

health insurance premiums not to be paid for by we, the taxpayer and the citizens of the State of Georgia, my great State. And then it was extended with the passage of ObamaCare to say that, through the year 2013, these States could not do that.

□ 1950

Well, what's happened is, I've got some statistics. And just to quote from the National Governors' Association report, "States are facing a collective \$175 billion budget shortfall through 2013" in large part because of this maintenance of effort requirement under Medicaid, that they're not allowed to make sure that the people on the Medicaid program are the ones that need to be there, the most needy that can't afford—their children can't afford health care. And now these rolls are sort of set in stone until the year 2013. And in many cases, Mr. Speaker, they include childless adults, childless adults who maybe were eligible to get on the program at a point where their income was very low or maybe they were out of work. But now, shouldn't the Governors be allowed—at least on an annual basis, if not every 6 months—to look at those rolls and make sure that the dollars for health care are going to the folks that really need it and their children? That's what the Medicaid program was all about when it was started as an amendment to the Social Security Act back in 1965.

So I wanted to mention that. It may have already been talked about earlier. My colleagues in the Doctors Caucus of the House know of what they speak with regard to health care. There are a lot of other issues in Medicaid. But I thought, in particular, I would want to discuss that.

But in conclusion, on this point, if allowing a State to improve its enrollment and its verification system saves enough money to keep our children's education program intact and the safety of its citizens, with regard to police and fire protection, intact, then why wouldn't we support this change? Why wouldn't we repeal this maintenance of effort?

If giving Governors the ability to manage their own Medicaid programs prevents drastic cuts to education or job creation programs, why in the world would we not support that? The only reason I can think of would be to force, under ObamaCare, more and more people into the Medicaid program, where the States have to eventually do that FMAP and that sharing of the cost because, otherwise, they would be in the exchanges, and the subsidies, as we know, go up to 400 percent of the Federal poverty level. It's all part of this grand scheme to eventually have national health insurance, Medicare for all, if you will, and it's got to stop.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank my colleague, the obstetrician from Georgia, who points out that on the graph, as the gentleman from Louisiana showed before, Medicaid expenditures now exceed

K-12 education. And as the other chart we've seen shows, we're over at the left-hand side. It will only get worse over time.

I yield to the obstetrician from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wanted to make one point on this new Congressional Budget Office score that was provided today. And I know some people are looking at that and saying the cost for the program, for the Affordable Care Act over the next 10 years, was only scored I think at \$1.16 trillion—if I can use the words "only" and "trillion" together in a sentence.

But what many people overlook is that the Congressional Budget Office must score under existing law. And one of the things that existing law does is it cuts physician reimbursement in Medicare by 35 percent on December 31 of this year. So add another \$300 billion to \$400 billion to that cost just for the so-called sustainable growth rate formula, which has not yet been repealed.

Now we will fix that before the end of the year for at least 1 more year. But the Congressional Budget Office has no way of scoring that. They must go with existing law.

And, of course, with the Independent Payment Advisory Board, the same thing applies. They have to think that those cuts that the Independent Payment Advisory Board is programmed to produce, that they are going to continue occur.

The other thing the Congressional Budget Office cannot easily estimate is the number of people who will be moved off employer-sponsored insurance onto the State exchanges or the Federal exchange. And that is a difficult number to know. The MacKenzie Corporation said it was going to be 30 percent. The Deloitte corporation has said 10 percent. We don't know what that number is. CBO is scoring that at a very low 1 to 2 percent because historically, that is the average of the erosion of employer-sponsored insurance.

Those points are important to remember in looking at these figures.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank my colleagues for their participation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

#### AMERICAN JOBS AND HEALTH CARE

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, thank you for the privilege. And thank you, to my colleagues in the Republican Doctors Caucus, for a most interesting but factually incorrect 45 minutes of debate here.

We really were going to spend this evening talking about jobs and about the American Jobs Act and one of the

great "woulda, coulda, shoulda's" of our time. But we're going to hold that for just a few moments, though, because there are a few things that really need to be discussed from the last half-hour.

First of all, most of the discussion was about Medicaid. That's a national program in which the Federal Government pays about 50 percent—it varies State to State, but roughly 50 percent of the cost of providing medical services to the poor, women, and children in the States.

Now the debate was most interesting in that the argument was that there would be a lack of access and simultaneously an argument that there were no cost controls. Yet if you were listening to our esteemed colleagues, you would have heard them say, The doctors are not paid enough.

I think if they're not paid enough, and the doctors want to get paid more in order to provide services, then the costs are going to go up. So the cost control argument here doesn't make a whole lot of sense. If you want to keep the costs down, you need to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the system.

Certainly certain services within the Medicaid and Medi-Cal, as we call it in California, are not paid sufficiently. Some other services are paid more than enough. So you need to balance that up over time. And all of these programs are run by the States. It's really the State that decides what the reimbursement rate is going to be. The Federal Government then matches the State's contribution.

So the argument really didn't make a whole lot of sense. And even more so, in the Ryan Republican budget, which has passed this House twice now, there is a significant reduction in the educational services for doctors so that the money that we, all Americans, spend to educate doctors—particularly in that part of the program, both the basic education and then in the residency programs—the Ryan Republican budget significantly reduces the amount of money available for residency programs for family care practices, for the very basic programs that we all want to access.

□ 2000

For family care, for basic care, that money is reduced. You go, wait a minute, that doesn't make any sense. If you are down here on the floor arguing that there is an insufficient number of doctors and they are not paid enough, then don't argue at the same time that it is too expensive and there are not enough cost controls; and please don't argue that there are not enough doctors because, in fact, the Affordable Care Act expanded the number of residencies for very basic care, for the family practice programs. I'm not quite sure I understand what they are arguing.

In addition to that, access across this Nation for millions and millions of people is provided in clinics. These are the

community clinics that a large population attend for their basic services, and most of those are the Medi-Cal or Medicaid population and the very poor that are not yet enrolled in what will be the expanded ObamaCares—the ObamaCares program.

So what do the Republicans offer us?

The Ryan Republican budget would cut by more than a third the support for the clinics, closing thousands of clinics across the Nation and in my State where people get access. So please do not come down here on the floor and argue for an hour or half an hour that access is being delayed when on the one hand you are cutting the money for access. That's what the Ryan Republican budget does. It cuts the money for access by reducing the residencies and reducing access to clinics by cutting by more than a third the money that is there to build up the clinics, the community clinics where people get care.

I'm going to take a deep breath here because I don't want to get wound up too tight about this issue, and I want to ask my colleague from New York, Mr. PAUL TONKO, to talk about the Medicare aspects of this.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely. We didn't hear too much about what would be lost in their cuts or repeal of the Affordable Care Act. Representative GARAMENDI, you are absolutely right, there is much that has been gained by the American population, health consumers across this Nation, with the efforts of the Affordable Care Act, to close the doughnut hole, to make prescription drugs more affordable for our pharmaceutical consumers out there, for seniors who require this medication, their prescription drugs to stay well or to stay alive. Far too many were balancing their household budget by reducing their intake of prescriptions advised by their medical community. That is immoral. It's unnecessary and has been addressed by the Affordable Care Act. So 5.3 million seniors today are drawing \$3.7 billion in benefits. That is something that could be taken away if the Republican majority in the House of Representatives had its way.

Now, this is a wellness aspect. This is part of a formula that allows people to be cured, to be healed, to be allowed to live with a quality of life that then addresses their very needs. And so I think it's necessary to point out what would be taken away from the benefits already offered, and there are more to come. But as we know, they're staged. They are rolled into the operations of reform over the next several years. But suffice it to say, the screenings, the annual checkup, flu shots that are made available without cost, no copayment, no coinsurance, no deductible is required here. These are huge benefits to every age demographic that are offered through the Affordable Care Act.

And so we heard about adding to the cost curve of health care. We have heard about repealing the Affordable

Care Act. We have heard about taking away the benefits that have just recently arrived at the door steps of health consumers across this great Nation. And why would you want to play politics with the very fabric of quality of life of the people that we represent collectively by undoing progress? This is a recurring theme. They want to undo Social Security that has a 76-year-old history. They want to voucher out Medicare that came to us in the mid-1960s that addressed the economic stability, the predictability of senior households and the quality of life in those households. Why would you want to take that progress away?

It is heart wrenching to listen to some of this insensitive, callous dialogue on the House floor that really renders the public that we are here to serve without benefits that have just recently arrived through the success of the Affordable Care Act.

Representative GARAMENDI, it is something that I think needs to be echoed out there from this House floor and shared with the constituents of this great Nation in a way that allows them to better understand what is part and parcel of the Affordable Care Act, a monumental piece of success. Is it perfect? No. We aimed for perfection, we struck with progress. But there is many, many a benefit that is part of the Affordable Care Act, and we are witnessing an all-out attempt by the Republican majority to turn that success into failure.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Let me pick up on that, Mr. TONKO. You are quite correct, it is not just an attempt. There have been 33 votes on this floor by the Republican majority to either terminate completely or to eviscerate in part the Affordable Health Care Act. Now, what would be eviscerated?

First of all, the Ryan Republican budget would terminate Medicare as we know it and give to every American who is not yet 55 years of age a coupon that basically says this coupon is worth 70 percent of the cost of insurance. Go get your insurance when you become 65 from a private insurance company. No longer would Medicare be available to all of those people who will eventually be 65. And for those people who are 55 to 65, it makes it impossible for Medicare to go forward on a financial basis because it takes away the younger people.

I heard something on the floor which I just said—wait a minute—some statistic that was tossed out here just a few moments ago that more people die on Medicare than die on regular insurance. Yes, Medicare is for the elderly. Medicare is for the elderly. Yes, they do get medical care but eventually they get old; and I will, too, be on Medicare, and I will die on Medicare. And I am so grateful to have Medicare available to me when I become 65 because I know that I have a solid insurance program. I know that I'll be covered, and I know that my younger brother and sister will be covered when

they become 65. They will have quality care. And guess what, they will die on Medicare. Yup, that happens. You're on Medicare for the rest of your life. It may be for a year. It may be for 30 years. But for whatever, you've got a guaranteed benefit that is available to you.

And what do you lose if the Ryan Republican budget and the effort to repeal Medicare is lost? Well, let's see. Nearly 13 million Americans will benefit from \$1.1 billion in rebates from their private insurance companies that are presently overcharging them. Hmm. And 86 million Americans, including 54 million Americans on private policies and 32 million Americans that are on Medicare, will lose their free preventive services.

Now, you want to reduce the cost of health care, then you've got to make sure that people stay healthy as long as possible. And how do you do that? Blood pressure. You want to deal with blood pressure, okay, it is very cheap, if you get your medicine. But you have to find out about it, so you need that free checkup. Diabetes, stroke, all of those things can be delayed and often prevented if you know it's coming. So what are we talking, 32 million seniors will no longer have a free checkup, preventive services.

In August, just a week from now, women will begin receiving free coverage for comprehensive women's preventive services—pap smears, breast cancer checkups. You want to repeal that? That's what the Republicans have voted 33 times to do—repeal the free checkups for women in America.

105 million Americans will have a lifetime limit once again. Today, they do not have a limit.

□ 2010

So if you're 30 years old, you have a private insurance policy and you get cancer, you'll hit that lifetime limit immediately. Not under the ObamaCares program. In that program, there are no lifetime limits, and you will continue to receive the medical benefits.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI.

One of the things you talked about with the influence or the focus on women's health care reminds me of the preexisting conditions that are precluded now as a rationale for denying insurance. And "preexisting" might mean, in youth, asthma; in our senior population, emphysema or cancer recovery or cancer struggle.

But it can also mean in a gender-related bias—being a woman. That is used as a preexisting condition. Being a woman is a preexisting condition. So the benefits to women, as you outlined in the direct services, the screenings, the mammograms and the like, are a portion. The other portion is just being born a woman can deny you insurance.

So, when you talk about the 30 cents on the dollar that the voucher would carry for the Medicare recipient, and

they're asked to go shop, this is saying that compared to today's standards, it's the senior digging much deeper into her pocket. It's the senior digging into another pocket to be able to afford his Medicare voucher portion. And that's unacceptable. That is playing to a special interest.

That's what I believe the espoused virtue of this deny, this repeal, is about. It's about playing to special interests that don't want to be told that there's a transition here, that there's a new day in America for health care consumers, and that the heart has been poured into this to be more sensitive, to address a moral compass that this Nation has always uniquely embraced, that we are a compassionate society, that we are going to make a difference out there, and that we are solutions bound.

That's what the Affordable Care Act was about: presenting a new approach to health care, providing more freedom and opportunity to our seniors and to our children.

If you're 26 and under, you can stay on your parents' policy. These are the formulae for success that allow us to go forward with much more dignity, much more success, cost containment, affordability, and accessibility. These are the dynamics of reform.

Why would you repeal something here other than to respond to special interests?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, exactly so. For 8 years in the early nineties and then in 2000, I was the insurance commissioner in California. I wish I had this law because I could have held the insurance companies responsible.

Now, my attitude about them is they always put profit before people. However, the Affordable Care Act has what we call the Patient's Bill of Rights, and this is the insurance discrimination that is eliminated by this law. And you spoke of a couple of these issues.

Discrimination against a woman simply because they're a woman. They have an existing condition. They're a woman. They could get pregnant. So the insurance companies would not cover or they would charge more. Those days are over.

Also, a young child, there are about 17 million children in America with preexisting conditions that can no longer be discriminated against by the insurance company. They have to be able to get insurance from an insurance company, 17 million children, one of whom is the son of my chief of staff, born with kidney failure. He had insurance the day he was born. He immediately lost insurance because he had kidney failure, and today, as soon as he leaves his parents' policy, which he's able to get now under the law because they cannot discriminate against children, he will be able to continue to get insurance. Under the old law, repeal the ObamaCares law and he will be denied insurance because there is an end to the Patient's Bill of Rights.

The Patient's Bill of Rights guarantees that insurance discrimination is over.

So what do they want here? What do the Republicans want from Americans? A big question.

Apparently, they want more money for the doctors, and that's certainly necessary in some cases.

Apparently, they say they want government out of health care. Does that mean end Medicare? Apparently, yes, because the Republicans have voted twice on this floor to end Medicare as we know it. You'll get a voucher. You will not have guaranteed coverage, and you will have to go out and shop for it yourself.

Apparently, they don't want community clinics because they've already voted on this floor to cut about one-third of the community clinics in this Nation.

Apparently, they talk about access, but at the same time they refuse to fund the residencies for family care, for the basic health care providers that we need in our hospitals and in our communities.

And apparently, they want to eliminate the Patient's Bill of Rights.

This is not a formula for America's health care.

Now, we also heard on this floor a few minutes ago, a half hour, 45 minutes ago, that the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office said that because the Supreme Court eliminated the mandate that States have to provide more Medicaid coverage there would be fewer insured. True. That's true. Texas has refused to increase its Medicaid program. Well, that is Texas' decision, and I'm sure the Governor and legislature will have to address that.

But the fact here is that the Medicaid coverage actually provides the opportunity for some 17 million Americans to get insurance that do not now have insurance. If we provide the clinics, if we provide the residencies for the doctors who would be able to care for them, they will have access.

I can assure you that if we also do the preventative services, we will see a decline in the number of severe cases. People will not get so sick that they have to go to the emergency room. They'll get care early. And with the drugs that are necessary, they'll be able to avoid the very expensive illnesses. That's to all of our benefit. You mentioned vaccinations. These are all ways of reducing costs.

So here we are, once again, debating something that is now the law, that is proven, proven to provide services to Americans, whether they are seniors or whether they are young, whether they are children. It works, and it's working for America today.

Mr. TONKO. Well, if I might ask the gentleman from California if he would yield.

I believe there's a whole lot of political posturing going on with the Medicaid decision by States. We are hearing a lot of talk about, well, we are not

going to pay for that portion because, while it may be 100 percent in the near future, it may go to 90 percent in the long-distance future, and they don't want to pay anything for the new installments of the Medicaid plan.

Well, today we are paying. It's not like it's against an absolute that costs nothing. If you have the poor uninsured, underinsured in any given State, there's indigent care. There is bad debt and charity that is addressed in ratepayer dollars for insurance coverage's sake because that is going to be incorporated into the overall actuarial plan, or you're paying it through taxpayer dollars and for a much more inefficient system.

To have the poor, uninsured, and underinsured go to emergency rooms visiting a different doctor team every time they visit that emergency room, or perhaps a different emergency room, to not provide the stable, standardized care, acceptable notions of how to provide a predictable outcome, you're going to pay needlessly and wastefully. This is about networking people to a system that provides a stability, a standard that will enable them to have a clinic, have a contract that will cover them and make certain that all of us are strengthened by it.

And guess what. The business community, we talk about competitiveness. We talk about a sharp competitive edge for America's business communities as they enter into the international sweepstakes on winning contracts. That translates into providing jobs and profitability for our business community. Well, part of their cost of doing business is to have health care for their workers. Many want the health care coverage for their workers but simply cannot afford it.

So the exchange opportunities that are part of the package of the Affordable Care Act enables them to cut their cost. It's taking their experience, their actuarial experience of 10, 15, 20 workers in that small business and putting them in a pool of millions of workers.

□ 2020

That enables them to shave the peaks and enables them to take those catastrophic situations. One person in their plan of 10 impacted by catastrophic situations can cause their premiums as a company and the copayments of their workers to skyrocket. But if they're enabled to join this pooled effort, it provides for a better outcome for everybody.

So there is wisdom and thoughtfulness poured into the reform elements of the Affordable Care Act. And it's done again with that American heart, that spirit, that sense of compassion for the worker, the sensitivity toward the employer, and putting together a package that has everyone responded to in a way that speaks to a long-overdue bit of success. The last industrialized nation, Representative GARAMENDI, to go toward a guaranteed health plan.

So, long overdue. And now to taste success and have it pulled away from the American health care consumers of this great Nation is a very troubling notion.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, Mr. TONKO, thank you very much.

Next Monday, did you know, next Monday is the annual birthday of Medicare? Next Monday. It went into effect in 1965, and ever since, as you said earlier, Republicans have been trying to terminate it. They tried again this year, but the American public knows better. They know that they want to live long enough to get to Medicare because in Medicare they have a guaranteed benefit. They know that wherever you are in the United States, whether you are in Vermont or in California, you have the same quality policy that will cover most of what you need. If you want more, you can go out and buy that, that's called the Advantage program. And you get to choose your program.

It's not a government takeover at all. In fact, it is a financing mechanism so that every senior in America can choose their own provider. They get to choose their provider. They can go wherever they want to go to get their medical services. And if they don't like their doctor, they can change.

So the government is not saying where you can go. In fact, the government is financing the system so you can choose whatever provider you want to choose. It is a common policy across the Nation. It is efficient and it is effective, and the Republicans are trying to destroy it. We won't let that happen. Bottom line, we will not let that happen. And there are serious cost containments in the current Medicare program and in the Affordable Care Act.

I'm just going to end with this, and then we really need to get to what we wanted to talk about, which were the job programs.

The Congressional Budget Office today estimated that the Affordable Care Act, over the next 10 years, will reduce the deficit by \$109 billion. In the 20 years going out, because of the cost containment in this system, the Affordable Care Act will reduce the deficit by over \$1 trillion. Now, that's worth engaging. That's worth us doing. And simultaneously provide far better health care to Americans and far better access to health care wherever they may need it across this Nation. It's a good thing.

When they want to stand up here and say ObamaCare, I'm going, you're right, Obama cares—cares deeply about the very health of every single American. That's why the Affordable Care Act is in place today, was found to be constitutional, does reduce the deficit, and does provide quality health care and choice of where you want to get your medical care.

Mr. TONKO. My colleague from California just indicated that there would be a favorable deficit outcome because of the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Exactly.

Mr. TONKO. Well, what else reduces the deficit? Putting people to work. Putting people to work, the American Jobs Act. Plain and simple: It's about addressing the deficit and providing for the dignity of work and the enhancement of services that strengthens the fabric of our communities, our States, our Nation. So, the American Jobs Act, according to experts, is a phenomenal plan.

We've heard the Republicans say we have some 30 bills that are about growing the economy and producing jobs when, in fact, when put under the test, when reviewed by some very sound organizations out there and professional economists and analysts, they said it would do precious nothing. That it was not the formula. It's not what the doctor called for, if we can stay on that health-care related theme. But the American Jobs Act, well, listen to some of the experts.

The chief economist at Moody's Analytics—who, by the way, Mark Zandi, was the former economic advisor for Senator JOHN MCCAIN—what does he theorize? That anywhere from 1.9 million to 2 million jobs would be the outcome of the American Jobs Act, something that not only produces the jobs, but would reduce the unemployment rate by at least 1 percentage point. That's a major significant factor.

What also happens is that, when you produce those 2 million jobs, you're addressing the GDP by at least 2 percentage points. Growth in the GDP, reduction in the unemployment, reducing the deficit, putting people to work, strengthening the economy, providing purchasing power at a time when businesses are saying the best thing you can do: Get us customers. A healthy economy, putting people into the work mode creates customers. It creates purchasing power. It creates a strength in the economy. Two million jobs.

How can we walk away from a proposal? Oh, I know why: Because there were those who spoke before cameras reaching all of America saying anything this President offers, we won't do; our goal is to make him a one-term President. My friends, that is putting partisan politics—petty, partisan politics ahead of the interests, the better interests of the American public.

Where is that American spirit? Where is that sense of patriotism? Where is that sense of responsibility, of leadership in this House and in the U.S. Senate that needs to go forward with the American Jobs Act?

Representative GARAMENDI, I know we've been joined by another colleague. It is just great to share this hour with you to talk about the progress we can taste that would lift every community in this great Nation.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I was reading one of the Hill magazines—often called the Hill rags—and they said that the Speaker of this House starts off his weekly press conference by asking: Where are the jobs? Well, the jobs, Mr.

Speaker, were proposed last September by President Obama—the American Jobs Act. Two million jobs minimum could have been created. This is one of the great woulda, coulda, shoulda's of our time. We could have had people back to work today, and in doing so reducing the deficit.

There are so many different pieces of this. Mr. Speaker, the American Jobs Act are where the jobs are. You talked about a piece of it. I'm going to just pick up one more. This is one that speaks to the American homes, what's going on in the house where we live. Many of those homes are run down, they have problems with insulation, or they don't have any insulation at all. They leak energy. Well, the President proposed, as a piece of the American Jobs Act, that we could provide construction jobs, really, low-skilled construction jobs, in rehabilitating the American homes. This is not a new concept. This has been going on for some time. It's been used repeatedly to upgrade homes in the United States and simultaneously save energy and save dollars for the American public. One piece of it, construction jobs, could have been put in place.

I'm going to pick up another one, and then I'm going to turn it back to you, Mr. TONKO. My daughter is a teacher, my son-in-law is a teacher. They've seen their class size just grow from 20, 22 to some 32 people in the class. Now, this is a serious problem for the teacher, making it more difficult to provide the quality teaching that's necessary. My daughter is a great teacher, my son-in-law is too, but it's much more difficult. The class size has increased by a third.

The American Jobs Act would have put 280,000 teachers back into the classroom. Now, if you happen to be a second-grader and you're not getting what you need to learn, then that's going to carry on through the remaining years of your schooling. And so 280,000 teachers could have been brought back into the classroom had the American Jobs Act passed.

□ 2030

Mr. TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. Yes, they are both significant bits of legislation, so it's good to interlace the American Jobs Act and the Affordable Care Act.

To the 280,000 teachers, I think it's very easy to state that the human infrastructure in our school systems across this Nation are a critical component to quality education, that personal relationship of students to teacher, the exercise of self-discovery—who am I, what are my gifts, what are my talents, what are my passions. That is exercised in the classroom. That is a spirit that prevails. It's a magic that happens in the classroom and that sense of self-discovery.

Part of our goal here is not only to enable these students to understand who they are, to draw forth the soul of the individual; it's to provide the opportunity for our workforce of the future.

That fourth-grader, hypothetically, that was impacted by class size or the lack of a teacher for certain subject areas, that's something that child will never gain again. What you lose in that given year is lost throughout the development. And it is important for us to make certain that every bit of opportunity, every bit of learning experience is granted our children so that they understand where they can best contribute to society, where their gifts can be utilized.

And it's part of that development of the workforce of the future, the workforce of the present, training, retraining dollars, that are part of the American Jobs Act, absolutely a critical piece of the infrastructure.

And the tens of thousands—this chart will say retain thousands of police officers and firefighters. We know it's tens of thousands across this Nation. An element of public safety, a quality-of-life component, making certain that our core communities have the given workforce of firefighters, of police officers that will enable us to respond to public safety measures.

These are a core bit of principle, along with veterans that would be hired with benefits that are significant. That element was done under pressure, under scrutiny, under growing public sentiment. But think of what could happen if we did all of these and did even additional services with our veterans who are returning home and are in need of employment.

These are the factors, these are the dynamics that are introduced through AJA, the American Jobs Act, that would allow for the deficit to be addressed and at the same time to have services responded to, essential services.

We've talked about the belt-tightening, addressing waste and inefficiency and outmoded programs and fraud. And after we capture those savings from that exercise, it's important, I believe, to slide that into an investment zone so that the result is cut where you can, so as to invest where we must.

The investment, absolutely critical. The investment in jobs, the investment in teachers, firefighters, public safety elements, our police officers, our veterans community, and items like an infrastructure bank bill, an infrastructure that we'll talk about in the remaining minutes of this Special Order.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, let me just pick up a little more on the education. The most important investment any society will ever make is the education of their children and the re-education of their workforce.

In the American Jobs Act there are the 280,000 teachers that would have been in the classroom this entire year. They're not there today because there's been no movement on this floor to even debate in committee, let alone take up a vote on this floor, the American Jobs Act.

Also, many of the schools across America are run down. Their labora-

tories, their classrooms are antiquated. They don't have air conditioning, many, many other problems. The American Jobs Act provided money for 35,000 schools across the United States to be upgraded, to be rehabilitated so that 250,000 jobs would have been created right there.

Before we go any further, I know you're all worried, oh, it's going to increase the deficit. The American Jobs Act would increase the deficit. No, it would not.

Mr. TONKO, you spoke earlier about when people go to work, the economy gets going, money is circulated, taxes are paid.

The other part of it is, the American Jobs Act was fully paid for by ending unnecessary tax subsidies to companies that don't need it, specifically the oil industry. The wealthiest industry in the world would lose its tax breaks that amount to over \$16 billion, and that money would come back to pay for Americans going back to work.

There are other things. The top end tax, at the very top end, the wealthiest 2 percent would see their taxes go back to where they were during the Clinton period. This is how the American Jobs Act was going to be paid for.

Mr. TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. I think it's interesting too because we're talking about the jobs created that impact the unemployment rate, that impact the reduction of the deficit.

In contrast, the Ryan budget, which we've talked about many times, the Republican plan for this House, that's been adopted by Republicans that are in leadership and running for President, would, in contrast, according to the Economic Policy Institute, the cuts in services would result in a reduction of 1.3 million jobs in the first year and 2.8 million jobs in the second year.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Excuse me, 4.1 million jobs total.

Mr. TONKO. So when you contrast that, that cut in jobs, the cuts that would be part of the Republican budget plan, adopted by this House, would grow the deficit because if we're arguing that employment reduces the deficit, unemployment, in contrast to the American Jobs Act, would drive up the deficit. It's going back to the failed policies of the past.

We've fought two wars that were never put on budget. We offered trillions in tax cuts that we couldn't afford, and we avoided talking about paying for the war. Did we think there wasn't going to be a crash?

Did we think that that behavior wouldn't come with a price?

Of course it had to extract a price from the American society, and it was the loss of 8.2 million jobs; it was the loss of as many as 800,000 jobs a month. It was about bringing America's economy to its knees and draining trillions of dollars from households that trusted that their investment with the private sector, with the financial industry was

going to return them lucrative dividends.

We saw the failure of those policies. Why would we go back down that road, which seems to be what the Republican plan, the Republican budget, is all about?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Excuse me for interrupting, but if you look at the Ryan Republican budget, it would cut education and other services by 33 percent. So instead of investing in our children, investing in re-educating and helping our workforce learn new skills, they would cut it by 33 percent.

In transportation, the Ryan Republican budget would cut transportation funding by 25 percent, even when we know that our infrastructure gets a D because of potholes, because the bridges are failing. So why would you cut the transportation budget by 25 percent?

If you want to put Americans back to work, you don't do it that way.

And you did talk about Moody Analytics already. It doesn't work.

Now, I'm going to just pick up one more thing. I'm on the House Armed Services Committee, and we heard testimony last week from the CEO of Lockheed Martin, and the CEO of EADS, and also from two other witnesses. And they said this: you cut the budget for defense, and you're going to lay off 2 million people. That's part of the sequestration.

So here you have the top CEOs of America's big huge companies saying don't cut the budget because you are going to lay Americans off. You're going to lose up to 2 million jobs.

And yet for the last 2 years, our Republican friends have been trying to cut the budget. Not in defense, but in everything else, arguing that that will somehow create jobs.

□ 2040

However, testimony received last week from the CEOs of three large American corporations and one smaller corporation said categorically, If you cut the budget, we'll lay people off—creating unemployment.

The American Jobs Act puts people back to work, and it is fully paid for.

Mr. TONKO. Earlier, I think you had made mention of modernizing our schools and that part of the American Jobs Act includes the investment in the revitalizing of our schools, some 35,000 schools across this Nation. The statistics are there. People document, historically, what investments in refurbishing our schools have meant. For every \$1 billion of investment, we can grow some 9,000 to 10,000 jobs. That's the start of the story. So what we have here, the modernization of schools, would create some 250,000 jobs. As I said, that's just the start of the story.

What happens after that?

Maintenance costs and operating costs are reduced because you might have energy efficiency embraced in that restructuring. You'll have better, more efficient weather-type situations,

more comfortable situations for students in which to learn, which is important.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, you might actually have bathrooms that work. You might actually have a place where kids would want to be. You'll have a school that has a decent paint job, air conditioning. Kids would want to be in that school. Yet we have schools across this Nation where you wouldn't want to be and I wouldn't want to be, and I certainly wouldn't want my kids in that classroom.

Mr. TONKO. They're typical danger zones with ceilings falling and poorly upheld infrastructure.

The jobs—the absolute jobs of a 250,000 count—would benefit, again, the economy. These operating costs are reduced, and they theorize that it could be in the neighborhood of \$100,000 a year. Now, think of what you can do locally with that. That might mean two teachers, or it might mean 200 more computers, or it might mean 5,000 textbooks. It's a way to invest by balancing those savings with the investment in children—in our future and our present—because our children represent our future and our present. It is a respect toward our children.

These are, I think, in keeping with the old American spirit—the pioneer spirit—to enable us to dream bold dreams and to encourage our youngsters to pursue these career paths and to develop, again, the workforce of the new millennium, in which we are going to be asked to compete in a global marketplace where there are investments going on around the world. Now is not the time to cut our commitment to our children and to our society and our competitiveness as a business community. So it all comes together in a very structured sense, in a very comprehensive plan.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, there is one additional piece to this puzzle, and that is that the Democrats have been putting forth for the last 2 years a project which we call Make It in America. This is the rebuilding of the American manufacturing sector. Twenty-five years ago, there were just under 20 million Americans employed in manufacturing. These were the middle class jobs. Now there are just over 11 million. We've seen the hollowing out—we've seen the outsourcing—of American manufacturing jobs.

There were actually policies in place before the Democrats in 2010 took control of this and ended tax breaks for American corporations that outsourced jobs. They actually were able to reduce their taxes by sending jobs overseas. We ended about \$12 billion of those crazy, unnecessary, destructive tax breaks. Now the President has suggested that we put in place the remaining \$4 billion. End those tax breaks, which is ending the rewarding of companies for outsourcing jobs. Turn it around and reward companies for insourcing, for bringing those jobs back home.

I have a piece of legislation that we've been working on, and it's actually getting some legs and moving along. It's part of Make It in America. Our tax dollars have been used in the past to buy foreign-made solar systems, wind turbines, trains, buses, light rail vehicles. My legislation says, if it's our tax money, then, by golly, it's going to be spent on American-made equipment, bringing our tax dollars home so that we buy American, so that we Make It in America once again. When we Make It in America, America will make it.

Mr. TONKO, I know that you are also into this with some pieces of legislation that you have, and maybe you'll want to talk about those. We can rebuild the American middle class by rebuilding America's manufacturing base. That's where you create wealth. Maybe it's in the food services. Maybe it's in the manufacturing of wine or in the manufacturing of food or automobiles or light rails or solar systems. We can do it, but we need to have in place smart government policies.

I beg my Republican colleagues to take a look at this. Don't just assume it's a Democratic idea. Make this an American idea, a Democrat and Republican idea, to change our policies so that we can rebuild the American middle class by making things in America once again.

Mr. TONKO. A couple of things come to mind legislatively.

What about investing, as the AJA does, in community colleges—the campus of choice across this Nation? The associate degree is a very important, valuable bit of material to have in one's hand. We are going to rely heavily on those associate degrees, and community colleges need our assistance. They are also there as the operational center of training and retraining programs.

What about investments in technology? investments in research? investments in alternative energy supplies that give us an opportunity to grow independent?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Excuse me for interrupting.

Before you came to the House of Representatives, that was your work in New York, wasn't it?

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely.

I was energy chair at the State assembly for the last 15 of my 25 years in the legislature, but then went over as president and CEO with NYSERDA, the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority. We made it our goal to advance research, to make certain that we would incubate these ideas—these innovations, the cutting-edge technology—that translate into jobs. Research equals jobs.

I have advanced legislation that would slide subsidies that are given to the historically profit-rich in the tenure of capitalism—our goal here is to not feed the profit margin of our oil companies—over to cutting-edge technology, renewables, providing for con-

sumer behavioral transitioning that enables us to grow American independence in the energy generation business.

Why are we sending tens and hundreds of billions of dollars over to unfriendly nations to the United States for our dependency on fossil-based fuels when, in fact, we can encourage renewables here and energy efficiency, utilizing that as our fuel of choice to make certain that we reduce demand that then reduces bills that then allows the competitiveness of our businesses to be all the sharper? Those are the sorts of things in which we want to invest, and it's the going forward from that point.

How about our infrastructure bank bill that would leverage public and private monies and that would stretch our opportunities to respond to that deficient infrastructure of which you spoke? These are important measures. This is the sort of cutting-edge opportunity—the investment, the pioneer spirit again.

We can learn from our American story. There have been those golden moments when we have hit bottom. There were those golden moments when we were tremendously challenged and when we rose to the occasion in tough times, primarily tough times, by responding with a tough agenda that said, look, true grit here will get us to the finish line—and it happened. It happened with Medicare. It happened with the Erie Canal, of which we often speak.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Social Security.

Mr. TONKO. Again, Social Security. You're absolutely right.

The President lifted this Nation, and he made certain that all families would have at least a foundation upon which they could grow, upon which they could live in this society. It addressed the dignity factor, which has made us unique as an American society: caring about our fellow man, caring about the men and women of this great Nation in a way that created an American society, a sense of community—we the people—talking of us in a community sense, a neighborliness, neighborhoods and societies speaking in a compassionate way, caring about one another. That's when we're at our best.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If we're going to really be caring about the American worker going back to work, we also need to be very cognizant of international competition.

You spoke earlier about the need for our workforce to be competitive, which is the education process—K-12, vocational education, community colleges. They're exceedingly important. Also important is that there be fairness in the international trade situation, that we look not just for free trade but fair trade.

One of the things that we really must address is the threat of China's unfair trade practices. The Chinese currency is undervalued; and as a result of that, they have a 20 to 25 percent advantage.



□ 2050

You eliminate that, and the American worker will be competitive.

We have one of the pieces of legislation in the Make It In America package that the Democrats are putting forward which is forcing China to end its currency manipulation. When it ends its currency manipulation and allows the value of its currency to rise to appropriate parity, we will be able to be competitive. You can bet why the Chinese don't want to do it. They want that unfair trade advantage. That's one of the pieces of legislation that we put forward.

When the Democrats controlled Congress a year and a half ago, we pushed a bill out of here that would force sanctions on China if they continued their currency manipulation. Since the Republicans have taken control of the House of Representatives, that legislation has died, has never even come up for a vote on the floor. It ought to come up for a vote. We need fair trade practices.

We need to use our tax money to buy American-made equipment and supplies. We need to educate our workforces. These are investments in the American middle class. This is how we can restore the middle class of America. Health care is part of it also.

You talked earlier about health care and the availability of health care for working men and women. We also need to make sure that those jobs are there.

The American automobile industry is instructive on this count. It is instructive in that the U.S. Government and the leadership of President Obama actually allowed the American automotive industry to continue to even survive. Using the stimulus program, the President stepped forward and said, I will not allow the American automotive industry to die, and he put our tax money behind General Motors and Chrysler. Those companies are now thriving. And it's not just those companies. It is the thousands upon thousands of manufacturers across this Nation and others who supply all of the parts and all of the services. Think where we would be today if Congress had not given the President the power and if this President did not have the courage to take up saving the American automobile industry.

Presidential politics come here. Mr. Romney says he would not have done it. Okay. President Obama did it, and the American automobile industry is strong and vibrant today, and the American middle class is back to work.

Mr. TONKO, we must be about out of time.

Mr. TONKO. Yes, we're down to our last 4 minutes.

I always find these discussions to be interesting because there's all this rhetoric out there about 30 bills that have been advanced by the majority in the House and that it's the salvation that's going to produce jobs and get America working again.

Major analysts have reviewed that legislative agenda and said it doesn't

do what they contend it will do. It doesn't produce the results. We would love that to be the case, but it doesn't produce the result. They said that we are really in need of legislation that will advance jobs.

Tonight, this discussion about providing the tools, putting additional tools into the kit that makes American industry competitive, speaks to our humble beginnings. So many people travel to these shores. Their journey was about the dream, a noble dream, an American Dream that they were going to make it here. That was our humble beginning, and we enabled people to experience the rags-to-riches scenario. We allowed for generations to continue to grow and prosper and build upon the success that preceded them.

Today, sadly, our middle class is weakening household income-wise. The next generation may be the first to go backward. The President is trying to move us forward, with great resistance in this House to reject progressive policies.

We say: Let's build upon the success of the past. Let's reach to those shining moments when we were challenged as a nation and produce the best outcomes. That can happen again here if we open up to what's best for America and not resort to petty partisan politics that want to deny a Presidency, that want to deny opposition that comes forward with constructive qualities to do it in a better way, to build the consensus.

We need to move forward on behalf of the nobleness of the American Dream. With heart and soul poured into the efforts here in this House, we can achieve and grow that middle class, purchasing power enhanced for the middle class, opportunities for our middle class. A strong middle class means a strong America. Let's go forward.

Representative GARAMENDI, thank you for leading us in this hour.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you very much for your passion on this issue, and thank you for your compassion for the American people. We can make it. We can make it in America. We need good and wise policies to do that. You can't do it by cutting, cutting, and cutting. You have to do it by investing, investing, investing.

The American public understands. They really do understand that we're a great Nation. There is no greater nation in the world. We need the kind of policies that will put Americans back to work and keep them healthy.

I want to thank those of you that are listening to this hour of discussion on health care and on jobs in America.

Mr. TONKO, thank you very much, and, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of our time.

#### REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from

Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here this evening following my good friends and their interesting discussion.

I wanted to spend a couple of moments this evening talking about reform.

Reform has been a major focus of my public service career beginning as a citizen volunteer, working as a State legislator, a local official. I was pleased to be part of innovation in my native State of Oregon in areas of tax reform, transportation innovation, environmental protection, land use, and government structure.

I am pleased to have been able to take some of the lessons that I learned in Oregon here to our Nation's Capital, working in Congress in areas of energy, bicycles, flood insurance, health care reform. For me, that's exciting and energizing. That's what makes me a little disappointed, to say at the very least, with what's happening in this session of Congress.

It's sad to see that today in the House the focus is not taking the Affordable Care Act where the questions of its constitutionality have been settled by the Supreme Court and moving forward to accelerate its implementation. Instead, the efforts are to slow it down, to repeal, to put sand in the gears. Not without a constructive alternative mind you, but just to be against the reform that's on the books.

It's depressing to see repeated attacks on environmental protections, something that Americans care deeply about that makes a difference to the quality of life of our communities, the strength of our economy, the health of our families.

It has been unfortunate that we were given by this Congress earlier this year what has been described, I think appropriately, as the most partisan transportation bill in history, and certainly the worst, undoing 20 years of transportation reform. Luckily, it collapsed under its own weight, but we were left with a pale 2-year extension, and we're soon going to be right back where we started.

We're watching, more recently, efforts that deal with agriculture in terms of the reauthorization of the farm bill, an opportunity to reform, to be able to save money, to improve the health of our citizens and the economic viability of America's farmers and ranchers. Instead, the bill that has passed out of the committee in the House would concentrate even more subsidy in the hands of fewer wealthy farmers and short-circuit the needs of Americans who eat, people who care about animal welfare, about the environment, and, most importantly, about the welfare of the vast majority of American farmers who, sadly, would have been shut off.

□ 2100

It looks now that the bill is so precarious that it may not even come to