

or safety grounds, such as fishermen, small business owners and environmental groups, will no longer be reimbursed for the cost of successfully litigating these kinds of claims. The idea that the bill will somehow eliminate an excess of lawsuits is ridiculous. Since litigation is by its nature so expensive, these cash-strapped plaintiffs usually only bring those lawsuits with the most likelihood of success. Without the possibility of receiving attorneys' fees, legal challenges will effectively become impossible.

Madam Chair, section 207 of H.R. 1229 only helps large oil companies avoid having to comply with U.S. law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Equal Access to Justice Act provisions in this bill are necessary to avoid costly delays to domestic energy development based on the extreme anti-energy agenda of a few groups. The Equal Access to Justice Act was intended to allow people and small businesses with limited financial means the ability to challenge the actions of the Federal Government. However, it is now being abused by deep-pocketed special interest organizations.

For example, in 2005, the Sierra Club and the Natural Resources Defense Council received nearly \$200,000 in taxpayer dollars after suing the Federal Government in an offshore energy project in California. The Sierra Club has annual revenues of \$85 million, and the Natural Resources Defense Council has annual revenues of over \$100 million.

There is no justification for forcing the American taxpayer to pay the attorneys' fees of special interest groups that have ample funds of their own. Wealthy, ideological groups opposed to more American-made offshore energy can continue to sue to their hearts' content, but taxpayers shouldn't have to foot the bill.

I oppose this amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same. Taxpayer dollars should not go to lawsuits being filed by special interests that are making millions and millions of dollars in annual revenue. I urge a "no" vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, when you're flabbergasted, the easiest thing to do is to not say anything else. I just can't believe that we're doing this useless legislation while people in the gulf are hurting the way that they are. It's senseless.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Madam Chair, the Equal Access to Justice Act restrictions in this bill is necessary to avoid costly delays to domestic energy development based on the political agenda of a few groups.

EAJA was established in 1980 as means for small businesses and individuals to seek judicial redress from wrongful government action.

It allows for party's to seek reimbursement of attorneys' fees from the taxpayers.

Payment of these fees comes directly of out agency budgets, in this case the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management.

EAJA was intended to allow people and small businesses with "limited financial means" the ability to sue the Federal Government without having to worry about the costs associated if they prevail.

However, it is being abused by deep-pocketed organizations with a political agenda.

For example, in 2005 the Sierra Club and the Natural Resources Defense Council received nearly \$200,000 dollars in taxpayer dollars after suing the Federal Government on an offshore energy project in California.

The Sierra Club has annual revenue of \$85 million dollars, and the Natural Resources Defense Council has annual revenue of over \$100 million dollars.

There is no justification for forcing the American taxpayer—particularly those on the gulf coast—to pay the attorney's fees of political advocacy organizations that have ample funds of their own.

That is not what EAJA was intended to accomplish, and restricting its use in this bill is both necessary and appropriate.

Environmental groups can continue to sue to their hearts' content—and they will because suing the Federal Government is their modus operandi—but taxpayers shouldn't have to foot the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

□ 1950

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAMBORN) having assumed the chair, Mrs. ADAMS, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1229) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to facilitate the safe and timely production of American energy resources from the Gulf of Mexico, had come to no resolution thereon.

JOBS AND THE MAKE IT IN AMERICA AGENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. ADAMS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr.

CICILLINE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to speak this evening about jobs and particularly about the Make It in America Agenda, but before I begin, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Michigan to begin this conversation.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Thank you, Representative CICILLINE.

I represent the city of Detroit. In fact, the congressional district that I represent includes metropolitan Detroit. Over the last 10 years, metropolitan Detroit has lost more jobs than any other metropolitan area in this country, but it wasn't just Detroit and its metropolitan area that's lost jobs. Other areas, other cities, other metropolitan regions in the country have lost millions of jobs over the last 10 years.

Now, during this same timeframe, this country has been investing our tax dollars to build bridges, to repair roads, to build hospitals, sewer systems, schools, to build industrial parks that will promote more business, to actually develop businesses and free enterprise models that are successful. Now, many of the American people may not have seen the benefits of this type of investment because all of the work that I am talking about that was funded by tax dollars was done in Afghanistan, and the people who directly benefited from these projects were the people of Afghanistan.

My position is this: we need to create jobs in America. We need to keep the jobs that we have here so they don't go overseas like they have in the past. In order to do that, I'm proposing let's take a share of the money that's intended to go to Afghanistan, redirect it to the United States to create jobs right here, jobs for the American people, because we're the ones that actually need it, and it makes sense. The money that we are investing in Afghanistan comes from U.S. taxpayers. Let's spend it in a way that benefits the taxpayers and creates jobs right here in the United States.

Now, I do understand that we've got to stop terrorism from breeding in other countries, and we certainly don't want other safe havens for terrorism to develop overseas. But in light of the fact that bin Laden is now gone, I'm asking this Congress, this administration to reassess our mission in Afghanistan. Let's take a part of the over half a trillion dollars—and that's trillion with a "t"—in military assistance that we've spent in Afghanistan over the last 10 years, let's take a share of that and return it home to protect our people right here in the United States.

Yes, we are at risk of a terrorist attack, but more than likely that risk is increasingly coming from within the U.S. So let's fully equip and fund the first line of defense against terrorism in this country, which is our first responders. It is our local police, our local firefighters, our local emergency

medical providers that we call on to help protect the American people. So I'm proposing let's take a share of that military assistance that's going to Afghanistan, and let's invest it in our local police, fire, and emergency medical providers to protect our citizens right here at home.

Then, finally, over the past 10 years, taxpayers have invested nearly \$30 billion—and that's billion with a "b", so we get these figures clear and the magnitude of our investment—we invested nearly \$30 billion in Afghanistan for non-defense spending, much of it going toward economic development and civilian assistance. Let's take a portion of that funding and redirect it to the United States to create jobs right here.

My point is this: it takes money to create jobs, and more accurately, it takes public funds that can be leveraged effectively to create the investment that yields jobs. We've been spending that money for over a decade in another country. Bin Laden is now gone. Let's reevaluate our role in Afghanistan, and while we're doing that, let's take a share of our precious tax dollars—people, this is your money and we need it right now—to create jobs, to fight foreclosures, to invest in manufacturing. It is our manufacturing capacity that made our country strong, that created the best products that were sold around the world. It's our manufacturing strategy and capacity that transformed the city that I represent, the city of Detroit, from the motor capital of the world to the arsenal of democracy back in World War II.

Metro Detroit and this country's ability to innovate and create and manufacture saved this country and saved this world from fascism. If we invest a portion of the money right now that we're spending overseas in Afghanistan and winding down in Iraq, and we invest it right here in cities like Detroit and Elkhart, Indiana, and Louisville, Tennessee—these are other cities that also have lost a lot of jobs—we can make America stronger.

We want to fight terrorism. We need to be a strong country, but the strength of our country comes from within. It comes from protecting the American people, and the most effective way to do that: invest in homeland security, support our local police and fire, and invest in jobs in America so that U.S. citizens can be financially stable and hopefully prosperous. This is how we built this country in just a little over 200 years into one of the greatest countries human civilization has ever known. We've done it by investing the people's money into the innovation and capacity to create jobs. It's through investing in the U.S.

I know I've been going on a little bit longer, but my point is this: I'm asking the American people who are watching tonight, call your Member of Congress, ask—demand, if you wish—that a share of your money that's going overseas right now be returned back to you to create jobs here, to protect our home-

land, and also, to reduce our overall debt and deficit.

□ 2000

We've been spending the money, over \$500 billion alone in the last 10 years in Afghanistan. This administration is slated to wind down that expenditure. Let's take a portion of that back to help our people, to make America strong again.

And you know why it's so important for America to be strong and not some other country? Because we believe in democracy. We, the people, actually have a voice, through folks like me, who you hired. I have the constitutional duty to be your voice here, not just for metro Detroiters, but for all of you who understand the value in manufacturing. That's the reason why my dad risked everything 80 years ago in the midst of the Great Depression to leave his homeland in India, to come here as a dream so that he could live his life as fully as he chose it and to raise a family. I am his only son, and he was so honored to see, many decades ago, the first Indian American elected to Congress. And I am here too as a legacy of an immigrant's courage to make a difference for himself, his family, and his country.

My point is this, people: It's our money. And you work hard for that money. And yes, we invested it overseas because we were trying to stop the people that were determined to wipe us out. And we got the ringleader. We took him out. Let's take a share of our money back and return it to our people. Let's create jobs here. Call your Member of Congress. Do it tonight. Leave them a voicemail message. Tell them, We need you, as a Member of this body that's constitutionally committed to represent the people, we need you to use a share of our money to help American families become financially stable again and to help this country's economy really endure in a prosperous way to help bring democracy and freedom throughout the world. I really am just so committed that we take a share of our funds right now to create jobs here.

I was born and raised in the city of Detroit, and it's heart-breaking to see what's happened to Detroit. But also too, there is so much promise there in Detroit because we still have the greatest talent in manufacturing. We have great research universities there in Michigan, including Wayne State University that I'm proud to represent. And we have the plants and the land to actually build new manufacturing operations. This country has the superb ability to innovate and outwork and out hustle and outsmart any of the competition around the world. All we have to do is this: return some of our money, our tax dollars, back to the U.S. so that we can prosper again.

Some of us are doing well, but I know overall—and I will close—that many American families are not feeling that financially secure, and I understand

that. Look, I have been through hard times myself as a young man. That's why I am stressing the fact, turn a share of our tax dollars back to our people so we can do what's best, innovate, invest, and create jobs.

Thank you so much. God bless America.

Mr. CICILLINE. One of the things I know that we all share as new Members of the Congress, as freshmen, is that we've been here for about 4 months, Madam Speaker; and we've had conversations and debates about cutting Pell Grants and cutting Head Start. We've endured attacks on women's health and NPR, attacks on the environment, and most recently, efforts to end Medicare as we know it. We really haven't had before this Congress a jobs agenda, at a time when Americans are suffering from some of the highest unemployment in a generation.

We all recognize that we need to cut spending, we need to be responsible in our management of the national debt. One of the key ways that we can do that is to grow our economy and get Americans back to work. And I believe, Madam Speaker, that one of the key ways that we can do that is to rebuild the manufacturing base in our country. There is no way we can maintain our position as a great economic power without making things in America. Making things in America is really a key part to rebuilding the economy of this country.

My home State of Rhode Island is one of the States that have been hardest hit in this economic downturn. Rhode Island was the first New England State to enter the recession, and it's currently facing the fifth-highest unemployment in America. But Rhode Island has a strong tradition of manufacturing. It's the birthplace of the American industrial revolution. This helped build the middle class and provided good-paying jobs for working families. In fact, Rhode Island used to produce one-third of the costume jewelry in the entire United States, yet our manufacturing sector has been really hard hit, especially in these particularly difficult economic times. According to the Alliance for American Manufacturing, there were 71,100 manufacturing jobs in Rhode Island in 2000; and by the year 2008, that number had dropped to 47,900. Rhode Island lost 15 percent of its manufacturing jobs during the period of 2008 to 2009 alone. And from 2001 to 2008, Rhode Island lost 10,500 jobs due to trade with China.

When was the last time, Madam Speaker, that you went into a store and found something made in America? Manufacturing jobs all across this country have seen a steep decline, from 20 million jobs in 1979 to about 12 million today, and the middle class has been left behind. And that's why this past week, when we launched the Make It in America agenda, I became so hopeful about this Congress' attention on manufacturing. This agenda is really about reversing manufacturing job

loss. It's about investing in good-paying jobs, world-class education, top-notch research, and sound infrastructure. We need to create an environment that encourages American manufacturers to innovate, grow, keep, and create good jobs here in the United States. When we Make It in America, our middle class will succeed. This agenda is based on the conviction that when more products are made in America, more families will be able to "make it" in America. The agenda is really intended to create the conditions to help American businesses produce goods here, to innovate, and create jobs.

It also includes being smart about the investments we make, to out-educate, to out-innovate, and out-build our international competitors. The President has already signed six Make It in America bills into law, many of them which enjoyed bipartisan support because business and labor leaders alike recognize that the Democratic agenda of making it in America is good for our country and is central to the future of our competitiveness, our jobs, and our leadership in the world.

This past week, we outlined a series of bills that represent really a cross-section of the legislative package, a dynamic agenda that will continue to evolve during the 112th Congress but is really focused on how we support the manufacturing sector again. Some of these bills have already been introduced. Others will be introduced in the coming weeks. The agenda includes the development of a national manufacturing strategy, directs the President to work with industry leaders, labor leaders, other stakeholders to develop a national manufacturing strategy for our country, to set appropriate benchmarks and measurements. Every other nation we're competing with that is serious about manufacturing has a national manufacturing strategy. The agenda also includes the Build America Bonds, expanding the Build America Bonds, the creation of a national infrastructure development bank.

If we're going to compete in the 21st century, we need to have an infrastructure which supports that competition. We need to have roads and bridges and transit systems and the ability to move information to compete in the 21st century. It includes making the research and development tax credit permanent and more generous to encourage job creation. It includes the creation of small business startup savings accounts, a reform of the Chinese currency system to give our American manufacturers a fighting chance to compete in the global marketplace. And it includes the Make It in America Block Grant, which I have drafted. This is a block grant which will help American manufacturers retrofit their factories, retrain their workers, buy new equipment, increase their exports, and make their facilities more energy efficient so that they can compete more successfully in the 21st century.

□ 2010

It's an ambitious agenda, but it's really about recognizing that we have got to start making things again in this country; that manufacturing was an important part of the history of America, an important way we built up the middle class in this country and became a world economic power.

We can no longer act as if manufacturing is not important. We need to make things here again so people can go into stores and buy things made in America. We need to start exporting goods made in America all over the world because we make the best products, we have the best workers, and stop exporting jobs.

This is an agenda which I hope will earn bipartisan support, that will be a key to helping rebuild the economy of our country and rebuilding our strong manufacturing base.

Madam Speaker, I think the most urgent priority we face is getting Americans back to work. Americans have been very hard hit in this recession. Members hear it all the time from constituents back at home. What are you doing to get people back to work, to get this economy back on the right track?

This Make It in America agenda, I believe, provides a real opportunity to again rebuild the manufacturing base of this country so that we can make things here again, and so that American families can make it as well.

At the same time, in addition to investing in this agenda, we also need to invest, as the President said, in education so that we can out-educate, so that our kids can compete, not just with the kids in the neighboring town or the next State, but kids in China and India and Germany and all over the world. That's who they're competing with in the 21st century. And we need to make sure they have the tools and skills necessary to compete successfully in the global economy.

In addition, we have to invest in science and research and innovation so we can continue to make the new discoveries, make the new inventions, create the new products that will allow us to lead the world and to again maintain our position as a world economic power. And that's why we think about the balance that we have to strike in managing the serious responsibility of reducing spending, eliminating programs that don't work, cutting waste, and at the same time, investing in the things that are necessary to keep our country strong—education, innovation and infrastructure.

And so, Madam Speaker, I hope that this Congress, the 112th Congress, will be known as the Congress that re-started and reinvested in making things again in America.

I know that my colleague the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) has focused as well on creating jobs, bringing some balance to our Federal budget, and understands the urgency, particularly in coming

from one of our great New England States, of rebuilding and manufacturing.

I'd like to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Thank you for yielding.

I just came here to advance statements by our fellow freshmen and my neighbor from Rhode Island because here we are in a virtually empty Chamber, sitting here talking about jobs.

Before I became a Member of Congress, just a few months ago, my job, and I was fortunate to have one, was the job of a district attorney. Now, the intricacies of that job are not well known, but one of the responsibilities we have in our State is, when there is an unattended death, a death that, for instance, did not occur in a hospital, it's important that that be investigated for any indications of foul play from a criminal standpoint. So, as a result, the troopers attached to my unit and my prosecutors reviewed the deaths of people.

I must say, just to put this in context in a very personal sense to me, one of the most tragic and heart-wrenching parts of that job was coming upon the scenes of suicides. And in the course of that, over the last couple of years, we actually saw situations where people, depressed, hopeless, took their own lives. And they left indications that I won't get into as to the reason they did that.

So many of those people were out of work, chronically out of work. Their homes were falling apart. Their families were falling apart, and hope had been extinguished. There were notes. There were indications. There was the way you go back and talk to a family and say what brought the person to this to make sure you knew just what happened.

That is the most powerful way, I think, that you can understand why we are here in this Congress trying to put people back to work. We have to do everything we can do in our power to do this. To be out of work is human misery, and it's a misery that extends to spouses, sons and daughters; conversations where one of these instances where the person that took their life was told that they would never be able to afford to go to the college they were accepted to.

So when we have this discussion here in this Congress, I hope we don't continue to have this discussion about jobs in empty Chambers. I hope it becomes the focal point of our open sessions because, frankly, there hasn't been enough of that discussion.

I came here imbued with a sense of challenge and responsibility, that I would do everything that I could to try and stop this human misery from occurring in families and individuals. So I hope as we go forward and we look at Make It in America, we look at other platforms and policies to try and put people back to work, we don't forget

these aren't people just called our constituents. These are real people, people suffering more than they ever should.

In my own district, as people are ready to go through the tourist system and the wealthier people come to celebrate their vacations, they're doing it in a region where the unemployment is 16 percent, and too many people are out of work.

I hope, as we go forward, that as freshmen, we come forward and remember what we said in the campaign just a few months ago, focus on what we said we would do. And I hope that kind of freshman enthusiasm is contagious, and I hope we're having robust discussions about putting people back to work, not here in an empty Chamber but in a full Chamber with ideas teeming so that we can accomplish that very important mission.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the distinguished gentleman and my good friend from Massachusetts, and I think it is a really important point that he makes tonight.

We talk about the urgency of job creation and about the enormity of the challenges facing our country. But behind all of these numbers and the unemployment rate, these statistics, are real families and real people who we see every single day in our districts all across this country, who are anguished and worried.

People often describe the American people are angry. I don't see anger. What I see in the American people is anxiety. People are worried about the future. They're worried about whether or not this economy is ever going to get on the right track, whether or not we are going to really be successful in growing jobs and getting people back to work. And they look at the proceedings of this Congress and they say, Where's the conversation about creating jobs? Where's the emphasis on putting Americans back to work? And they grow more anxious.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for reminding all of us that we're here fighting for real people who are counting on us to do the right things to get them back to work, to get this economy back on track and to put our country's fiscal house in order. These are big challenges, but they're challenges we have to meet.

I will end by, again, reminding everyone that this agenda—and I want to really acknowledge the leadership of our minority whip, STENY HOYER, who really has led the charge on Make It in America and the legislation that's contained in that agenda, specific bills which I hope will earn bipartisan support, that really get at this issue of how we grow the manufacturing base in this country, which provided such strong support to the middle class and a real opportunity to fulfill the American Dream and to ensure that America can compete internationally and sell our goods all over the world.

I hope we can come together in this Congress and work quickly to pass the

legislation that is part of the Make It in America agenda so that we can be sure American families can make it.

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

□ 2020

PRICE OF GASOLINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AMASH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, with all the issues that we deal with here in Congress, the American people deal with other issues at home. Some of those issues are connected, and some of those issues they don't see the connection. But they do wonder about something.

They wonder about the fact that gas prices in some places in this country January of 2009, when the President came into office, were unleaded \$1.32 a gallon; mid-range, \$1.42; super range, \$1.52. Gas prices in April of 2011 over here somewhere in this country, looks like it could be Texas because our numbers are about there, \$3.99 for regular, \$4.09 for mid-range, \$4.19 for the super, the ethyl, as they used to say in the old days.

So since the President has taken office, something that affects every life in this country: the price of gasoline. Because whether we like it or not, whether we come up with alternative energy sources or not, whether we have new ideas about high-speed trains, subways, elevated railways, buses, the majority of the people in the United States move around by automobile; and the majority of those automobiles are driven using one of two fuels, either gasoline or diesel.

Now, neither one of these charts shows a diesel price; but amazingly enough, back when I was a youngster, diesel was the cheapest fuel we had available. But diesel prices are no longer cheap. Diesel prices are competitive, usually around the mid-range price of gasoline. But there are people who have good reasons to drive diesel vehicles. And so whether we like it or not, whether it fits our congressional legislative program or not to have gasoline and diesel being the fuel that moves people around this country, it is a fact. And you may think otherwise all you wish, but it is a fact.

There are no wind cars where you hook a sail up and hope that the wind is blowing towards Washington, DC tomorrow morning at 8 o'clock so everybody can get to work. It is not happening.

So everybody gets up and everybody goes out, and most everybody, unless they have one of the brand-new electric cars, starts their vehicle with gasoline or maybe diesel, and they go to work or they go on vacation or they travel to see their relatives, or whatever the purpose of their trip.

So let's be frank. Until we come up with alternative sources that move people from point A to point B in the United States of America, we are bound to gasoline and diesel. And in the 3-year track record of this administration, we have seen, I understand it is reported, the highest gasoline prices in the history of the country, even higher than the famous Jimmy Carter days when Jimmy Carter had us waiting in long, long ration lines and paying extremely high gasoline prices. At \$4 a gallon, I think we topped even the numbers that came under President Carter almost two decades ago.

So here we are, we have gone full circle in a Democrat Presidency, and here we are back with the issue of gas prices.

Now, why are gas prices so important to people? Because it is how we get where we are going to go. If you are taking your kid to soccer game or to baseball practice or football practice or lacrosse up here in the East, or track and field, or whatever your young people are doing, you have got to get them there; and in most instances they can't walk and they can't ride a bike. They have to go in an automobile. And when you move them from game to game, they go in automobiles. And when they go to take their tests for entry into college, they have to go to an independent location. Many times they travel there by automobile.

You have to pick up the laundry. You have to pick up the groceries. You have to do a million things; get the kids to school on time, get the kids home from school, take the wife out on a date. Unmarried people are dating, and that's part of their date costs. And at a time when we have some of the highest unemployment in modern times, we bumped back above 9 percent, I understand now, so there is a lot of people out of work.

Those people who are out of work, some of them are drawing unemployment, and some of them are just trying to figure out a way to make do until they can find another job. And to have a roughly \$3 increase per gallon in the cost of their fuel to move them around the country, people feel that immediately. It is literally sticker shock to go in and start filling up your tank.

I have a fairly small tank in my car. My wife's got a little larger tank, so more of a sticker shock. I drive a hybrid, so I'm getting some pretty good gas mileage. But still, I watch that thing go up to \$54 to fill up my tank and watch my wife's go up to \$65, \$70 to drive.

I have a daughter who is working part time and going to college. Sometimes she has to go for testing; in fact, today she went for testing in a town about 40 miles from where we live to take a test, and it is a full tank of gasoline up there and back for her in the little car she drives, or almost. And she works hard. She will work all day and maybe 2 days at her job to pay for a tank of gasoline. So it immediately affects your budget.