

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Again, I appreciate both of the gentlemen's perspectives on this, but this is about the right tool for the right job. The intelligence community is the one that's supposed to develop the intelligence, the threat stream, the lead, and pass it to somebody who is in charge—the TSA in this case—of protecting the transportation sector.

Again, I make the argument it is important, but I just think this is misplaced. The intelligence community would have to try to create this expertise, which they do not have today in the entirety of the intelligence community, to make security plans. This is not what they do. It's not what they're equipped to do. They are not, in most cases, with the exception of the FBI and DEA, they're not domestic agencies. They're agencies that are designed to collect overseas. So it is just not a good fit.

Again, I appreciate the gentleman's position. I just think the community would have to spend a lot of time and resources diverting from its real intention and mission to keep us safe.

Just quickly and just for the record—I think it's important—the information that the gentleman referenced was aspirational. We saw a lot of press reports that I think misrepresented the information that was provided. It was something that Osama bin Laden thought about. It is not something that the intelligence community believes was operational, which means you have to be vigilant all the time on all these issues.

So I commend the gentleman in his effort on trying to bring better security to our railways. Again, just the right tool for the right job. This is not the right place. Unfortunately, I will oppose it but would like to work with the gentleman on the right place to get the job done.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Delaware has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. CARNEY. I certainly thank the gentleman and appreciate his comments and certainly respect his expertise. But I can't imagine that the intelligence agencies aren't, as they're doing their activities—intelligence activities overseas—aren't finding out that there are threats to the U.S. rail system. My amendment would just make that a priority within all the things that they do.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CARNEY).

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

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 1620

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BENISHEK) having assumed the chair, Mr. YODER, 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. 754) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. Mr. Speaker, we just finished a very important debate here on the floor dealing with the ability of the American Government to understand the threats that face us across this world. I want to commend my colleagues both on the Republican and Democratic side for working long and hard on the intelligence legislation that will be up on the floor, probably tomorrow.

In the hour ahead, what I would really like to focus on and bring to the attention of the American people is the necessity for jobs. We spend a lot of time talking about security, as we should, and we've certainly seen that in the successful effort to bring down bin Laden and finally see that justice was properly served. Congratulations to the military, to the intelligence community, and particularly to President Obama for his courage in ordering that action, risky to be sure, but ultimately extraordinarily successful.

The other part of American security is our economy. At the end of the day and even at the beginning of the day, this Nation will never be secure unless we have a very strong, vibrant, growing economy that provides every American that wants to work with the opportunity to go to work. And so the focus of our attention for this hour ahead is economic security: how to secure the economic well-being of every American, how to secure the economic well-being of the American public. It can be done.

There are essentially six elements to achieve economic security and economic growth and strength, and we will cover many of those today as we talk about this issue. Let me very briefly lay them out to you.

The first is education. I think we now understand that an individual who has

little or no education has very little opportunity to find economic security. It's difficult to get a job if you don't have an education. So for an individual, a good education is essential. Unfortunately across America, report after report, usually every 6 or 7 years a new report comes out and says America at Risk. Our education system isn't measuring up. Yet here in the last 3 months and in the days ahead, my colleagues on the Republican side have consistently cut the education programs that many, indeed millions of Americans depend upon.

Back home in my State of California, education funding is similarly cut, so that now a class that 5 years ago was 20 students is now 30 students. At the University of California, 10 years ago it may have cost \$1,500 or \$2,000 to go to school to pay the tuition. Now it's \$8,000. And in the budget that's being proposed that was presented to the Appropriations Committee today, the Republicans are virtually reducing to a point of nonexistence Pell Grants necessary for higher education.

So education becomes the first key pillar in building a secure economy for an individual. Similarly, it is the pillar to secure a good growing economy for this Nation, because this Nation will not be able to compete economically unless we have the best educated workforce in the world, and we're not even close today. We were in bygone years, 30, 40 years ago, and we can be in the future, but it's going to take a change. As my colleagues come and join me during this hour, we will be talking about the ways in which the education system can be improved and the way in which we can transition people from education to work and back to education and back to work.

The second pillar is research. Research is an essential element, because from that research comes the new products of the future. I think we only need to think about the things that are in our home. The television, the VCR, the other things that we depend upon, were mostly invented in America. The fundamental research for computer chips and the like, America made, and much of the technology that we now find in our green technology, a lot of the wind turbines, the initial wind turbine industry, the solar industry, the photovoltaic and the rest, research in America's great institutions, our universities, our laboratories, led to these kinds of products. The battery technology that we now find in the hybrids, invented in America, but I think most of you would say, but not made in America today. That's true. So what we have seen is that the research, while done in the United States, did not lead to those things being manufactured in the United States. We need to understand why, and we'll go into that today, also.

So education, research, and then the third element is making those things in America. Manufacturing matters, and that is the core subject of today's

discussion: Make it in America. You can educate, you can research, but ultimately you have to make it in America.

Now, there are ways that we can enhance the American manufacturing sector, and my colleagues and I on the Democratic side have put forth a program that we called Make It in America, so that America can make it, so that American families can make it, and we know that these programs that we're proposing will cause that to occur.

□ 1630

The remaining three things that we will talk about, not today, but I want to make sure we lay them out there: Education, research, manufacturing, make it in America, the next element is infrastructure. You have to have roads and streets and sanitation and water systems, communications systems. All of those things are critically important. Fortunately, part of the stimulus program, not enough of it, but a big part of it was to build the infrastructure. The largest surge in infrastructure investment ever in the history of this Nation was the stimulus program, overlooked and certainly overlooked in the politics of last year's election, but it was there. It was a good point, but we have to carry that forward.

Fifth point. We have to be international. Unfortunately, the word "international" in America has come to be that we give it all away. The trade agreements of the past often led to the outsourcing of American jobs, and so, as we look to the future, we want to make sure that as we look international we talk about, as President Obama has suggested, that we once again become an export Nation. We can do that. There are programs that will cause that to happen, and also, we need to be quite sure that when we talk about international we talk about fair trade, trade that is fair to American workers.

And so as these trade programs come before us, we will be taking a very hard look at are those programs good for American workers, or are they simply good for Chinese workers. If they are good for those workers overseas and not good for American workers, you can see strong resistance from those of us on the Democratic side who say, wait a minute, international is good. We understand the need to grow markets. We understand the growing markets of the world, but we will no longer allow American workers to be put at a disadvantage by some trade agreement that is not fair to American workers.

The final element is this: we have to change. We cannot be what we were yesterday. We have to be what we can be tomorrow, and our President very clearly points this out as he talks about capturing the future. We can but only if we do these six things, and the final one is change.

Let me go now to a couple of the specific elements that we need to talk

about here. Sometimes it's helpful to put up one of these placards. It helps focus at least my attention and perhaps yours. This is the Make It in America Agenda. These issues we've talked about, trade, tax policy, energy policy. Let's pick up the energy policy here.

It is incumbent upon America to secure its energy future. I think all of us go to the gas station from time to time, all too often it seems to me, and you know now we're filling up with \$4 a barrel oil. Why? Why did that happen? Well, it basically has happened because for more than 30 years America has talked about energy security. We've talked about ending the importation of oil. We've talked about how we can provide the energy necessary for this Nation. Yet, we now find ourselves in a situation very similar to what we found in the 1970s, that is, insufficient energy available to us. The "Drill, baby, drill" mentality that we saw on the floor today is not the solution to this.

The solution to the energy issue is to transform our energy systems from the 19th and 20th century energy system, the fossil fuels, where we are dependent upon the petrol dictators of the world, and on coal, which I think all of us have come to understand presents enormous challenges for us, challenges of climate change, challenges of despoiling the surface of the Earth as we now find in the Appalachian Mountains and enormous health risks that come with the burning of coal. We need to move away from these fossil fuels to the fuels of tomorrow.

As we do that, we need to use our tax dollars to accomplish this goal. Right now, our tax dollars are used to support the oil industry. The oil industry thinks that is all well and good, but how many of you want to have \$4 billion, \$5 billion, \$6 billion, even \$12 billion of your tax money go to the wealthiest, most successful industry in the world as a subsidy? This is oil welfare, plain and simple, to the industry that simply does not need it. We're talking about the wealthiest, most successful industries in the world that have, for a century, for a full century, enjoyed the generosity of the American taxpayer. They receive welfare. Plain and simple, it's a subsidy, to subsidize the oil industry.

Yet we know in the last few days the Big Five oil companies have produced record profits in the last quarter. So much so that in the last decade, the decade 2001 until 2010, the oil industry has had over \$1 trillion of profit, \$1 trillion dollar of profit. At the same time, they have received billions of dollars of subsidies. We need to bring those subsidies back into the Treasury. Tell the oil industry, for a century you have been living off the welfare of the American public taxpayer. No more. That money is coming home.

And we're going to use it for two purposes: one, to reduce the deficit. President Obama has suggested about \$4 bil-

lion a year. I think you can go as high as \$12 billion if you add up all of the subsidies, bringing that money back into the Treasury to be used to reduce the deficit and to support industries of the future. We're talking about a lot of money here. Take a look at this.

ExxonMobil, \$10.7 billion of profit in just the last quarter. Oxychem, \$1.6 billion. Conoco, \$2.1 billion. Oh, you're going to love this. The CEO of Conoco oil a couple of days ago got in front of a microphone and said it is un-American to take away our welfare, to take away our subsidy. I don't think so. I think it is un-American to give the wealthiest industry in the world a subsidy. We can go on and on here. We see Chevron doing very well. Oh, yeah, BP—we know that bunch. They're the ones that didn't have enough money to safely drill for oil, but they did manage to make \$7.2 billion of profit this last year.

So, as we look at the energy systems of this Nation, we need to understand that the money that you and I are presently giving to the oil companies as a subsidy needs to be brought back and used to reduce the deficit and to support the energy systems of the future.

I'm going to wrap this very quickly with 2 pieces of legislation that I've introduced that would take those subsidies back from the oil industry and apply them to tomorrow's energy systems, the green energy systems, solar, wind. Our tax money should be used to buy American made solar, wind, turbines, and other green technologies. Right now, our tax money, we do subsidize those industries. Our tax money is used to purchase products that are manufactured offshore. My legislation says, good, we need to subsidize. We need to promote those industries. Those are the industries of the future. Those are energy sources of the future. Let's use that money to buy American-made equipment.

If somebody wants to go buy Chinese solar cells, fine, use your own money. One of these companies wants to go buy European-made wind turbine, that is fine, do it. But don't use my tax money. Don't use your tax money. American tax money must be used to buy American-made equipment.

Similarly, with our gasoline taxes that are now being used to buy buses, trains, and build highways and bridges, great. Good thing to do, but make sure that those things are made in America.

□ 1640

Now let me turn my attention to my colleagues. Three of them have joined us. I notice that our minority whip has joined us today.

Mr. HOYER, you've been the advocate, the leader, of developing the Make It in America strategy. Please share with us your thoughts, and then I'm going to turn to my other two colleagues.

Mr. HOYER. I'll be very brief.

I thank the gentleman for his continuing focus. If I am the corner of the phrase and the focuser of Make It in

America, you are its chief spokesperson and salesperson, so I thank you for that effort.

It's so important because, clearly, Americans are rightfully very concerned at the fact that we don't have enough jobs for the people who are looking for jobs. We've got to have a growth agenda in America. We've got to have an agenda in America that focuses on expanding opportunities. We've got to have an agenda that gives to Americans the sense that they and their families and their children can make it in America.

You have been focusing night after night, week after week, month after month on a jobs agenda, which we call "Make It in America." We've introduced over 25 bills that are focused on trying to help us focus on that agenda, on trying to help business—small, medium and large—expand their businesses and on trying to give them assistance in doing so.

I want to say to the gentleman that, in his continuing to focus on this jobs agenda, it is critically important that Americans understand what the Make It in America agenda is all about so they can contact their Members of Congress and Members of the United States Senate and say, Look, we support the Make It in America agenda. We believe that it's an agenda for our opportunities and our children's opportunities.

I want to say something about the statement, to which the gentleman referred, made by the president of Conoco, a statement that apparently indicates he believes that his company is entitled to a tax preference and that if we did not give that tax preference that somehow it would be un-American. Of course, life, as I like to say, is a series of trade-offs: if we're buying things; national defense; defeating terrorism; making sure our seniors are secure in their pocketbooks and in their health; making sure that we participate in helping young people, particularly disadvantaged young people, get the educational start that they need; making sure that our college students can develop their talents so they can make us a more competitive Nation; and that the innovation, an innovation to which the gentleman referred earlier, will still be done in the United States. Then we need to make sure that the products and technologies that are developed through that enterprise are, in fact, then subject to a Make It in America reality.

As for the gentleman from Conoco, I don't know him, but I applaud the oil companies, and we need the energy that they give us. The fact of the matter is we gave subsidies, and we give subsidies in various areas, as the gentleman from California knows, to encourage doing things that are not now profitable but that will have a long-term payoff for not only the companies but for America. That is why the government invests its money, as governments all over the world do, in devel-

oping emerging technologies. The gentleman spoke, of course, of solar, wind and other renewable technologies that will have a tremendous payoff but not in the short term; therefore it's hard to get investors to put money in. That's why governments, not just in this country but all over the world, have done this in the past: for instance, when the prices of gasoline were not such that they provided the resources to encourage research, which we knew we needed, and drilling, which we knew we needed.

Yet now, when you have the profits of the product, I am shocked, frankly, that those who promote the free market system, which ought to be driven by the markets, driven by demand, driven by profits, would now say, notwithstanding the fact that oil profits among the Big Five, in particular, are up to historic levels, that we should still continue to ask our taxpayers to subsidize them even further. That seems to me to make no sense.

But back to the principal focus of making it in America: The gentleman has been so right in his focus of making sure that we create the kind of environment in this country that will empower people to make things in America, to grow things in America, to sell them here, but also to sell them around the world. The President has indicated he wants to double exports. The only way we're going to double exports is if we make things in America to sell overseas. That's the only way you can get exports whether they be goods, frankly, or services. We ought not to preclude the growth of the service sector in our economy servicing overseas, whatever that service agency might be.

So I want to thank the gentleman for continuing to keep the focus on an agenda that, I hope, our Republican colleagues will embrace as well. This is not a partisan agenda. I don't think there is a Member of this Congress who doesn't want to grow the economy and create jobs. We believe that the Make It in America agenda is focused on doing just that, and I would encourage our Republican colleagues, our Democratic colleagues, our brethren in the Senate to join together to pass this Make It in America agenda so we can see a resurgence of the manufacturing might of this great country that when we continue to be the inventing, innovative, developing center of the world's economy that we also, once we've done all that, then bring it to scale, or make it in America.

Andy Grove of Intel, as you know, has observed that if, in fact, what we continue to do is do the voltaic cells, do the chips, do the other technologies and if we then take the products to scale overseas, inevitably, Andy Grove believes—and I share this view—that our inventors, innovators and developers, themselves, will go overseas. The American public, by large numbers, understands that that's not a policy that is defensible or profitable for

them, for their families or for America in the long term.

So I thank the gentleman from California for his focus, for his tenacity and for his compelling advocacy of the Make It in America agenda.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you very much, Mr. Leader, for what you've done. Mr. HOYER, you've been on this, actually, longer than I. You have some history in this House that goes way back. I think about a program that you and the Democrats put forward before I arrived. I've only been here now about 20 months. It was the stimulus bill, the American Recovery Act.

In that Recovery Act, there was about \$12 billion for transportation. In that transportation program, you and the Democrats, signed by President Obama, said that the money had to be spent—and this was the high-speed rail program—on American-made high-speed rail.

Guess what happened?

Of the high-speed rail companies of the world—none were made in America—the Japanese, the Chinese, the Germans, the French, and the Spanish all began to find American manufacturing plants because they wanted access to the high-speed rail money that was in the stimulus bill.

The point here is that, if we use our tax money wisely and say to the world "come and build a high-speed rail, but you're going to make it in America," they will establish those manufacturing plants here in America. It's already happening. In Sacramento, Siemens, and in New York, a couple of the European companies are already locating those manufacturing plants.

SHEILA JACKSON LEE, from the great State of Texas, has now joined us, and she has been on this issue for a long time.

So, if you would, share with us your thoughts on how America can make it by making it in America.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman from California.

If it were allowed on the floor, I would say, "Yippee," but I will try to adhere to protocol or take a lariat and circle it around out of excitement.

□ 1650

Thank you very much for the years of tenure and leadership that you brought from the legislature in the State of California. You brought it here with a sense of action, and we thank you. I am delighted that our Democratic whip has been at the forefront of this issue. And the gentleman from Rhode Island—I know others may be coming—is a mayor, a former mayor who understands the importance of jobs.

Let me just say, to add to your comment, both President Clinton and President Reagan have quotes that suggest that if you build infrastructure, it is an investment that will continue to give and give and give. Since 9/11, my good friend, I have been on the Homeland Security Committee, and

the attention of the United States, rightly so, has been on securing the homeland and national security. And just one moment so I can transfer into this discussion, 70 percent of the American people now with the capture and demise of Osama bin Laden still are concerned about our security but, in actuality, believe that our troops can come home completely. I hope that we can move in that direction. This is not a Republican issue or a Democratic issue. Seventy percent of the American people frankly believe our troops have done an enormous tribute to themselves and to the American people.

What does that mean? It means bright young men and women are going to be coming home. And let it be known that they will not just come home in need of health services. They will come home eager to participate in the American Dream. And, frankly, I want to make sure they can do that, and I want to make sure we end the war in Afghanistan.

But I believe we have, as you have mentioned, the tools of the trade. I see this word "trade," and some of us get a little nervous about that. But let me tell you how I explain trade. I want every item that can be sold overseas to someone else from the United States to be sold. I have taken to inventorying the manufacturers in the 18th Congressional District in Texas. And if I might, if you are listening, call (713) 655-0050 and let our office know you exist, that you make something in the 18th Congressional District in Texas. And I would venture to say that my colleagues will tell you call them or get on their Web site, because we want you to be able to sell it overseas.

Make It in America is to recognize the validity of the product you have made. We want to make sure that there are taxes that are fair to manufacturers. I am in the Manufacturing Caucus. We want to generate it. Energy means all kinds of energy, and I will dwell on that very lightly. But I am a person who is an equal opportunity welcomer of solar and biofuels and a number of other energy types to join in energy.

Labor, I have already said to you, I am trying to bring our soldiers home. But there are young people graduating from college in 2011. They were at my town hall meeting, to my distinguished friend, and they asked me about work. And I said to them that we in this Congress are working to provide jobs for the talented young people that will walk across those various stadiums and auditoriums getting their diplomas, doing what we asked them to do. Can we put them to work?

And then, of course, if you reinvest in America, I will tell the State of Texas—I don't want to get into anyone else's business—that we don't have to close schools. We don't have to lay off teachers. We can educate the workforce. And some of the workforce can be those with their hands, vocational trades, learning to manufacture, building the high-speed rails that I am so

excited about that I am trying to find some land in the 18th Congressional District or somewhere in Texas and say, Come one, come all.

By the way, I serve on the Intellectual Property Committee on Judiciary, and every time I have a hearing in that committee, I say that this is the work of the 21st century, protecting the genius of America, and it's a lot of them. It's unbelievable the inventors who are here. I want them to know that there is some value of first to file to protect their product.

And lastly, what you have been talking about, the idea of redoing our infrastructure. A good friend of ours who served as the chairman of the Transportation Committee was such a leader, a distinguished gentleman from Minnesota. He, in the course of his service in the last couple of years, had a bridge collapse in that State. He kept saying over and over again, Build infrastructure and you'll put America to work.

I wanted to capture these words as a mandate, as an instructive vision that the Democrats have captured. And the only thing we need are partners. The President has already shown his pride and his ability to put dollars to make jobs and to build infrastructure. I have seen public housing go up. I have seen roads being improved, dams, bridges, and of course, light rail and high-speed rail. So we've got the right thinking.

And I don't want to stop without just adding this point: There's not one of us that does not have the consciousness and the sense to recognize that we must have responsible spending and responsible reduction. I take great offense to anyone who suggests that I am opening the treasure chest and throwing money to the wind. I believe that education is valuable. Infrastructure is valuable. But there are ways that we can reasonably, down the road, as Mark Zandi has said, begin our belt tightening. But we have to recognize that the debt ceiling is not for the State of Texas or California—it is to help this Nation—but we do it sensibly. I hope we can do a clean one, by the way. But the point is that Make It in America is an engine of job creation.

And I just want to thank the gentlemen for constantly bringing us to the floor, giving us the opportunity, of course, to do as the Boy Scouts may have done and to recite these words: Trade, taxes, energy, labor, education, intellectual property, and infrastructure, and go around to our constituents in telling them we are not going to forget you. And I believe that we're going to create some jobs and watch America continue to have its economy not only make baby steps, but it's going to be spinning. It's going to be humming, and people are going to be back to work. I am grateful for this philosophy and this mission.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you so very much, Ms. JACKSON LEE. You have been a leader in all of these issues over

these many, many years and speak wisely and legislate very wisely on that.

The tax issue out there is one that just always befuddles me. It befuddles me as to why my colleagues on the Republican side just don't seem to get the message. We passed a tax bill last year that ended the subsidy that international, multinational companies were given to off-shore jobs. \$12 billion a year of our tax money was given to these huge American companies when they off-shored jobs. What was that all about? I still haven't found out where that law came from. But it was in the Tax Code, and American companies were taking advantage of that tax reduction, tax subsidy, corporate welfare to send jobs overseas. We passed a bill. It's over. The President signed it. Not one of my Republican colleagues voted for that. I don't understand. I'm befuddled by their lack of support for American companies who want to keep jobs here. Apparently they're willing to support American companies that want to send jobs offshore. Anyway, one small example.

I wonder what it's like to be the mayor of the largest town in Rhode Island. It was probably an enormous experience. And then to bring that experience here to the floor of the Congress and to the committees and to share with us all of that down-home, on-the-ground experience of bringing jobs to the community.

Mr. CICILLINE, if you would care to share with us some of that experience in the legislation that you've brought to us.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman from California for his leadership on Making It in America, and I certainly thank our leader, Mr. HOYER, for making this a priority.

I think we all realize the single biggest responsibility that we have is to get the American people back to work. I know in my home State, families are hurting. With one of the highest unemployment rates in the country, our single greatest responsibility is to do everything we can to get people back to work. And I've been disappointed that we've been here for 5 months and there hasn't really been, from our friends on the other side of the aisle, a jobs agenda, jobs legislation. And I'm really pleased that we on the Democratic side have put forth a very ambitious but very important agenda of Making It in America.

□ 1700

When you think about it, we've had an economy that was built on bubbles and credit swaps and all kinds of things, and they all failed and they hurt families in this country very, very badly.

I think what we need to do is return to this idea of making things again in this country that we can sell all over the world, and having policies developed at the national level, at the State level, at the local level that support

manufacturing, that give American manufacturers the ability to compete in the global marketplace, give them an ability to grow jobs, and to create opportunities to make things that we can sell to the rest of the world so we can export American-made goods, not export American jobs.

We have the best workers, the best minds, we have the best innovators in the world, and what we need is to have policies at the national level that recognize we have to make things again. We need to stop the Chinese from cheating in manufacturing and having an unfair advantage, and we need to recognize that this is an important part of rebuilding the economy of this country.

We've put forth, as you know, Mr. GARAMENDI, with your leadership, a whole agenda, a whole set of bills that will help jump-start and support what's already happening in American manufacturing.

Try to go into a store and find something with those three words: Made in America. It's almost impossible. We can change that. We have to change it. And the agenda that we've put forth will help to do that.

The bill that I am lead sponsor on is the Make It in America Block Grant. It's a simple idea: take resources and invest them in American manufacturing. Help manufacturers retrofit their buildings for more energy efficiency, retrain workers for the new equipment of the 21st century. Buy new equipment, increase their exports. The kinds of tools that we know, that I hear from manufacturers when I travel throughout my district and talk to them and listen to them, what they need to give them a chance to compete in this global marketplace.

We have responsibilities to do that. It's the best way we can grow jobs. You're absolutely right. It's unimaginable that tens of billions of dollars in subsidies are being given to big oil companies, corporate welfare at a time when our constituents are facing some of the highest gas prices ever.

The short-term strategy is we have to pass anti-gouging legislation, we have to release some of the strategic reserves that will lower the price at the pump now, and we have to invest in a long-term strategy of clean energy, renewable energy, the kinds of investments in the manufacturing area particularly that will lead to a good energy future for our country.

I thank you, Mr. GARAMENDI, for your leadership. This is an important agenda. It's not just about job creation. It's about regaining that position as the leaders of the world of manufacturing.

Rhode Island led the Industrial Revolution. We have a long history of innovation, of manufacturing. This country can lead again in this area, but we need to have policies that support the great minds that are doing this work, the great manufacturing. We need to have job training that gives people the skills necessary to take these jobs, and we

need to make it a national priority so that we can start making things here again, and so that American families can make it in America by relying on manufacturing.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Mr. CICILLINE. And we note that your part of the Nation was where the manufacturing started in America, and the rivers, taking the power of the rivers and using it to start the mills and eventually creating the early American economy and continuing on to this day in a very special part of this Nation, the Rhode Island and the New England area.

There are many, many things to say. As you were talking, Mr. CICILLINE, and bringing us up to date on how we can do these things, I notice that two of my colleagues came in to join us.

Again, Mr. TONKO, you were here for the very first Make It in America discussion, you and I, on this floor some months ago talking about what we can do in this rebuilding the great American manufacturing base, the strength of America, the incredible innovation that's possible, and you just happen to come from one of those areas where it was done and it's still being done.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You're from New York, right? The Albany area, upstate New York.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely, Representative.

Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI, for bringing us together in what is this usual important discussion. You have done that time and time again for us to focus on an innovation economy, on building it, and making it in America is an important aspect of the work we do. Thank you for bringing that to the attention of the greater public that watches these proceedings.

I do represent this region in upstate New York where we have the confluence of the Hudson and Mohawk Rivers, and it was birth to the Erie Canal, and that birth to the Erie Canal developed a port called New York, which became a major metro area, and a necklace of communities that were given birth to by that canal movement that became epicenters of invention and innovation, that then inspired a westward movement, and not only inspired the growth of this great Nation, but impacted the quality of life of people throughout the globe.

That pioneer spirit should speak to us again as we develop budgets, as we promote public policy. It should be about investing, not dis-investing. It should be about funding, not defunding.

The current climate here in this House with the new majority is to defund, to take those dollars away from economic recovery and to shift them over to tax cuts for millionaires, tax cuts for billionaires, ending Medicare, block granting Medicaid, dis-investing, providing for corporate loopholes.

This is not the strategy that America needs. This attack on middle class

America is unwarranted. It is not going to resolve what we need to resolve here in the great United States of America.

We need to invest in a way that allows us to bulk up and compete and compete effectively on the global scene so that we can drive this clean energy economy, this innovation economy.

I know from my work prior to coming here to the House of Representatives, with NYSEDA, the New York State Energy, Research and Development Authority, there is job opportunity galore. There are entrepreneurs, there are innovators that work with the Angel Network, work with venture capitalists, and work with public funding like that from the Federal Government that enable us to take ideas and move them along. Where R&D is, where research and development lands, so will manufacturing. That's what we have within our grasp, but what I see happening is walking away from that progressive approach and catering to a crowd that has grown stronger and stronger through this recession.

When we look at some of the outcomes as the majority here challenges us about not doing the mindless handouts to oil companies, we're seeing some of the CEOs garnering some quarter of a million shares, prime shares of stock. That's what they're doing with these payments, these handouts to the oil companies, when we could invest that in job creation, and that's what this Make It in America is all about.

I know when we put those down payments on invention and innovation, we can expect lucrative dividends and we can have job growth, and the kind of job growth that is secure because it stakes itself in the community as small business and they grow within the community; they grow and expand their opportunity.

I have, within the capital region of New York, the third fastest growing hub for science and tech jobs, and that's happening because of investment from the public sector, partnered with private sector investments, and it works. It's a winning formula, and I would say that we just need to pursue in that fashion and we can gain tremendously. And why would you change that slow but steady growth upward in recovery from the recession? After 8.2 million jobs lost through the Bush recession, why would you turn that around? And that's the attempt right here. Stop it, turn it around and go back into the ditch that drove this recession.

I just think we don't want to repeat that recent history of Reaganomics and the second Bush Presidency. It is devastating to the economy. It's devastating to America's working families, middle class. It's devastating to job growth.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Mr. TONKO.

You started with the Erie Canal. It's interesting to note that at that period of time, which was the last decades of the 1700s and the early 1800s, the

United States Government set out on a course to build infrastructure, and the infrastructure was the canal systems at that time, and you so quickly and correctly pointed out the growth that came from that. That lesson, now more than 200 years old, needs to be repeated in America once again.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely. I think what people will say too is, well, we don't make those products anymore in America. Well, we might be able to if we modernize our manufacturing processes.

But also, if you're going to try and convince, if we try to convince each other that all the products that America can make, design, engineer, discover and manufacture are over, what are we telling ourselves?

There are products coming out as we speak. There are products coming out every week, and a sophisticated society braces itself to invest in education, in R&D, in the down payments of taking ideas and moving them along; and we can then manufacture those latest products on the scene. That's the growth of a sophisticated society.

□ 1710

So this can-do spirit prevails in the Democratic Caucus in this great House in which we serve. I am proud to serve with these Members who are visionary, who are supportive, reinforcing the efforts of manufacturing of a newest kind here in the country.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You talk about innovation and new things.

Last week, I was out in my district talking to manufacturers. One company is called Bridgelux—"lux" I think is light, bridge lighting to the future. They make LED lights. The kind of things that are now in the stores—when you get a flashlight, it's an LED flashlight. They have taken those LEDs to a whole new level of technology and advancement.

In fact, if we would put them in these lights here in the Chamber, we could reduce the energy consumption by about 90 percent, which wouldn't be a bad thing for the taxpayers. Their particular system would allow those lights to change color, which might put me in a better color; that wouldn't be such a bad thing, and to dim when people are not here, and move the lights, and in that way improve our ability to see while simultaneously saving us a lot of energy.

The company is 2 years old, has 250 employees, is manufacturing these advanced LED lighting systems in Livermore in my district, and I am going, "Go Bridgelux, go!"

They need something, though. They need access to the American markets. And that is where the use of our tax dollars, in this case perhaps the local tax dollars in the cities around that area, would reach out and save the taxpayers a bundle of money by buying lights from that company.

Mr. TONKO. Not only is it promoting energy efficiency; it can help us along

this trail of energy self-sufficiency, which then pulls us out of our dependency, which is gluttonous to date, on unfriendly nations providing us our supplies for energy. It just doesn't make any sense.

The clarion call that we heard at the voting booth last fall was to start growing the economy, stop shrinking the middle class, and that is what we are about with this Make It in America.

I know our friend, Representative TIM RYAN from Ohio, has something to add to that agenda because he has been aggressive on this, also.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Indeed.

Mr. RYAN, you come from a part of the world that was and is going to be, given your leadership and the leadership of this Make It in America agenda, the premier manufacturing place in the world. We will contend in California; we will be happy to contend for that and compete for that title, but you are in the process of rebuilding the manufacturing base in the heartland of America.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It's interesting. My district, the Youngstown-Warren metropolitan district, was the fastest growing in job development in the last month or two.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Name those places again.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Youngstown and Warren, Ohio.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We are talking about what America thinks was yesterday, and you are telling me it's the fastest growing?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And it is just recent. But in large part, a couple of different things.

There is \$1 billion invested into a steel mill, but also we have a major auto plant. And it was the work of the last Congress and the President saying we cannot lose the American auto industry, and they made investments in companies like General Motors. Now we have three shifts selling the Chevy Cruze all over the world. Every employee got a \$4,000 bonus a few weeks back that they are spending in our community. These are the kinds of things that happen when you make things in America, when you manufacture products in the United States of America.

But the goal here I think for all of us is to wrestle control from the major multinational corporations who are running this institution and then have undue influence over the government. Whether it is globalization moving manufacturing offshore, or if it is the oil companies who not only aren't paying taxes but are completely content with our citizens sending \$1 billion a day out of the United States to go try to find cheap oil, which isn't so cheap anymore, and diminishing day by day, what we are saying here is, if we drive that \$1 billion a day back into the United States economy for the kind of research and development that is going on in Upstate New York, that is going

on in California, that is going on in Youngstown State University and Akron University with polymers, if we pump billions of dollars into this, instead of falling from first to second to third in the green energy revolution behind China and Germany, we will start leading it. And it is about coming up with the next technologies that you gentlemen were sitting here talking about, whether it's lightbulbs or something else. We need to discover that here in the United States, and then make it here in the United States.

But what all the major tech companies are saying now, they want to manufacture here in the United States. There is so much risk when you move your operations to China, losing intellectual property, losing the cutting edge, losing the quality, that there is an incentive here.

But if we don't pump money into research, that is why this whole philosophy that every single thing the government ever does is awful and the government should just serve big business, cut taxes for the oil companies, make sure that the big multinationals don't pay anything in taxes, and we will come back and cut NIH, cut energy investment, cut the National Science Foundation, cut the National Institutes for Science and Technology, their standards and technology. These are the kinds of things that we have got to be investing in. It starts with let's get out of this dependency on foreign oil, \$4 a gallon is nonsense, and this illusion that if we continue to keep drilling, we are somehow going to drop the price, is an illusion. Let's take control of our own destiny here.

I want to just show real quick this chart. This is the U.S. balance of trade from 1960 to 2010. If you will look in the last 10 to 15 years, we now have \$500 billion in a trade imbalance. Most of this is energy. Most of this is oil. What are we thinking? We are giving away the house.

This is not good public policy. This is not good economics. Let's take control. Let's invest in our own people. A billion a day we send to another country that doesn't like us, and it finances the war on terrorism? And then we take our budget and have three wars going on at the same time. So we pay them to run the terrorist operations, and then we pay our own military to go to the Middle East to try to stop it. Meanwhile, the middle class in the United States, we have a \$3 trillion deficit on the roads and bridges and infrastructure, sewer. College expenses are going up. We're not doing research. This is a recipe for disaster for the United States.

I yield to my friend from California. Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you very much for that.

You just reminded me of last night at 2:30 in the morning, the House Armed Services Committee completed the markup that is moving out of committee, the National Defense Act. We do it every year. Seven hundred billion dollars.

A study done by one of the think tanks came up with the number that America spends about 17 percent of its total defense budget protecting the flow of oil out of the Middle East. So you can add that to the deficit. That is over \$100 billion a year that we spend of our tax money to protect the flow of oil, not only for us, but for the rest of the world.

We need to build a domestic energy system not based on carbon-based fuels, but rather the future energy, all of the clean green technologies, nuclear and others, that will provide us with the energy security we need.

In doing so, each and every one of those, if we spend our tax dollars on buying American-made systems, will come back, just as you say, and build our communities stronger along the way.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We had a group in Cleveland, Ohio, do a study a few years back that, if you added in that cost, the 17 percent of our military budget that protects the oil lines, supply lines for oil all over the world, the actual cost of a gallon of gas would be another \$1.15, because of the subsidy. It's another subsidy to make oil come here.

All we are saying is pump that money back into the research. Somebody in this country will come up with some synthetic, some magical something or other that will replicate diesel fuel. It will happen if we put the money into it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. It is actually already there. It is called advanced biofuels, algae-based fuels, everything from cosmetic oils to fuel for the Navy ships. So we can do these things. But, again, it is how we deploy our resources.

We have about 5 minutes, and we are going to do a lightning round between the three of us. I am going to turn to Mr. TONKO.

□ 1720

Mr. TONKO. I would just encourage us here in Washington on the Hill as we develop policy and debate budgets to keep in mind the history that should be replicated, sound history, history that had a proven track record, like that of the global race on space.

Some of us are old enough to have been youngsters or adolescents when that message, that very noble vision, of President JFK and his offering in an inaugural address that we are going to win the race on space, the global race on space, and land a person first on the Moon. And it was more than that poetry of landing the first astronaut on the Moon, that happened to be an American, and his quote of "one small step for man, one giant step for mankind." It went well beyond that. It was this opening of the gates to technology that then invaded every sector of our economy, all aspects of life. And it was that technology investment that grew because of the soundness of a plan that enabled us to win a global race.

Now, that was done with passionate resolve and a thoughtfulness and a

clear vision. We need to embrace that sort of American spirit, that pioneer spirit in this present moment and repeat good history, sound history, that grew our economy. I think we can do it and I believe we can do it, and Make It in America is the way to make it all happen.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Give him a minute of my time. He's from Pennsylvania. He can't help it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I look up and find another colleague here. We have just a few moments left.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I appreciate the gentleman from California. I come from a region of the country, western Pennsylvania, bordering my friend from Ohio, and I was listening to the debate, and I just wanted to talk about this same issue.

This is the key to our recovery and our continued leadership and innovation in this country because, as we have seen in western Pennsylvania and all across this country, the American worker is going to compete and win on a level playing field against anybody in the world any day of the week. We just want to make sure that we have a tax policy that is in place, a trade policy that is in place, and a manufacturing and jobs policy that is in place that is going to allow the American worker that level playing field to compete and win against the rest of the world.

Mr. GARAMENDI. As a great example, your colleague next to you there has a piece of legislation that calls for fairness in the financial markets, the value of the dollar versus the value of the Chinese yuan. Mr. RYAN, you have put it out there. You say it has to be fair. Wrap it for us.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It is clearly currency manipulation. Here is the deal: Chevron, \$19 million refunded from the IRS last year. They made \$10 billion. Valero Energy, 25th largest company in America, \$68 billion in sales last year; they got a \$157 million tax refund check subsidized by the taxpayer.

If we are going to do this, we need shared sacrifice. We need everybody to contribute, especially those people making a lot of money, to help us reinvest. These folks are benefiting from an old-age industry—that we are running out of oil. It only makes sense. It went into the ground for 4 billion years. We pulled it out in 150 years, and we are burning it. Something is happening. It is an old industry and we are subsidizing it. We need to be Americans who invest in the next great technology to lead the world.

Mr. GARAMENDI. And indeed we will. Over the weeks and months ahead, we are going to talk about the Make It in America agenda, the legislation that has been introduced by the Democratic Caucus here in the House of Representatives. There are about 25 pieces of legislation, ranging from the ones that we talked about here, using our tax money when we buy solar equipment, make sure it is made in America. A bus, if you are going to use our tax money,

make sure where it is made. Innovation, the innovation economy, all of those things. This is legislation that we have, infrastructure financing and all the rest. We are going to talk about it piece by piece.

I thank my colleagues for joining us. I have the sense that behind me we are about to be gavelled that we are out of time. I want to thank the American public for listening to the Make It in America agenda.

AMERICAN JOBS AND THE NATIONAL DEBT

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

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the American people for watching today.

I wanted to talk with my colleagues here today about jobs, how we create jobs in America, and what we are going to do about our national debt. We have a spending problem in America, and we have heard a lot from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They have been talking about jobs bills. I heard someone say that we haven't passed any legislation or taken up any legislation in this House that addresses jobs. Well, that puzzles me. Maybe they have been absent, but it seems to me since I arrived here in January, we have been focused on jobs, and I just want to give a few examples.

Number one, this week we have been working on energy legislation that will open up drilling, open up drilling in parts of the country where right now it is prohibited. Those will be jobs. Those are jobs, good-paying jobs in the energy sector. Not only will that allow for the creation of jobs; it will allow for our country to be more energy independent.

We have taken up all sorts of legislation regarding health care since I have been here. We voted to repeal and to work on some legislation to replace the Obama health care law. Well, I talk to small businesses, business owners, all the time, and they tell me that the Obama health care law hurts them; that because of the increased price that they have to pay, that they can't hire as many people. That is a piece of legislation that directly addresses job creation.

There was a provision that a lot of small businesses will tell you about; it was a 1099 provision that was included in the Obama health care law. We repealed that. We were fortunate enough to convince the Senate to pass it and the President to sign it.

I am joined by my colleague from Indiana. I want to say this, and then I am going to turn it over to him. Every time that we deal with our spending problem in this House, every time that we deal with our debt problem and our deficit, every time that we try to get