

then it was announced that the employer was going to switch over and put them into the exchange with the retirees.

This woman spent most of her adult life taking care of a brother and a sister who were less fortunate in life and needed a family member to step up and be there. This woman's retirement plan has been totally crushed by ObamaCare, and she's concerned now. As a smart lady, she went out to get some estimate of what it was going to cost her in her retirement now for health care compared to what it was before. It's completely unaffordable. So does she choose health care, or does she choose to still be there for her brother and her sister who have come to rely on her? I think there's many of those stories.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

As we finish, I want to go over just a couple of things. One of the things the Secretary stated, Dr. FLEMING and Mr. THOMPSON, is that she needed to use some money, and the prevention fund was one of the things she was going to use to help implement the exchanges. We've now had prevention funds used for massage therapy, kickboxing, kayaking, Zumba and pickleball. I didn't know what pickleball was. But that's tennis, badminton and ping pong. I can go on and on. It's utterly ridiculous. It should have been spent on health care. That's what this bill was supposed to be about.

Let me finish by saying that even with this 1 hour here, we have lots more to talk about. We've barely scratched the surface. It's a complicated issue. Democrats and Republicans should have gotten together in a bipartisan way to work out a health care plan that does the principles that were pointed out here today, which is to increase access and quality, lower costs and to leave health care decisions in the hands of doctors, patients and those patients' families.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

JOB AND HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, once again we're back here on the floor of the House of Representatives to talk about what I believe is the most pressing problem here in the United States, and that's jobs. Americans want to work, Americans are capable of working, and it ought to be our job here on

the floor of the House of Representatives to talk about how we can create jobs.

We've just heard about 1 hour of discussion from our good friends on the Republican side, the Doctors' Caucus, about how to destroy the Affordable Health Care Act. For 36 times, the Republicans have put up legislation that would essentially gut, amend, or destroy the Affordable Health Care Act, which has the promise and the probability of providing health insurance for 50-plus-million Americans that are today uninsured.

Why would you want to deny those people health insurance? I can see no reason for it.

I notice that they also did not spend any time at all talking about their effort to destroy Medicare. Medicare was a promise made to seniors by the American people that when they reach 65 years of age, they would have a guaranteed health insurance program. Yet, for the last 2 years and 4 months, the Republicans have continually put up legislation that would end Medicare as we know it and turn Medicare over to the insurance companies.

One of the last statements made here on the floor by one of our colleagues was decisions on medical services ought to be in the hands of the physician and the patient. I agree. I was also the insurance commissioner in California, a statewide elected position for 8 years; and I can assure you that under the private health insurance programs, it is the insurance companies that are making the decisions about what medical care will be given to individuals. That is wrong. We did our best in California to stop that. But if you turn Medicare over to the private insurance companies, as the Republicans want to do with their voucher plan, then it will be the insurance companies that will decide what medical services will be available, if at all, to seniors.

I'd like to put that aside and go back to the issue that I really wanted to talk about, but there are some things that you just cannot let go, things that are said on the floor that need to be at least discussed in their fullness.

Let's talk about jobs. Let's talk about the fact that over the last 30 years we have seen the middle class in America held down. The middle class in America has made very little economic progress over the last 30 years. We're going to discuss that in some detail and specifically what we can do here with public policy, with proposals that have been put forth by the Democratic Caucus in the House and our colleagues in the Senate, solid proposals to put Americans back to work and to rebuild the American Dream so that every American has the opportunity to put their foot on the rung of the ladder and climb just as high as they can do so.

Before we get to those rungs on the economic ladder, I'd like to have a more full discussion about what has happened to the middle class over the

last 30 years. Joining me in that discussion is the Representative from South Carolina, the Honorable JIM CLYBURN.

JIM, if you'll join us, I know you have some things you'd like to discuss; and I see you have your own chart there.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague, Congressman GARAMENDI, for his leadership on this very important issue.

Just a few minutes ago, we received some breaking news: the stock market just closed, and for the first time in the history of this great country, the Dow Jones Industrial Average closed over 15,000 at 15,056. Standard & Poor's also closed at a record 1,625. So much for a socialist President.

Now, during my 20 years of service in this body, I have often reflected upon my experiences growing up in a church parsonage in the little town of Sumter, South Carolina. Early on, I internalized an Old Testament scripture, Micah 6:8: To do justly, to love mercy and walk humbly.

Today in this great country, we are experiencing an injustice that continues to get worse, one which I believe demands our attention. Indisputable evidence continues to show that income inequality has worsened over the last 30 years. The Congressional Budget Office released a report back in October 2011 on the distribution of household income between 1979 and 2011.

□ 1620

On the distribution of household income during that time, you might remember that report came out just a few days before the so-called supercommittee held its first public hearing. I served on that special panel, and I raised concerns with the CBO director about the ever-widening gap between America's rich and poor.

This chart is from that CBO report, and it shows that over the past 30 years, the wealthiest 1 percent have enjoyed income growth of more than 275 percent, while the lowest 20 percent have experienced only 18 percent growth.

Working families across the country have seen their wages stagnate and decline as earnings for the wealthiest few continue to soar. In fact, earnings for the top 1 percent during the current economic recovery have risen 11.2 percent, but declined for the other 99 percent by 0.4 percent. I'm going to repeat that.

The 99 percent have seen a decline of 0.4 percent—that is a negative—while the upper 1 percent, a positive growth of 11.2 percent.

Now, my friends across the aisle will talk about the American Dream and the ability of every American to work their way up to the top. But numerous studies have shown that there is less economic mobility in America than most people think. The fact is that if you work hard, play by the rules and

take responsibility, it is currently harder to get ahead in America than it is in many parts of the world.

Let me cite an example. Thirty years ago, CEOs made an average of 42 times as much as rank-and-file workers, 42 times as much.

Today, a newly released report confirms that last year, CEOs of the biggest companies in the United States made 354 times what the average worker made, 354 times. That is the widest pay gap in the world.

Do most Americans believe that our CEOs work 354 times harder than their average employees?

Here is another example. Over the last 45 years, average income for 90 percent of Americans went up just \$59—almost no change at all. That's over 45 years, an increase of \$59. For the top 10 percent, average incomes rose roughly \$116,000. For the top 1 percent, average income rose \$628,000; and for the top 1 percent of the top 1 percent, the average incomes rose \$18.3 million.

The numbers are so staggering it's almost difficult to comprehend. So if we convert the dollars to distances, the vast majority of Americans, 90 percent, saw their average income increase by 1 inch. The top 10 percent went up 168 feet; the top 1 percent, 888 feet; and the top 1 percent of 1 percent, their incomes rose by almost 5 miles relative to that 1 inch.

We are recovering from one of the greatest economic recessions in American history. As I said in the beginning, the Dow Jones Industrial Average just a few minutes ago closed for the first time in history over 15,000. The stock markets are setting record highs, but working families continue to struggle.

Wages have stayed low, and unemployment is still too high. It does not have to be that way, and it should not be that way. This Congress can and must take direct action to restore a just economic system for working people.

We need to raise the minimum wage. We need to boost Pell Grants, Head Start, and other support for public education. We need to invest in innovation and infrastructure to create jobs now and foster broad-based economic growth and prosperity. And we need to pass a budget that reflects the values of working Americans.

It is time to "do justly." It is time to refocus on the American Dream, on building ladders of opportunity, on restoring fairness in our Tax Code, and on creating good, high-quality jobs so that every American who wants a job can find a job.

I call on Speaker BOEHNER to appoint budget conferees as soon as possible so that we can get to work on a budget that puts America back to work.

I thank my colleague from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Mr. CLYBURN, for your excellent exposition of the problem faced by the middle class, by the working families of America: the fact that over the last

40 years they've seen virtually no progress in their economic status while those very, very few at the very top have seen extraordinary wealth. It's also a shifting of wealth, and some say that this discussion is a discussion of class warfare. Well, I wouldn't call it warfare, but I would say that the middle class of America is clearly losing, while those very, very few at the top are clearly winning. And the reason is the policies of the United States are pushing the wealth to the top and literally taking the wealth from the working men and women. We need to change those policies, and our discussion here is very, very much about that.

Thank you for your excellent discussion.

I see that our colleague from Washington, D.C., ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, is here. Thank you very much for joining us. And, Mr. CLYBURN, if you'd like to stick around, we will engage in a discussion, but I think you have other obligations.

Mr. CLYBURN. I do, but I appreciate the time.

Ms. NORTON. I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina, one of our leaders, and my good friend from California for his leadership, his almost weekly leadership on the issue of jobs. Both of my colleagues have discussed long-term declines in the middle class, much of it owing over the last decade to the policies of this Congress and the Federal Government.

The last thing you would expect Congress would do in the face of a recovery that is still in the throes of recovery is anything to hurt it, so I wanted to come to the floor to discuss the early warning signs we are seeing of jobs loss because of the sequester so that we can do something about it now.

First, let me indicate, quite unexpectedly, the best statistics I've seen in a long time, and how we are stepping on these statistics with each day of the sequester.

□ 1630

The April jobs report unexpectedly showed 165,000 workers added to non-farm payroll. That was terrific news. What it tells us is that the private sector is making jobs, trying its best, because those jobs were not created in the public sector; those jobs were created in spite of the fact that the Congress is furloughing people, cutting programs to the States and, thus, jobs.

So the April jobs report, you might say, means maybe it's going to be all right after all. Early signs are absolutely not. April reported the first 2 months of the sequester. It's 4 months to go, and already we see horrific news, each day, a kind of rolling disaster on jobs and the economy.

Deep cynicism spread the week before last throughout the country as Americans saw Congress vote to relax the sequester on the air traffic controllers, just as Congress was about to take

a week-long recess; deep cynicism because nothing had been done for the American people, for their jobs, for their programs, but the skies were cleared.

Actually, there was a good reason for that, and that reason was, of course, that the controllers, who were only doing their jobs, about 10 percent of them had to be furloughed each week; therefore, with less people, there were slowdowns. That was already beginning to have a catastrophic effect on the economy, and that's why I think, yes, Congress, and even the administration, moved to correct that.

Sequester-driven flight delays were already placing over 80,000 American jobs at risk. And if it had gone on, if just this one sector had gone the full sequester, that would have lost \$9 billion, one sector alone, in the economy. All right. One sector. One sector and only one sector.

Have we shown we understand what our bottom line responsibility is?

Whether you come here you think to reduce the deficit, or whether you come here as a Member of Congress you think to add revenue to grow an economy, both sides should agree that the best way, and perhaps the only way, to do that is to create jobs. People with jobs pay into the economy rather than requiring us to spend and add to the deficit.

Yet, when the sequester began and the administration warned of its effect on jobs and the economy, howls came from my good colleagues on the Republican side that the claims of the administration were overblown, that they were exaggerated, that the President was crying wolf, not to mention those of us on the Democratic side.

Here are the early signs, and I bring some examples to the floor this evening because there's still time to correct the sequester. I bring them to the floor to ask the appropriators to do what the President has done in his budget and correct the mistake of the sequester, recognizing that neither Democrats or Republicans anticipated that the sequester would ever happen, so neither side has to take credit or blame if we change it since neither side wanted it.

But look at the early effects, and let's look at some of the effects that flow directly from what Congress has done:

250 workers at the Hanford nuclear reservation laid off;

The contractor that repairs our U.S. Naval ships, Continental Maritime, laid off 185 employees;

418 contract workers laid off at the Tobyhanna Army Depot in Pennsylvania;

Northrop Grumman Information Systems in Lawton, Oklahoma, lays off, or anticipates laying off, 270 workers.

Those jobs add up. I'm not trying to call the roll. I'm trying to give examples of what the sequester directly does to jobs in the military sector, no less.

U.S. Army Garrison-Rock Island Arsenal, 175 employees laid off.

By the way, these are not furloughs. These employees are gone.

That's how we get, I say to my good friend from California, to the CBO figure of the loss of 750,000 jobs. Imagine this Congress doing anything to cause, to be the direct cause of the loss of jobs when we should be trying with all our might to create jobs after the Great Recession.

The examples abound. You will find them with every small business in your district feeling the effect by laying off people or refusing to fill vacancies. You will find it in every sector of the country.

Military bases are now going on a 4-week schedule for schools. Workers at missile testing fields are being fired.

We're having the functional equivalent of the meat inspectors exception to the sequester. Remember that they were the one sector, because we were afraid that rancid meat would appear all over the country, and you have to have meat inspectors to inspect.

Well, now the dairy farmers are saying that they can't get access to production information about milk and are anticipating higher prices on milk. So look at how that affects the farmer, whom he employs, and the milk, that's us, the consumer. That's how it's passed through. That's how it's passed on.

You know, you'd expect some of these examples from a depression, or even the recession that we are just coming out of, but who would have expected that hospitals are now reporting that medical schools anticipate not taking on as many residents, not with the sequester and the amount of money that comes to hospitals from the Federal Government. And they say that means fewer residency spots and fewer doctors in various communities, since residents tend to stay in the communities where they do their residency.

I've come to the floor when we're discussing jobs precisely because the sequester cuts to jobs in the public sector and the private sector and speaks to whether we're going to make it in America, keeping what we have, much less making in America and growing what we need to have.

The sequester itself is even affecting what was always exempted from cuts in the Congress, public safety cuts, even at the Federal level. U.S. attorneys throughout the country are cutting. We never would have allowed that to happen before.

After Boston, I asked the Federal police forces to come and have a conversation with me. The Capitol Police, the Federal Protective Service, the Park Police, none of them are exempt. And to the extent that they are not doing furloughs, it's because they are requiring people to work tours of duty that no public safety officer should have to work if he really means to keep us safe.

So I say to my good friend, Mr. GARAMENDI, whom I'm so grateful to for keeping us focused on jobs when

every other day we're talking about something else, I'm grateful because these dumb cuts are, above all, cruel cuts.

I haven't begun to mention their effect on the domestic programs for the very needy, the 70,000 children who will be off of Head Start, the 600,000 off of the WIC program, Women, Infants, and Children. That is the program for the most vulnerable children, who will lose basic nutrition assistance.

□ 1640

I was concerned that we weren't paying any attention to this, that it was only crisis by crisis. After the controllers matter came to the floor, the very day we left I, myself, came to the floor and said, with the controllers, you're only moving money around. That's what we did with some appropriations. If we had a budget meeting or even a meeting of any kind of both sides, we'd probably come to a compromise where some of what it would take to get off the sequester might mean doing what we did with the controllers, just moving from one program area to another.

But other ways to relieve the effects of the sequester would surely mean doing the kind of budget we meant to do in the first place. You'd want to do something with respect to matters that can only be fixed by some addition of funds, as, by the way, I think will be done in the next appropriations.

To be sure, sequester cuts go over to the following years, but they'll go a full year, and you will see some funds added just because it will be too heartless, too impossible to otherwise begin to justify.

So I come to have this conversation with my good friend, who focuses us, I think correctly, on the long term. We are forgetting to think about the long term when we see the sequester cuts that have a gnawing effect on the middle class so that, by the time we get to the point when we must do something about it, we will have a very steep hill to climb. That's what Mr. CLYBURN was talking about when he talked about what is now an impossibly large income gap of the kind we have not seen in my lifetime, of the kind we are making as we speak.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you so very, very much for really bringing to all of our attention the extraordinary impact that the sequestration is having on American families. Jobs are being lost. Real jobs are disappearing, and Americans, working men and women, are feeling their paychecks being significantly reduced.

Now, another word for sequestration is austerity budgets. Shortly after the Great Recession began in 2008, there was the debate about should the governments of the world, the United States, Europe, China and Japan, should they take a policy of actively engaging in the economy to boost demand, which would be a Keynesian model of increasing the purchasing power within the economy, or should

there be a reduction in government spending because of the deficits that were created as people lost their jobs and as tax revenues declined?

That debate was robustly engaged here on the floor of the House, with the decision being made to engage the government in increasing the demand. So the stimulus bill came forth, and it really worked. It really had an effect. Hundreds of thousands of jobs were created. The decline was stopped, and slowly in 2009 and 2010, the American economy began to recover.

Now, Europe made a different decision. In Europe, they made a decision not to stimulate the economy but rather to go into austerity, to reduce the budgets of the governments. The result in Europe has been perfectly clear. They have headed into a deep, deep recession yet again. They never came out of it. And so the entire European economy has been continuing to decline over these years. Austerity has gained in Europe a very, very bad name. In fact, conservative magazines such as *The Economist* magazine have been for the last 2 years saying, no more austerity, you have to stimulate the economy. We now see policies in Europe that are now turning around and looking to the stimulation of the economy as we did here.

China did exactly the opposite of Europe. They followed the American model—or we followed theirs, depending on how you want to look at this—and they put into place a very heavy stimulus program, almost all of it in infrastructure, creating enormous demand and growth in China.

Now, unfortunately, here in the United States, our initial effort at stimulus was cut short. It was cut short by the 2010 election. We had a new Congress, and the American Government since that moment has been involved in an austerity program. The sequestration is but one of the austerity programs that have been foisted upon the American public by our colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle. We have had fiscal cliff after fiscal cliff, and every time we come up against that cliff, we've seen a reduction in the role of the Federal Government in so many ways.

Ms. NORTON, you so clearly pointed out dozens of ways in which the Federal Government is backing away from previously important tasks, tasks such as, well, flight controllers, airline flight controllers. Now, we passed a bill to deal with that, but nevertheless, we took money out of the construction of airports and the upgrading of air traffic systems to keep the air traffic controllers going. So the austerity continued even in the airline sector.

We've seen it in my district. I've got maybe more than a thousand miles of flood levees. The Army Corps of Engineers, \$250 million reduction in their ability to upgrade and to deal with the levees and to prevent flooding. On and on. I won't go through all the list that Ms. NORTON put forward. But those are

the continuing austerity measures that have been forced upon us.

It can't continue. It cannot continue. Our task is to create jobs. Our task is to put Americans back to work. Our task is to make sure that this incredible income disparity ends and that we find ways to rebuild the American middle class.

Ms. NORTON. If the gentleman would yield, this has been a very important, it seems to me, a very clear explanation the gentleman has given as to how we got where we are, and particularly his description of the difference between the European model and the American model. With the European model you would think that would be all the object lesson we would need because Britain is one of our closest allies. And what austerity has done to Europe it will almost certainly do to us.

What I don't understand, Mr. GARAMENDI, is why my good friends—our good friends—on the other side would believe that you can get something for nothing. Many of them believe in the economy of the private sector. Well, the first thing the private sector does is to invest. Once it invests, it hopes to yield from that investment. The kind of approach you're speaking about says that if you do nothing, if you—you, the Federal Government—step back and contribute nothing to a recovery, then recovery will happen.

Well, let me tell you why I think that's impossible. The economy is of a piece. You can't pull an important piece out and expect the whole to remain whole, particularly when ours is a demand, a consumer-driven economy. What that means is what the Federal Government does is really meant to get people out there spending so that other people can make jobs. Well, the last thing you want to happen, if you want to make sure people have jobs, so that they're spending so that other people have jobs, is to cut back yourself on the jobs that you're responsible for.

□ 1650

The sequester does that with the furloughs. Imagine what will happen in their counties across the United States—3 million Federal workers—when those workers who feed their economy go on furloughs. That's the equivalent of a job cut. They have got to cut back spending. That cuts back demand. That works its way through the entire economy.

What we're doing is dampening demand because we're sending the signal to the private sector that we are cutting the programs that made jobs. You can look at Head Start as a program for kids if you want to, but I bet the thousands of teachers and other Head Start workers look at it as a jobs program. So if 70,000 kids are gone, imagine how many workers are also gone.

It's almost as if our colleagues don't understand the way the economy works, that you could take one sector of it that's very important—the Fed-

eral sector—damp it down, and expect the rest to keep growing. And the operative word, my friend, is "growth." We were doing almost nothing for growth because we had no balanced approach that allowed some revenue to fuel growth. What we're doing now is keeping growth from happening because we are deliberately cutting jobs that we need, which, in turn, feed the economy.

People with jobs buy goods and services. People who make goods and provide services will look to see if anybody is cutting jobs. If I run a department store in my county and the auto plant there lays off people, I cut back on inventory.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Exactly.

Ms. NORTON. Because that's how the economy works. The sequester is working that way, I say to my friend, and we can do something about it. There are 4 months left in this sequester. Before it becomes more of a rolling disaster with some of the examples I have given as emblematic of the disaster, we could, all of us, decide, let's just do a budget, a budget that I'm sure I would disagree with in many ways—in other words, it's not a budget I would want, because my good friends on the other side would want the things they would want. They would want some cuts. I would want to add some revenue, to WIC—Women, Infant and Children, for example. But together, at least we could stop the sequester and stop the catastrophic sequester cuts that drive down jobs as if we were creating a new recession of our own.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, we certainly will create a new recession. We know that 750,000 Americans will be unemployed, lose their jobs by the end of this fiscal year—that would be the first of October—as a result of sequestration.

Now, it's not that we haven't tried to do a different proposal. Our budget proposal is one that would maintain the reduction, but push it forward so that it doesn't immediately dampen the American economy. The President has made a similar proposal, but we've had no action. Right now, we are calling on our colleagues and Speaker BOEHNER to appoint a conference committee so that we can actually do a budget. Please, let's get that budget going. Let's get this thing out of the way of America's job growth.

Ms. NORTON. You remember how our colleagues said, for 3 or 4 years now, that the Senate refused to do a budget; and if they would just do a budget, then maybe the kind of meetings we've all been calling for would happen and we could work together? They did a budget, and still we get no action so that we can sit down and try to work the sequester out.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, that's exactly the problem. We need to get this sequestration out of the way of America's growth.

There are many things that we can do. I'd like to remind everybody that the President, more than 2 years ago,

put forth an American jobs proposal, an American Jobs Act. In that proposal—which has never been taken up by the leaders of the House of Representatives—those who are in control of the House now, our colleagues here on the right side of the aisle, have never taken it up.

So what was in it? There was a \$50 billion immediate investment in infrastructure. Well, what is infrastructure? Infrastructure is highways, our roads, our streets, our sanitation facilities, our water facilities, airports, flood levees, the kinds of things that upon which the economy can grow and be built. It is the foundation of the economy. They brushed it aside, wouldn't even consider it. One of the most basic things that any economy, any government must do is to make sure the foundation is in place.

The President had also proposed—and it's part of our Make It in America—an educational program to make sure that our students are ready for the jobs that are part of the American economy today and to retrain American workers.

A proposal that I have is that our tax dollars be spent on American-made equipment. Oh, my, how strange would that be. But yet we go out and buy Chinese steel to build the new San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge. No, we don't buy American-made steel and give Americans the jobs; we turn the jobs over to China.

Wind turbines, solar panels, all of the new energy systems, our tax money supports those systems. Shouldn't we be buying American-made equipment with your tax money? I believe we should. That's my legislation.

The Democratic agenda, the Make It in America agenda, is about 30 different bills dealing with rebuilding the great American manufacturing sector. I know that if we were to carry these policies forward, if they were to become law, we would see a resurgence in the American manufacturing sector.

The reason that that is so important is this—Mr. CLYBURN spoke to this earlier when he was here. I've got a little different display. This is what's happened to the American middle class, and beyond.

I'm going to use a football analogy here—I played football back at the University of California a few years ago—actually, many years ago. So we can use a football analogy.

The bottom 99 percent of America, 99 percent of every family and 99 percent of all of the workers and men and women in America have, since 1966, seen a net increase in their take-home pay of \$59. This is in constant dollars. The top 10 percent have seen their income grow by \$116,071 over that period, '66 to 2011.

The top 1 percent—remember the 99 percent thing? Well, this is the top 1 percent—have seen their income grow by \$628,817. Now, the very, very tippy top, that is, the one-tenth of 1 percent—we're talking the superwealthy

billionaires here; Mitt Romney wouldn't fit into this category—they have seen their income grow by over \$18 million annually.

So what we're seeing in the American economy is a skewing of the wealth in this economy. Literally, the wealth in the economy is flowing to the very top so that the wage increases are not among the men and women that work every day, that put in their 40 hours a week or more. But, rather, it's flowing to those at the top. This is the result of economic policies that are put in place here in the Congress—tax policies, educational policies, other kinds of policies that lay the foundation for this extraordinary inequality.

This has never been seen in America. During the Gilded Age in the 19th century, this kind of wealth disparity was not in existence. During the Roaring Twenties, this type of wealth inequality was not seen in the American economy. Only now, in the last 20, 30 years, have we seen policies put in place that have created the most inequality ever in modern American history.

□ 1700

What does that mean? What does that mean to the average American family? It means that both mom and pop are working. It means that they cannot afford to send their children to school. And added on top of that, the Great Recession has stripped the wealth from the 90 percent. The wealth was stripped, mostly in the housing market collapse.

So now we are faced with the situation, what can we do? Well, what we can do is to rebuild the American manufacturing sector, because this is where the middle class had decent wages. We are not talking about a \$7.50 an hour minimum wage. We are talking about wages that a man or a woman could earn to protect and to provide for their family.

Ms. NORTON. If the gentleman will yield on that point?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I would be happy to.

Ms. NORTON. The point you are making about disparities in income needs to be understood as you are portraying it—as a new phenomenon in American life. That, yes, there were recessions and there were very hard times, and there were times before the New Deal when government did not do much about it.

The kind of policy-made disparity that we are experiencing today, not disparity that comes because a few wealthy people created wealth in the last part of the 19th century, and even then there was a need for so many workers the disparity was not as great as today, but disparities that come straight from policies like failure to raise the minimum wage, come straight from policies like 20–25 years of failing to raise the user fee so that we could build roads.

Now, construction jobs are classic middle class jobs. If we want to build

the middle class, we've got to go in the modern era to the post-World War II economy. Americans who didn't have a college education could raise four and five children because they had good manufacturing jobs made in America.

My good friend talks about how if we take the materials for bridges, however, and you buy them in China, we are not making it in America, and we're having a downward effect on our own manufacturing sector. But at the same time, as he points up, infrastructure—he points to the classic way to come out of a recession by building what you would have to build anyway.

Here is the government investing in something that's never controversial, because building roads and bridges and water infrastructure are always the function of government. If you would have to do it anyway, the theory goes, you do it when in the process of doing it you can create jobs and fuel the economy.

We are about to have to do another infrastructure bill. We did one 2 years ago that will last only 2 years because we did not raise the user fee, so it goes for only 2 years at a time. And even though we had some of the materials from abroad—something we've got to keep from doing next time—every bridge had to be built by an American worker, all that cement had to be the work of the American middle class.

If we have to do it anyway, construction is probably the best way to revive the economy in the first place, because it has an effect on all the rest of the economy. It wakes up the rest of the economy.

Because we should be working right now—and I know Mr. SHUSTER, who's chair of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, does want to do something—we ought to be thinking about precisely the sector that you have mentioned, the sector that creates jobs, does what we have to do for the crumbling parts of our country, which turn out to be the parts underground where our water and sewers are and the parts above ground where we drive to and from work every day.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If the gentledady would yield for a moment, you're exactly right about the infrastructure. We need to build it.

I notice that our colleague from Ohio has joined us. The last time we were on the floor, we talked about these issues. So if you would like to carry on here for awhile, please, Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I would just like to support what the gentledady from the District of Columbia has been saying, that this is bread and butter, this is Economics 101 in how you get the economy back up and running. At a time when we have these high unemployment numbers for the building trades and the construction trades, what a shot in the arm.

For work—and I think this is the essential point—this work needs to be done anyway. So it's either going to get done now or it's going to get done

later. Why not do it now when you can get the best bang for your buck, to put people back to work when they need to go back to work and also jump-start the economy as opposed to say, Oh, we're going to wait, we're going to do it 5 years from now when cement is more expensive 5 years from now, labor is more expensive 5 years from now, all the other costs associated with the project and the materials are going to be more expensive 5 years from now. So let's get the job done now, let's make these investments now, let's get the economy going now.

We are having some job growth and the sequester is hurting, but we have got to make these investments. Let's rebuild the country, and let's rebuild the way our cities look. Let's have an innovative approach to the way we create and invest in our downtowns and tie it into what we are doing in many older industrial areas where we are knocking down a lot of old homes. Cities like Youngstown—180,000 people lived in that town a few decades ago, they're at 70,000 now—were knocking down homes because of the neighborhood stabilization program. Now we have green space. Now we are planning urban gardens, urban farming, so we can get fresh foods into some of these food deserts because of the investments that we are making. We should do the same thing with bike trails and downtown redevelopment and incentives for investment downtown as we do the roads, the bridges, the big heavy infrastructure.

Combined sewer—how many cities have hundreds of millions of dollars, billions of dollars, in need for combined sewer overflow? These cities don't have the money to do it. And if they do it, if they even can, if they have the bonding capacity to do it, they're going to drive rates up so high in their own communities they are going to further create sprawl, which means more new waterlines, more new sewer lines, in more green space, and that's counter-productive.

Let's drive people back into the urban core, let's have urban space, urban farming, urban gardens, farmers' markets, fresh food for our young people and people who are living in our cities, at the same time we make these investments. When you are building roads and bridges and needing steel, it's going to affect manufacturing.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If you use American taxpayer money to buy American-made equipment, supplies and products.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Right. And you look at the supply chain with manufacturing and you see the six or seven or eight jobs for every one job that's created on the manufacturing floor.

I love representing my district, like we all do, but I'm in northeast Ohio, so I could do a factory tour a day for my career and not even scrape the surface as to what the manufacturers are. And whether you're talking about the defense industrial base, whether you're

talking about construction all the way down the line, auto, the manufacturing capabilities in this country, they're tremendous.

Now we see on the defense side that maybe a lot of the defense industrial base isn't in America like it used to be. How do we come together, Democrats and Republicans, and say, well, we are spending this money, why don't we drive it into Youngstown, Ohio? Why don't we drive it into Mobile, Alabama? Why don't we drive it into Iowa? Why don't we drive it into some of these old industrial areas? This can be done.

I want to make one last point.

□ 1710

The narrative today is that everything that the government does—every dollar the government spends money on—is bad. Well, that's the narrative we're all operating on now because our friends on the other side, quite frankly, have won that discussion. But here we are. We can't get a transportation bill because that falls into government spending. Early childhood education, Head Start—that all somehow falls into this abyss of wasteful government spending when the fact of the matter is that these are investments that yield results and that create value and wealth in our society.

I will just say that we were in the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee hearing today, and we were talking about the Navy. We were talking about the sea lanes, and we were talking about the Strait of Hormuz and all of these different areas that we protect, that tax dollars protect, so that commerce can go—government investments to help business thrive.

It's a delicate balancing act, and to come up with just the bumper sticker slogans in order to score political points has damaged our ability to do what we did from post-World War II into the eighties, and that's to invest in research, invest in infrastructure, invest in American workers, and then let the free market go from there.

So I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership on the Make It in America caucus—in promoting manufacturing. I thank the gentlelady from the District of Columbia. It's an honor to be with you.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio, who knows what it is to rebuild the manufacturing base, and I thank you for the work that you've been doing.

We have just a few seconds, Ms. NORTON, if you could wrap and then I'll wrap, and we'll call it a day.

Ms. NORTON. When the gentleman speaks about manufacturing, both of you have spoken about manufacturing in its different aspects.

Look at what is happening today. The private sector is bringing manufacturing home because of the low cost of energy, and we are producing more of our own natural gas because of the low cost of energy. The government just needs to do its part. Don't counter-

mand what the private sector is doing. Do what the gentleman says. Don't take jobs from Youngstown. Help Youngstown to rebuild Youngstown. It's going to be built anyway. Now is the time to rebuild it.

So I thank the gentleman for yielding to us in this very important discussion every week.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We must start thinking about what we can do rather than what we cannot do. This is America. This is the country that built the future—we really did—and we can claim the future if we reach back into our history and do what we did before. We were builders. We built the foundations.

Mr. RYAN, as you said so very clearly, it's investment. It's investment in the intellectual ability of Americans—in education and research. It's investment in the infrastructure. It's investment in the business community. There is a combination of government and private sector. It's the history of America. It's an exciting history. It's a potential. Unfortunately, we are ignoring the key role that the governments—local, State and Federal—play in that process. We're builders, we're Americans, and we're going to do it. We will make it happen, and I will tell you this: when America begins to make it in America, Americans are going to make it.

I thank my colleagues.

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

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE ACTIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SYRIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-22)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAINES) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1622(d), provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency, unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions of the Government of Syria declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004—as modified in scope and relied upon for additional steps taken in Executive Order 13399 of April 25, 2006, Executive Order 13460 of February 13, 2008, Executive Order 13572 of April 29, 2011, Executive Order 13573 of May 18, 2011,

Executive Order 13582 of August 17, 2011, Executive Order 13606 of April 22, 2012, and Executive Order 13608 of May 1, 2012—is to continue in effect beyond May 11, 2013.

While the Syrian regime has reduced the number of foreign fighters bound for Iraq, the regime's brutal war on the Syrian people, who have been calling for freedom and a representative government, endangers not only the Syrian people themselves, but could yield greater instability throughout the region. The Syrian regime's actions and policies, including pursuing chemical and biological weapons, supporting terrorist organizations, and obstructing the Lebanese government's ability to function effectively, continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue in effect the national emergency declared with respect to this threat and to maintain in force the sanctions to address this national emergency.

In addition, the United States condemns the Assad regime's use of brutal violence and human rights abuses and calls on the Assad regime to stop its violent war and step aside to allow a political transition in Syria that will forge a credible path to a future of greater freedom, democracy, opportunity, and justice.

The United States will consider changes in the composition, policies, and actions of the Government of Syria in determining whether to continue or terminate this national emergency in the future.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 7, 2013.

THE CASE OF DR. KERMIT GOSNELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FLEMING. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is, indeed, a pleasure to be here tonight to talk about a very, very important subject, and that is the case of Dr. Kermit Gosnell.

Before I do, I do want to mention a couple of things about the previous Special Order of my friends on the other side of the aisle who were talking about, for instance, Medicare and coverage under Medicare and ObamaCare, pointing out that insurance companies are not as good as the government in terms of denying care. I would suggest to my friends that at least you can change your insurance companies. You cannot change your government. So I see that as a fatal flaw, among many, with ObamaCare.

Also, a lot of time was spent talking about income disparity. I absolutely agree with my friends that the rich are getting richer and that the poor are