

LARGER TRUCKS

□ 1930

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I rise today in favor of protecting our infrastructure, keeping our roads safe, and reducing emissions. There are serious safety, infrastructure, and environmental concerns involved with allowing even bigger and heavier tractor-trailers on our roadways than are currently allowed. Trucking accidents cause too many deaths, and the 3,373 victims in 2011 alone were disproportionately people who were driving in cars caught in these heavy truck crashes.

These oversized trucks also inflict disproportionate damage on our roads, and especially on our national bridge system. They impose a significant cost on the rest of us to pay for these repairs. Plus, allowing larger and heavier trucks would divert freight away from our rails and onto our highways, increasing congestion and emissions at a time when we are working hard to reduce both.

 RECOGNIZING CATHEDRAL HIGH SCHOOL

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

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary students, parents, and faculty of Cathedral High School in El Paso, Texas.

Yesterday, I had the privilege of meeting with many of Cathedral's best and brightest, along with their principal, Brother Nick Gonzalez, and Chief Justice Richard Barajas, who leads the Center for Advanced Studies. What Cathedral's students have achieved under their watch is truly incredible.

This year, a record six graduating seniors have been designated as Gates Millennium Scholars and five others were finalists for this prestigious award that provides scholarships to outstanding minority students. Two others will be attending service academies.

Overall, 98 percent of the graduating class of 115 has been accepted to college, and 32 seniors will be graduating with a degree from El Paso Community College in addition to their Cathedral diploma.

Cathedral is representative of our vibrant binational community in El Paso. Over 85 percent of the student body is of Hispanic origin, with students from El Paso, Ciudad Juarez, and southern New Mexico. The school's rigorous curriculum emphasizes social justice and community service, so graduates are not just model students, they are also preparing to become model citizens.

I am proud to represent Cathedral High School and expect great things from all the students I had the privilege of meeting yesterday.

 MAKE IT IN AMERICA:
 MANUFACTURING MATTERS

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, it's good to be back here for another week of work. We certainly have work to do. Out across this Nation there are a lot of people that are still unemployed, and it's time for Congress to take this extremely important task and to get it done.

We've been talking here on the floor for a long time about how we can create jobs in America. The Make It in America agenda that my Democratic colleagues and I have put forth over the last 2½ years is an extensive number of bills designed to bring jobs back to the United States. And we need them.

An article that appeared in the newspapers this last day or so talked about this. This is Paul Krugman talking about the long-term unemployment that we now have here in the United States. He cites that for the last 5 years we've been in a crisis. Unemployment remains elevated, with almost 12 million Americans out of work. But the real striking and huge number is in another category, and that's the long-term unemployment: 4.6 million Americans have been unemployed for more than 6 months, and more than 3 million have been jobless for more than a year. The programs that my Democratic colleagues and I have offered over the last 2½ years would have gone directly to that problem.

He argues that when you have this long-term unemployment, you create a problem that these men and women are not likely to ever get back into the workforce, citing several statistics that are found around the Nation. But we can do something about that, and the Make It in America agenda is exactly what we ought to be working on.

Before I go into the specifics of that agenda, I'd like to cover one other issue. This is seen in a report from the International Monetary Fund that they just came out with in the last couple of days warning the United States to be very careful about continued reductions in our budget. They argue that the austerity program that the United States has actually been on for the last 2 years—now, remember, immediately after President Obama became President the United States took on a stimulus program, an enormous stimulus program of a little over \$700 billion. That actually created the start of the rebirth of the American economy, but it only lasted for a year, a year and a half.

Then we undertook, at the behest of my Republican colleagues, an austerity program, one that involved seriously

reducing the Federal budget. Over the decades, beginning in 2011, we will see a nearly \$2 trillion reduction in Federal expenditures in the 10-year period. That is what austerity is all about.

Today, if you were trying to get on an airplane somewhere in the United States, you were beginning to see yet one more effect of austerity, and that is the air traffic controllers going on furlough, so that 1 day out of 10 air traffic controllers will not be working, meaning that there will be a shortage. Some say, well, they should have moved the money around and they could have done it some other way, but that's not the way the austerity program is in the United States, and that's not the way the sequestration law is written.

Sequestration is across-the-board cuts, expenditure item by expenditure item, with no—or very little—authority to shift money from one lower priority to a higher priority. Therefore, today, the air traffic controllers, some were not working. There was a general slowdown of air traffic across the United States resulting in some of my colleagues not getting to work today to vote on the three bills that we had up here on the floor just a few moments ago.

In any case, the IMF warns: U.S. austerity will slow growth. This was a warning that was issued to the United States. It was also issued earlier to the United Kingdom, who have been on a very serious austerity budget for the last 3 years. The result is that the United Kingdom has actually seen a shrinking in their economy, as has most of Europe. Austerity did not work in Europe as an effort to deal with the downturn of the economy and the Great Recession, and it certainly is not working here.

We need to create jobs in the United States. A rational economic strategy would say that when you have a general decline in the economy caused by a lack of consumer spending, then it is time for the government to step in and to provide support for the economy. We can do that in a way that actually is an investment strategy. This is where I would like to take this conversation.

Instead of talking about austerity and cut, cut, cut at the Federal level to deal with the deficit—an issue that, indeed, we must deal with, but that's a long-term issue that we have to get about—but we have a short-term crisis right now with employment and the lack of demand here in the United States.

So, what do we do about it? Well, first of all, we end sequestration; give a rational way for the government agencies to address the \$85 billion of cuts that are taking place in the next 6 months—better yet, to put that off into the future. Let those cuts occur in the years 4, 5, 6, 7, out in the future rather than right now, when what we ought to be doing is increasing the government expenditure on key investments, like keeping the airplanes in the sky, like

keeping the men and women who are at my Air Force base in Travis, continuing to provide the support that the Air Force needs in moving men and equipment out of Afghanistan, and shifting those budget cuts off to the future. I hope that happens. I have asked my colleagues, and certainly the President has asked for this to happen. We'll see if my colleagues here are ready to do that.

So, what do we do in the meantime? It's about investments, those kind of Federal Government expenditures that actually will create immediate jobs as well as long-term economic growth. There are several, and I'll go through them very, very quickly.

First, education. The most important investment that any economy will make, any society will make is the investment in education. And it's not just K-12; it's the higher education system, a doctorate education, as well as the retraining of those long-term unemployed who need to be prepared for the jobs of today and tomorrow, not the jobs of yesterday. So that's the education.

The second piece of it is research. It's the foundation of future economic growth. You need to have a robust research program if you intend for your economy to stay ahead. Fortunately, America has had such an agenda for a long time. However, the sequestration cuts—for example, \$45 million out of research at the University of California-Davis in just the next 6 months—that means layoffs, layoffs of technicians and others who are involved in those research programs. And it means that those research efforts will not come to fruition in the near future. They will be delayed, and the benefit of them will not be seen for some time.

Some of this is real jobs right away. For example, some of that research has to do with bioherbicides and biopesticides. These are naturally occurring organisms that occur somewhere in the environment. They are discovered, they are brought back to the laboratory and grown and become a bioherbicide or a biopesticide. Research in that area is clearly going to be delayed as a result of sequestration. So let's delay the sequestration, put it off in the future years so that we can grow the economy today.

The third element of economic growth is in the area of infrastructure. You have to have infrastructure. This is about moving Americans across our landscape. This is about our ports, our highways, our airports, and other critical elements in the transportation infrastructure.

□ 1940

We know that we are woefully behind on meeting the infrastructure needs. Probably eight out of 10 bridges in the United States are deficient. We know that our highways are filled with potholes and don't measure up to the standards that we would want, simply

for the protection of our automobiles' suspension systems. We know that there is far more to infrastructure than just highways and ports and airports.

For example, the Mississippi River is flooding. So what is the status of levees in the United States? Well, the status of levees in the United States is not good. In my district, I have more than 1,200 miles of levees, and many of them are insufficient to protect the people who live on the land side of the levees, the farms and the cities.

One of the most dangerous cities in the United States is Sacramento, California. It ranks number two after New Orleans. We need to have that levee repaired, yet the Army Corps of Engineers is taking a \$250 million cut in its levee budget and in the projects that it does in deepening the ports and maintaining the ports. It makes no sense that at a time when we know there is severe flooding, even to this day along the Mississippi, that we would take \$250 million out of the Army Corps of Engineers budget. But that's precisely what is happening with sequestration.

Infrastructure goes beyond that. I'm going to come back to infrastructure in a few moments, but I see I'm joined by one of my colleagues.

I'll just rapidly finish with the other two elements in a program for building the American economy.

The final two elements are manufacturing. You have to make things. I'll come back and talk about that in a few moments. And the final element is you must change. The economy is changing, people have to change with the economy, our education system, our infrastructure. All of these require that we are willing to change.

Now, my colleague from the great State of Ohio, please, share with us your thoughts on sequestration, jobs and what we can do here in the United States to put people back to work.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

In line with what you were talking about on the infrastructure piece, I think it's important that we take a look at what investments need to be made in the country. We're living, unfortunately, in a narrative in the country where everything that the government invests in is a waste of money, according to some people here in the United States Capitol. No investment that the government could make could possibly be a good one. So we are forced into a discussion of either you're a socialist and the bureaucrats should be CEO of the company or nothing.

What the Democrats are trying to articulate is for us to reestablish the formula that led to the great economic expansion here in the United States. We had figured it out. We figured it out. In just a few hundred years throughout the industrial revolution this new country figured out how to make investments, how to protect intellectual property, how to protect private property, and how to make investments in certain things that were

going to yield dividends down the line, that were going to help business and workers alike all at the same time.

And that formula was invest in infrastructure—invest in roads, invest in bridges, invest in ports, invest in the airports, invest in the research, invest in the space program, invest in military research that eventually would spin out into the world. We had the formula. Invest in our workforce, public schools, universities, GI bill. A pretty simple formula. This is not brain surgery we're talking about here, but it worked. And this little country that was fairly small and really insignificant at one point became the industrial powerhouse of the entire world because of that genius of public-private investments.

And, of course, the private sector came in and made big investments. Of course, they did. That's what they do. But our job here, in some instances, is to get out of the way. And we're all in agreement there that, of course, the government can get too much in the way, and we've got to streamline government. The Tax Code is too complicated. It needs to be simplified.

We can do all that without having to disinvest or eat the seed corn that is the future economy of the United States of America. And why I love to join my friend here from California is because every time he comes to the floor, he's talking about how do we make investments today that are going to pay us dividends down the line.

And when you talk about infrastructure, you're talking about making investments that are going to put, for the most part, building-trades workers to work, who make a decent salary, a good salary, good benefits, good health care. And then they go out. You have a road built or a bridge built, and the painters and the ironworkers and all these projects, sheet metal workers, they all come and they build and they all get some money in their pocket. Then they go down the street and they go to Home Depot and they spend some money there. They buy a house or add a room or put a pool in or they invest. They send their kids to college, and the whole thing keeps going. That's what we're talking about here.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. RYAN, your lesson on American history is right on. We often hear some of our colleagues talk about the Founding Fathers—the Founding Fathers wouldn't do it this way, they wouldn't do it that way, or they would.

It's very interesting that George Washington on becoming President, the first President, went to Alexander Hamilton, his Treasury Secretary, and asked Mr. Hamilton to develop a strategy to grow the American economy. Alexander Hamilton came back with a report 3 or 4 months later, laid out about a dozen different elements, and in that report that Alexander Hamilton brought to President Washington was the genius of what you just described. He said, the Federal Government

should provide for infrastructure investment. He didn't call it infrastructure. The Federal Government should build canals, ports, and roads. He also said, the Federal Government should buy American-made products to encourage manufacturing in America. So this is not new.

Your recitation of American history down through the line actually began with our very first President, laying out the partnership, the public-private partnership, the Federal Government playing a key role in those investments that create economic growth.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Right. And if you look, comparatively speaking, now to what China is doing, what India is doing—granted they're developing countries—but they're spending 7 or 8 percent of their GDP on infrastructure projects. Here in the United States we're spending maybe 2.

I know we are not a developing country; but we do have major investments to make in our cities, in our rural areas, whether you're talking about combined sewer systems, whether you're talking about waterlines, whether you're talking about dealing with the septic systems in rural areas, whether you're talking about bridges. I think in Trumbull County, where I live, I think we have 60-some bridges that are deemed not adequate.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Unsafe.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Unsafe. In one county in Ohio, and there's 88 counties.

And we have high unemployment, much higher than any of us would want. And, yes, we have problems; but the Federal Government is getting money at 1 percent. And I know my friends—and I'm on the Budget Committee and we talk a lot about deficits and everything else—I know a lot of people would say we can't borrow our way out of this. And what I'm saying—my argument that I'm making—and I don't want to attribute anybody else to this—is that we've got major billion-dollar, hundreds of billion dollars—probably the Society of Engineers says a couple trillion dollars' worth of infrastructure needs over the next decade or so—why wouldn't we invest in these projects? And they say, well, you've got to borrow the money. We're going to borrow the money at 1 percent, maybe a little higher, depending on the day of the week.

□ 1950

That project that we can do today is going to be a certain price. It's going to be \$100, say. What's that project going to be like in 5 or 10 years? It's going to be that much more expensive. Labor is going to be more expensive. Energy costs are going to be more expensive. The raw materials are going to be more expensive. Cement is going to be more expensive. Steel and brick are going to be more expensive. Go right down the line. Everything is going to be more expensive. And part of the problem with the Treasury is we don't have enough people working, paying taxes into the Treasury.

So, to me, you get a twofer, and it's not like the project doesn't need to get done. This is not "make work." This is something that needs to get done.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Let me give you an example.

The American Public Works Association—these are people with the sanitation systems, the water systems and the like—estimate that 25 percent of all of the fresh-treated water in our municipal water systems is lost to leakage, and they estimate, together with the EPA, that we need to spend over \$300 billion immediately to deal with sanitation systems in the United States that are inadequate and \$335 billion in drinking water so that we have clean, available drinking water.

One more point here: for every billion dollars we spend, you put 28,000 people to work immediately. Those are the engineers, the draftsmen, the architects, the men and women who are operating the equipment, who are back-filling the ditches, laying the pipe. And if we use another strategy that we've developed on the Democratic side called Make It in America—if you use our taxpayer money to buy American-made equipment—then in your district, the steel mills begin once again to produce American-made steel, and all of the pipe and other equipment that's needed can be produced in America, using our money.

I love your example of the 1 percent. There have been Democratic proposals—and in fact, the President talked about it here in his state of the Union—about creating an infrastructure bank. If you take that 10-year or 15-year money that the government can borrow at a percent to, maybe, a percent and a half and put it in an infrastructure bank and then loan it to those cities and municipalities and counties and others that need to build these systems—well, let's say we borrowed a percent and a half and that you loaned it out at 1.6 percent—that's enough to pay that back. We circulate that money in our economy, we use that money to buy American-made products, and we get this economy moving.

It's there for us. We can do this if only we'd put our minds to it. Set aside for a moment the deficit issue. I said for a moment, not forever. We know we have to deal with the deficit, but you cannot solve that deficit unless you have Americans working, and we can put Americans back to work.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And, I believe, unleash a new economy. I mean, we are strangling the economy right now because we're not making those kinds of investments.

Again, when you look at our competitors—because I'm from northeast Ohio. We play a lot of football, and there's a scoreboard. America is not going to win every game, but we'd better be in a position in which, in the global economic competition, we are competitive, and we know what makes us competitive.

I'm not saying it's all about making money. A lot of this stuff that we're talking about is quality of life. We won't get into health care and preventative maintenance or anything like that, but we have human beings in Virginia and in major towns who are stuck in traffic for 2 hours in a commute in and out of a city. We're not investing in the high-speed rail, which would be another job creator and good for the environment and a new industry, and it would help develop and spread new technologies.

So we are not leading right now. We have status quo. I hate to say this, but we have a lot of people who want it to be that way. They want the Congress to be dysfunctional because they don't necessarily like government. You don't have to be enamored with government, but you do have to recognize that there is a role to be played here.

If you play sports and if you read the newspaper and watch the football team, you think it's the quarterback, it's the wide receiver, it's the running backs—it's the skill position people—who get all the press, but none of that works. Let's say that those people are the private sector, that they're the CEOs that we worship. Well, within that team there are linemen, and there are blockers and tacklers and linebackers, people who are in the guts of the game, on the front lines, making it happen so that this other stuff can happen.

The infrastructure is the blocking and tackling. It doesn't make the headlines, but it does what needs to be done in order for all of the other stuff to work.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You reminded me of my college football career at the University of California, Berkeley, where I was an offensive guard and a defensive tackle, blocking and tackling.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. So this resonates with you, yes.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Oh, it resonated with me just fine—along with a lot of bumps and bruises and cuts and the like.

But this is the public-private partnership. This is the role of our government to make these critical investments in education, in research. In fact, one of the Make It in America agenda items is the extension of the research tax credit—a permanent or at least a long extension of it.

Representative CARNEY has introduced House Resolution 905, which would extend that. We have been extending it 1 year at a time, but that doesn't give the businesses the opportunity to plan on a long extension or on a long period of time for research. For example, I was at Genentech in my district. They have a major biopharmaceutical program there—the biggest biopharmaceutical plant in the world. They conduct a lot of research, but the start-stop of the research and the development tax credit makes it difficult for them to plan long into the future.

So this piece of legislation, part of the Make It in America agenda, does that extension and gives this certainty to businesses.

We also have the infrastructure bank being reintroduced by our colleagues here on the Democratic side. This is one of about two-dozen bills that the Democrats have introduced for the purposes of moving the economy by bringing the manufacturing back home. We also have the Patriot Corporations of America Act, by Representative SCHAKOWSKY from Chicago, that rewards companies when they bring the jobs back home. Previously and even today, American corporations can take a tax break for shipping jobs offshore. They don't get a tax break when they bring those jobs back home. We want to reverse that.

There is a series of bills. I call the attention of Congress to these bills, the Make It in America agenda, so that we can once again Make It in America, not only make things in America, but Americans can make it—infrastructure, a critical element of this.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. When you look at manufacturing, which the R&D component leads to partnerships with, you have two problems. One is it's year to year, so you can't plan your long term, as you said. But at the same time, the budgets for the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health have been inconsistent as well. Those are things that we need to ramp up. Those aren't huge money items, but those yield a lot of value.

So extend the R&D tax credit; beef up the National Science Foundation; beef up the National Institutes of Health; beef up the research in the Department of Energy. Public-private partnerships. Lay that groundwork for the private sector. Help the private sector.

We had a group of CEOs in last week who were in the semiconductor industry. They talked about the same thing, and they talked about the public-private partnerships and how that's needed for us to maintain our competitiveness here. These are good-paying jobs in upstate New York and other places, and these are the kinds of investments that we need to make. Again, we've got to get out of this mentality that every single thing that the government does is bad. There are some things, and it's the public-private partnerships that are going to ultimately lead the way for us.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Alexander Hamilton and George Washington had it correct: the American Government working with the private sector can make the difference.

When we talk about infrastructure, we have an opportunity this year, Congress and the President, to make a huge impact on American jobs. We are going to rewrite, in this session, the Surface Transportation Act for America.

□ 2000

Mr. RAHALL and I have authored a bill that we hope becomes part of that

Surface Transportation Act, that simply says: as we spend the taxpayers' money—this is money that is collected from the gasoline and the diesel excise tax—that that money be spent on American-made steel, concrete, bridges, buses, trains, whatever.

It can work.

One quick example. In the stimulus bill, there was an opportunity for Amtrak to buy new locomotives, about half a billion dollars to be spent on these new locomotives. In that section of the law, one sentence was added that said, These must be 100 percent American-made. Nobody was making locomotives in America before that, but Siemens, a German corporation, one of the biggest manufacturers in the world, said, Oh, half a billion dollars? We can make locomotives. In America? Sure.

In Sacramento, California, they opened a manufacturing plant. There are probably somewhere between 200 and 300 people working there today manufacturing 100 percent American-made locomotives. And on May 13, 3 years after they began this process, the first 100 percent American-made locomotive in probably more than a century rolls onto the tracks of America.

We can do this.

Mr. RAHALL's bill, H.R. 949, will provide that opportunity, American-made, using American taxpayer money. I also have another bill that does the same for solar and wind projects.

We can do these things; we just need to put our mind to it and get past this business of austerity. We cannot solve this problem of American jobs with an austerity budget. We've seen it fail in Europe, and we see it failing here in the United States as the long-term unemployment continues to harm 4.5 million Americans that have been out of work for more than 6 months and another 3 million that have been out of work for more than a year. We need an investment strategy, a Make It in America strategy, an investment strategy in those things that create long-term economic growth.

Mr. RYAN, I thank you very much for joining us this evening. If you'd like to wrap, and then I'll wrap, and then we'll call it a night.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I'd just add, lastly, that to me it's about exciting the country and getting the country excited about what the future of America is all about. Tax cuts for the top 1 percent of the people and austerity for the rest is not a vision for an exciting America that young people want to come into.

The private sector is going to be a huge part of this, but there are things that we need to start doing here. Whatever the percentage is that the government's role is in investments, I don't know what that number is, but we're not doing it, and there's no aspirational vision to excite young people to say, Man, we're going to the Moon, or we're going to go energy independent, or we're going to have high-speed rail

that's going to connect the entire country.

I think the President has desperately tried to provide that vision, only to be pulled down to the depths by some of the folks here who I think have a completely different agenda, and that agenda doesn't align with the America that was built over the past century or so.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. RYAN, I thank you so very much for joining us this evening.

We're still the strongest, best country in the world. There's no other place like America. And if we begin acting like we can and are a strong, robust, building, growing, dynamic country instead of being weak and pulling ourselves back and saying, Oh, we can't do it; we can't do it—no, we can do it. We can build. We can invest.

Every time we invest a dollar in infrastructure, we put Americans back to work and we give them an opportunity to take care of their family, to stay in their home, to provide for their children's education. When we do that, we create the foundation for future economic growth, whether it's education or research or building the infrastructure and making it in America. As we do these things, this agenda is the American agenda, the one that created this country.

As you so well said when you opened here: It's the American history. It's there before us. We can do it. We must do it. We owe it to the American people.

Mr. RYAN, thank you.

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

MAKING LIFE WORK FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to be on the floor tonight for the next few minutes, and I hopefully will have some other colleagues joining me here in a few minutes. Tonight is about making life work for American families.

What are we doing on behalf of the American people here in the House of Representatives to make life a little bit easier for working families, working moms and dads? And let me just say that there are things across the board, whether it's health care issues, energy, reducing the deficit and the debt for Margaret and George, my two kids, and future generations, all of those things add up and matter.

I want to talk for just a few minutes about one proposal that I have in front of the House of Representatives that's going to come up for a vote here after we return from our district workweek. But before I do that, I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, tonight, that we're going to do something a little bit different in