilities.

And so how do we break with guidance counselors with, in my estimation, the robotics in the schools, Legos in the early schools, and begin this pipeline to get people excited about using their hands and making things again. And not everyone is going to go to college and get a 4-year degree.

Mr. CICILLINE. I think you raise a very important point. Of the things I think we have seen, unfortunately, is the way that we have approached manufacturing in this country the last couple of decades where we have actually sent messages to young people that they should think of something other than manufacturing, that it's sort of a dead-end career and manufacturing doesn't exist here anymore. We're going to be a service economy.

And you hear it in the language of guidance counselors and sometimes in parents. I would say if kids came home and said, Mom, Dad, I want to be a manufacturer, their parents would say, Really? That doesn't have a bright future.

I think what we have to really do is support both in career and technical academies manufacturing tracks to be sure people see this as a career path and to remind people that manufacturing jobs pay, on average, above non-manufacturing jobs. So these are good-paying jobs. And that it requires a different skill set today—a more advanced skill set.

But when you look particularly at what's happening with innovation and design and 3-D printing and all the intersections of making things with this new technology, it's a career path that has tremendous opportunities. But I agree with you very much that we have to stop saying to young people, Your life is only a success if you go to college.

When I was the mayor of Providence, I used to visit schools all the time and very often hear principals or teachers say, Everyone is going to go to college, right? And they would encourage everyone to raise their hands.

The truth is, we have to send a message to young people that if you want

to go to college, and you're interested in that, great. We want to be sure you have all the tools to be successful. But you can have a fulfilling, successful, wonderful life or you can support yourself with your family in other careers like advanced manufacturing and realize that's a valuable, important, valued part of our economy. And I think there needs to be a lot of language around that and a lot of support so that people see that as a career path.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Yes. I think a lot of the jobs people have today, you're tied to a Blackberry after 5 or 6 o'clock, your iPhone on the weekend. A lot of these manufacturing jobs you put a good hard day's work in, you go home. You go home and get the grill going. You go to your kid's little league game. You go watch the Browns. You do whatever it is you've got to do. The Patriots or whoever you're rooting for. You have time to do other important things and be with your family and other things.

And I remember looking back in the heyday in Youngstown and Niles, where I grew up, my grandfather had a great job, was well paid in the steel mill, and at 3 or 4 o'clock, he was gone. And he would go to his garden, they would have time to make dinner, have a happy hour where the families would come together and be together and have that quality of life.

And I think we can look at manufacturing and say, Well, hey, it's clean, it's a new skill set, it's exciting. There's a lot of really hot things going on in manufacturing today. You can work in a team. You're creating new products in all different sectors of the economy, and you have a life outside of your work that is important for your family, your children, your kids, and everything else.

Mr. CICILLINE. And you are making things that are sought by the rest of the world. I think one of the things we should never lose sight that those words "Made in America" still mean a lot. And people understand when a product is made in America, it's made by the best trained workers in the world; it has the best quality standards in the world. And so people all over the world want to buy stuff made in America.

So I think given the opportunity to do that—and, certainly, I think all Americans want to do that—given that opportunity, we will see tremendous growth in our manufacturing sector. But I think it's very important that in this moment we understand the significance of changing some of the policies in Washington that undermine American manufacturing.

I want to take a minute to applaud the President, who has really made the rebirth of American manufacturing an important priority. He talks about a lot of this in the State of the Union, I know, and addresses to the country.

He established recently this Investing in Manufacturing Communities Partnership, a program to help

strengthen manufacturing and to help States develop regional manufacturing strategies. I am particularly proud that Rhode Island received one of the first grants in the first phase of this program. That will really allow us to develop a strategy that will help to support and strengthen Rhode Island manufacturing and, obviously, recognize what that will mean for job growth.

But it's been, I think, very valuable to have the President take a leadership role and continue to make the case that manufacturing and making things and rebuilding American manufacturing is a key part of our economic recovery.

It's one of those issues where one would hope that there's bipartisan support. You have been a great leader of the Manufacturing Caucus with a bipartisan leadership there. You look at the Make It in America agenda and you think, Why hasn't every single bill on that agenda already become law? These are good, commonsense bills that support American manufacturing, which is so critical to our country.

We're in a difficult period where there's not a lot of bipartisan support, but I'd love to hear the gentleman's thoughts on that because it seems so critical.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I agree. The issue really is we need to get on the stick because China, the European Union, many other countries are pumping a good deal of money into 3-D printing. We have one set up. The President wants to do an additional 7 to 10 or 20, maybe 30 additional centers, where you have these public-private partnerships where you're innovating in areas of the economy. We have the first in Additive Manufacturing. You have one of the first grants to start developing in Rhode Island.

The Chinese are dumping tons of money in 3-D printing. They're going to have 10 innovation centers in China. So they're full speed ahead. And this is an area that we want to win. We want to make sure that we are on the cutting edge, not just because we're Americans, but because our success is the world's success.

I think making these investments is critical. There really isn't that much money. In the grand scheme of things, putting hundreds of millions of dollars into these critical areas of the economy, if you look at three-dimensional printing, it's a printer, in essence, like the printer you would have on your desk, except you pump materials into the printer, and it can print your iPhone, it could print a shoe. They have YouTube videos of houses being printed one day.

It's just amazing how this is going to revolutionize manufacturing. We used to have the mainframe computers that became desktops.

So we have manufacturing today that builds rooms that could also be shrunk. And parts. And it has a transformational effect to have a desktop

manufacturing unit that every American could utilize. And the kind of innovation that's going to come from this, the kind of decentralizing, streamlining efficiencies in the supply chain, all of these things that can revolutionize our country. Look at what the Internet has done for wealth creation. But this is the kind of wealth creation that hits people in Rhode Island, hits people in Youngstown and Akron, Ohio. It's not just Silicon Valley. They benefit, manufacture it somewhere else, and no one else really benefits from it other than the product, which is a significant benefit. This, I think, can be very revolutionary in that regard.

So we've got an obligation here. Seeing the tea leaves, reading the leaves, we've got to make those investments.

Mr. CICILLINE. Absolutely. First and foremost, I want to congratulate you again because you have led the country with the manufacturing center, being the very first one. And I'm hoping we're going take a group from Rhode Island soon to visit so we can see the success of what you've done and the kind of model it can provide for the whole country.

But I think you're absolutely right. I think 3-D printing is one example that is really going to transform the way we make things in this country. We have some great partners in Rhode Island—the Rhode Island School of Design—where I think we're going to really begin to understand that design is going to be such an important part of this new manufacturing, and it's going to make everyone a manufacturer, in some ways—to have the ability to print products.

So you're right: our competitors around the world also know this. And they're making very substantial investments. So I think this is one of those moments in the history of our country where we have to realize that if we're going to continue to lead the world economically and continue to be a place where products are produced that are the envy of the world, we have to create conditions that help companies and individuals innovate and be successful in making things so that we can start shipping American-made goods all over the world.

One of the things I think we have to look at is how do we support American manufacturers in tax policies so that we're not incentivizing companies to ship jobs overseas and instead incentivizing companies to keep jobs here; how do we provide research and development tax credits that are more generous and more permanent so they can plan the kinds of investments that will help grow jobs.

I know you have the same experience. You go to a manufacturer in your district, and you're awed by the entrepreneurship and the commitment and dedication of the workers there and the quality of the products they're producing. And all they're asking from us is give them a set of tools to level the

playing field to help them succeed so they can sell their products to the rest of the world.

□ 1745

That should be a bipartisan effort. Making things and taking pride in making things in America should be something we all agree on. I hope that we will enjoy a lot of bipartisan support in making that a reality.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Well, it takes some public investment. That's what I worry about and I talk to our Republican colleagues about.

My concern really is this national narrative that there isn't anything that the government could spend money on that would be a good thing—it's all bad, any spending at all. So that is a bad narrative to operate from when you're trying to say, hey, here's the public-private partnerships that we want to see, as I said in my opening.

So the public-private partnership with NAMII in Youngstown, the Additive Manufacturing Institute, public-private partnership; a lot of companies, defense companies—companies like Siemens. So here is the investment in Youngstown. Now there is the building that was refurbished was an old warehouse—and that's great—in old downtown. Now there's other businesses looking to locate. They say well, we want to be around the innovation that's happening there. So for an older industrial area, fantastic for us to have that opportunity.

Then Siemens comes in, and Siemens donated \$440 million worth of software to Youngstown State University to create that pipeline. You can see how just that little public investment is driving all of the private investment that's not just going to help our region—the tech belt from Cleveland to Pittsburgh, to Akron and Youngstown, that whole region—but transform throughout the entire country. Everyone will benefit from this.

So you begin to see that pipeline that you can create. And as you said, get on a track for manufacturing when you're in high school so that when you're 18, you're not wandering around saying what car can I go buy and get myself into debt, or go to college for 1 year and accumulate debt and drop out because it's not your thing. We want kids to graduate from high school with a skill, to be able to go out in the world and earn if they don't want to go to college.

Get these 3-D printers in the schools. These kids are amazing. They'll learn it like that. That's going to take some public investment.

Mr. CICILLINE. You're absolutely right. In my State, in the cities of Woonsocket and Pawtucket and Central Falls and Providence, which all have mill buildings that were filled during a different time, filled with good-paying jobs, and so we have to make adjustments to sort of what the demands are of the marketplace: What are the new technologies that are

available, like 3-D printing? What are the skills that workers need? And what are the incentives we need to create to help those buildings be filled with manufacturing jobs of the 21st century?

And you're right, it's going to require some public-private partnership—thoughtful, careful, efficient kinds of relationships, but a real public investment that will bring tremendous benefit not only to my State, but to our country.

I, too, worry that there is a group of folks here in the Congress who believe we can't invest in anything that's important for our future. And as you mentioned, our competitors are doing it, and they're doing it at a much faster pace. So if we're going to be successful, we need to seize this moment and build on the rich and wonderful manufacturing history of our country. I think we will see tremendous opportunities in my State, and I know in Ohio and across this country.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I appreciate the gentleman being here. I see States represented here, Rhode Island and Connecticut and Massachusetts and Ohio and California, and you could go on into Michigan and Indiana and Wisconsin and all through New England and into Maine and New Hampshire. We are a manufacturing country. We always have been. So I thank the gentleman.

Can I ask, Mr. Speaker, how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I would like to make a few comments slightly off topic for celebrating Manufacturing Recognition Day tomorrow and just explain to my constituents at home in a couple of minutes—because I don't want to take the entire time, but in a couple of minutes, explain to my constituents at home my feelings and how I think things are playing out here in Washington. I haven't had an opportunity to be home, and I want to communicate to them.

My position here obviously is we need to get the government up and running. We have the national discussion going on about health care, the Affordable Care Act. I voted for the Affordable Care Act, support the Affordable Care Act. We're going to have its glitches as it rolls out. But prior to a few years ago, as we were getting into the run-up of the Affordable Care Act, I had 1,700 families in 1 year go bankrupt because of health care costs, numerous people losing their insurance.

As we're talking about the next generation of manufacturing, it has been an ugly process in communities like ours with people losing their jobs and not having health insurance, and 45, 50, 55, 60 years old can't yet qualify for Medicare, are stuck, can't get any insurance. That was a problem. Health care costs going up dramatically.

But what's happening here is we're now having a discussion from a smaller group in the Republican caucus of Tea

Party members who are hellbent on killing the Affordable Care Act and dismantling it.

Now, here is the problem: They have every right as an American citizen and as an elected Member of the United States Congress to have that opinion and to fight for that.

Here's where I think there is a problem: We have an obligation here in this Chamber to make sure that the government runs—runs smoothly, gets funded. We're going to have our arguments as to what the investments are, what the Tax Code looks like, what are the trade agreements. These are all fights we have in this Chamber. I'm not here to say that democracy is pretty. It's ugly. It's messy. There's a House of 435 Members, a Senate of 100 Members, a President, an executive branch. This is an ugly process. It is inherently ugly. As Churchill said, it's the worst form of government on the planet, except for all the others.

We have an obligation to keep the government running. So my argument, my complaint with what the Tea Party members are doing by saying, well, we'll extend what we call a continuing resolution—funding of the government—we will agree to extend it for 6 more weeks if you defund ObamaCare or if you delay ObamaCare.

Now, as I said, they have every right to make that argument and they have every right to have that belief, but a couple of points.

We fund the government, and then through the normal process of governing—committee process, the struggle between the House and the Senate, the Republican House and the Democratic Senate and a Democratic President—we have that fight through the normal budgetary process.

You do not shut down the government because you don't like a piece of legislation that passed the House, passed the Senate, was signed into law by the President of the United States, and the Supreme Court deemed it constitutional. You do not shut the government down because of that. You continue the government operating, and then you have this other fight.

And guess what? Maybe you won't win the fight. I was here in 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006. The Iraq war was going on. I was against the Iraq war, had no interest in us going to Iraq, campaigned against it my first election. But when we got down here, we, through the political process, fought it and we tried to end it. Then, eventually, in 2006, Democrats won the House, won the Senate. We began the process of trying to continue to end the war in Iraq. We didn't do a very good job of it because President Bush was still in office. President Bush had just won reelection in 2004, but we continued the fight.

My friends say the Affordable Care Act is not affordable and not popular. Guess what? The Iraq war was not affordable. The Iraq war was not popular. Well over 50 percent of Americans did not want us to be there at one point.

But you just don't shut down the government because a policy has shifted in the country or the mood of the country has shifted on something. You have to work through the political process.

So let's have that fight. And if you don't win it—if I were the Tea Party, I'd say: Boy, this ObamaCare is so bad, set it up and let it go. Wait until the American people see this. We're going to sweep them in 2014. We're going to win the Presidency back in 2016.

Why wouldn't you just let it go? If it's so bad, let it go. You win the House back. You could defund it. You could strip it down. You win the Presidency. Start back over. We could go back to that old system where people are going bankrupt with their current health care plan or getting kicked off or not getting coverage for a preexisting condition. You have every right to do that.

So let's get back to regular order. If Speaker BOEHNER brought a bill to the House floor today, right now, called all Members and said we're having what we call a clean CR, we're just going to extend funding from the current levels out for 6 weeks or 8 weeks—whatever the number would be—and he brought it to the floor, it would pass, Democrats and Republicans. The Senate would send their bill over; the President would sign it. The government would open back up, and we could go back to having our fights about the Affordable Care Act; and the Tea Party folks could talk about how bad it is, and we'll have examples of people that have benefited and we'll move on.

Now, the other problem I have is that we've already had this political fight. It doesn't stop us from having it again. Sometimes political fights take some time. So we just had this fight.

Our friends on the other side called this "ObamaCare," and President Obama just won reelection—clean sweep across the country; more Democrats in the Senate in States like Indiana. SHERROD BROWN won reelection in Ohio. President Obama won Ohio and a bunch of other key swing States where the central issue was repeal ObamaCare. So that battle was just fought, and to shut down the government in this process, I think, is improper.

Here we have now all these other issues with the debt ceiling coming up and all of these other things. Let's have the fight, win the political argument, win the political battle. Take it back to the people in 2014 and 2016 if that's ultimately what you want to do. As I said, you have every right to do that. This is a democracy. The political system will allow for it.

So I just want my constituents to know, you know, I don't think we should get into a position of necessarily picking what parts of the government should open and not open. Open it up.

The other point is, the Democrats, for the number we want to open it up at, we wanted a much higher number. There's been too many cuts, in our estimation, for some of these essential

programs that are long-term investments for our country. So we already compromised, because our number was \$1.58 trillion, or something like that, and the Republican number was \$986 billion. And the President said we'll take that number, so we already compromised.

If you go out and want to buy a car and someone makes an offer for \$10,000 and you say, "No, I'll give you 9 for it," and they say, "Okay, we'll take it for 9," that was a compromise. That's what happened here.

But still, to be clear to my constituents, every bill that has come off this floor didn't just say we're going to extend funding for the government. It said we're going to extend funding for the government and we want to repeal ObamaCare, we want to repeal the Affordable Care Act, and we want to delay it for a year. That is an issue that has been argued. We can continue to do it, but let's do it through the normal political process.

Let's get NIH back up and running, Centers for Disease Control, Food Safety. All of these things can be funded with a total package.

If Speaker BOEHNER brought a bill to the floor, a clean continuing resolution that funded the government without any of this extraneous stuff, it would pass with Democrats and Republicans. The Senate would agree to it, the President would sign it, and the doors would open back up.

Lastly, let me say—because my friends have come up on the other side and said, well, we want to fund NIH because there's pediatric cancer patients there that need help, and I say of course we want to do that. But we want every family in America to have insurance if their child gets cancer. We want every citizen to have access. And the Affordable Care Act has done that for millions and millions of people. It got rid of preexisting conditions. It has taken the insurance companies out of the doctor/patient relationship.

Before, if you were a child or you had cancer, you could hit your lifetime limit on your insurance policy and then you were screwed. You couldn't get insurance because you hit your lifetime limit in just a year or two. The Affordable Care Act removed that cap and it allows those investments to be made and allows that person to be able to get their health care.

These are commonsense things. So I wanted to communicate that to my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say thank you. We are here also to recognize National Manufacturing Day tomorrow. I want to thank Congressman REED, who is the cochair of the House Manufacturing Caucus, for his leadership on establishing more of these innovation centers, along with Congressman KENNEDY and all of our speakers here tonight.

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

□ 1800

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy my friends on the other side of the aisle, some really terrific public speakers. I also enjoyed particularly the question from my friend across the aisle who said: "Why not let ObamaCare just go through?"

That is something that has been debated and I have discussed with so many of my constituents. There are many people in the country that are so angry about ObamaCare being passed. It is just hard to call it "affordable care" because I have heard from so many that it has just devastated, so many who have told me that it is anything but affordable. It is devastating them.

Some have said if we just let ObamaCare go through, it is going to hurt so many people. It has already hurt so many people. If we just let it go through—stand by, just get out of the way, let it hit, let it get the full hurt and damage that will continue—that will just get worse as it hurts the economy as it continues to make most people's health care and health insurance both go up.

If you are a purely political animal, that is the perfect question to ask: Why not just let ObamaCare go through and let it do its damage?

But when you care deeply about people and see the damage it is doing, how can you stand by and let it keep hurting the way it is? People have already lost insurance, they've already gotten their notices, we continue to get emails, we continue to get calls, I continue to hear from people I know and trust back home, I hear from other people around the country.

There has been an email where people could send us their stories and then we try to verify: ObamaCare@mail.house.gov. So those stories continue to come in at ObamaCare@mail.house.gov.

So if you are purely a political animal, whether Republican or Democrat, then it is a good question to ask: Why not just let ObamaCare come through? Because if it is as bad as people are telling us it is—you see the damage to the economy, you see the people that have lost full-time work and gone to part-time work because of it, having to take multiple jobs, losing the benefits they had, you see businesses that had cultivated and trained employees, who did not want to lose employees, who were building and building but got above the 50 threshold and now they have had to cut below that or go to part time, you see the damage—then, yes, for purely political animals why not let it go through?

As my friend noted, if it is all that bad you will win the next election, the

majority in the Senate next time, you will win the Presidency next time.

But there are some of us that don't think in purely political terms. We hear from people—our hearts break when their hearts break, we rejoice when they rejoice—and it is hard to feel good and stand by and let a train wreck or a nightmare, depending on which Democrat's description of ObamaCare you want, just let it go and continue to wreak havoc on America and real American people, on American lives.

We've mentioned some of the stories before. As I say, they continue to come in to ObamaCare@mail.house.gov.

Here is one from Jeff:

I run a business in Tyler. We have part-time associates that work 35 hours per week on average. But this varies due to the changing business levels. We provide transportation services moving freight to and from Tyler. Since the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, we have had to cut down hours of these associates to get below the employer-mandated level of 30 hours. These associates are used to working 35 hours on average per week. As most Americans, they set their budget for their family around this many hours. Our company needs to be able to compete in this market so we need the flexibility of the part-time worker. However, we must now cut hours of loyal, dedicated associates below 29 hours. This is creating a problem, first for our associates, who are simply trying to make ends meet, and for the organization that I run to provide quality service to our customers. This law is handcuffing the businesses and will ultimately drive up costs of running a company. When costs rise they are passed along to the customers and on to the end consumer. We will continue to struggle economically under this law. Please do whatever you can to reverse this law and restore liberty to this country and our businesses.

Here is one from Tammy:

When ObamaCare first passed its law, I asked my ObGyn what he thought of it. His words were that it "sucks." I told my husband that I bet when all this is said and done he would retire. And guess what? He did. So the part about being able to keep your doctor is definitely not true. Also, I own a small business with less than 50 employees, and we will never be able to grow our business any bigger than what it is right now. Sad.

From Tammy.

Mary said:

We had insurance through Moen in my retirement package, which cost us \$27 per month. It has been canceled effective January 1 of 2014 and comparable coverage is going to cost us \$300 per month. We are on Social Security.

That is from Walter and Mary in east Texas.

Here is one from Harold:

My granddaughter teaches elementary students in Mesquite. She was shocked to find that the health insurance she carries on herself and her son has doubled in cost since the school year. She inquired as to why. And well, you already know what the answer she was given: ObamaCare.

A single mom and her son.

Here is another from a business owner:

I have been told that my company offers what is known as a Cadillac health plan, although it has been years since anyone in my