They are obstructing in their unwillingness to keep college loans affordable, making sure that on July 1, 7 million students across this country will have their student loan interest rate double.

They have been obstructionist when it comes to the Paycheck Fairness Act, the simple task of making sure that women who do the same job with the same experience are paid the same money.

Obstruction, obstruction, obstruction. They could have done their part to make things happen for the American people, but they haven't done that.

Mr. Speaker, the actions of this Congress will speak louder than words. It's time for the Republicans to show their concern for the American people and not just with partisanship.

Stop the obstruction. Let's create jobs for the American people.

□ 1220

STARTUP JOBS ACT 2.0

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

Mr. DOLD. This week, I joined with some of my colleagues to introduce the bipartisan Startup Jobs Act 2.0.

Mr. Speaker, students come to America from all over the world. They earn advanced degrees in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. Then, upon graduating, they're forced to leave our country—forced to go back home and, in essence, compete against us. With them goes their knowledge, their ideas, and their aspirations to change the world. Many of these students want to stay here in America to make something of themselves here because America is still the best place for ideas to become realities. These ideas become solutions, which turn into job-creating companies.

According to a study by the National Foundation for American Policy, immigrants founded or cofounded almost half of the top 50 venture-backed companies in the United States. Since our Nation's founding, immigrants have flourished right along with our economy. America becomes a richer and more dynamic society by encouraging the best and the brightest from all over the world to set up shop here on our soil. That is why I'm honored to be an original cosponsor of the bipartisan, bicameral Startup Jobs Act 2.0 that will help America get back to work.

THE GOP'S ORPHANS

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, if Congress were a musical, then House Republicans would be Little Orphan Annie, singing, ''The sun will surely come out tomorrow,'' because with the urgent challenges facing this Nation, with Americans staring at an impending fiscal cliff and economic calamity, the GOP has simply said, ''Maybe we'll get to it tomorrow.''

Let's revisit the little orphans the GOP has left behind:

Needed transportation and jobs bill.

The Medicare doc payment fix.

The debt ceiling extension.

The student loan interest rate hike.

The sequester's arbitrary, indiscriminate cuts.

The farm bill.

Postal reform.

The expiration of the Bush tax cuts, the AMT taxes, and the payroll tax cut which would collectively cost families $4,000 more next year.

The impact to our economy and these poor little orphans is a staggering $7 trillion. The nonpartisan CBO has said failure to act on these will send America back into a recession.

The Republicans need to recognize that every orphan deserves a home and work with us on responsible bipartisan solutions, or it's going to be ''a hard knock life for us.''

PASS THE TRANSPORTATION BILL AND PUT AMERICANS BACK TO WORK

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

Mr. COHEN. Much emphasis has been put on the deficit and that we do need to deal with the deficit. But at the same time, one way to deal with it is to stimulate the economy. There's no better way to stimulate the economy than a transportation bill that repairs our infrastructure, puts people to work here in America, and improves the ability of industry to move its product and for consumers to get product. Yet the transportation bill that's been passed in the House and passed in the Senate—differing bills—is stuck in a conference committee.

We need to pass a transportation bill and put America back to work with American-made products by American workers. My city of Memphis is a transportation center. We know highways and runways move product and move people and make sense. So I urge our leaders to see that the conference committee comes back, doesn't have extraneous provisions, and does what is necessary to put America back to work and passes the highway bill.

AMERICAN JOBS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MULVANEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We all like to think about ''what if''—what if I had actually gotten an A rather than an F in that high school class? What if I had hit that home run instead of struck out? The what-if game is part of our life. But I want to take that up today in a very, very serious way. This is about what if this Congress, led by our Republican colleagues, had taken up and passed President Barack Obama's American Jobs Act.

Last September, the President made a very bold proposal to put Americans back to work, a comprehensive piece of legislation that covered many, many different parts of the American economy. It's called the American Jobs Act. Fully paid for, not increasing the deficit at all, but paid for with the elimination of unnecessary tax breaks for Big Oil, unnecessary tax cuts for the extraordinarily wealthy 1 percent of Americans, a fully paid-for American Jobs Act proposed by the President last September.

What if? What if this House under our Republican leadership had taken up the elements of the American Jobs Act, modified them, as is our nature and our responsibility, but nonetheless passed those very significant proposals that would, according to economists, create somewhere between 1.3 and 1.9 million jobs immediately? Not some day in the future, but now. What if we had done that last September? What if our Republican leadership had allowed those measures to come before the committees and on this floor to be signed by the President? Then 1.3 million Americans or maybe even 1.9 million Americans would have a job today.

We're going to talk today about the most tragic what-if this Nation is pondering at this moment. What if the American Jobs Act had been implemented?

Let's talk about what it is. What are the elements of the American Jobs Act? Bear with me, if you will, as we go through these. I'll go through them rather quickly, and then we'll come back and touch on them as we go on.

If you've been watching here in the gallery or if you are watching C–SPAN, you would have heard my Democratic colleagues talk about the transportation bill. The President said last fall, We need to have a transportation bill, and we need it now. We need to put men and women back to work in the construction industry repairing our bridges, building our highways, paving our airports, building the infrastructure that this Nation needs.

The student aid bill. We know that if America is going to compete, we have to have the best educated workforce in the world. And so the President proposed a student aid bill, legislation that would provide additional sources of funding so students can go to school in community colleges, in 4-year schools, and in the master and doctorate programs.

The President took up one of the great conundrums and problems that this Nation faces from our competitors. Yes, China. China manipulates its currency, and the President said that has

to stop. He asked for the House of Representatives and the Senate to pass a piece of legislation dealing with the manipulation of the Chinese currency, which gives them somewhere between a 20 and 25 percent price advantage on all the things that they manufacture and import into the United States. He said, Do something about that. Give me, the administration, the power to deal, to put a tariff on those Chinese goods if the Chinese Government continues to manipulate its currency.

He said we ought to buy American-made products. We ought to use our money, our taxpayer money, to buy American-made goods.

□ 1230

I have a piece of legislation that would do just that, and I'll talk about that before this hour is done.

Buy America. Enhance the Buy American provisions. Do away with the waivers that have created a 12-lane freeway for foreign products to find their way into America despite the laws.

The President said that there are millions of homes in America that are inefficient, that leak energy and cost the homeowner or the renter vast amounts of money. He said we could put people to work putting in new windows, caulking, putting insulation in the attics. We could put people to work and, in the process, reduce our consumption of energy and create jobs.

He said there ought to be a permanent research and development tax credit so that our industries would stay ahead of the competition around the world, so that they would know year after year after year that the research and development tax credit would be there and the more that they invested in research, the more that they took that research and developed products, the more jobs would be created, and they didn't have to worry that, well, maybe, it won't be there next year, so this 5-year research program, we won't do it. No, he wants certainty. His American Jobs Act would have given certainty. But the leadership in this House refused to take up all of those provisions.

The President went on and said we need a payroll tax cut for businesses and for the worker. We did a little of this. Businesses didn't get a tax break on their payroll; however, the men and women that do work and do get a salary did get half of what the President proposed.

He said we ought to put veterans to work. And fortunately, on Veterans Day last year, we did pass a bill to do that, and we should consider even more.

285,000 teachers have lost their jobs this year across America. The President said that we cannot survive as a stable, growing country with a just society if we don't educate our kids, and so he said let's put those teachers back to work, 280,000 of them, and police and firemen along with them, so that we would have the public protection.

He said that in addition to a transportation enhancement, an additional $50 billion over and above the transportation bill, we ought to put people to work and give a jump start. Just like you would with a dead battery on your car, he wanted to put those jumper cables on the American construction industry, $50 billion, get it up and going.

And he said we need a permanent infrastructure bank.

I'll finish this up quickly, because it gets to be a rather long what-if. But, oh, what if. What if we had done these things?

How about rebuilding our schools and houses, again putting people to work. And how about allowing Americans to refinance their homes to stop the inevitable decline of the housing industry as more and more people were forced into bankruptcy and losing their homes.

It's the American Jobs Act, proposed by the President of the United States last September, and to this day, two of those policies have been adopted. What if? What if?

The economists say 1.3 million Americans would be working today if this legislation had been allowed to be brought to the floor of this House, had been allowed to be brought to the Senate and the President to sign it.

And don't forget this: It was fully paid for. It was fully paid for. The deficit would not have been increased. However, the oil companies would not have $12 billion of your money in addition to what they've taken at the gasoline pump—the wealthiest industry in the world. We'd get our tax dollars back, and we'd put people to work.

And for those with a million dollars of annual income after all of the deductions, after all of the credits, for those with a million dollars of annual income, their taxes would have gone up to pay for putting 1.3 million Americans back to work. What if?

I'd like now to call upon my colleague from the State of Oregon who for years has fought for transportation, one of the senior members on the Transportation Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO, you were here late last night fighting one of the most foolish proposals I have heard of, to cut the transportation budget by $37 billion. Thank you for fighting that fight and informing us. Fortunately, this House rejected that foolish proposal.

I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman.

I would just key in on one of the aspects of the President's proposal, and that would be long-term legislation to invest $450 billion in our crumbling infrastructure.

Now, some people say to me, well, Congressman, I don't work in construction. I say, these aren't just construction jobs. We have the strongest Buy America requirements in the area of transportation investments. Underline two words: ''investments'' and ''jobs.''

Now, those investments, if made under Buy America in, say, transit vehicles, involve engineering, manufacturing. They involve steel manufacturing. They involve sophisticated fabrication of vehicles, the tires for buses, all of those sorts of things. We could put millions of people back to work and begin to revive the devastated American manufacturing sector and for once keeping the Chinese from stealing our jobs because of the Buy America protections.

But, no, the Republicans don't want to do that. They don't really like the Buy America provisions in the bill, and they don't want to make the investments.

We were here till midnight last night. The gentleman from Georgia proposed that we end all new Federal investment in transportation infrastructure on October 1. There would not have been one penny more. All of the money that he would allow in next year's budget would only be enough to pay for ongoing projects.

When the States finish a project, we reimburse them. We authorize the projects; the States build them; we reimburse them. The money that he would limit us to would only pay for projects already ongoing. That would bring it all to a halt, despite the fact the system is falling apart. We're living off the legacy of Dwight David Eisenhower, a mid-20th century legacy. It's falling apart. It needs to be rebuilt. We also need to build out a 21st century infrastructure to more efficiently move goods and people and compete with our competitors.

Now, I heard a lot of nonsense last night, and 82 Republicans voted for this today, so this is a problem. The Republican Conference is having an internal war among themselves. They have 82 Members who believe the Federal Government—the Federal Government, the people of the United States assembled, the 50 States and territories—should not invest in transportation and infrastructure, that it should be done by the 50 States. It should be devolved. That's crazy. That's crazy. In the 21st century, we're going to have a 50-State transportation policy?

And how are the States going to pay for it? We tried that, until 1956. We had a turnpike built in Kansas that ended at the Oklahoma border, because Oklahoma didn't have the money, until Eisenhower passed the legislation and the Federal Government could invest. They want to go back to those good old days.

And then they prattle on about, well, these are just government jobs, government. They hate government. No, they're not government jobs. The government does not build bridges; the government does not build transit systems; the government does not build highways, gentlemen. They don't build any of those things. We go out and contract through the States for the lowest qualified bidders under Buy America requirements to build these projects with American workers and American products.

So let's stop all this nonsense on the Republican side of the aisle about the

government can't create jobs. The investments the government makes can create jobs in the private sector.

We have an infrastructure that's falling apart. The President wants to rebuild it. The Senate even wants to rebuild it on a bipartisan basis. But, no, the Republicans in the House of Representatives have stopped forward progress on this legislation, forgoing potentially millions of jobs. It's a shame. I only hope that the Senate and the President can prevail on this issue.

I thank the gentleman for bringing this to the attention of the House.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. DEFAZIO, for years you have been fighting for infrastructure. I didn't watch last night's debate as you fought fiercely to prevent one of the most foolish pieces of legislation—well, there have been many foolish pieces of legislation proposed by our colleagues, but you couldn't be more correct.

□ 1240

Let me just put this up. I came across this yesterday. Basically what this is is it's a diagram of the employment in the construction industry. We had about, what is that, 5,570,000 men and women working in the construction industry in January, and here we are in May and we're just over 5,500,000—some 20,000, almost 30,000 have lost their jobs. And the proposals that our Republican colleagues are making would guarantee that once these projects are finished, it would be over, nothing more.

But the President laid out not only a transportation bill, but he laid out a very robust jump-start to it—$50 billion of additional money invested. Now, let's understand, this is not government money; this is an investment by the American people. It is their gasoline tax, their diesel tax. It is their investment in the highways and bridges and transportation systems of this Nation. Well, I guess if you're anti-tax and you're anti-roads and you're pro-gridlock, you're guaranteeing that the economy will slow down and eventually, who knows, even collapse.

Fortunately, there's a gentleman here from the great Mid-Northwest, Mr. KEITH ELLISON. You've been on this issue for a long time. I know in your area you've been very, very concerned about the issues that are in the American Jobs Act. Please join us.

Mr. ELLISON. I want to thank you, Congressman, for making the issue of jobs the front and center issue.

We've been here all week long, and one of the things that I find just shocking is that we have not dealt with the issues that are really in front of the American people. And the number one issue is jobs.

We haven't dealt with future jobs that students could perhaps get if they got the education, which has to do with the doubling of interest rates on student loans, which is due in a few weeks unless the Republican majority acts. We certainty have not taken up a transportation bill that would extend extensive work to people. As many as 280,000 education jobs are on the chopping block in the upcoming school year due to pressure on State budgets.

So the bottom line is that this is an interesting week that we live in because there is no doubt—no one of the 435 Members of this body are under any doubt—student loan rates are doubling, unemployment is record high, and yet we didn't deal with any of these critical issues. I'm really shocked. I'm astounded. I'm under the impression that we're all here to work hard.

I'm one of those who doesn't like to sort of imply or even say that the Republicans are sabotaging jobs for political advantage because it's hard for me to imagine that any true public servant would ever do something like that, but there are a lot of folks out here who believe that is the case. I want our Republican colleagues to disprove that premise by getting some pro-job, pro-education legislation that we all can agree on.

Another thing that I'm glad to talk about is with regards to the Obama job plan. Under the American Jobs Act, Obama has laid out a plan. He has set forth a set of ideas, and one of the elements that I want to talk about a little bit is the job program for the long-term unemployed.

Obama has talked about dealing with the issues of the long-term unemployed, people who have been out of work, and you know, who have been chronically out of work for a long time—they call them the 99ers. It's modeled after an unemployment program in Georgia. Under that program, workers continue to collect unemployment benefits, plus a small stipend to cover transportation and other expenses at no expense to the employer. After 8 weeks of training, the company may hire the person or not, and it can amount to a free tryout.

So I think that the Obama administration, under the American Jobs Act, is being responsive to the needs of the American people. I think the same cannot be said for the House of Representatives under the Republican majority. Under the American Jobs Act, the Republicans could bring it up today. Some of these ideas are things that they have proposed, and they won't even take those up. So this is really disappointing.

I think people who have been chronically unemployed for weeks and weeks and maybe perhaps years—I talked to a woman who has been out of work for 2½ years. This woman has a college degree, she is a highly trained professional from my district—Lauren, if you're watching, you know that I'm talking about you. I think the American Jobs Act has just what the doctor ordered if the Republican majority will take it up.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, Mr. ELLISON, in your community and my community, people want to go to work. They want a job. They want to be able to be part of the American machine that creates the wealth of this economy. They want to have the opportunity to provide the money for their family, take care of their needs. They take pride in their work. They're hardworking people, but they can't make it.

We have a long, long tradition in America that dates back really to the very first day of the American modern government. The day George Washington was sworn into office he undertook an industrial policy. I know our Republican colleagues like to talk about the Founding Fathers. Well, they really ought to listen to the Founding Fathers. And if they had listened to the Founding Fathers, they would have paid attention to the President's proposal on the American Jobs Act, because here's what George Washington did: he turned to his Treasury Secretary, Alexander Hamilton, and said, Mr. Hamilton, we need to grow this economy. We need to put people to work. We need to be a strong Nation, a strong economy, and I want you, Mr. Hamilton, to develop a policy to do that.

Hamilton came back a few months later with an industrial policy, 13 different items on about five pages—now it would probably take 5,000 pages, but nonetheless, he did it. Do you know what was in it? What was in that industrial policy that Hamilton presented to Washington and to Congress—and mostly implemented over the next decade or so—were policies that—let me put this back up. Let's see here. How many of these were in it? And here's the great ''what if?''

There was a transportation part to those policies—in fact, two different ones. One, Hamilton said if we're going to grow this economy, we need to have good roads, we need to have good canals, and we need to improve our ports. He proposed legislation that did become law—some of it by the States, some of it by the national government—that created the canal systems, put the roads in place, and improved the ports of America. Very beginnings of this Nation. Pay attention, my colleagues who like to talk about the Founding Fathers: the Founding Fathers said we need America to have a transportation program.

Currency reform was on the agenda. Yes, it was. Hamilton, Treasury Secretary, said we need to pay attention to the currency issue. There was a huge fight going on at the time about the Federal bank, about the currency issues, but he said we needed a common currency, and we needed to be aware of the international exchange rates that were going on so that we were not put at a disadvantage.

There was a Buy American program. Hamilton told George Washington and the Founding Fathers that we needed to put in place a Buy America provision. You just heard our colleague from Oregon talking about a robust Buy American provision—and sometime before I end I'll talk about my legislation

that says if it's our tax dollars, it's going to be spent on American-made equipment and American jobs. We're not going to use our tax dollars to buy foreign equipment. That's precisely what Alexander Hamilton told George Washington in the very first Congress of this Nation, and they began to implement it.

Energy efficiency wasn't there. He did, however, talk about this one, this was one of the 13. He said we needed to have a robust research and development program—they called them patents at that time. We need to be ahead of everybody else. He wanted to put in policies, and they did become law. And here we have it today, just on these issues alone, these six issues.

The Founding Fathers said transportation. They said watch the currency. They said Buy American. And they said we need to be ahead with research and patents and be on the cutting edge of technology.

□ 1250

What if President Barack Obama's American Jobs Act had been taken up by the Republican leadership that control this House?

What if they had listened to the Founding Fathers and actually implemented what the President wanted to put in place? 1.3 million, 1.3 million jobs, perhaps as much as 1.9 million jobs Americans would be working today. The great ''what if'' question of our time.

What if they had listened to the Founding Fathers?

Mr. ELLISON, I know you have more to say.

Mr. ELLISON. Well, Congressman, if we had listened to the Founding Fathers, we'd be quite aways ahead. It's interesting, in the political rhetoric you hear, some people claim the Founding Fathers, but they don't claim the real Founding Fathers, the ones who actually had the foresight to make America a strong economic country by making sure that the government played an important role in making sure our economy was working, by promoting transportation, patents, currency protection and things like that.

But I would say that as we work here today, and as we think about all of the things that our Nation needs, none are more important than putting Americans back to work, I think. The American Jobs Act is a plan set forth by the President, and he's set this forth at a time when he's reaching his hand out. He's extending his hand. He's trying to get the Republican majority in the House to work with him.

But apparently they just won't do so because they have ideological and political considerations. One of those ideological things is that they just don't think the government is any good. They don't think the government can do any good. They don't think the government can help. And so we see proposals and amendments to simply eliminate the Federal role out of transportation. And of course we've seen them eliminate the Federal role out of environmental protection. We've seen a whole host of things like this.

You would think that the reason we have high unemployment is because of ''job-killing regulations.'' They love this refrain. I'm sure Frank Luntz is very proud. He's a pollster who comes up with clever phrasing that they use a lot. But it's not job-killing regulations.

Any small business person will tell you the key to their success is customers. The key to customers is people who have jobs, who have some money to spend. If you've got no customers and your customers are broke, then they're not going to buy your cakes, your pies, and those folks are not going to be able to pay the taxes they need to keep our valued public employees working, teachers, firefighters, police officers, public health nurses, people who make the water and the meat safe to eat and drink.

They like to throw around terms like ''socialism,'' but what we argue for is a mixed economy, a balance between the private sector and government, which enhances the performance of both, all in service to the American people.

So today I am in favor of us getting a strong, long-term, 6-year transportation bill. I am absolutely in favor of helping our students who are fearing that education is getting out of their economic reach. Absolutely, we have to be there to reform currency, to level the playing field with China.

We should buy American. What's wrong with buying American? I think buying American's good. I rather prefer buying American. In fact, whenever I get a product and it says ''Made in America,'' I get a warm fuzzy all over.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Wouldn't you love to go into K-Mart or Target and see on the shelves ''Made in America''?

Mr. ELLISON. Made in America.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Made in America. That's why the currency reform is so important.

Mr. ELLISON. If it was made in America, maybe we could make it in America.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Americans would make it if we made it in America. We'd have those middle class jobs. That's where it is.

Mr. ELLISON, thank you very much. I know you've got a plane; you've got to get back to Minneapolis. Thank you so much for joining us.

This is part of the Democratic agenda. This is something we've been working on now for well over 2 years, and we call it ''Make It in America.'' This is rebuilding the American middle class. This is about the American middle class coming back.

Over the last 20 years, we've seen a decline in American manufacturing. In the early nineties, we were a little more than 19 million, almost 20 million, Americans in the manufacturing sector. Those were middle class jobs, where you can go to work, earn a living, live a middle class life, buy your bass boat, take the kids on a vacation.

Today, we're just over 11 million middle class manufacturing jobs in America. So looking at this dismal situation, a couple of years ago, shortly after I arrived here, we began looking at what do you do about this. Why did this happen? Why is it that the American manufacturing sector declined?

We did our studies. We did the economic analysis. But mostly, we looked at public policy. We looked at the laws of this land. We looked at what was going on in the public policy sector; and what we found was the policies of this Nation discouraged manufacturing and, in fact, rewarded American corporations that would offshore jobs, literally, actually, giving American corporations a reduction in their taxes for every job they offshored. Total about $16 billion a year.

I know; you don't believe that. How could there be such a policy? That was my question. What? You mean to tell me that the tax policy of the United States gives a tax break to American corporations when they ship a job offshore?

Can't be. In fact, it was. And so in the last year, the last months of the Democrats' control of this House in 2010, we undertook to change that. We put a bill on this floor that would eliminate $12 billion of that $16 billion tax break that American corporations had for offshoring jobs. It passed without one Republican vote. Not one Member of the Republican Party voted to end a tax break for American companies that offshored jobs.

The Senate took it up; it passed. President Obama signed that legislation.

Public policy matters. Public policy matters a great deal.

We've talked here today about the Buy American provisions, been in law for 30, 40 years, that basically say, if it's our taxpayer dollars, it ought to be used to buy American equipment.

Over the years, probably beginning in the eighties and carrying on, those provisions began to gain loopholes, one after another, so that at the end of 2010, the loophole was a 12-lane freeway that you could drive any project through and buy whatever you wanted to buy from wherever it came from. So much so that in San Francisco, when the Oakland Bay Bridge between Oakland and San Francisco had to be rebuilt because of earthquake safety issues—some of it fell down in the Loma Prieta earthquake—the largest construction project, public works project ever in California. The main central steel column for a uniquely designed bridge, $1 billion or more, Chinese steel, Chinese welders, 6,000 jobs in China to save 10 percent.

It turns out the steel was faulty, the welds were faulty, the jobs were still in China and the inspectors were Chinese.

□ 1300

If we'd have had a Buy American provision that meant anything at all, we

would have had 6,000 jobs in America; the inspectors would have been American; and there would be American jobs.

So my legislation, H.R. 613, says this: If it is your tax money, it's going to be spent on American-made equipment, American-made steel, and the jobs will be in America.

Where is that bill? It hasn't even been taken up for a hearing in the Transportation Committee.

We're nibbling around the edges here. Of every bill that comes through this floor that's relevant to this issue, we try to shoehorn into it a Buy American provision. We try to increase the Buy American laws. We try to make certain that your tax money is going to be spent on American-made equipment. That's our agenda.

Have we been successful? No. No, we've not.

When the half-baked, worthless transportation bill was brought to the floor by our Republican colleagues, who could not even get agreement in their own caucus, we tried to put a provision on, an amendment on, and it was rejected. It was rejected.

Americans want to go to work. Public policy matters. Will your tax dollars be spent buying Chinese steel? I'll give you another example.

In Los Angeles, they went out to buy new light rail cars. Two bids were the final bids. One was by Siemens—yes, a German company that has a manufacturing plant for light rail cars in Sacramento, California. Siemens said that their light rail cars would have a minimum of 80 percent American-made content. A Japanese company came in and said, We'll do it for 60 percent. There was a slight difference. I think there was about a 2 percent difference in the bids.

So what did the MTA, the Metropolitan Transportation Authority, do? It chose the Japanese company. American jobs were lost immediately in Sacramento as a result of that decision.

Now, whose money is going to be spent buying those cars, those light rail cars? Whose money is it? Your money. It's your tax money. Good for Japan. They're going to get some jobs. Bad for Sacramento. Layoffs have already occurred, and there are more to come.

Do you want another example? I'll just use California. That's where I'm from.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit System, BART: $3.2 billion for new trains over 10 years. $3.2 billion. Two bids. One, Bombardier, a fine Canadian company, said they would build them with 66 percent American-made content. Okay, that's good. It's not good enough because Alstom, a French company, said they would build them with 90 percent American-made content. Yes, it's a little more expensive, but we're talking $1 billion of American jobs here.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit System said, Well, the Federal Government says it's 60 percent, and we're going to have to go with 66. I said and thousands of Californians said and New Yorkers, which is where most of these jobs would be, that Alstom has a plant in New York to manufacture light rail and heavy rail cars. They said, Wait, let's take 2 months—2 months—and let's rebid this, and let's see what we can do. Alstom was prepared to lower their bid if they would have had an opportunity, and $1 billion of American jobs are not here. They're somewhere else around the world.

Public policy matters. Public policy matters.

I think it's about time to wrap up here, so I'm going to go back to where we started.

What if the House of Representatives under the control of our Republican colleagues—totally under their control and the Senate also under the control of the Republicans because it takes 60 votes there—what if the President's American Jobs Act had been taken up and passed? We'll modify it, and don't forget it was fully paid for, 100 percent paid for with no increase in the deficit. The economists said clearly that 1.3 million would immediately result from the President's American Jobs Act. What if?

What does it mean to you in your community? Would that road have been built? Would you have had the job paving that road? repairing and painting that bridge? down at the local school, painting the school? cleaning up the playgrounds? putting new toilets into the restrooms or, specifically, a new laboratory in the high school—not a lavatory but a laboratory? What if?

What if we had put aside partisan politics?

Keep this in mind that the Republican leader of the Senate, on the day or shortly after President Obama was inaugurated, said that his number one goal was to make sure that this was a one-term President. So how do you do that? Well, when the President proposes an American Jobs Act that would employ 1.3 million Americans immediately, you make certain that it doesn't become law. You slow it down. Everything has to be 60 votes in the Senate; and here in this House, you do not even take it up. You don't allow a vote on it.

You don't do a transportation bill. You don't take the $50 billion injected immediately into infrastructure—totally paid for. You don't do it even though that would employ tens of thousands of Americans. You make certain that the 288,000 teachers who have been laid off across America are not rehired so that my daughter's classroom is not 22 students but 35 students.

How do you destroy a President? You make certain that this economy doesn't move. You take his American Jobs Act, and you sit on it. That's what has happened. The great ''what if.''

What if we put Americans back to work? Yes, maybe Obama would get reelected—maybe I'd get reelected—but I'll tell you this: Americans would be working. Americans would be working. What if?

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CICILLINE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 11 a.m. on account of official business in district.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5883. An act to make a technical correction in Public Law 112–108.

H.R. 5890. An act to correct a technical error in Public Law 112–122.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, June 12, 2012, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6381. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Acetone; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0039; FRL-3944-2] received May 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6382. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Managment Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluxapyroxad; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0421; FRL-9346-7] received May 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6383. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Penflufen; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0425; FRL-9341-8] received May 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6384. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Propylene oxide; Tolerance Actions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0253; FRL-9346-8] (RIN: 2070-ZA16) received May 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6385. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to Sterility Test Requirements for Biological Products [Docket No.: FDA-