

this House has sent over to the Senate and help set the stage for the next President of the United States who needs to come in with a strong mandate from the American people, from the United States Congress, with a clear vision that Americans support our new President to take us where we need to go as a people.

□ 2010

But the components of the agenda of the next President need to include a balanced budget—a balanced budget amendment, a commitment to that balanced budget amendment, and a mandate from the American people to get that balanced budget amendment passed. It's the only way that I can see that we get that accomplished, Mr. Speaker. We need to call for the Presidential candidates to call for a balanced budget amendment.

So I will go through these issues again: pass a balanced budget amendment, one that has an 18 percent cap on spending of GDP, one that requires a supermajority to raise taxes, that has legitimate exemptions for a declared war or a case of a serious national emergency. Balanced budget amendment, repeal ObamaCare, repeal Dodd-Frank and the other financial components that I said, and let's move forward with a country that's based upon freedom, upon liberty, upon free enterprise. If we do all that, Mr. Speaker, the American people will take care of the rest.

We still have interest that we've got to pay and principal that's got to be paid down before we can get rid of the interest bill. This is a huge credit card that has been run up. The debt of the countries in trouble in the EU is \$4.5 trillion. And now President Obama's \$1.33 trillion added on to his \$4-plus trillion threaten to take his term of the Presidency well over \$5 trillion, knocking on the door of \$6 trillion in accumulated debt in his time in office.

Whatever we do that's good, we still have to pay the interest and have to pay the principal on that debt. So the recovery time, the depth which we might have otherwise fallen a little bit further, it takes a lot longer to recover when you borrow the money to do so. That's the nature of the free enterprise system. That's the nature of capital and investment and risk. That's the nature of Keynesian economics that the President has embraced.

I am a supply-sider. I don't believe that borrowing money, handing it to people, telling them it's their patriotic duty to go out and spend that money is how we're going to recover from this economy. We're going to recover from this downward economy by producing those goods and services that have a marketable value here and abroad. We do that, we'll sell, we'll compete, we'll rebalance our trade deficit, we'll make American industry strong again, and we will again be the powerhouse of the world. When that happens, we are strong culturally, politically, we are

strong militarily, we are strong economically, and we will continue to be looked up at by the rest of the world.

If we fail economically, if we become one huge Greece—as Chairman RYAN is concerned, and as I am and many others—if we become one huge Greece, there is no one to bail us out. There's no one there. We can hold our tin cup out, but no economy will be big enough to put enough in the tin cup that we can get a meal. We would be in a situation of default. It would be a sad, sad day in America. It would take generations to build our credit back again. It would take generations to recover. In fact, the trajectory of this country would be so altered that we could never recover.

Power abhors a vacuum; it fills it. If America has an economic crisis, as I'm suggesting looms in our future, that power, that global vacuum will be filled by our competitors. Much of that power that is projected around the world has been paid for in treasure and blood, Mr. Speaker. We must maintain that for the future destiny of our country. We must maintain it out of honor for those who have sacrificed so much to protect freedom and liberty around the world.

We are a great country. We're the unchallenged greatest Nation in the world. We derive our strength from Judeo-Christianity, western civilization, and free enterprise capitalism. We need to understand those underpinnings of American exceptionalism, those pillars of American exceptionalism. We need to celebrate them. We need to teach them. We need every child to understand the pillars of American exceptionalism and be able to recite them in the same fashion that the seven sacraments are recited in the very Catholic Church that's standing up for our constitutional rights today, along with the other faith-based organizations.

It's a big picture we have going on in this country, Mr. Speaker. It's a great country that we are. It's a great country filled with great people, people with individual spirits, individual sense of self-sacrifice, willing to tighten their belt, willing to carry their share of the load.

And what do they want out of it? An opportunity to work, prosper, raise their family, live free without an oppressive government reaching in and regulating every aspect of their very lives. They want to be able to utilize the God-given liberty that was articulated by our Founding Fathers, and promote that kind of liberty to all humanity throughout the world, wherever they may be.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your attention to the discussion that I've had with you this evening, and I would yield back the balance of my time.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA:
MANUFACTURING MATTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALAZZO). Under the Speaker's an-

nounced 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 very much.

I'm joined tonight by two of my colleagues, Mr. TONKO from New York and Mr. ALTMIRE from Pennsylvania. We're going to be talking about the President's budget and about one of the issues that we think really will propel America back to the leading edge of the world's economies.

We've had some tough times, but we've seen some progress. If we can once again make it in America, we're going to see this economy grow, we're going to see the middle class come back to life. We're going to see an expansion of wealth and the opportunity for families to make it in America when we make things in America.

Let me just start off this discussion with the progress that's been made. Some of our colleagues here would like to say that nothing good has happened over the last 3 years when, in fact, this chart, which is from the Department of Labor Statistics office, points out very, very clearly where we have come from since the Great Recession began.

If you take a look at this, the gold columns over on the far left—or far right, depending on your perspective—you can see the great decline that took place from 2007 until January and February of 2009, when President Obama came into office. Since that time, we've seen a steady improvement in the number of jobs in America. So even though we were seeing here in this particular 2009 period a continued decline, each week that went by we saw improvements, less of a falloff, and we began to emerge from the depths of the Great Recession.

So beginning here in about 2010, we began to turn around and we began to see positive job growth. Every month since that time we have seen positive job growth in America—not enough, not enough to satisfy any of us on the Democratic side and not enough, I'm sure, on the Republican side, and certainly, as President Obama said when he appeared here at the State of the Union, not enough to satisfy the President.

So we're now looking at the President's budget going forward, proposed, came to the Congress yesterday. That budget lays out how he would like America to move forward, and how we in the House of Representatives and the Senate can put into place the laws, the programs, and the money to pay for the advancement of the American economy.

□ 2020

So we're going to spend tonight building off the President's budget and the things that are in there.

Over the last year, my colleagues and I have been talking about the key ladders to success, those things that create opportunity in America. And certainly, they're education, it's the research, it's the manufacturing, the infrastructure, and the opportunities that come with them.

Tonight we'd like to start by focusing on one part of the President's budget, which was the R&D, the research and development portion of the President's budget. Now, in any economy, if you're going to grow that economy, you have to stay in the forefront of technologies. America has been the best in the world at this. And in doing so, we have created extraordinary growth in the economy and opportunities for new businesses.

Unfortunately, in the last 20 years, we've seen those businesses go offshore. But the genesis of that growth is often in the research and development, usually funded by the Federal Government. And that research and development comes in several different parts of the Federal budgets. Certainly, we see it in health care, the National Institutes of Health. We see it in the national science, in the Energy Department, and in the military. Each of those organizations has a research budget, and from that budget comes new innovation, new products.

For example, the defense research agency, known around here as DARPA, really did the grunt work, the initial development and research to create the Internet. And we've certainly seen what that has meant to America.

Now, with that introduction, \$148 billion in the President's budget for all the research and development that the Federal Government supports gives us the opportunity to create the new solutions to today's health problems, today's economic problems, energy issues and defense issues.

Fortunately, my two colleagues today are well-steeped and very, very knowledgeable about the research budget. My colleague from New York ran a research program in New York. Share with us, and then if you'll reflect on the President's budget.

Mr. TONKO. Sure. Absolutely.

Representative GARAMENDI, thank you for bringing us together for an hour of thoughtful discussion, dialogue that needs to be exchanged here on the House floor so as to promote what I believe is a very progressive agenda.

And in my heart, I believe that the President has promoted a budget here that allows us to move forward in a progressive style to be able to talk about sustainable outcomes, to be able to talk about meaningful employment, cutting-edge ideas that will now take us, as a sophisticated society, embracing our intellectual capacity, to move forward with the soundness of job creation in the realm of high tech.

Now, we have been talking on the floor, a number of us for several weeks now, months perhaps, about the vision of reigniting the American Dream, re-

igniting that American Dream through the underpinnings of small business as the pulse of American enterprise and, certainly, entrepreneurs who are those dreamers and movers and shakers and builders that provide the soulfulness of the vision of how we can move ideas forward that translates into jobs and translates into product development.

Then finally, a thriving middle class, making certain that in any democracy the measurement of a resounding future comes through the measurement of how well that democracy's middle class is performing. And so we know that, through reforms out there, we can go forward with this budget and address small business, entrepreneur development, and thriving middle class dynamics in a way that will build the sustainable outcome.

We cannot, in my opinion, I totally believe that we cannot cut our way to prosperity, cut our way to opportunity, cut our way to an economic recovery. We do it through investment, investment of the soundest order.

Now, to your point, I had served, before entering Congress, as president and CEO of NYSEDA, the New York State Energy and Research Development Authority. And it was there that I got to see programs that we've devised and funded through the State legislature, where I served for nearly 25 years, my last 15 of which were as energy chair. It was quite an eye-opener to see the program development that was providing job opportunities of a new variety, of a cutting-edge opportunity.

And there, not all the research scenarios were, perhaps, a success story; but without that investment, without government joining forces with academia and the private sector, we do not strike that sort of visionary outcome, and what you saw were tremendous investments made that enabled us to pave the way for investments in the Internet, or GPS, or working through the DARPA vision of how we strengthened our military, and then sharing a lot of that information and that intellectual property with the growth of jobs here in this country.

That is the sort of opportunity that is envisioned here by the President in his budget presentation to Congress. And it's that sort of investment that believes in the American worker, believes in a thriving middle class, believes in the strengthening that small business brings to any community, and believes in entrepreneurs, that "rags to riches" scenario that has been, you know, very much a part of our American story. The American history is replete with success stories, "rags to riches" scenarios where America was seen as the promised land.

Well, we have not abandoned manufacturing. We have endorsed this idea of investing in manufacturing, investing in research; and I am really pleased to see that we're moving forward with soundness, with this budget presentation in a way that translates into

jobs, no other higher priority, and we do it by reigniting the American Dream.

So, Representative GARAMENDI, seeing those success stories through the lens of NYSEDA, the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, where we were able to speak to water efficiencies, where you're saving mountains of electrons, we got to see it in electric vehicles that were being developed, we got to see it in energy retrofits for business.

These are the sorts of ideas that a sophisticated society embraces. We don't abandon these goals. We get into it full steam and go forward.

And by the way, it's because we are competing with other nations in what is a global race on clean energy and innovation. If we don't take that in, if we don't acknowledge that we're in the midst of that race, we will watch nations pass us by, and we will let down generations of American workers, and that would be unforgivable.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you so very much, and thank you for your extraordinary experience in dealing with research and then translating that research into real things that Americans could make.

Now, the great manufacturing center of America is represented here by my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE). Thank you for joining us, and share with us your thoughts as we look at the President's budget and on making it in America.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman from California and my friend from New York (Mr. TONKO). We have a discussion going now about manufacturing in America. And our colleagues understand the relationship that exists between manufacturing and R&D, research and development. And it's critical that we look at those together, because of the discussion that we're having in this country about why, over the past several decades, we've lost so much in manufacturing, we've lost our core manufacturing businesses.

I come from western Pennsylvania. We have seen the steel industry over the past several years. Although there is a resurgence today, it's been many, many years since we lost a lot of that steel industry that we had in western Pennsylvania, and it was the core base of employment for generations in the Pittsburgh area.

Across the country, we've seen our manufacturing industry decimated by foreign competition; and the reason R&D relates to this, as the gentleman certainly knows, is it's a continuum. And at first, when America lost its manufacturing lead to other countries, we still kept the innovation; we still kept the R&D. But the continuum that exists between someone in America coming up with an idea, an invention, turning that, through R&D, into a real product, a real innovation, we have always been the leaders in that in America. Americans have led the way with innovation, with creation, with technology, and then turning that into the

manufacturing sector, turning that towards product development, manufacturing, exportation to other countries, creating a base of people who are going to use that product.

The whole continuum is something that we have seen over the last several years through foreign competition. We've lost our lead in a lot of those things. And because of our failure to invest in research and development, because of our failure to keep up with the foreign competition, we've lost even more than just the manufacturing sector. We've lost our competitive edge on the innovation side as well.

That's why it's so critical, even in the times that we face now, severe fiscal restraint, a recession that we are finally recovering from. We have to continue to make that investment in R&D because, as the gentleman from New York said, if we don't do it, other countries will—and they are. And if we expect to compete in a global economy, if we expect to get back our lead in manufacturing, which we are starting to do, it has to begin at that first stage of innovation, of research and development, creating new products, leading to new ways of manufacturing, more cost-efficient ways of manufacturing.

We're going to be able to do it, and we're starting to see the resurgence in America specifically because we understand that continuum that exists. It would be a tragedy for workers in this country to begin moving in the other direction.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

□ 2030

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. ALTMIRE, and thank you for the work that you've done for us in western Pennsylvania. Indeed, at one time, I know, when I was growing up, it was the center of the American steel industry and manufacturing there, and to the immediate west in Ohio and Indiana and on.

I want to put up this chart because it really demonstrates the challenge that we face and the opportunity that we have.

This chart speaks of the 12 years with 6 million American manufacturing jobs lost. Let's go back about 20, 25 years ago. There were just under 20 million manufacturing jobs in America. Over the years, it was up and down, with a slight decrease. Then beginning around the year 2000, we began to see a precipitous decline, basically the outsourcing of American jobs. The great manufacturing heart and heartbeat of America just began to slow down to a rhythm where now we are down to just over 11 million manufacturing jobs. This is our work. This right here. This decline is the challenge that this House faces.

When you start with what the President has suggested, you start with R&D, because that's the genesis. That's where the new ideas and the new products are developed. Then you have to couple that with manufacturing.

I want to give just two examples from my own district, one that I learned last weekend when I was back home in the Sacramento Valley just west of Sacramento.

A university town, the University of California, Davis, about 10 years ago, some graduate students at the engineering campus or the engineering school there at the University of California, Davis figured out a new program, a new way to do advanced manufacturing. They were into machine tools, and they figured out a way to take machine tools and make them far more productive and innovative and capable of doing some really different things. They took that idea—these were the entrepreneurs that you talked about, Mr. TONKO. They took that idea and they started a small business. In the intervening years, they began to grow. They now employ 75 people in the Sacramento region for the development of these advanced machine tools.

A company in Japan took a look at this and said, Oh, we want to do that. They were in this business. So they bought the company, and they thought about taking the company back to Japan. No. Didn't happen. Instead, they decided to build that manufacturing facility in Davis, California. That factory is now being constructed, and it will soon employ a hundred people.

So here we have an example of where research out of the University of California, Davis engineering school led to the creation of a new business in the machine tool industry and the continuation of research and development and advancement and, now, manufacturing taking place in California.

There are a couple of other pieces of public policy that fit into this continuum of development of economic growth, and they were policies that were put forth by the House of Representatives when the Democrats controlled the House. It was this: For any company that wanted to make a capital investment, they could immediately write off that total investment in the first year. Rather than depreciating that investment over 7, 10, 15 years, they were able to take advantage of it. A very, very powerful incentive to make it in America, to build your manufacturing facility in America.

So this company, DTL, is now growing in California as a result of the research at the university, coming out, entrepreneurs taking the ideas, building a business, and now investments, in this case by a foreign company, into the United States. We call that insourcing.

I'll come up to the other example a little later.

Mr. TONKO, take it from there.

Mr. TONKO. Representative GARAMENDI, thank you for that lead-in. Certainly Representative ALTMIRE talked about the need for us to invest in manufacturing, when you look at that precipitous drop, losing the many millions of manufacturing jobs, per-

haps the largest loss of manufacturing jobs in world history. It's up there. It ranks very high. Why? Well, policy, tax policy that encouraged taking jobs offshore and investing in other nations. We were rewarding that behavior.

What we're talking about now is turning that around, doing this U-turn, putting the brakes on a process, on an incentive that really was destroying hope for American workers. So now what we see is a new vision of providing incentives for those who will build opportunity in this Nation.

Also, I think when we look at some of the focus that existed or didn't exist over the past decade and a half, you look at where we were going as a Nation, and the focus wasn't on agriculture, it was not on manufacturing, but it was on the service sector, and primarily on the financial service sector.

Now, we know that scenario. We won't go down that road. Suffice it to say, we turned our back and said, Here's the keys; play as you wish. No watchdog in the equation, and people created vehicles by which to circumvent regulation. So we put at risk the Nation's economy. Every family that invested into their future was put at risk.

So we ignored manufacturing.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, may I interrupt you for a moment?

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You mentioned something that we actually talked about last week. I want to hand you this chart. If you would hold that one up there and let me go back to the microphone.

You mentioned the effort that we made in the 2002 change from a manufacturing economy to what this chart calls a FIRE economy—finance, insurance, and real estate—a FIRE economy, one that collapsed because it was about manipulating money instead of creating mechanical engineers and chemical engineers and nuclear engineers. We created financial engineers. The result? Not good. The Great Recession.

Please excuse me for interrupting.

Mr. TONKO. It's a valid point. Where was that linear, where was that outreach, that extension into all of America with the good products we developed that would serve this Nation well? So what we're talking about now is bringing back some programs.

What was ignored was the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, MEP. MEP is a program I hear about all the time from my manufacturers who are still clinging on, who are working trying to be productive, offering hope to the worker. They're saying, Where is the MEP program? Well, it was brought back last year, and it's reinstated into the budget this year. The request to Congress is to support the Manufacturing Extension Partnership.

What does that do? It's an MEP program. Okay. It's alphabet soup. But

what does it do? It allows for manufacturers, small and medium-size businesses, small and medium-size manufacturing firms, to develop additional markets.

The President has said let's get into exporting; let's build it in America and export to the world. That's a vibrant economy. Also, it enables us to define, to explore new opportunities and to adopt those technologies and retrofit our manufacturing base with that know-how, with that productivity margin growing. That means greater opportunity for us to compete in the global market, to create jobs, and to provide hope again for the worker.

So it is good to see that MEP, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, is back in this budget. It's a statement that we care about manufacturing, we care about small and medium-sized businesses, and that we are going to see that as the springboard, the economic springboard to the economic recovery that we so much deserve.

It's about priorities. That's what a budget is. It's like, Where are you putting your investment? How are you developing that formula? What is the hope that you anticipate that is translating to America's working families?

This is the moment for us to move forward by reigniting the American Dream, doing it through small and medium-sized business, the pulse of the American enterprise, investing in those dreamers, those movers, those builders, those entrepreneurs, and then resulting in a thriving middle class. Again, where there's a thriving middle class, you have a strong democracy.

So reignite the American Dream, and, gentlemen, we have work to do.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Indeed we do. We have much work to do.

Mr. ALTMIRE, you've been working long and hard here in the U.S. Congress on these issues. Carry on this discussion.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I wanted to transition into talking about the trade deficit that we're facing in this country. But before I did that, I wanted to close the loop with what Mr. TONKO and Mr. GARAMENDI have been talking about for my colleagues.

□ 2040

I hear a lot back home. You'll have town hall meetings, and you'll have discussions with people about federally funded research. It seems as though there's always an example somewhere of a research project that seems on the surface to be unjustifiable, and in some cases, people will argue it's ridiculous that we're funding certain things. I just wanted, for my colleagues, to give a couple of examples of federally funded research that has paid huge dividends for everyday life.

There was in the late 1970s and early 1980s a big national story about federally funded research that studied the eyesight of eagles. At the time, it was considered to be a mockery—it was of no use to society, and it was a waste of

money. Well, lo and behold, what did we get out of that research? We got night vision goggles for our troops who were serving overseas on the military battlefield. We got soft contact lenses. We got so many innovations from that type of research. The touch screen on our everyday iPad was federally funded research out of the University of Delaware, of course many years after what I'm speaking of. The GPS system, which so many of us rely on, was from federally funded research. The Internet was created, as we all know, through the Pentagon and federally funded research.

So I would say to my colleagues, for those who may be skeptical that certain projects—and you know, I'm sure there are some that you can point to that haven't paid dividends, but there are some that maybe on the surface didn't sound like good ideas in the beginning that have paid huge dividends. I would go back to that example of studying the eyesight of eagles. LASIK eye surgery was the byproduct of that type of research. So investment is what we're talking about. Research and development just pays back so much more than what we're paying into it.

The R&D tax credit has to be made permanent. That is a key part of this. The manufacturing extension partnership that the gentleman was talking about is a key part of our future in this country, bringing back a resurgent manufacturing base. What happens if you don't do that? What happens if you aren't competitive in the global economy?

It's what this chart shows.

Now, this will come as no surprise to our colleagues. This is the U.S. trade deficit from 1976 through 2008. You don't even need to look at the numbers, and you can see it's heading in the wrong direction and that it has been heading in the wrong direction for a very, very long time, and there are a lot of reasons why this is.

Some of it has to do with our foreign competitors and their getting their act together and joining the world competition in a way that they hadn't before. But a lot of it has to do with our own policies and the fact that we have not invested, that we have not had a strategic manufacturing strategy in this country and that we were a little bit slow to react to what was happening overseas.

The role that we have in this House is to change that, and we have a decision to make in this country: Are we going to continue to allow this to happen and just sit back and wait while other countries continue to improve, to modernize, to become more cost-efficient, to become more competitive, and to continue to make this trend worse for the American worker? Or are we going to take action? Are we going to invest in our future? Are we going to change the way that we do our manufacturing strategy in order to incentivize making products in America?

We talked a couple of weeks ago, the gentleman from California and I, on this very floor about a provision of our Tax Code which may very well be, in my opinion, the most egregious and unjustifiable provision in the entire Federal Tax Code, which is, if you have physical assets, if you have a plant in this country, a manufacturing plant, and if you want to move that plant overseas, if you're going to close your operations, if you're going to get rid of your American workers, if you're going to move your physical assets, literally move those assets overseas, in some cases, you can get a tax deduction for the cost of your moving expenses. The American taxpayer, believe it or not, will cover the cost to move that plant overseas.

That's ludicrous. There is no reason that provision should exist, and that's one of the reasons you see the chart going in the wrong direction—because we have been slow to react. Yet we're at a turning point in this country. We have a tremendous opportunity in front of us to do the right thing, to change the policies that have led to our trade deficit and to begin turning the corner and heading in the right direction.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much for pointing out the eye of the eagle. We have to keep our eye on this particular prize, and that's rebuilding the American manufacturing sector.

I handed this chart to Mr. TONKO a while ago. It really needs a further explanation.

What we did beginning in 2000, actually before that, was to develop a FIRE economy—finance, insurance, real estate—not manufacturing. So manufacturing was allowed to decline, and of course real estate, finance, and insurance grew and became the essential economy in the year 2000 to 2010. And, of course, the great collapse in 2007 and 2008 as a result of, as Mr. TONKO said, regulatory oversight disappearing and anything goes. We're reversing that.

Mr. ALTMIRE, you talked about the egregious tax policy of giving the tax breaks when companies offshore jobs. It was actually in 2009, just before the new Congress came into effect, that we enacted legislation that eliminated much of those tax breaks.

Now, there is more to be done. In the President's budget, he calls for the full elimination of tax breaks to companies that offshore jobs and, as he said here in the State of the Union address, turns that around and gives a tax break to companies that bring jobs back to America. In his budget and in his proposals are specific actions on tax law that we must take to carry out that commitment to American and foreign countries that want to bring jobs back to America.

We can do this. Public policy plays into this—the budget and the research and development piece of it. That's the genesis. That's the start of the idea of a new business or of a new technology and then the manufacturing support

that goes with it. There is the tax policy, and we've talked about the vast manufacturing systems. All of those are the feedstock to get these companies up and going so that the entrepreneur, in using the research and creating a small business, will ultimately create a bigger middle class, reigniting the American Dream in doing that.

Mr. TONKO, I'm not sure where we want to go with this. I think we ought to spend a few moments talking about transportation if that's okay with you gentlemen.

Mr. TONKO. I think before we leave this talk of manufacturing growth, both of you gentlemen held up tremendous charts that tell the story.

What I think is interesting is, when you overlay those two charts with the deficit—the trade deficit and the loss of manufacturing jobs—they mimic each other. They absolutely trace the same curve. And so as you drop those manufacturing jobs, as the commitment was the tax policy and the investment in manufacturing declined, the trade deficit impact from Representative ALTMIRE's chart—they're mimicking each other. You can see the precipitous drop here is almost at the same rate as the impact of the trade deficit.

So we can step back and deal with facts or we can be in denial. We can be bitter about success and come on to the floor and try to hold back success. But instead of a tug of war on this House floor, let's tug together. Let's tug forward to make certain that we're investing where we ought to. Let's cut where we can but invest where we must. One of those investments has got to be in the human infrastructure. We're talking about capital investment, and we're talking about physical infrastructure, but we need to talk about the human infrastructure with this manufacturing comeback.

When I see advanced manufacturing embraced in my district, where we as a hub in the 21st Congressional District of New York, in the Capital Region of New York, have seen tremendous growth in clean energy and innovation, those jobs are coming about because of an investment in nanotechnology, semiconductor research so as to transmit more electrons over an exact same-sized cable. From what we do today, we talk about the investment in chips and in growing those chips to a smaller, smaller dimension so that they can have an impact—a partnership with agriculture, communications, energy generation, health care—you name it. Any industry can be impacted by that nanotechnology investment. So there is all this investment, but you're going to need the workers who are now being part of an advanced manufacturing stage in our society, where we're having more and more investment and keen intellect. You need to train those workers.

The President has said, Look, we've got a vehicle that is very sound out there. They're called community col-

leges. In my district, we not only have Hudson Valley Community College, Fulton-Montgomery Community College, Schenectady County Community College, but we also have an ag and tech campus in the SUNY system, the State University of New York system, in Cobleskill.

□ 2050

All of these are having cutting-edge involvement in research that spills over to the worker. Cleanroom science, retrofitting homes to solar, making certain that you have a trained workforce for nanotechnology, all of this is happening in our community colleges. And the President said, Let's go forward and invest. There is, I believe, an \$8 billion investment in our community colleges to train the worker. So let's not pull back on success. We see what's working. We know what has to happen. We have the formula based on history that ought to speak to us. And let's get it done. The worker can't wait until the next election.

The decisionmaking on this floor should be about hope and opportunity, not about the next election, but about the next jobs we can bring into the congressional districts of this great country that, in a cumulative format, will spark a reigniting of the American Dream.

My district is the donor area to the Erie Canal; and we saw a necklace of communities emerge from that investment which, by the way, came at a tough time for this Nation. Governor DeWitt Clinton said, Look, here's a solution: We have a tough economy. Let's provide opportunities for shipping our cargo, building. And what happened? A number of immigrant patterns traveled to these shores in hope of that rags-to-riches scenario, and they invested. They were the brains behind the industrial revolution, immigrants who came here and developed—along with the industrial giants—an agenda for jobs.

We can do that again. This is the American pioneer spirit. The DNA within my district is a pioneer spirit where these mill towns became the epicenters of invention and innovation. And the same story can be lived today if we're willing to reignite the American Dream through investments in small business, entrepreneurs, and a thriving middle class.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you. And you really hit one of those issues directly, particularly the education issue. And we ought not jump to transportation before we deal with the investment in the human capital, that is, in the American worker.

And the President did, in his budget, lay out \$8 billion for community colleges to work directly with companies to educate their workforce. I can give a specific example. Again, in Davis, California, there is a biopesticide firm that actually goes out and finds microbes, or various kinds of naturally occurring materials, and uses that and makes that into a biopesticide, not a chemical

but a biopesticide. They need technicians in their laboratories and in their manufacturing. They go to the community college to bring up the necessary skills and bring those workers in.

So there are jobs out there, but they have to have the education behind them. So much of what the President is proposing—not only with community colleges, but with the Pell Grants and proposing \$30 billion going into our K-12 schools so that those schools can be upgraded, and an additional \$30 billion to bring the teachers back into the classroom.

Mr. TONKO. Representative GARAMENDI, if you will just yield on one point, what I believe is also important with the community college investment is the stated purpose of creating partnerships with the private sector.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Exactly.

Mr. TONKO. So it's not like one person or one institutional network working in a vacuum but, rather, a partnership that is fostered by this budget process, by the thinking here of the administration working with Congress. Let's develop those partnerships with academia, community colleges training people and retraining.

Many people are starting second careers. They lost a job through no fault of their own. This was a brutal time on America's manufacturing base. Let's bring that base back, and let's give them the tools they need to be successful so that it grows more and more opportunity so that we can have as sharp a competitive edge as possible as we enter into the global sweepstakes on jobs.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. TONKO.

Mr. ALTMIRE, I see you are kind of ready to go here.

Mr. ALTMIRE. The gentleman has given me so much to work with here on community colleges, and then I will transition into transportation, as the gentleman would like to do.

I visited, just yesterday, the Community College of Allegheny County, outside of Pittsburgh; and they have an amazing fundraising campaign going on, because western Pennsylvanians, private industry, and the foundation community believe in the future of our country, and they believe in the future of community colleges. They have a \$40 million fundraising campaign. They've already exceeded \$30 million. And the discussion was about all of the wonderful things that are happening as a result of the innovations that are taking place at the community colleges, not just in western Pennsylvania but across the country.

We have energy resources in western Pennsylvania that are unique. And all the time we hear about employers saying that they have jobs available, but they can't find people who are trained to fill those spots. So being right on the cutting edge, the Community College of Allegheny County has almost two dozen new programs, new curricula

that they have established to train workers and retrain, in some cases, to fill the new spots—geologists, managers, people out there on the work-sites, all types of ways, through the natural gas industry, the nuclear industry, energy, research and development, what we were talking about earlier.

Our community colleges really do play a unique role in this because of their ability to partner with local businesses, to identify the needs, to retrain workers who have lost their jobs through downsizing or changes in the workforce. It's an amazing resource for this country, and the President is right to put a focus on community colleges as part of our resurgence in this country.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. ALTMIRE, if you could wait just a moment. Now you've got me engaged in this, and you talked about your community college. We are going to be going to our community college in Fairfield, the Solano Community College, and we're going to take the work that was done by this Congress in 2010 when it brought the Pell Grants down into the community colleges.

Previously, the Pell Grants were only available at the 4-year college level, but now the community college students can also vie for the Pell Grants and the loan programs that had been significantly improved back in 2010, before we lost the majority here. We took back from the big Wall Street banks the student loan programs, reducing the interest rates, reducing the hassle for students, and making loans far cheaper and more available.

Just this year, the President took one additional step under his authority and stretched out the payment mechanisms so that no graduated student who had taken out a loan needs to pay more than 10 percent of their annual income to repay that loan. All of this is part of investing in the human capital, investing in the workers.

I suspect the three of us could go on for a long time about education.

Mr. TONKO. Let me just mention this. Last night, I spoke before the ERC, the research center at RPI, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. They are well regarded for their development of scientists and technology experts and the engineers of the future. Their funding is primarily from the NSF, the National Science Foundation.

There is a 5 percent increase in NSF in this budget, and rightfully so. What they're doing in this think tank is stretching the creative genius and the imagination of folks with regard to lighting designs, lighting designs that will be used in ways that are unbelievably creative and constructive. It's about creating the incubators of the future, the entrepreneurs of the future. It's about developing the professors that will train students into the future. It is an infrastructure unbelievably sound, and it is NSF-funded.

You know, for people to say, Well, our best days are behind us—what I'm

hearing tonight is that there's optimism. There's great optimism. There's a reason to be hopeful. There is a charge for us to be optimistic by investing in opportunity. There are the tools that America's base needs. They need these tools. And how dare we not provide them. Earlier statements on the floor were denouncing workers instead of providing hope, training, and retraining people in areas that will be geared toward their specific strengths.

We all have certain skill sets or have that potential for those skill sets. There's a passion that everyone has for certain types of work. Let's not denounce the worker. Let's insert hope in the equation and, again, provide for the infrastructure, human infrastructure required for this manufacturing base.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. ALTMIRE, I was about to respond that, while the lighting at Rensselaer is obviously good, it's California where the light-emitting diode—the LED—is actually being manufactured by a new startup company called Bridgelux, which has taken that technology and, with a little bit of assistance, is going to be able to manufacture in America.

However, controlling this for the next 20 minutes, we're going to move to transportation. Mr. ALTMIRE, why don't you get us going on transportation.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Earlier, our colleague, Mr. TONKO, was talking about the Erie Canal and the foresight and the commitment that went in and just the unbelievable feat that it was to accomplish that. And I was thinking, as the gentleman was speaking, about the debate that we're having in this country about transportation and infrastructure.

□ 2100

We are going to debate tomorrow and vote probably Thursday in this House on a very underfunded transportation bill that does not contain the same foresight that the gentleman was discussing occurred in New York. And I think about the debate that must have occurred in New York when the Erie Canal was proposed, and the cost and the expense and the manpower and just the time commitment that was necessary, a seemingly impossible task.

You think about the intercontinental railroad in the 1800s and what the country's debate, the political debate had been at that time. What must have been the debate in the 1940s and 1950s when President Eisenhower finally got off the ground the interstate highway system and began connecting our roads in a way that we'd never done before.

That's what we're facing right now. We have a system of transportation in this country to move goods from point A to point B, manufacturing and make it in America, what we were talking about. Well, if you make it in America, you have to have a way to move goods across the country. We can do that in all kinds of ways. We can do that on our waterways, through shipping, cargo

ships; and we also have barges in my neck of the woods. In Pittsburgh, I have a system of locks and dams in the district that I represent, six different locks and dams that average 85 years old. They were built to last 50. Two of them have been rated by the Army Corps of Engineers as in imminent threat of failure. That is a crisis of infrastructure, and that's happening in similar ways all across the country.

You look at our aviation system. If you want to move goods by air, we have an air traffic control system in this country that is still based in technology from the 1950s. And this NextGen technology that is possible through satellite technology, it is expensive but it's long overdue, and it's a commitment that we need to make in this country, as they've made in other countries. Our competitors don't have the same bottlenecks that we do at their airports because they have more modern air traffic technology.

And then you get to our rail system. We all understand the bottlenecks outside of Chicago and other places in this country and our lack of modern investment in our rail system. But what we're going to be talking about this week in the House is our roads and bridges and a highway system. I spoke earlier about President Eisenhower's vision with the interstate highway system and the way that this bill lacks that same vision because it underfunds that investment and it doesn't require or doesn't even incentivize products to be made in America.

There are literally trillions of dollars of need in our transportation infrastructure. Certainly we don't have the ability to afford it all, but I can't think of a better way to put American workers back to work, to put American jobs back in play in the manufacturing sector, to have a resurgence, a regeneration of our manufacturing sector than through our transportation infrastructure.

I'm very disappointed at the lost opportunity that the bill we're debating presents because there are so many ways American workers can win, American manufacturers can win, and, most importantly, America can win. And we're missing that opportunity. But through the discussion that we are having today, maybe we can move this country in a different direction.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. ALTMIRE, for getting us started. And I've got to compliment you on the really neat segue that you used, the Erie Canal to move to modern transportation. That was very nicely done.

We do have a real challenge. This week, we're going to be taking up a transportation bill that the Secretary of Transportation, who has now been in office nearly 3½ years and who was a Member of the House of Representatives for I think over 20 years and a Republican, says that this is the worst transportation bill he has ever seen. Ever seen.

This transportation bill that we are going to be taking up is underfunded.

It totally eliminates from the funding stream the public transportation sector. So we're talking about Amtrak, buses, light rail, the metro systems here in Washington, New York, San Francisco, Chicago, Atlanta and other places that are going to be cut out of the funding stream.

There's a whole lot of other things that are within this piece of legislation that are nonsense and nonstarters and ultimately detract from the goal that you so well stated, Mr. ALTMIRE, of building that infrastructure that we need for a modern, thriving, growing economy that's based upon manufacturing.

Now, if all you're doing is sending buy-and-sell signals over the Internet, I guess you don't need a highway. But if you're sending cars and rail systems and you're sending equipment back and forth across America, you better have all of that transportation infrastructure in place. So as we rebuild the American manufacturing sector, we will need this in place.

Now, Mr. TONKO, you took the train from New York today.

Mr. TONKO. I did.

Mr. GARAMENDI. What happened that you were talking about earlier?

Mr. TONKO. Yes. Well, there was concern expressed on that train that the transportation bill advanced in this House falls grossly short of what's needed.

And, you know, when you look at the many sectors of the infrastructure community, it's not just our traditional roads and bridges which require assistance. It's mass transit. It's rail. It's also telecommunications and it's energy. And it's water. So all of this infrastructure requires an investment. And how do we make up ground where we have underinvested in this area?

Well, the President proposes a \$10 billion infrastructure bank bill that will leverage government moneys and private sector moneys that will enable us to provide for the sorts of investments that are required. Now, investing in our transportation infrastructure has great merit. Many of us can cite those weaknesses out there.

My district, in Montgomery County, lost 10 people when a bridge collapsed along the New York State Thruway. There are bridges around the country that need immediate attention. There are those situations where many believe we're going into a water economy in the next 10–20 years. If that's so, how are we treating that resource of water? Are we being the most efficient?

And energy, if we're going to move into a creative, innovative arena for energy supplies and diversify our mix, we need to retrofit the grid system in order to make it all work, in order to incorporate these ideas. Or we can stay beholden to a fossil-based infrastructure for energy supplies, which means that we'll be beholden to nations that are oftentimes unfriendly to the United States and use those energy consumer dollars, American consumer dollars, to

pour into their treasury and develop their troops to fight against the American forces. So it's an issue of national security.

So there are many dynamics here that need to be addressed in a full-picture view, not just dealing in some sort of snapshot of denial. That does not produce an infrastructure bill that is worthy of the needs of Americans out there from coast to coast.

You know, sometimes, Representative GARAMENDI, you're looking for that Sputnik moment. That's what inspired our win in the global race on space—U.S. versus USSR. We gave it our all because we had that Sputnik moment. We got knocked on the seat of our pants, stood up, dusted off the backside and said: never again. And we won that global race on space.

What is our Sputnik moment today?

Is it bridges collapsing with people dying? Is it paying God-awful prices for energy supplies and not creating our new energy supplies? Is it ignoring a water economy that is to come and will be a strength for this Nation and a wisdom to invest in our water resources?

All of these moments could be referred to as Sputnik moments, and we need to take those experiences and that recent history and have it influence our thinking and have us go forward with a sound investment in infrastructure.

So I see great potential here in this budget. I see great opportunity. And I see investing our way to opportunity and investing our way to an economic recovery, investing our way to the re-igniting of the American Dream, which is our principal foundation by the Democratic Caucus in this House. Let's reignite that American Dream. Let's do it through small business and through investment in entrepreneurs and a thriving middle class. Infrastructure is prime amongst those areas of investment.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, you are so very correct about reigniting the American Dream. One of the dreams I have is to drive down Interstate 5 in California and not have my car knocked to pieces on the unimproved and the falling-apart highways. In America today, we have 150,000 miles of roads that are in desperate need of repair—150,000 miles. That's about 50 times back and forth across America.

□ 2110

Now, if we did that and repaired those highways, what could happen? What could happen if we actually built a real robust transportation network in America? Well, back to the jobs issue, back to making it in America: What if our tax dollars were to be used to buy American-made equipment? This piece of legislation, H.R. 613, is now working its way into the transportation bill. The bill that our Republican colleagues put out has a very, very weak Buy America.

This particular bill, H.R. 613—I happen to be the author, and I'm kind of

proud of the piece of legislation—would require that our tax dollars, which will be used to fund the transportation program, the airports, the NextGen system and the roads and bridges that both Mr. TONKO and Mr. ALTMIRE talked about, that those be made in America, that we make it in America. We would use our tax dollars to actually make these things in America. So if we're going to build a high-speed rail, let's make it in America.

In fact, that's happened. In the stimulus bill, the American Recovery Act, there was a provision for some \$12 billion for high-speed rail in various parts of the United States, and an additional sentence was added to that law that said all of this money must be spent on trains and equipment made in America. Guess what happened? Foreign companies that built high-speed systems decided, oh, \$12 billion, we want a piece of that. And so they came to America, and they built manufacturing facilities. One was built in Sacramento. Secretary LaHood was just there a couple of days ago visiting that factory. The German company, Siemens, built a large manufacturing plant in Sacramento, California, to make light rail and to make locomotives for Amtrak, to make and to be prepared to build the high-speed rail systems that are coming.

Why did they do it? Because it was the law of the land that said your tax money, American taxpayer money, must be spent on American-made equipment. But what this bill does is it extends that idea as we go forward so that when we build bridges, the steel is American steel, and it's put together by American welders and by American ironworkers, and that the cement is American cement and that the computer systems that are being used to develop these things are American made. We can rebuild the American manufacturing sector when we decide it is the public policy that we use American taxpayer dollars to make it in America once again.

There's another piece of legislation that does the same thing for energy products. You've heard of solar systems, the photovoltaic systems, the big wind turbines that we're beginning to see across America. All of those energy products are essential elements in the future. Once again, our taxpayer money is used to support that. And my legislation says if you're going to get American taxpayer money to support your solar system or your wind farm, then you're going to buy American-made solar panels, solar equipment and wind turbines. We can make it in America.

So all of these things fit together—a transportation program that is going to give America what it needs to travel and an education program so that our workers are prepared and an R&D, research and development, program that allows us to innovate for tomorrow's economy.

Mr. TONKO, I think we have about 2 minutes left. Could you wrap it up for us?

Mr. TONKO. Sure. Absolutely. I think beyond the innovation and the ideas that translate into jobs, research equaling jobs, there are these benefits of connecting us as a Nation. We are a large Nation geographically, and the interconnecting that can be done through the investment in infrastructure is important.

Now, we know beyond the roads and bridges and the rail and the grid system for our energy supplies there's a telecommunications network; and that effort to create a national wireless initiative is very important. It will range from first responders with interoperable communications devices for first responders to a high-speed Internet system so that we're wiring in to remote areas and enabling this country to truly prosper.

So, tonight, we have heard such great comments about what we can do and what we must do about cutting where we can, by addressing inefficiency, waste, fraud and outmoded programs, but maintaining the vigilance about investing where we must. If we do not invest, we deny the American Dream. If we invest, we reignite that American Dream. We reignite the dream through the investment in a historic display of what America is at her greatest: when she invests in ideas, she invests in her workers, invests in infrastructure, in small business, entrepreneurs—those dreamers, shakers, movers and builders—and invests in a thriving middle class. It can be done, and it will be done if we put our minds to it. Mr. GARAMENDI, we have work to do.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We have work to do indeed.

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

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENISHEK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, happy Valentine's Day to you. Thank you for this time.

There is so much going on. We have had in recent days the testimony of the director of CBO, Congressional Budget Office, making projections. We've had the White House dictating what religious beliefs people could observe and practice and which they could not, and then what was said to be a compromise so that individuals—actually institutions—could practice religious beliefs, the insurance companies that they utilize will have to provide the coverage that the President dictates even though it is against the religious beliefs, and then naturally the way things work, the insurance companies will spread out the costs, and they will pay for them anyway, which will be, once again, in breach of their religious beliefs.

It's quite interesting. I've been trying to take this all in, Mr. Speaker, as we have seen ObamaCare basically rammed down the throats of Americans with the vast majority not wanting that bill passed, with the vast majority in Congress not having read the bill, and with Speaker PELOSI at the time saying, we'll have to pass it so we can find out what's in it. Well, as people are finding out what's in it, they're not terribly happy.

And when you realize, as some of us did before it passed, as some of us were arguing here on the House floor before it passed, that if the President's health care bill passed, it would be such an intrusion into the rights of Americans that as I said here on the floor, it would be about the GRE, the government running everything, that means every aspect of people's lives. That includes setting aside people's religious beliefs when that came into conflict with the President's health care bill. We knew that it would run up tremendous debt. We knew that it would cut Medicare by \$500 billion—something our friends across the aisle don't like to talk about a whole lot.

Before the supercommittee fiasco ever occurred, the Democratic majority in the House and the Senate passed a bill a majority of Americans didn't want passed that would wrest control away from Americans in so many different areas and would take control and give it to the Federal Government in a way that was never anticipated in the Constitution.

□ 2120

So as we have seen this White House dictate to the Catholic Church, to Catholic hospitals, what they would be allowed to practice in the way of their religious beliefs, it's been quite interesting. We've heard many Catholic leaders who have said, you know, gee, we supported President Obama when he was Senator running for President. We thought he would do all these wonderful things. From conversations, as President Jenkins at Notre Dame had with President Obama, he just never anticipated that there would be this type of usurpation of religious practices and the ability to practice one's religious beliefs.

This isn't about contraception. Anybody in America that wants contraception can get it. That's not an issue. In fact, it's been interesting to hear people say people have a right to have contraception provided. When I look at the Second Amendment of the Constitution, there is a right to bear arms, but I don't remember anybody who was pushing for the government to basically provide whatever people want in the way of health care, paid for by somebody else. I don't remember them saying, well, the Constitution mentions the right to bear arms, so the Federal Government must provide everybody guns. There's all kinds of things that are ensured under the Constitution and under the Bill of Rights,

but it doesn't mean the government's supposed to buy them for everybody.

But in view of the White House's position, President Obama's position on what religious practices he would allow the Catholic Church to observe, Mr. Speaker, I figure we really need to make an addition to the Constitution. Since the President has already taken these actions, then I think maybe we need to just observe some language that we insert into the shadow of a penumbra. So where it says in amendment one to the Constitution of the United States, "Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," I think in order to make the President's actions and the White House actions consistent, as those reflected by Secretary Sebelius, we need to insert there a line that comes up and says, But only if you are a religious institution and your beliefs agree with the President of the United States. Because if your religious beliefs come into conflict with Secretary Sebelius or the White House, unless the White House is willing to make some insurance company deal with your practice, then you're just going to have to set aside your religious beliefs.

So apparently the parenthetical has been inserted into the Constitution. I'm hopeful that on this issue the Supreme Court will strike down ObamaCare, say there are so many aspects of this bill that are unconstitutional—the mandate to buy a product for the first time in American history is only one of them. But that mandate, of course, is central to the bill itself.

But then the way it supercedes the religious institution's beliefs, why we would say "religious institutions" is because the President and Secretary Sebelius in their so-called "compromise" had not been willing to recognize an individual's beliefs, which I've always understood the Constitution was talking about.

No, they say it is confined to the religious beliefs and practices of a religious institution. Because under this White House's interpretation of the Constitution, if you're an individual and you are Baptist, Catholic, Jewish, Muslim, whatever it is—although the FBI has apparently been meeting with named coconspirators for funding terrorism and trying to eliminate any kind of language that might in any way offend people that have supported terrorism, we don't want to offend those who want to kill us, of course.

But other than that, this White House sees it that if you're an individual and not a religious institution, then you have no right under the First Amendment to practice your religious beliefs if they're in conflict with what President Obama or Kathleen Sebelius want to do. You'll have to set them aside. It's only under their interpretation of the Constitution—and of course we know the President was an instructor—not a professor, but an instructor—at a law school at one time, so I'm