how we are going to save our jobs, how we are going to keep higher tuition from going up? A 26 percent increase in tuition. How are America's children going to learn and have the opportunities they must have?

Something is wrong with this ticket. We have a new ticket: Kerry-Edwards, a new America for new people, so children can prosper, so that our schools can be well, so that our health system can be back to what it ought to be.

I say to America, come on, get out. It is their turn, express their views. A new America for a new American family.

ATTORNEY GENERAL ASHCROFT AND HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

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

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today for the fifth time to speak in protest of the unfair allocation of Urban Area Security Initiative grants from the Department of Homeland Security. Broward and Palm Beach Counties in my district have not received nearly enough, no, not nearly enough, of the funding they need to keep our families and our communities safe from terrorist threats.

Attorney General John Ashcroft issued a warning in south Florida on July 1 that the terrorists behind the deadly assaults on September 11 are between 75 and 90 percent complete with their plans for a major attack against the United States this year. Mr. Speaker, our region with its ports, airports and millions of visitors cannot be ruled out as a possible target or terrorist base of operation.

In my district we are very much aware of the area's vulnerability. We are at a high level of intensity in south Florida. Broward County and Palm Beach County must be designated as its own urban area so that we can receive the funding we need to enhance the security measures that will protect our families, our communities and critical infrastructure.

□ 1015

The City of Miami cannot be trusted to allocate these funds.

FORCING KEN LAY AND FRIENDS TO REPAY STOLEN FUNDS

(Ms. WATSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, today is the first good day that Grandma Millie has had in a long time. Disgraced former Enron chairman Ken Lay has surrendered to the authorities. This is an important milestone. Many Americans, including myself, worried that Lay's close ties to President Bush would permit him to go free. I am heartened that it appears those fears have been proven wrong.

But while Lay's arrest is an important step on the road to justice, justice will not be complete until the victims of Enron's crimes get back the money that Lay and his cronies stole from them. The full scale of Enron's greed is laid bare on recently released tapes, where Enron traders openly crow about stealing millions of dollars each day from Grandma Millie.

What a shame. My congressional district in Los Angeles is full of Grandma Millies, hard-working homeowners who pay their bills on time and in full. They deserve better than this.

I call upon all of us to join to force Ken Lay and his friends to repay the total amount of stolen money.

SUPPORTING SMALL BUSINESS WITH 7(a) LOANS

(Ms. BERKLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, small businesses are the economic engine of this country. My home State of Nevada is considered one of the most business-friendly States in the Nation. In fact, Nevada has the fastest growing number of women-owned small businesses in the country.

The Bush administration talks about the importance of our small businesses, yet the President's budget eliminated funding for the SBA's 7(a) loan program. Our entrepreneurs depend on these loans as the only source of affordable, long-term financing for their small businesses.

Yesterday, the House voted to restore the funding for this program. That sent a clear message to this administration that we will not tolerate this attempt to jeopardize the strength of the small business community.

Yesterday's vote was a vote for small businesses in Nevada and throughout the United States that depend on the SBA's 7(a) loan program to live their dream of owning a business, expanding their existing business, and hiring new workers.

It is time for new leadership in the White House. We need a President that not only talks about the importance of our small businesses, but follows up those words with action to fight for our small business community.

VALUES

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the administration likes to wrap itself in so-called middle-class values. Let us compare the rhetoric to the record.

This administration has gutted section 8 housing. America's most vulnerable citizens literally may be evicted from their homes as a result.

This administration has refused to extend unemployment benefits, even though the money is there to help America's economically disadvantaged.

This administration has rolled back environmental regulations, fouling the air we breathe and the water we drink.

This administration has lavished tax cuts on the rich, and crumbs on the middle-class.

This administration has underfunded education to such an extent that every child is left out, not just a few left behind.

This administration did such a good job of working with big drug companies that they were able to raise prices three times the rate of inflation before the prescription drug bill passed.

These are not middle-class values. Middle class values are common sense, common decency and the common good.

Middle-class values are going to return to the United States in 117 days.

Mr. Speaker, let the President know he ought to start packing. They are about to leave.

PRAISING SELECTION OF JOHN EDWARDS AS RUNNING MATE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to praise JOHN KERRY's selection of Senator JOHN EDWARDS as his running mate.

For more than 2 decades, Senator EDWARDS has been fighting on behalf of the little guy against America's large corporate interests. JOHN KERRY picked the perfect running mate to complete a ticket that brings hope to middle-class Americans that their needs will no longer be ignored at the White House.

Senator EDWARDS talks movingly and effectively about two Americas. Over the past 3 years, the bridge between them has grown dramatically, thanks to failed policies pushed by the Bush administration that benefit only the privileged few. I am confident the Kerry/Edwards ticket will energize Americans to demand a change of course and support a new vision for America.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3598, MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2004

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 706 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 706

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for

consideration of the bill (H.R. 3598) to establish an interagency committee to coordinate Federal manufacturing research and development efforts in manufacturing, strengthen existing programs to assist manufacturing innovation and education, and expand outreach programs for small and medium-sized manufacturers, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 706 is a structured rule that provides for the consideration of H.R. 3598, the Manufacturing Technology Competitiveness Act of 2004. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate, evenly divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science. The rule also provides a motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

This is a fair rule, one that provides for a coherent bill. The underlying legislation is the realized result of extensive discussions on a bipartisan level. It is very important that this legislation move forward and that it be sent to the President's desk in an effort to support and assist our small and medium businesses, especially in the manufacturing sectors.

H.R. 3598 reauthorizes the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, MEP, which continues to be a resounding success. The MEP is a network of not-for-profit centers that assist businesses in their daily operations. From plant management to technical assistance, the MEP continues to strengthen our manufacturers through hands-on assistance.

It only takes a cursory look at a survey in 2003 on MEP's success to realize the benefits. As a result of MEP's help over that year, companies created or retained over 35,000 jobs and invested nearly $1 billion in new technology, equipment and training. During that same period, sales for small and medium MEP-assisted companies rose by $1 billion.

Boasting a long list of success stories, this program received $106 million in the House version of the Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary appropriations bill which is expected to pass the House later today.

The legislation expands on previous achievement by authorizing a new Collaborative Manufacturing Research Grants program at $40 million in fiscal year 2005. The additional funding will allow manufacturing and small business to focus on the new challenges that face their economic livelihood. As a result of the new grants, manufacturing companies will be able to join with groups such as not-for-profit organizations, research groups and universities to focus on technology changes. All of this research will be used to accelerate industry technology and continue strong viability.

Of the many important small business manufacturers that use these important grants, Hialeah Metal Spinning in my congressional district stands out to me. I meet frequently with Karla Aaron, the president and owner of Hialeah Metal Spinning, regarding important manufacturing issues in south Florida. Ms. Aaron has served on various local, professional and national boards, including the Board of Directors for the National Association of Manufacturers. This incredible company over which she presides, with only 14 employees, is one of the leading manufacturers of precision metal-formed parts.

Hialeah Metal Spinning could not be as successful without MEP assistance. These grants are used to move forward important employee training in a successful effort to stay on the leading edge of manufacturing technology. I was surprised to learn that these grants only pay part of select training sessions, which may range up to $150 per hour. However, constant training is essential to the manufacturing business, and the MEP assistance is extremely important.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill that helps all of our local manufacturers. We bring it forward under a fair rule to the floor.

I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) for their leadership on this important issue. I urge all of my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, historically, manufacturing has been a major generator of good, high-skilled, well-paid jobs and remains a staple of local and State economies throughout the Nation. But manufacturing jobs are disappearing.

From January 2001 to January 2004, the United States lost 2.5 million manufacturing jobs. Manufacturing's decline and the shipping of manufacturing jobs to other countries threaten the livelihood of millions of America's working families.

In western New York, I have seen firsthand the devastation that occurs when communities lose their manufacturing base. Across my district, from Rochester to Buffalo, tens of thousands of high-paying manufacturing jobs have vanished and are vanishing in just the last few years, as companies have been driven out of business by cheaper foreign imports or have outsourced jobs abroad for cheaper labor. Buildings once home to booming businesses and factories now stand abandoned. In western New York and across the country, people are outraged; and they want their Congress to do something.

One small way the Federal Government can help is through the Manufacturing Extension Program. MEPs around the Nation work with small and medium-sized manufacturing businesses to utilize technology so that the companies improve and grow. Experts help train manufacturing employees, adopt better business practices, and take advantage of new technology.

For every Federal dollar spent on MEPs, the client manufacturing companies have benefited more than $8. That is, every $1 benefits by $8. In New York State, over 1,000 manufacturers have benefited from MEPs. In western New York alone, almost 6,000 small manufacturers have been helped.

□ 1030

Just recently, High Tech Rochester, an MEP provider, joined forces with the New York State Research and Development Authority, the Greater

Rochester Enterprise, and the Rochester Institute of Technology in a collaborative effort focused on identifying, incubating, and creating renewable energy companies in western New York. These public-private partnerships are the key to revitalizing our economy and creating good manufacturing jobs.

Inexplicably, the Bush administration wanted to end the MEP program last year. As the economy hemorrhaged jobs, the administration proposed to slash this program that works by 60 percent for fiscal year 2004, threatening as many as 40 MEP centers across the country. I was proud to join my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. QUINN), to protest these ruinous cuts.

Reauthorizing the MEP program is one thing that we can do, but we should be doing more. Congress could require the Secretary of Commerce to develop a revitalization program for the electronic component sector. Such a plan would evaluate the potential impact on the domestic electronic component sector if all America's new weapons and security equipment purchased by the Departments of Defense and Homeland Security contain domestically manufactured electronic components like computer chips. This could bring new life into this manufacturing sector, resulting in good, new jobs for hard-working Americans.

I offered an amendment in the Committee on Rules to require the Commerce Secretary to develop a revitalization plan, but the Committee on Rules refused to allow it. I also offered an amendment expressing the sense of the Congress that the Federal Government can be a partner not only in research and development of new products, but also revitalization of key sectors of domestic manufacturing. The Federal Government can take proactive steps to help revive the domestic electronics component sector by adopting Federal procurement policies that promote or require the use of domestic-made goods. The Committee on Rules also refused to make this amendment in order.

The changes in our Federal procurement policies could reignite the lagging high-tech sector. Why in the world do we not want to do that? Why are we stopping here with very little, albeit important measures? The ripple effect of such policies would be enormous and would help domestic manufacturers to compete with foreign manufacturers in private sector activities. Such an initiative could create jobs in the manufacturing sector.

Mr. Speaker, it is a truth that for most workers in America who have lost good-paying jobs, the second job not only pays less salary, but fewer or no benefits. Consequently, the standard of living is falling in the United States. It is high time that the Congress began to debate that and have a better understanding of what we, the Congress, can do.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science.

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule. It is a fair rule that will enable consideration of all of the amendments that are directly related to this bill.

The stated goal of every Member of this body is to try to help smaller manufacturers compete, and H.R. 3598 is designed to do just that. But H.R. 3598 will only result in real assistance to manufacturers if it gets signed into law. We want something more than press releases. We want something more than the satisfaction derived from doing something worthy in the House only to have it die elsewhere. We want this signed into law. This is a good bill that can get signed into law.

So what we asked the Committee on Rules to do was to craft a rule that would allow debate on all filed amendments directly related to the bill, and I emphasize that: filed amendments directly related to the bill; but only on those amendments, and that is what the Committee on Rules did. It rejected amendments from both Democrats and Republicans that were not directly related to authorizing manufacturing R&D programs run by the National Institute of Standards and Technology. Now, that seems like a reasonable approach.

We can save for another day, and I am sure that day will come, general debates about outsourcing or specific debates about programs that do not focus exclusively on manufacturing, like the Advanced Technology Program. Indeed, any Member truly interested in funding ATP could have offered an amendment to the Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies appropriations bill that we have been discussing on the floor this week. So this rule is not cutting off any House debate on broader issues that may impinge on manufacturing. There are other vehicles for that debate. The rule simply says that this important bill should not be encumbered by those debates.

I should add that we had very extensive debate on H.R. 3598 in committee. We seriously considered numerous amendments from the other side of the aisle, and we accepted one amendment as offered and two others in modified form. This bill already reflects an animated, but open-minded discussion. This bill has the fingerprints of Republicans and Democrats alike all over it.

Also, as my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON), graciously pointed out at the Committee on Rules yesterday, no one thinks that this is not a good bill. It is a good bill that is needed to ensure the continued health of the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program. We all ought to be doing everything we can to move it swiftly through this House in a form in which it can move through the other body and be signed by the President. This rule will ensure that nothing extraneous can hold up our aid to our manufacturers. That is our number one objective: aiding our manufacturers, while allowing full and open debate on matters within the borders of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule and of H.R. 3598.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON).

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, as I listened to my friend, the gentleman from Florida, present the Committee on Rules majority view on the MEP program, it just reconfirmed my belief in epiphany.

Let me remind my colleagues that the MEP program was a bill and a program that the President of the United States, President Bush, has tried to kill for the last 3 years, that the House appropriators and the majority last year produced no funding for. So we are making progress today. And I am glad to hear, as I say, my friend present the view of the Committee on Rules, and I hope it is the view of the majority of this Congress, that the MEP program is important. And then I listened to my friend who is the chairman of the committee, who does know that the MEP is good, and he has fought for it over the years, say, well, even though there are some other things that we might be able to do to help unemployment, let us wait. Let us not mess up this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to tell those 2 million Americans who have lost their jobs over the last 3 years to wait a little longer, to wait, and maybe we will get to some more progress later. I just do not think we can do that.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 706, the rule for consideration of H.R. 3598, the Manufacturing Technological Competitiveness Act. This rule does not allow for consideration of many excellent Democratic amendments that would improve this bill.

For example, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) offered an amendment in committee that would have required data collection, study, and policy responses to offshoring of American jobs. We need to understand how these trends are affecting our manufacturing and professional workforce. It is hard to imagine a more needed or a more nonpartisan provision that could help us work together in addressing the challenges of American manufacturing. How in the world can we be addressing a bill that deals with manufacturing and not think about offshoring, and not at least say, can we have a study to see what are the problems and how can we correct that? How

in the world in common sense could we not be dealing with that kind of an amendment today?

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) offered an amendment in committee that would have improved the training of manufacturing technicians at our community colleges. We clearly need to be doing more to address technical training in an increasingly competitive international marketplace. How in the world can we be dealing with a manufacturing bill and not talk about how we can make our workers more productive?

The gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) offered an amendment in committee that would have funded the Advanced Technological Program at the Department of Commerce at current levels; asking for no additional funds, just let us keep this important program going. The ATP program should be an increasingly important factor in providing needed resources for the entrepreneurs who will create jobs and industries in the future in America. This is not a wish. We know ATP works. It has worked. It has created thousands of jobs all across this country. And there were a number of other worthy amendments that were not made in order as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, during the past 4 years, perhaps nothing has dominated the economic news more than the loss of manufacturing jobs and our manufacturing base. Each new report on job creation and job losses on offshoring and on our growing trade imbalance stimulates lots of hand-wringing and partisan sniping, but the reality is that Congress has done little to directly assist our manufacturing sector, especially our small and medium-sized manufacturing base.

H.R. 3598 provides us with the opportunity to show what Congress can do. The rule for this bill should have provided every Member of this body with the opportunity to offer his or her ideas on dealing with the manufacturing crisis. Surely to goodness we need more ideas, not less ideas, on how to keep jobs here in America. Instead, the rule before us today limits both the amendments that can be offered and the debate time that they can be afforded. It is as if the majority wants to make sure that this bill gets as little public attention as possible. This is not the way one of the most important issues of the day should be handled in this House.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we need more ideas on how to create jobs in this country, how to stop offshoring, not less ideas. For that reason, I encourage a no vote on this rule so that we can come back with an open rule that will allow us to bring all of the ideas to help get America back to work.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), a leader in this Congress who has consistently been working for improvement of technologies and in effect for strengthening the economy of the United States.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule to bring up H.R. 3598, my bill on manufacturing technology competitiveness. I believe this rule is fair and balanced.

The main goal of H.R. 3598 is to authorize manufacturing programs at the National Institute of Standards and Technology that help small and medium-sized manufacturers innovate so they can remain competitive in the global marketplace. One of these programs is the highly successful Manufacturing Extension Partnership program.

This program has roughly 60 centers and 400 satellite offices throughout the country. These centers provide small manufacturers with tools and assistance to increase productivity and efficiency. They do many things, and for one, they try to bring ideas from the laboratory down to the manufacturing floor. Another example, they might help to redesign a factory floor or help to train workers on how to use the latest technology or equipment. The net impact of these centers has been very beneficial on small to medium-sized businesses and is strongly supported by them as well as the National Association of Manufacturers.

The legislation also creates a collaborative grant pilot program to support research partnerships between academia, industry, nonprofits, and other entities to develop innovative technologies and solutions to scientific problems in manufacturing.

To truly help the manufacturers, we must have a bill that can be passed into law. Therefore, I want to keep this legislation focused on these specific programs that have strong bipartisan support. However, others have wanted to add extraneous provisions that, while well intentioned, take away from the focus of the bill. This is why I may oppose some of the amendments made in order, because I believe they will detract from the bill.

This rule largely helps ensure that the debate will remain on the manufacturing programs at NIST. I think that is fair and is in the best interests of our manufacturing community. I urge my colleagues to support this fair and balanced rule.

I would like to take a few minutes to respond to the ranking member of the Committee on Science for his statements a few minutes ago. I have no question that his intentions and the intentions of his colleagues are good. They are genuinely concerned about manufacturing and manufacturing jobs, just as I am. My concern is that it has taken considerable effort to negotiate this bill. They mentioned that several attempts have been made to kill the MEP program. I believe this bill now fully supports that program, and as written will also receive the support of the administration. I urge my colleague to support the rule and the bill.

□ 1045

I have no difficulty with the ATP program. I think that is something that also has to be revised and resurrected, and I will be working in the future to do precisely that. So I want to assure my colleagues that we are in accord on basic ideas, but we have a lot of work to do before we can proceed with the additional activities that they recommend. And I am certainly willing to help them and work with them as we try to do that in the future.

With that, I conclude by once again urging my colleagues to support this fair and balanced rule, and we hope they will also support the bill and bring it into effect.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I rise in opposition to the rule on H.R. 3598, the Manufacturing Technology Competitiveness Act.

The Committee on Rules blocked consideration of several amendments offered by my colleagues on the House Committee on Science to this bill. This body should have the right to discuss and to debate every amendment offered, not only by the members of the Committee on Science but Members of this body.

One of the amendments that was blocked yesterday by the Committee on Rules was an amendment that I offered which would have required the Under Secretary of Commerce for Technology to do a study on the effects that offshoring manufacturing and professional positions is having and will have on the U.S. economy both now and in the future.

Every day more Americans watch their jobs being shipped overseas. Jobs are disappearing from every sector of the economy, from engineering to health care workers, forcing hundreds of thousands of families into unemployment and low-paying jobs.

Since 2000, we have lost 2.7 million manufacturing jobs, of which 500,000 jobs were in high-tech industries such as telecommunications and electronics. Since 2000, 632,000 jobs have disappeared in high-tech service industries. In 48 of the 50 States, jobs in higher-paying industries have been replaced with jobs in lower-paying industries since November of 2001. Between 2000 and 2003, the number of unemployed college graduates grew at a rate of almost 300 percent compared to 155 percent for workers with a high school degree or lower.

A March survey of 216 CFOs found that 27 percent plan to send more workers offshore in the coming year. Twenty-seven percent of 216 CFOs said that they intended to send more jobs offshore this year.

We currently are unable to assess the short- and long-term effects of the problem because we do not have sufficient or accurate data on the problem. As I testified yesterday before the Committee on Rules, I pointed to the fact that the Wall Street Journal, The Washington Post, and Business Week all have had recent articles pointing to the fact that we lack the data to determine the effects of outsourcing.

Some would have us believe that outsourcing is good for our economy. Others would say that it is negative, and they have drawn their conclusion based upon insufficient data. Mr. Speaker, I intend to offer a motion to recommit, instructing the Committee on Science to report the bill back to the House with a provision requiring the Commerce Department to complete a study on the effects that outsourcing is having and how we can address this issue both in the short and long term.

The administration, the Congress, and the American people deserve to know the facts so that we can work to make business more competitive and create better-paying jobs here at home. Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand why the majority, both on the Committee on Science, in the Committee on Rules, and the majority on the floor that will be voting on this legislation either today or tomorrow would not want additional information concerning the problem of outsourcing.

We simply are saying give us an independent study, assess the problem, tell us where these jobs are going and why they are going offshore, and also what effects it not only is having on our economy today and the future but also on young people who are trying to determine right now what fields to enter in and major in in college. Where are their jobs going to be tomorrow? Where will they be 10 years down the road?

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule so that we can have an open debate on outsourcing and the other amendments that Members choose to offer.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to make sure any colleagues who are actually listening to the debate realize what we are talking about. The bill we are bringing to the floor extends the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, the MEP, which is a very important program that helps small business stay competitive, which trains workers who are employed by small businesses to retain their competitiveness and increase, obviously, their skills in new technologies. It is a very important program, and that is what we are bringing to the floor today.

A lot of things can be said, and some of them are even true, about macroeconomics and the reality of the world we live in. But what we are bringing forward to the floor today is a bill that extends an important program, and this MEP program is important to small businesses, especially to the manufacturing sector in this country. That is what we are bringing forward.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member, who I have just promoted, but, in any event, the leader of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me this time.

I start out that way because I hope someone is listening to this debate. I believe it is important to add clarification to my good friend from Florida and to be able to tell the American people and our colleagues what we are really talking about. I wish it were as simple and as sedate as he has so effectively made it seem, but that is not what we are speaking about, Mr. Speaker.

Frankly, we are talking about a very small and narrow representation by our good friends in the majority to answer an enormous and devastating problem that Americans are facing every single day, and that is the loss of manufacturing jobs and the toppling of America as a major economic force, as a singular economic force in this world. We are talking about an R&D bill when we should be talking about retooling the manufacturing infrastructure of America.

The reason why we should be doing that is because we have lost over 3 million jobs, and are continuing to do so. We gained only 112,000 jobs in the last month, when we need 150,000 to barely keep up.

This rule does not do what we asked our colleagues to do in the Committee on Rules, which was to create an open rule so that together, in a bipartisan way, we could focus on creating manufacturing jobs in America. Our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), talked about ''buy America,'' ensuring that industries here, American-based industries, stay here; and not selfishly denying our international posture, but making sure we make jobs and keep jobs in America.

Why would we not have the Costello amendment that simply asks a question about outsourcing, which is the major burnout of manufacturing jobs in America? The fact that we are outsourcing, along with other type of necessary skills gives us a gaping hole in the creation of jobs in America. Why would we not want to have education and training, when we have thousands upon thousands of college students coming out of school and possibly not being skilled in the necessary skills of jobs of today? Why would we not suggest that that helps to create a better trained population?

The Advanced Technology Program has helped us generate increased and cutting-edge technology. Why we would not want to have that amendment to really have a vigorous debate on creating manufacturing jobs, I just do not know.

I am offering an amendment to ensure that the MEP centers are not stopped and closed, and I would hope my colleagues would support those amendments that would increase the opportunity for the MEP centers to be in place.

Mr. Speaker, what I wanted today was a vigorous discussion on creating manufacturing jobs and keeping them in America. I am sad to say we have not reached that point with this rule. I hope my colleagues will see fit to not support a rule so that we can have an open rule and do what we are asked to do, bring jobs back to America.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished leader of the Committee on Rules for yielding me this time, and I rise in opposition to this rule. It makes in order only three of the 10 Democratic amendments offered.

The essence of the bill, as well as many of the amendments offered at the Committee on Rules, were derived from legislation I introduced last year, the American Manufacturing Works Act, a bill that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) cosponsored before introducing his own bill 4 months later.

It is said that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, so I must say that I am flattered that so much of the bill we are considering today originated from my bill and from Democratic efforts. But the imitation and flattery stopped during the committee markup, during which it was made clear that amendments not acceptable to the administration would not be viewed favorably. This is despite the fact that the amendments being offered made good policy sense and were endorsed, in many cases, by manufacturing groups, such as the Modernization Forum, which presumably have some knowledge about what the manufacturing sector needs to regain its health.

So along with many others, I offered an amendment that was voted down in the committee. My amendment recognized that one of the most critical elements of our manufacturing competitiveness is to have a technically trained workforce. This amendment would have expanded the National Science Foundation's Advanced Technology Education Program to include the preparation of students for manufacturing jobs.

Now, apparently, the Committee on Rules determined, as the Committee on Science majority already did, that providing training for our workforce is not important. The Committee on Rules also determined that we do not need a study assessing trends related to outsourcing and that we do not need to

authorize the Advanced Technology Program, a program that the chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), and subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), support and that they recommended in testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee be funded at $169 million.

The committee's decision, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, seems shortsighted, especially since the manufacturing sector is still suffering. In fact, 11,000 manufacturing jobs were lost last month, for a total of 2.7 million jobs lost over the last 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, as I conclude, it is obvious this rule does not give Members an opportunity to improve the bill. It seems like the majority is more interested in getting the bill's provisions right in order to meet the administration's requirements than they are interested in getting the bill right. So for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from upstate New York for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong opposition to this rule because I had offered an amendment that was to literally add President Bush's own legislative initiative, the Jobs for the 21st Century Initiative.

On April 5, President Bush, finally realizing that we had a crisis in America of a loss of manufacturing jobs, offered the Jobs Initiative For the 21st Century. That was on April 5, just a short time ago. He said, and let me quote President Bush, ''We are not training enough people to fill the jobs for the 21st century. There is a skills gap. And if we do not adjust quickly, if we do not use our community colleges, we will have a shortage of skilled workers in the decades to come.''

Now, this is a rare moment of bipartisanship on my side. I agreed with the President, and I thought he was right. Now, what happened? You all craft a piece of legislation, and showing a total disrespect for President Bush, you did not include his own initiative on manufacturing jobs.

□ 1100

So I picked up the mantle, and I offered his amendment, his concept, his ideas that he put together; and the Committee on Rules did not think it was worthy of being included. It may not be. Maybe President Bush is not that smart when it comes to manufacturing jobs. He did lose 2.7 million manufacturing jobs under his watch.

The other side of the aisle, when they drafted the legislation, did not include it. There was an amendment offered by a Democrat, and they did not include that amendment. I cannot think of anything more disrespectful to the President than what the majority has done by not including his ideas, his concepts of how to prepare American workers for the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, they left it on the editing floor. I gave them an opportunity, and they chose partisanship and politics over the skills of American workers for the 21st century.

However, I took a step back and thought about it. It makes total sense to me now that I think about it, because, in fact, the program that we are authorizing, the manufacturing extension program, President Bush has tried to eliminate every year in his budget. As a matter of fact, just a short time ago in his economic plan, his economic advisers said flipping hamburgers should be redefined as a manufacturing job. No disrespect to our hamburger flippers in America, McDonald's and Wendy's and Burger King, they work and do a good job; and we are outperforming Japan and Germany and China in the hamburger-flipping business.

But when this administration has an economic strategy that defines hamburger flipping as a manufacturing job, that literally tries to eliminate the manufacturing extension program year after year, and now in their moment of shame, after 3½ years of being the stewardship of lost jobs, they try to act in this holy picture that they are doing something, not one Republican had the common sense or decency or courtesy to include the President's own plan. And I tried to do it and was shown total disrespect.

Mr. Speaker, the President was not even up here, nor were the President's lobbyists up here, trying to get his initiative included. There is a reason we have lost 2.7 million jobs in manufacturing, because the other side of the aisle does not have a strategy for it and does not give a whit for it.

Mr. Speaker, I will probably in the end vote for the bill because there are some good things in here, but what has become clear to all of us is the President and this Congress run by Republicans do not care about 21st century jobs and the technical skills and the training that is required to fill those jobs.

As the President said, we can add and train an additional 100,000 workers each year, but what did the other side of the aisle do? They left those 100,000 workers and their skills on the editing floor.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON).

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I think we all recognize that we are in a manufacturing crisis right now, and it is going to impact the quality of life and the standard of living not only for our generation, but for my little girl's generation and for my grandchildren's generation. We have a crisis. By all accounts, a major portion of that problem is around outsourcing and offshoring of jobs. I have always understood that we cannot solve a problem until we better understand the problem.

We had an opportunity today to try to do something about understanding that problem. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) had an excellent amendment that would help us understand it, and I would like to have the gentleman explain to us how we are going to try to understand this problem of outsourcing.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, let me first say I was utterly amazed in the Committee on Science when I offered my amendment. I thought it would be noncontroversial. We had a number of amendments that there may have been some controversy and debate back and forth on, but I thought offering an amendment that would require an independent study of our government to address one of the major problems in the United States today, the loss of manufacturing and other high-tech jobs offshore, certainly would be acceptable to both sides of the aisle.

Mr. GORDON. It was just a study?

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, it was exactly that. It calls for a study. It would mandate a study. The Secretary of Commerce would be required within 60 days after the President signed this legislation, he would be required to enter into a contract either with the RAND Corporation or any other credible company to do an independent study, report back within a year, and at the conclusion of the year, the Secretary of Commerce would have 4 months to put together his recommendation based upon the results of that study and make recommendations to the Congress.

So that is why I was amazed and again amazed yesterday at the Committee on Rules. We are asking simply to study the problem, identify how many jobs have been lost in what sectors, what does the future look like as far as outsourcing is concerned, and then take action. Members are talking about the number of jobs we are losing overseas, but no one is taking action. With this study the administration would have a blueprint and a plan as to what needs to be done.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, did any Republicans on the Committee on Science vote for the amendment? Did they vote against it?

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, yes, they did. It was a partisan vote right down the line. The Democrats supported it, and the Republicans opposed it. I was told at the time the reason the Republicans opposed it was because of process; they were concerned about jurisdiction and that other committees would claim jurisdiction. And, of course, we have dealt with that problem before by exchanging letters.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I would point out that now we are on the House floor, and so there is no jurisdictional problem.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, there is no jurisdictional problem on the House floor, and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) made that point very clearly to the Committee on Rules, that if they allowed this amendment in order today, there would be no jurisdictional problem.

I frankly believe if this amendment had been allowed in order and debated, I cannot see how any Member of this House would vote against an independent study addressing the major problem that we have in this country of outsourcing jobs.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, just to be clear, we are getting ready to vote on this rule, and if we vote for this rule, any Member who votes for this rule is voting not to allow us to have the opportunity to have a study on outsourcing?

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I would tell the gentleman that any Member who votes for this rule, in my opinion, is voting for the status quo, to take no action whatsoever to try to determine, to try to collect the data and determine what is going on with the offshoring of jobs and how to address the problem.

Mr. GORDON. But, Mr. Speaker, if we vote against this rule, we can turn right around and come back and have a vote not only on trying to find out better the problems of outsourcing, but allow any Member who has a good idea about trying to improve and increase our manufacturing base in this country, to allow them to bring it to the floor and try to improve this situation; is that correct?

Mr. COSTELLO. That is correct. If we defeat the rule, we can come back and debate the issue of outsourcing. I have to believe there are a number of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who will vote against this rule in order to move forward with the study so we can gather the data and come up with a blueprint to address this problem.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address H.R. 3598, the Manufacturing Technology Competitiveness Act of 2004.

I find it very important that we address manufacturing technology competitiveness at a time when over 8.2 million Americans are without employment and over 10 percent of African Americans are currently jobless.

Today the American economy is facing challenges unlike any that it has ever faced before. The sector most drastically affected by this decline is the manufacturing industry. Historically, the manufacturing sector has been a pillar of the American economy. Without a strong manufacturing base, we will not have a strong economic recovery. Not only is manufacturing a key source of skilled, high-paying jobs, but it also is critical to our economic and national security that we have the ability to manufacture goods we need in this country.

In my home State of Texas, more than 156,000 jobs have been lost since January 2001. The manufacturing unemployment rate continued to rise last month.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill was marked up in the committee, the vast majority of the suggestions from this side of the aisle were dismissed. The markup was uncommonly partisan. No matter how good the amendment was, and there were many amendments spoken about as being good, but no support.

So as we debate this bill on the House floor today, I am hopeful we can reach constructive consensus on many of the amendments being offered today, and I do ask that as many Members as possible join me in voting against the rule.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for her remarks.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, as a student of representative democracy, I continue to be amazed at the imagination demonstrated by our friends on the other side of the aisle. They talk about problems and talk about problems; we bring forth solutions.

Today we bring forth with this rule legislation that will authorize $160 million for the manufacturing sector of our economy for training of workers in small businesses in the manufacturing field to retain their competitive edge in technology. We bring forth solutions. We have to deal with things. When in the majority, we have to deal with things like whether amendments are germane and other technical matters, which sometimes may seem too technical, but they are important.

So it is nice to engage in theoretical debate, even about very important problems, like we have seen today. I maintain that it is even nicer to bring forth solutions for the problems of the people of this country. We have done that with this rule. We bring forth a very important piece of legislation. The $160 million for the manufacturing sector for training is critical at this time to retain jobs in this country. It is not theory, it is reality.

So I would ask all of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to support not only the very important underlying legislation, but the rule that will make possible the consideration by this House of this very important underlying legislation in order to help the manufacturing sector of our economy which is so important.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The question is the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4755, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 707 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 707

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4755) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1115

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.