

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IS BEING BULLIED

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the administration is bullying religions. Yes, the government has required some religious organizations to violate their tenets and provide certain health care coverage for their employees—or else.

After an immediate backlash by the American public, the administration promised that it would make some changes; but the same day that it made this promise, it finalized the original mandate as-is with no changes. The original edict is now in effect. The big announcement about a change resulted in nothing, only more words.

The administration said it had the power to issue this order because it was implementing ObamaCare. If the administration has the power to infringe upon a constitutionally protected right, what will follow? What individual freedom will be trampled next, all in the name of “we’re the government, we know what’s best”?

The Constitution is being insulted and violated. We should fear this type of unyielding power and religious persecution. After all, the Constitution was written to protect us from this type of government.

And that’s just the way it is.

TRIBUTE TO MARYLYN SCHMIDT

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Marylyn Schmidt, a resident of the State of Michigan, who dedicated her life to the goal of achieving true universal health care for all Americans.

She spent countless hours, day in and day out, organizing, mobilizing, and educating the citizens of Michigan in order to build grass-roots support for passage of a single-payer bill in Congress, H.R. 676. She passionately believed that every person in America should have access to quality, affordable, and accessible health care as a fundamental civil and human right.

I knew Mrs. Schmidt for almost two decades. I had a profound respect for her unique leadership in advocating for human rights, universal health care, and protecting Social Security and Medicare. She belonged to numerous community and social-justice organizations, including the Michigan Improved Medicare for All, the Michigan Alliance to Strengthen Social Security and Medicare, the Michigan Universal

Healthcare Access Network, and the Oakland County Welfare Rights Organization. For over 20 years, she fought for the human, economic, and civil rights of the voiceless and the vulnerable citizens of Michigan who wanted nothing more than a better life for themselves and their children.

Thank you, Marylyn Schmidt, for remaining steadfast in your belief that health care should be a fundamental human right in this country. The people of Michigan and all of those you helped and fought for will always remember your kindness, your courage, and dedication to this just cause.

□ 1710

MAKE IT IN AMERICA:
MANUFACTURING MATTERS

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, I look forward to this hour with my colleagues to talk about jobs. How do we create jobs in America? We are now well over 14 months of the Republican control of this House, and not one significant bill has passed this House that would create new jobs. There are many bills to wipe out environmental laws, many bills to wipe out regulations that protect the citizens of the United States from pollution and contamination of one sort or another, but where are the jobs bills? We absolutely have to create the jobs in America.

Today, we are going to take about an hour to discuss how we can create jobs in America. One of the principal ways is to Make It in America: Manufacturing Matters. Manufacturing was the heart and soul of and the foundation for the great middle class, the rise of the middle class here in the United States. It wasn’t too long ago that manufacturing in the United States was a big deal. About 20, 23 years ago, we had almost 20 million Americans in manufacturing. It also happened to coincide with the largest percentage of Americans that were in the middle class.

Over the intervening years, we’ve seen the slow decline until we hit this period of 2000 to 2009, and we saw a precipitous drop to just over 11 million manufacturing jobs in America. That coincided with the decline of the middle class in the United States.

So what we want to do today is to focus on, how can we rebuild the American middle class? One of the principal ways of doing it is to focus on manufacturing and to focus specifically on rebuilding the great manufacturing sector in the United States. There are many, many ways to do this.

My colleague from Oregon is here to join us, and I know that there are many things that are happening in Oregon that speak directly to this, one of

which is competition between Oregon and California for the manufacturing of light railcars. I’ll let my colleague from Oregon go first, and then I’ll pound on him that California is a better place to manufacture light railcars than Oregon. But either way, they’re made in America, and that’s to the benefit of all Americans.

Please join me, and let’s see where we can take this.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you. I deeply appreciate your courtesy in permitting me to speak, and I appreciate your leadership in focusing on the need to rebuild and renew this country, putting Americans back to work, being able to not just revitalize our economy, but our neighborhoods and strengthen our families. It is true that there are some areas where there are some great opportunities for healthy competition. The gentleman may be referencing the fact that recently we have started manufacturing a streetcar in the United States for the first time in 58 years, and it’s being manufactured in Portland, Oregon. But I would note that that project, manufacturing streetcars, includes the work of subcontractors across the country, including 40 in the Midwest that had been so hard hit by some of the decline in manufacturing activity.

The point is that being able to make goods in this country, whether it’s light rail, streetcar, heavy rail, whether we’re dealing with fabricating steel for bridges and roads or rebuilding the power grid, these are all areas that are a tremendous source of family-wage jobs. I find no amount of irony that one of the major Republican candidates for President somehow thought that President Obama was being—and I’m using his direct word—“elitist” by advocating that young people have the chance for a college education or going to a community college. My goodness, how out of touch can you possibly be? I don’t know any American that doesn’t want his or her child to be able to have the opportunity for further education and training. This is part of an agenda here. I look forward to the conversations this evening.

At one point, I’d like to cycle back to the spectacle we had on the floor of the House the week before we recessed for Presidents Day where we had the most partisan transportation bill in the history of the House—narrow in focus, small in vision, dividing the various elements of transportation—that was so bad that our Republican friends were embarrassed to even have a hearing on it. Never before in the history of the House have we had a major surface transportation reauthorization that never even had a hearing.

Well, mercifully, our Republican friends have decided that that wasn’t getting them anywhere. The outcry from transit agencies across the country, from cyclists, even from the people who advocate safe routes to school, the program designed for our children to be able to get back and forth to school

safely that they eliminated—so they've put that on the back burner. But the point is, you are right. We've enjoyed, if I can use that term, their Republican leadership of the House for 14 months. We have no economic development plan, we have no transportation bill, and we continue to have an opportunity to rebuild and renew America languishing.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you so very much for circling back to the transportation issue. That issue is still before this House. There has been no hearing, and the bill that was put forth by the Republicans simply has gone nowhere. In fact, it hit the brick wall. I'm sure one of the reasons it hit the brick wall is that there is no way to create a modern transportation system in that bill. For example, we both talked about streetcars and light-rail cars. In California, there is a factory near Sacramento that makes light-rail cars. I'm delighted there's a factory now in Portland, Oregon, that is building streetcars. And the factory in Sacramento is also building locomotives.

The reason this is happening is that the Democrats, in their recovery legislation, the stimulus bill that gets such bad press—totally undeserved, I might add—actually had a clause in it that American taxpayers' money was going to be used to Make It in America. And that started or propelled both of these operations as cities decided they would use some of their own money, some State money, and some of the Federal money to enhance their public transportation programs.

However, the transportation bill that you brought up just a moment ago totally removes the public transportation sector from the bill. Now I don't know how we're ever going to build buses, trains, and light rail, Amtrak, without the support of the Federal Government.

□ 1720

I know you were deeply involved in this. I heard you talk about this once before—with a little bit of animation. You may want to circle back and pick that up again.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Well, I appreciate the invitation.

You know, today, as we speak, the people in Michigan are voting in a Presidential primary to help determine the Republican nominee. I just mentioned one of them. My friend and former colleague here, Rick Santorum, with whom I served in the House, is the person who thinks it's elitist that American families have an opportunity for their kids to go to school. The other major contender, the gentleman who is likely to even win the ballot in Michigan today, more Republican votes, has been quoted as saying one of his top targets, if he's elected President, would be to eliminate Amtrak.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Seriously? I've heard him say a lot of things, but—

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Yesterday he was on the trail. This is one of his top five projects.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Is this Mr. Romney?

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Romney wants to eliminate the funding for Amtrak. This is one of his targets.

Well, the United States is—in the past, I have actually been brought up short when I've talked about the United States having a third world rail passenger system, because I've ridden railroads in places like Malaysia or Thailand, and we do an injustice to their rail systems.

The United States is the only major country in the world that does not have higher-speed rail passenger service. It is the only major country that has no plan to move forward. The President, to his credit, put forth \$14 billion to be able to strengthen our rail passenger system, some of which, several billion would have helped with a California vision; the California voters have approved an opportunity to go forward.

It is frustrating for me because there is no doubt that Americans will have higher-speed rail over the course of the next quarter century, no doubt. But the question is, coming back to the point that you have so relentlessly and eloquently developed on the floor here, Congressman GARAMENDI, is the notion of: Where will America's rail system come from? Because the path we're on, if we follow it with Romney, who would zero it out, with Republicans who have fought these investments every chance they get, the high-speed rail we'll have will be built and operated by the Chinese. They will design it; they will build it. The value will be added in another country, and we'll pay for the privilege.

The alternative is to invest here in the United States in the tracks, the signals, the equipment, to be able to revitalize a vital system of transportation, taking pressure off of airports and roads. But, as I say, the choice is whether or not we're going to build it, we're going to own it, and it will accrue to the benefit of the American public.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, you're right on an issue that is very close to my own policies, which is, if it's American taxpayer money that's being used to buy a bus, a light railcar, a streetcar, a locomotive, or a train set for BART in California or the Metro system here in Washington, D.C., then our money must be used to buy American-made equipment. Plain and simple, those are American jobs.

We had a terrible example of bad policy in California. The San Francisco Bay Bridge, Oakland-San Francisco Bay Bridge, a multibillion-dollar project, the steel in that bridge went up to bid. It's \$1 billion or so of steel for the bridge. One contractor put in two bids. One bid was 10 percent cheaper, and that was Chinese steel. The other bid was American steel, and it was 10 percent more. So the bridge authority, in its wisdom, selected the cheaper.

It turns out that cheaper is not necessarily better and, ultimately, not cheaper. It turned out that it was far more expensive. There were serious flaws in the steel, in the welding, and 6,000 to 8,000 jobs were in China rather than in the United States. Ultimately, the cost was higher, and we did not benefit in the United States, even in California, from the increased economic activity that would have occurred if the direct jobs in manufacturing and welding and fabricating that steel were in the United States.

We don't want that ever again. If it's our taxpayer money, from whatever source, then make it in America. Use our money to buy domestic-made buses and trains and steel. We've got work to do.

I put this one up here, not to get away from the transit systems and the public transportation systems, which are critically important, but we've got 150,000 miles of road that need repair. The transportation bill that had been offered by our colleagues on the Republican side doesn't even get close to keeping up with what we need in the highway system and repairing the bridges that are falling down or could fall down across America. We have work to do.

We need to reignite the American Dream, and part of that dream has been the world's best transportation system. Unfortunately, over the last decade or two, we have seen that decline in American status in transportation. Whether we're in the third world or the second world, we're surely not in the first world for highway transportation or for the public transportation system.

We have work to do to reignite the American Dream. This transportation bill that ultimately we must pass, the Senate and the House, we must come together and pass a bill that is adequately funded, that provides for public transportation as well as for the road transportation. Our Republican colleagues are not even close to that. They've got a \$75 billion hole in their wallet not filled by the programs that have been put forward.

I know that you've been serving on this committee. You're far more familiar than I am with it. So let's just continue with this for a little while.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. One of your points about the impact, that one piece of the bridge project, the \$400 million element of steel, it wasn't just the steel itself. Had we been developing that portion of the steel for the project in the United States, there would have been thousands of other jobs that would have been related to it to support that effort, in terms of the manufacturing, the development, the people who provide the equipment to manufacture the steel and put it in place, and the tools. It is a dramatic ripple effect.

You referenced 150,000 miles of road in critical need of repair. What's under the surface is even in worse shape. We

have, in the United States, every day 6 billion gallons of water that leaks from water mains that are old, in some cases unsafe and unhealthy. That's the equivalent of 9,000 Olympic-size swimming pools. Lined end to end, it would go from Washington, D.C., to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Mr. GARAMENDI. That's a lot of swimming.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. It's a lot of water that's wasted.

It is a problem in terms of undermining roads. We've all seen these terrible pictures of sinkholes that develop. I used to keep them and use them for presentations. I stopped when one of the sinkholes was actually in my old neighborhood of Portland, Oregon, that opened up in the middle of the street and swallowed a maintenance truck. This is serious business.

The American Society of Civil Engineers, every 5 years, does a report card on the state of American infrastructure. Their most recent report card showed that we have \$2.3 trillion unmet need, and the grades ranged from C-minus to an F in terms of water, the electrical grid, transit, roads and bridges. This is serious business in terms of American quality of life. And think about the hundreds of thousands of family-wage jobs if we were investing in rebuilding and renewing America.

□ 1730

I know you appear to have a little statistic here.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I would like to have handed this to you as you were talking about the expansion that occurs when you invest in infrastructure. I ran over to get this, but I didn't want to interrupt your discussion.

For every dollar invested in infrastructure investments, \$1.57 is pumped into the American economy. That's the multiplier effect that occurs when you invest in this. These are investments that pay dividends year after year. This is the immediate turnaround. You described it so very well. It's the small business that is fabricating, it's the steel mill, and on and on. \$1.50. If we invest a dollar today, we get \$1.50 back in economic activity, people paying taxes. We recoup much of that dollar investment. That is just the immediate multiplier effect.

Let's say we have an investment in a water system in Portland, Oregon, that is old and needs to be replaced. That's now in the ground, and it's going to serve year one, two, three, and probably for the next century. So it's not something that is used up. I suppose if we were to invest in an artillery shell, and we shoot it off in Afghanistan, well, okay, that is a one-off, one time, and it is gone. Perhaps to good purpose, but gone. You invest in infrastructure in America, you get an immediate return, and it is there for the next generation and the generation beyond.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. That's a very important point. The Society of Amer-

ican Civil Engineers has produced another fascinating report about what the cost will be if we don't invest in the water infrastructure. They have documented tens of billions of dollars of extra cost if we do not take care of these problems. It is not a problem that is unknown to American homeowners, who quickly find out if you don't fix the hole in the roof, you end up with massive structural damage.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Excuse me. You're getting too close to my roof. Move on. Don't focus on roofs, because I didn't fix it, and, yes, I got to repair the inside as well as the roof.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. The damage that you mentioned earlier in terms of the roads that are in need of critical repair, the cost to the American motorists in terms of the damage to car suspension systems and tires, that wear and tear wears out cars more rapidly. Delays in traffic for something like UPS—a 5-minute delay I think translates to something like \$100 million of costs to them over the course of a year. This \$1.57 of economic impact for every dollar invested translates into over 25,000 jobs for each billion dollars that is spent on infrastructure. A far greater rate of return than on military spending, on a lot of the other things—tax cuts, for Heaven's sake. This is real economic benefit, particularly when we've got a building trade sector where unions are looking at 20, 30, 40 percent or more unemployment. These are opportunities to put people to work tomorrow on things that people in America need today.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We ought not dance around one of the issues involved in this infrastructure. That's, where is the money coming from? How are you going to pay for this stuff?

Our colleague ROSA DELAURO for more than 15 years has made a proposal here in this House that we create what Europe has had for the last almost 30 years now, an infrastructure bank, a way to finance those projects that have a cash flow, the specific ones that you're talking about. The bridge has a toll, has the ability to pay off a loan. The water system has a fee associated with the delivery of water, the sanitation system. All of those are what I call cash-flow projects.

ROSA DELAURO from Connecticut has proposed an infrastructure bank in which the Federal Government provides the initial capital, say a 10-year note. We could borrow at the Federal level for less than 2 percent now on a 10-year note, put that in the bank, go to the pension funds around the Nation, and they all invest in the bank. We may have \$25 billion, \$30 billion, \$50 billion. And in some cases, depending on how robust you want to go, you could have \$100 billion of capital available in the infrastructure bank to finance the kinds of projects that have a cash flow associated with them: toll roads, water systems, sanitation systems, airports, bridges.

All of those things are possible. In doing that, you not only create the op-

portunity to finance those projects and obtain this kind of economic stimulation, but you also have taken off of the general fund of the Federal Government and some State and local governments, taken off their general fund the burden of financing those and are freeing up money for those infrastructure projects that do not have a cash flow associated with them, such as, for example, many of the highways and biways and county roads throughout America where there's no fee associated with them.

We have the opportunity to finance these things if we could just get off the dime. Please, the leadership in this House, move us forward, give us a project that we can actually put in place, an infrastructure bank, and other kinds of projects that will actually create jobs.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. There are lots of ways of going about this.

Ronald Reagan in 1982 understood that the gas tax, a user fee, could be used to help the country, which at that point was in a serious economic recession. Ronald Reagan signed into law a nickel-a-gallon increase in the gas tax that helped spur economic development activity.

If you don't want to raise a tax, there are unnecessary tax benefits that are flowing, for instance, to the largest oil companies that no longer need these tax breaks. In fact, George Bush the younger was famously quoted as saying when oil prices got to \$50 a barrel that oil companies didn't need incentives to drill for the most profitable commodity on the face of the planet. Where we've watched it go to \$100 a barrel or more, we could completely capitalize the infrastructure bank the gentleman talked about just by unnecessary tax benefits to oil companies, which the majority of the American public would approve in a heartbeat. There are also the expiring tax provisions on the wealthiest of Americans where just half of that would enable us to fully fund the transportation gap over the next 10 years.

I have bipartisan legislation that would deal with a water trust fund that would leverage close to a trillion dollars because of what the gentleman said—that there are other funds flowing for infrastructure like that, a trillion dollars of development over the next 20 years. There are opportunities here for us to step up and meet the needs of America and to rebuild and renew it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We have work to do, and Americans want to go to work and they want things made in America.

I was interested in what you were saying about the use of our Tax Code. The Big Five oil companies in America—Exxon, Chevron, BP, and the other two—have in the last decade made a trillion dollars of profit. Yet at the same time, those Big Five get \$4 billion a year in tax subsidies. Our tax money is going to those companies as if they

don't have enough of our money already. They do. If we dial that back and bring that back into the system for infrastructure investment, you could use it, as you say, for transportation because it's associated with transportation. You could use it for clean energy. Let's say you take 3 years of that and suddenly got \$12 billion, we could capitalize an infrastructure bank. All of these things are possible if we get away from the notion of continuing to help the oil industry.

□ 1740

The wealthiest industry in the world doesn't need our tax money as a subsidy, and we ought to reel that money back in and use it for things that really create investments in America.

There are other ways we can do this. We had what are called bonds, Build America Bonds. Those have expired, but those were extraordinarily useful for small cities, big cities, and counties to build infrastructure. Many, many things that could be done, but unfortunately we are now 12, 14 months into the current control of the House by Republicans and not one of these things have come to the floor to rebuild the American economy. We have work to do. And we can do it.

I want to just point out that the Democratic Caucus, our colleagues on the Democratic side, have introduced 36 Make It In America bills, different kinds of ways to do it.

My two bills deal with our tax money for transportation. The gasoline tax, use it to buy American-made steel, equipment, buses, and the other one I have is using our tax money. If we're going to subsidize wind turbines and solar cells, we buy American made, and this is a way of keeping the jobs in America.

I know you have some additional thoughts on this, and let's continue on.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Well, it is one of the very real problems we are facing in terms of building it in America. We are in the process of constructing a wind energy in the United States. It's been remarkably successful over the course of the last 20 years.

We've watched the price per kilowatt-hour produced by wind drop dramatically. At the same time, we are watching these wind turbine farms—you have them in California. We have them in the Pacific Northwest. They're in the Midwest. They're in Texas. They are providing revenue to rural America. Farmers and ranchers are being able to harvest the wind, literally.

Mr. GARAMENDI. With the cows and sheep beneath the turbines.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. At the same time, this is low carbon. This is not adding to our greenhouse gas effect. It's not something that is being exported overseas, giving money to people who don't like us very much.

At the same time, it is building this infrastructure: people who are now manufacturing wind turbines in the United States; people who are putting

up, fabricating these towers; people dealing with the transmission capacity.

But I will say that one of the things this Congress should do is to extend the production tax credit. We've talked about benefits that flow to the oil industry long past time that they were necessary to provide incentives for them to develop oil resources, but we have provided a little bit of an incentive to help get the wind energy business competitive.

Well, that production tax credit expires at the end of the year. Already, we are watching investment patterns start to pull back because people are uncertain that they can go ahead with large-scale projects, investing tens of millions of dollars not certain that they will continue to have this tax benefit. That's outrageous.

Of the \$4 trillion of tax provisions that are going to expire at the end of the year, the opportunity for us to actually have deficit savings by recalibrating some of those—at a minimum, we ought to step up, and we ought to step up now, to be clear that the production tax credit is, in fact, going to continue so we don't shut down the wind energy industry, we don't lose the manufacturing and the construction, to say nothing of clean, renewable energy. That would be a tragedy.

We have bipartisan legislation I've introduced with my friend from Seattle, Congressman REICHERT. We have a number of very distinguished cosponsors, including yourself. This is something that shouldn't be languishing. There's a bipartisan interest in making sure that the wind energy industry doesn't shut down and that we continue making it in America.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very, very much for bringing that issue up. It's one that is extremely important in my district because I do have the two major northern California wind farms in my district, one in the Solano County area and the other one in the Altamont Pass area.

My own history in this goes back to 1978, when I authored the first State law to provide a tax credit for those companies that built the wind turbines way back in 1978. So we've come a long, long way on this, and we ought to get it going.

I notice that you're going to have to go, and I'm going to wrap up shortly after you leave.

We've gone through a lot of things here. I'm going to just bring one more issue, and that has to do with the price of fuel in America today.

Thank you so very much, my colleague from Oregon, bringing us the Northwest perspective on this.

I went out and purchased gasoline this last week when I was back in California, and it was something around the range of \$4.15 in one station, another, \$4.25. I said, What's going on here? Why are we seeing this sudden rise when, in fact, in the Midwest of the United States, there is actually a surplus of oil? What's happening here?

I think we can look to several different things that are taking place.

One thing we know that is taking place is speculation. Because of the Dodd-Frank legislation, the government now has the power to deal with speculators, and I know the President picked this issue up when he was in Florida last week and said that this is something that a special task force has been set up in the Department of Justice to ferret out the speculation that's taking place in the gasoline markets.

I've also said I'd heard a rumor that the United States is actually exporting gasoline. In fact, we are. We're exporting over 26 million gallons of gasoline a day. You heard that right. The energy companies say, well, the price is going up because of a shortage of gasoline. What are you selling me? There's a shortage when we're actually exporting gasoline? Why are we doing that? Well, we do import gasoline, too, but your imports are balanced by exports. So how does that help America? I don't think it does.

Speculation, the export of gasoline, and you wonder why the prices are going up?

Well, certainly the speculation has to do with the question of Iran and whether we're going to shut down the Strait of Hormuz or not. Well, that's speculation. But the reality today is there's a glut of oil in the Midwest that ought to be used for refining gasoline and diesel in the United States. We ought to make it in the United States and keep it in the United States.

Twenty-six million gallons a day being exported? We'd like to have that in California. We'd like to have that drive down the price in California.

There's not a shortage. There may be a shortage of wisdom. There may be an excess of market-driven policies here, but we have a crisis in the United States, and it is certainly the price of gasoline.

A lot of discussion about "drill, baby, drill."

Okay. Let's understand that we are now drilling and producing more oil in the United States this year than in the previous 8 years. That's right. Right back to the Republican administration, when George W. Bush was in power and the Republicans controlled both Houses, the drilling of oil was at an all-time low. As we've come into this period of time, we've seen the production increase to the highest it's been in the last 8 years, and more to come.

But the opening of the Outer Continental Shelf, the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge and others will have nothing to do with the near term, that is in the next 5 to 10 years, because of the length of time it takes to produce from those new areas.

By the way, you don't need to waive every environmental law in the Nation or in the State to go get that oil. Off the coast of California, with directional drilling, you don't even need to get onto the ocean to get to the oil. You can drill from the land, reducing

the risk to the marine environment to near zero and access oil that's 6 miles offshore. We ought to be looking at those things.

□ 1750

There is one other thing, and I think I will wrap with this so that my Republican colleagues, if they need a little time to get here for their next hour, have fair warning.

Natural gas, it's an extraordinary asset for America. Natural gas is readily available. We're producing more natural gas in America now than ever before, and we're discovering that we can get even more. We're looking at an extraordinary asset. This is an American asset. It is a strategic asset. It is leading to the creation of jobs in America right now.

In my own district that I share with Representative GEORGE MILLER, in Pittsburg and on the Antioch city boundary line, we're seeing Dow Chemical coming home, bringing jobs back to America, investing large sums of money—millions and millions of dollars—in that facility because of the low price on natural gas. All across this winter in every part of America we've seen homeowners' heating bills, not soar, but actually decline. Yes, it has been a warm winter, but the price of natural gas for heating in the North Atlantic States, in the New England States, across the Midwest, and even in California is at an all-time low. The average last year was \$4.30 when, just 5 years before, it was in the \$10 to \$12 range.

So we're seeing an incredible opportunity for America. Energy is the foundation of our economy. When you have a ready supply in abundance, you ought to recognize that as a strategic asset. Yet in committee after committee, in my own Natural Resources Committee, I've seen my Republican colleagues put forth bills that would export natural gas, that would take this strategic asset and send it overseas because the energy companies can get a higher price overseas. They don't need a higher price. They're doing quite well, thank you. What we need is a reliable, low-cost energy source in America.

Do not allow—do not allow—by legislation or by executive order the export of natural gas from the United States. There is a little bit that now goes to Canada or to Mexico under the NAFTA agreements, all of that in pipeline; but just this last week, one of the big Wall Street hedge funds decided to invest \$2 billion in a Texas scheme to build a liquefied natural gas export facility. Well, I suppose it's nice to build it; but by golly, that's America's strategic asset that's going to be sent overseas.

Be aware of what's happening here. If you send that gas overseas in any large quantity, you're going to drive up the price of natural gas in America. So American farmers are going to pay more for their fertilizers, and we're going to see home-heating prices

throughout the Nation rise as those exports of this strategic asset rise. We're going to see that Dow Chemical is going to make a different decision about whether to come back to America to take advantage of the low cost of natural gas or whether it's going to say, okay, America is so screwed up in that it's taking one of its most basic strategic assets and selling it for the highest price.

I think back on the story of Esau, in the Bible, when he sold out his birthright for a bowl of porridge. We ought not to do this. We need an energy supply in America that we do have available to us.

So, with that, if my Republican colleagues are anywhere nearby, they can claim their hour.

We've gone through some very, very important things here—the Make It in America agenda and 36 Democratic bills that would build our economy, that would cause us to come back and rebuild our great manufacturing sector. It will happen. It's government policies that over the last 25 years have caused the American manufacturing base to erode, policies such as tax breaks for American companies that would send their jobs offshore. We stopped nearly all of that before the Democrats lost power here in Congress.

So we ask our Republicans to work with us in putting into law these 36 bills that will cause us to rebuild the American middle class, to reignite the American Dream and to give the middle class the opportunity to engage in manufacturing.

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

PROCEDURES IMPLEMENTING SECTION 1022 OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 112-91)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Attached is the text of a Presidential Policy Directive establishing procedures to implement section 1022 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81) (the "Act"), which I hereby submit to the Congress, as required under section 1022(c)(1) of the Act. The Directive also includes a written certification that it is in the national security interests of the United States to waive the requirements of section 1022(a)(1) of the Act with respect to certain categories of individuals, which I hereby submit to the Congress in accordance with section 1022(a)(4) of the Act.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 28, 2012.

BORDER SECURITY

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am here tonight to talk about one of the issues that is of extreme significance. In fact, in every town hall meeting I've ever held, one of the first questions that's asked, if not the first question, is about illegal entry into this country and is about, specifically, border security.

So in talking about what the issue is before us, this is a map of the United States that is divided into the Border Patrol sectors, the areas that the Border Patrol has. As you will see, if you can, from the numbers, there is a vast difference in the numbers of people coming illegally into this country based on the sectors.

If you go to the sector of the State of Maine, the last time we had verifiable figures, the last time we had complete figures from the Border Patrol and from the Department of Homeland Security, only 56 illegals were apprehended trying to get into Maine, which has to tell you that there are not a whole lot of people from Nova Scotia who are trying to come over here and take hockey jobs. In fact, I have to think they probably looked at them as tourists.

But if you look down here in the area in blue, the Tucson, Arizona, sector, which is only part of Arizona—it's not the entire State of Arizona—in the last 2 years for which we have complete data, 51 percent, or a quarter of a million people, came through Arizona. In fact, 51 percent of all of the people who illegally came into the United States and who were apprehended came through the Tucson, Arizona, sector and were apprehended in the Tucson, Arizona, sector. This has to bring about the simple question of why.

Why is this part of Arizona the obvious entrance of choice of those trying to get into this country illegally? I really think the answer lies in the next chart.

This is the borderland along our southern border. The black line is 100 miles from the border, which is, by definition, both by statute and judicial decision, the legal jurisdiction of our Border Patrol. The area in red is the area that is owned by the Federal Government in those areas. You'll see that that specific area of Arizona—almost 80 percent of that—is owned by the Federal Government. That's almost 21 million acres of land owned by the Federal Government, which is in sharp contrast to, say, the Texas border and especially the northern border. Of that roughly 21 million acres, an area the size of the States of Connecticut and Delaware combined is wilderness area, and that doesn't include also areas that are endangered species habitats.