

these ridiculous top secret clearances by outsourcing.

NATIONAL CHILDHOOD CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, this is National Childhood Cancer Awareness Month.

Childhood cancers are the leading cause of death by disease amongst children in our country; and each year, nearly 13,400 children are diagnosed with cancer.

I have been privileged to have met with many doctors and researchers who spend every day searching for answers in Minnesota's award-winning institutions, like the Mayo Clinic, the Children's Hospital of Minnesota, the Gillette Children's Hospital, and the University of Minnesota. There is no doubt that we can be proud of the incredible work that they are doing in Minnesota.

I am also cosponsoring legislation that will make cancer treatments more affordable for families and will encourage the development of new treatments by redirecting taxpayer funds that are spent on Presidential campaigns into childhood cancer research.

Mr. Speaker, we all look forward to the day when cancer is 100 percent treatable in our children, and that's why I stand alongside doctors and families and, most importantly, cancer patients in the search for a cure.

AMERICA'S INHERENT FREEDOMS ARE BEING ATTACKED

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

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, freedom of speech and religion and the recognition of the God-given dignity of every human life are core principles upon which America was founded, but these inherent freedoms are being attacked.

The Southern Poverty Law Center is one of the worst offenders—targeting and persecuting Americans who stand up for their moral convictions. This group routinely attacks mainstream, pro-family organizations, slandering them with false accusations of hatred and bigotry. Motivated by their inflammatory rhetoric, a gunman burst into the Family Research Council's lobby last year and shot a security guard, later admitting that the assault was inspired by the Southern Poverty Law Center's hate list.

We cannot let the beacon of freedom, known as America, become home to hate groups and other extremists, including those who slander their political opponents.

□ 1930

CONSTITUTION DAY

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

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, on this Constitution Day, I want to applaud those in the Armed Forces who take a pledge to honor and defend the Constitution at the risk of life and limb.

Every generation of Americans has been protected by what Frederick Douglass once called "that glorious liberty document." We should take the time today to salute those who defend the Constitution. I fear that sometimes we take for granted the sacrifice that these brave men and women bear.

They, like their predecessors, are the ones who allow us to secure our freedoms in the Constitution to pass down to future generations. They are the ones that allow us to gather here today to do the will of the people. They are the reason why the Constitution has lasted over two centuries as the prime example in the world of a free government.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WENSTRUP). 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, earlier in the session today, we paused in remembrance of those who were killed here in Washington, D.C., yesterday, yet another tragedy for this Nation, another shooting, senseless rage by some individual. We heard on the floor here a few minutes ago a plea by some of our colleagues to call us to action so that we who represent the millions upon millions of Americans would find within ourselves the courage to take action on wise gun safety legislation, mental health, and other things that we know can help to address the problem that plagues this Nation. So today, as we start this one-hour, I want to just remind ourselves that we have work to do here.

Joining me tonight is PAUL TONKO, a Representative from the State of New York. We often have had the opportunity to speak on the floor about the issues that confront us. Perhaps, PAUL, you may want to comment on this tragedy, and then we'll turn to the other issues that we want to take up today.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI, and thank you for bringing us together on what will be thoughtful discussion in how to invest in America and grow the economy and grow job opportunities, create that climate that best cultivates job action and job growth in our society.

Just moments ago on the House floor, we held a moment of silence in

recognition, in commemoration and respect for those who gave it their all, as many were Federal employees in that situation. I also want to attach my comments to those of yours in extending my condolences to the many family members and friends who are so impacted by this tragedy, this horrific act that wiped out their lives prematurely. May they rest in peace.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I join you in those condolences.

Our subject matter for the evening was really going to be about the economy, about income within this Nation, or the lack of it.

I want to just start by referring to a statement that Franklin Delano Roosevelt made during the economic crisis of the 1930s. In fact, this statement is etched in the marble at the F.D.R. memorial here in Washington, D.C. He said:

The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

The test of our progress. Well, what has been our progress over these last several years?

This last week, the economic study of the progress of America since the great crash of 2007 was made public. There has been progress. There has been economic growth. There has been the creation of wealth. We have seen progress, but it's not the kind of progress that F.D.R. talked about in the thirties. What we have seen is exactly the opposite of what he called for: to provide more for those who have little.

Here it is, the tale of two Americans, a stunted recovery, but, nonetheless, a recovery.

Where did the economic growth go? Where did the wealth go that was created? Was it to those who have little? No. No. No. Ninety-five percent of all of the wealth that this economy created since 2007 in the great crash went to the top 1 percent. Ninety-five percent of all of the wealth went to the top 1 percent. The remaining 99 percent wound up with 5 percent of the wealth that the Nation's biggest economy created since the crash of 2007. Franklin Delano Roosevelt would not have stood for it, and he didn't. Nor did Bill Clinton.

From 1993 to 2000, the economy grew very rapidly. The distribution of the wealth that was created during those years went in a remarkably different way than what has happened over the last 5 years. During the Clinton period, 55 percent of all the wealth that this Nation created went to the bottom 99 percent. The top 1 percent did very well. They got 45 percent of all of the wealth. You can say that was not enough for the bottom 99 percent, and I would agree; but compared to what's happened over these last 5 years, it's a remarkable improvement on the distribution of wealth.

What is the distribution of wealth? It's not a class struggle. It's about the

men and women of this Nation that work hard, that get up every day, go to their jobs, as did those 12 people who were killed yesterday here at the Navy Yard in Washington, D.C. They got up. They went to their job. They worked hard for themselves, for their families, and for this Nation.

So men and women all across this Nation are doing what we want them to do: participating in this society, following the American Dream. They work hard, play by the rules, get on the economic ladder and climb.

Here's what happened to them: not much.

Something is desperately wrong here in America that the result of 5 years of labor by the 99 percent, that they would find their reward to be 5 percent of the wealth that was created. We need to address this, and tonight our subject matter is how we can do that.

Before we go to that, I want to put up one more chart and then ask my colleague to join in.

What does it really mean down home? What does it mean out there in the subdivision or in the tenements? What does it mean in America when 95 percent of all of the wealth created winds up in the hands of 1 percent?

Here's what it means:

It means that there's hunger in America;

It means that mothers and fathers are not able to have a job that they can provide their children with a meal, with food on the table;

It means that in this House of Representatives there will be this day, this week, an effort to provide even more hunger in America, more children going without food as the supplemental food program is slashed by \$40 billion. That's \$4 billion a year for 10 years, \$40 billion, so that the 1 percent can have even more.

This is not right. It is not right in this Nation that we have hunger. It is not America as it should be, and it certainly is not the way Franklin Delano Roosevelt said America should be when the test of our progress is not whether we add more abundance to those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

We have a challenge here in America. We need to change things. We need to change the public policies that would deny food to hungry children, to parents, to our seniors, to our children in schools. It's time for us to put in place policies that create a real economic growth, real growth that the working men and women of this Nation can share in the economic progress of our Nation, and tonight we're going to spend some time talking about how we can do that.

My friend from New York, PAUL TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. Representative GARAMENDI, you have highlighted in very stark contrast the difference in the thought process and the philosophy of what was then under President Franklin Roosevelt and what is now,

and certainly what had happened during the Clinton years, which proved much more progressive in its nature.

If we think of that quote of President Roosevelt where society needed to be tested as to whether or not they were going to add more, add to the abundance of those who have much, that was a tremendous litmus test. It was a challenge to this country to search deep into its moral compass. What you're highlighting here, Representative GARAMENDI, is that it's an ebb and flow. It's looking for ways to pay for tax breaks for those who are perched way on the top.

Where you talk of that 95 percent, 98 percent of the growth of the economy going to the top 1 percent, that's unsustainable. When you think of the gimmickry that is going on, to be able to provide for the cost of such spending—because these tax breaks for those perched on the top is an order of spending—it's done through cuts to programs that speak to hunger, cuts that will impact seniors, cuts that will impact our very young, cuts that will impact our struggling families.

There is no mistake between the correlation of tough times and those who are dependent on a number of Federal programs. Throughout history, you can suggest through data that are compiled that those charts go upward when you have tough times and the reliance on some of these programs grows, and it's not unusual that has happened during the recession. So some struggling families required assistance.

You also have the elderly population that have nutrition inserted as part of their health care formula and is part of their wellness agenda. If a diabetic does not get their nutritional needs met, there are problems. If there are situations where people are doing without food, it can be the difference between quality of life and sometimes survival because of the absolute need to have a well-balanced nutritional program.

The same is true of our very young. We cannot ask our young children to go without the nutritional values they require or ask them to study at their best level in a classroom on an empty belly.

The moral compass is very direct here. It points our way and challenges us to take those words uttered decades ago by President Roosevelt. They speak with greater resonance, a deeper more profound resonance than they had when they were perhaps first uttered by the late former President. We need to take that to mind. We need to have history speak to us. We need to look at what happened when we invested in America, in her working families in the toughest of times.

When we think of the progress made during those Roosevelt years, that was a gentleman who was challenged in his own right and who led this Nation, lifted this Nation's economy while serving in a wheelchair. That is a powerful statement, one that had progressive

outcomes written all over it. We need to go forward and look at these orders of investment that will grow the economy, a tax policy that draws fundamental fairness so that there isn't this gross disparity between growth for some and denial for others.

It's absolutely statistically tracked now from as far along as the mid to late seventies to today. You can chart what has happened with some of these efforts to reduce assistance to working families in middle-income communities. It is unsustainable. We cannot grow an economy with these sorts of policies in play.

So tonight, let's look at those investments, from education, higher education, to infrastructure, to advanced manufacturing that is required so as to allow us to compete effectively in a global economy where our manufacturing base can survive if we do it smarter, not necessarily cheaper. If we do it smarter, we will land contracts, grow jobs with the productivity factor that is developed by inserting our policies into the transformation into an advanced manufacturing economy and by providing the investments that will draw policies that are progressive and more resources that will provide a lucrative dividend, make them an investment rather than outright spending, as we saw with some of these tax relief measures which did not produce a growth in the economy and just made life very comfortable for a very relative few.

□ 1945

So I think the challenge is before us to go forward and put a sound budget together—none of this kicking the can down the road with a continuing resolution. Let's name the designees to the conference table from each House, from each party. The President has outlined the budget with his administration. The United States Senate passed its version of a budget. The House has passed its version of a budget. Let's name the participants at the conference table. Let's do it in daylight. Let's flood the lights on the process. Let's show the sharp contrast between the various solutions and recommended approaches that will allow the public to be best engaged in the process and to understand the wisdom or lack thereof of some of the moves that are required or requested of us here in the House.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you very much. You are quite correct that we need to move in that direction. The American economy is about 60–70 percent based upon consumer purchases of homes and cars and all those other goods. Part of that reason that we're not seeing the kind of economic growth that would normally occur in a recovery is the 99 percent don't have money. They lost a great deal of their wealth. Trillions of dollars of their wealth was wiped out in the financial collapse, their pensions, their homes and equity in their home. As the economy has recovered, the creation of the

growth, the wealth, didn't go to them so they have not been able to really increase their purchasing power, which has dampened the economy.

Now, there are things that we can do. You were beginning that process. Let's go through them. I'm going to put this back up because this is not just a picture of the distribution of wealth in the economy, that is, the economic growth; it is also a picture of why the economy hasn't really returned. There are other factors, to be sure, but clearly the absence of purchasing power, that is, new wealth in the hands of the 99 percent, the absence of that has retarded the economic recovery.

This is something we have talked about here many, many times, and Mr. TONKO brought this up, many of these issues. We call it the Make It In America agenda. This follows along on President Obama's jobs program. Many of these elements are the same as he proposed. They are displayed a little differently here.

Tax policy; critically important. We need to redo our tax policy. Mr. TONKO talked about the tax policy and the effect that we've seen over these many years. But what I would like to do today is focus on these others issues, the issue of infrastructure, research, education, labor, and energy.

On the labor side, we have talked about that a great deal here. The working men and women, laboring as they are, are they getting a fair share of the economic growth? The answer is categorically, no. Are there policies that can change that? Yes. One of them has been of discussion here in Congress, which is the minimum wage issue. California has a minimum wage law that is before the Governor. He is expected to sign it, and that will push the minimum wage up to about I think \$10 an hour, and that will cause the entire wage structure in California to move upward, shifting wealth to the working men and women in California. Whether the Nation will follow that, the President has called for an increase in the minimum wage, and that will certainly be helpful in shifting to the working population of this Nation a larger share, or at least a fair share of the growth of the economy.

Let's talk about infrastructure for awhile. I know this is an issue you were working on, Mr. TONKO, following the floods of a year ago. We see those same floods—different floods, but devastating floods, occurring in Colorado. You were one of the strong advocates for rebuilding our infrastructure. Why don't you pick that issue up, and let's talk about how we might be able to accomplish that.

Mr. TONKO. There again, it's policy or lack thereof that's impacting us heavily. Witnessing some of the unusual 100-year storms, 500-year storms as they're designated in a rapid succession over the last several years, dating back to the late 1980s, but then in rapid succession 2006, 2011 and 2012 in upstate New York in an area that I represent,

or just south of me in the area that borders my district, tells me that even the nomenclature is ludicrous. It is not a 100 or 500-year storm; it's happening frequently. And it is because we don't embrace some of the science out there that, through data compilation, is begging our attention. If we're going to continue to ignore those impacts of Mother Nature, if we're going to ignore the global warming and impacts of Mother Nature on our infrastructure, we are going to have more and more bills for cleanup.

And is it just replacement, or are we talking about reevaluating situations? For instance, some of the electrical utility efforts that stayed most abundantly strong were distributed energy projects along the coast in metro New York with Superstorm Sandy. I saw infrastructure, bridges displaced by the powerful force of water, in some places equated to the cfs, the cubic feet per second, flow of Niagara Falls. So the data are telling you that these storms are more and more frequent, you're going to get this extra volume of water, precipitation, do you just replace, or do you take a longer span, greater height to that bridge design? These are things that need to be discussed. Again, it is going to be money coming out of the pocket because we're not dealing with the fundamental science that is telling us we should anticipate more and more of these storms.

The infrastructure along these efforts, the coastal erosion, is requiring all sorts of improvements of ports. This affects our economy. This requires a master plan. This requires a Make It In America agenda that puts into play investments into our infrastructure, to replace what has been damaged with a sound investment, reinvestment here, that improves upon a situation rather than just replaces when we know that it will probably not withstand the forces of Mother Nature into the future. So infrastructure is critical, and the millions that we can put to work with that kind of legislation. The President has called for improvement in our infrastructure that will put millions to work. The best way to resolve a deficit in this country is to have people going to work. The dignity that comes with that investment in work opportunity is good for working class families across this country. So we know what to do. Let's get on with the business.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, we were talking about this earlier before we came up here, and you may want to take up this issue. This is an issue of what an infrastructure investment needs to grow the economy.

Mr. TONKO. It speaks also to the order of investments, rather than the order of spending, as some might label it. As we improve our infrastructure, for every dollar invested, according to Mark Zandi, chief economist with Moody's and former economic adviser to Senator JOHN MCCAIN, \$1.57 is real-

ized for every \$1 that's invested. To me, that is a lucrative dividend. That is an opportunity for us to grow the economy by investing dollars, with the anticipation that there will be a good return on that investment. That's how it works. That's the beauty of building. I think it's what President Roosevelt saw in the 1930s and 1940s. He saw this opportunity to respond to the needs of America, public works projects that were absolutely essential, building water treatment centers, building schools and infrastructure, roads and the like.

President Eisenhower saw the beauty of an interstate highway system, putting people to work and making strong opportunities available for commerce. These are the fundamental needs of a sophisticated society. It's the needs of certainly America in a modern age, innovation economy. So the roads and bridges as traditional sources, water treatment facilities, utility grid upgrades, telecommunications, this goes well into the new technology spheres of today where you wire communities and neighborhoods for business. There is a dire need for that sort of activity. That puts people to work. That's an investment that will draw a rate of return on the dollars invested in those projects, and that's what makes the wisdom of that approach very remarkably sound and comprehensible.

I think history has taught us well, and for us to ignore history at a moment when we are still struggling with this comeback. And yes, there has been a steady growth in private sector jobs, but many propositions sent to the House and to the United States Senate by the Chief Executive, by the President, have been denied simply because of the source from whom they are coming. Let's be frank about this. This is not the time to play personality warfare. It's time to do sound, progressive policies that provide for then good politics, bipartisan politics for this Nation and her people and her working families. It's as simple as that. Let's go forward, invest in our manufacturing base. Innovation economy, clean energy economy, which requires the tools of a modern-day economy so we can build it cheaper and smarter perhaps, but definitely cheaper. That's how you land those contracts in the international marketplace.

So I am hopeful that our best days, Representative GARAMENDI, lie ahead if we have the tenacity, if we have the integrity to go forward with what are the soundest of policies and the boldness of investments that are done, that are placed on the table with the full anticipation and expectation that there is a reasonable rate of return on that investment.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We know there is an immediate return on investment in infrastructure. Mark Zandi laid it out there. You invest \$1 in infrastructure now, and you get back \$1.57, and you have somebody working immediately. They become a taxpayer rather than a

tax receiver. So there are some real opportunities here.

I want to just take a couple of seconds. I was reading *The Wall Street Journal* as I was flying from California today, and there was an article by Martin Feldstein, who was Ronald Reagan's chief economic adviser, and he focused in his article on several things and growing the economy. How do you get the economy growing? He specifically talked about infrastructure. He talked about infrastructure as a way to immediately employ people. We certainly agree with that. And it's also a way you lay the foundation for future economic growth because that infrastructure is then available for the future.

I was in Fresno, California, I guess 2 or 3 years ago, and went to the high school to talk at an educational conference there, and they are setting this conference in an auditorium that was built by the WPA, the Works Progress Administration in the Roosevelt period, the Franklin Delano Roosevelt period. So we were using this wonderful auditorium 70 years later. You go, wow, there's an infrastructure investment in education.

So it is by building this infrastructure we employ people immediately, and we then have the foundation for future economic growth.

You mentioned the water system, sanitation, electrical energy systems. Roads, highways and the like. And it's jobs today. I want to talk about how we can finance them.

Mr. TONKO. Don't forget our ports, our rail, our airports.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Let's not forget, this is not new economics. George Washington in his first month in office, and this is the first President, folks, his first month in office, turned to his Treasury Secretary, Alexander Hamilton, and said, develop an economic policy. Hamilton came back a couple of months later, not with a report that we would have, several thousand pages, but maybe 50 or 60 pages, and he laid out an economic policy. Number one on his agenda was to build America's infrastructure—ports, canals.

I know you're going to launch into the Erie Canal now that I've mentioned canals, which is your favorite subject. And he also talked about roads. He talked about laying down the infrastructure for the growth of the economy.

Before we get to your Erie Canal, I want to talk about something that actually happened. This is a good thing. This is a very good thing.

In the stimulus bill, which by the way did work, not as robust as we would have liked, but it did work, there was a provision to build locomotives for Amtrak. I think it was about \$800 million over a period of years would be spent on building locomotives for the east coast.

□ 2000

This is so you can get home, Mr. TONKO, on the east coast here. These

locomotives were to be 100 percent American-made. I don't know who wrote that provision, but it was one of the very few provisions in the stimulus bill that said make it in America, 100 percent American-made.

Siemens, a German company, one of the big international industrial companies, said, \$800 million. Oh, you have to make it in America. Okay.

Siemens had a factory in Sacramento, California, to manufacture light rail cars, you know, street cars and the like. They got this contract.

This is the first locomotive made in America by Siemens under that stimulus provision. They're going to make, I think, 80 of these over the period of the next several years, 100 percent American-made.

And now, across the United States, as a result of this infrastructure investment, we're beginning to see companies in a supply chain, some that are making the wheels, the truck underneath, which is where the wheels attach to the locomotive, the facility up on top that attaches to the electric lines. All of this, American-made, 100 percent American-made.

And by the way, I have a piece of legislation in that would continue that that says if you're going to spend your tax money on transportation systems, highways, bridges, locomotives and the like, it's going to be your tax money used to buy American-made equipment, just like George Washington said we ought to do it.

Mr. TONKO. Well, you know, it does go back to our humble beginnings. And again, history instructs us. History, if we allow it, will guide us. In some of our toughest times we realize some of our greatest, most monumental success stories.

And you did mention the canal, which for my area, I see the 20th Congressional District that I represent, is a donor area for that canal.

But I just want to make this factoid available. In those times, people look back, and they think, well, what a wonderful project, and it probably sailed through. No, it met with great controversy, and it was proposed because of economic difficult times.

And here was a vision. That's leadership. Give us the vision of how you can grow the economy, what can we do that is strong and forceful and will change the outcomes out there. And it was this connection of a port, in a little town called New York, that gave birth to a necklace of communities called mill towns in upstate New York that became epicenters of invention and innovation.

That all came about with a struggle, a struggle to find the investment available to build this canal. So the struggle will always be there.

Mr. GARAMENDI. What was that canal?

Mr. TONKO. The Erie Canal, barge canal history, which is wonderful.

But my point here is that there will always be struggle. For issues, there

will be a counterforce to every force of perceived good that can happen, but that doesn't mean we should walk away because the climate or the environment is difficult.

We go forward. We know what has to be done. History has been instructing us here. Science, through data compilation, is reminding us of some very tortuous outcomes that have been part of very atypical storms. Superstorm Sandy, which gripped the entire Northeast, was atypical. Tropical storms and hurricanes in upstate New York, unheard of, that produced all sorts of damage, including loss of life, loss of farm land, valuable farm land, loss of businesses, loss of homes in some ways, totally swept away by the forces of water.

That is a difficult situation that needs to be addressed with infrastructure improvements. If not, if we do not take this to heart and mind, we will be, I believe, a lesser society for not having paid strict attention to both science and history which ought to guide us.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, if you take a look at Superstorm Sandy—I don't know what they're going to call the storm that is occurring in Colorado, but we're also seeing the necessity to prepare for climate change and these new very strong, very dangerous storms that we now have seen repeated.

There's going to be a major infrastructure investment rebuilding Colorado, just as there was a major infrastructure investment in rebuilding the east coast following Superstorm Sandy. As that investment is made, we will see the economy begin to pick up as men and women return to work, if we take—what I think we ought to do is to spend that money on American-made concrete and steel and the like. As we rebuild these necessary infrastructure works we will add to the economic potential of that rebuilding.

Now, how are we going to pay for it?

Let's get down to what has been, I think, the most common complaint here: oh, you're just going to borrow the money and we're going to run up the deficit.

Well, Martin Feldstein was very clear today that if you make an investment in infrastructure, you're going to immediately employ people, and you will be making a major step towards solving the deficit problem. You do that now, he said. Begin that investment now.

Yes, you're going to borrow the money, not all of it, and there are ways that we can get, that we'll deal with that.

But there is a necessity of enhancing the economy. His suggestion was the infrastructure as one of the principal ways of doing that.

Now, we have ways of financing this. It's been discussed forever, dating back to the mid- and early nineties, that we ought to have an infrastructure bank.

The Europeans have an infrastructure bank. It's proved to be very successful. The money goes out to build

infrastructure. The repayment is made by bridge tolls, by fees on roads, by canal fees, other kinds of fees. That money comes back. It's circulated.

The President has called for an infrastructure bank, taking an idea that's been before Congress for the last 20 years, and he said, let's do it. Let's do it. We can borrow money at the Federal level still, less than 3 percent, sometimes 2 percent, put that into an infrastructure bank, invite the private sector pension funds and others to become part of that bank, and then lend that money out to those projects that have a cash flow, toll bridges, sanitation projects, waterworks, other kinds of things, so that we can get this economy moving.

We also had a program coming out of the stimulus bill called Build America Bonds, BABs, Build America Bonds. Those lasted all of 2 years, and then our colleagues here refused to reenact the Build America Bonds. These are other ways in which local entities can borrow the money and build the infrastructure and get their economy going.

And, furthermore, laying the foundation for future economic growth: you can't build a city on yesterday's infrastructure. You need to replace it, to be sure; and this is part of the problem in our cities, the aging infrastructure, the waterworks, the sanitation system and the rest. We need to rebuild that, but you also need to expand the infrastructure.

One final way that we can talk about financing this is how we do spend the tax revenue that does come in to the American Treasury.

Right now, Congress is debating on how to spend money for the next fiscal year which begins on October 1, how are we going to spend it.

Part of that appropriation process is to appropriate \$87 billion for the Afghanistan war in the coming year, October 1 through the 2014 year, until September 30, \$87 billion for Afghanistan.

How much money for flood protection in Colorado, flood protection in my district, flood protection across the Eastern Seaboard to build the seawalls? Virtually nothing.

But \$87 billion for Afghanistan. For what? For what? To build facilities that we will either destroy as we leave or will be destroyed shortly after we leave?

Seven billion dollars for the Afghan National Army, \$2.5 billion of which is for good things to be done, no line items, no particular knowledge about what they're going to spend that money on. I suspect most of it's going to wind up in some bank account by some crook in the Bahrain banks. \$2.5 billion.

What could we do with \$2.5 billion here in America?

And by the way, we're drawing down the troops in Afghanistan. We're actually going to spend more money in Afghanistan next year than we are this year, even though we have 60 percent fewer troops in Afghanistan.

We're making choices. Your Representatives, 435 of us, and 100 Members of the Senate, are making choices about how your money's going to be spent.

And by the way, I haven't talked about the nuclear bombs, 5,000 of them. We're going to rebuild them. Now, there's a good investment. Really?

I don't think so, not when the levees in my district can't be rebuilt to protect my citizens from floods, to rebuild a nuclear weapon that we don't need in the first place. I don't think so.

So we're making choices. We're making choices for you, the American taxpayers, about how your money's going to be spent.

For me, I want to spend it in America. I want to spend it on American-made goods and equipment, not on products from China, as happened with the newly reopened San Francisco-Oakland Bay bridge—steel from China, not from America.

I want that money spent here, and I want that money spent on our infrastructure, on our education, on research, energy projects.

We're going to make choices. We're making those choices right now. We're up against the wall. By the end of this month, September 30, the government runs out of money.

Where are we going to spend it?

Or are we going to spend it all?

Are we just going to shut down government?

I don't know. I'm worried. I'm worried about the choices that we're making. I'm worried about more expenditure in Afghanistan and not here at home. I'm worried about rebuilding all these nuclear weapons that, God willing, we'll never use.

Choices. Can we actually build America?

Can we find the willingness to create an infrastructure bank?

Can we find the willingness to bring the money back home and spend it here to build this economy?

Because, ultimately, as our Joint Chiefs of Staff have said repeatedly, it's the American economy. Without that strength, there won't be military strength.

I've gone on too far here. Mr. TONKO, let's begin to wrap this up.

Mr. TONKO. Yes. In fact, I will offer my closing comments here, Representative GARAMENDI.

You know, I think what you talk about in choices are exactly what a budget is about. It's the priorities we establish, in a bipartisan fashion and a bicameral way, that enable us to go forward with the best blueprint that grows the most hope and promise for this Nation. If we can deliver that hope, we've done our job.

This is about investing in the American Dream. It's about responding to that old, old adage within this Nation that you tether that American Dream here in this wonderful Nation, where people rightfully anticipate that if they play by the rules, they roll up

their sleeves, they invest their talents and their skills and their intellect and their passions into work, they rightfully anticipate to taste success; and that allows them to have an equal shot at opportunity in this Nation.

That has not been the guiding course. We have had an unlevel playing field. We have made choices that have penalized the great percentage of Americans; 95 to 98 percent of Americans have been impacted by some of these choices and priorities to the negative.

And so it's important for us, I believe, to offer that dream, that American Dream, the underpinnings of support that it rightfully requires.

The cost of a college education ought to be addressed by Washington. We need to forcefully come up with a plan that reduces that cost, because that higher ed opportunity, those apprenticeship programs are training the workforce of tomorrow. And without that workforce, without that human infrastructure, we are less robust in our competitive force.

What about the investment, as Representative GARAMENDI mentioned, in infrastructure?

What about that infrastructure bill that has worked well in sections of the globe?

Why not go forward with that opportunity so that small business can prosper in that outcome?

The great engine of this economy, of this comeback, has been small business growth; jobs provided by those business citizens who are tethered to their community, who have enabled women and men in all sections of this country to draw a paycheck through some sort of commitment that they make as a small business person, giving that work opportunity to their neighbors and to the communities that they call home.

That's the strength that we need for small business so that we can continue to be that engine of comeback. That comeback scenario is incredibly valuable to this Nation.

And what about going forward with the commitment?

There's a soundness of that moral compass that should guide us. Forever there will be those who require justice in our society, economic and social justice.

We're reminded by our Founding Parents that we are in search of a more perfect Union. Well, the imperfections need to be addressed by those priorities that are established, established by us, the people's representatives in this House and in the Senate and in the White House, all of us working in a bicameral, bipartisan way to put aside petty partisan differences, to put aside personality warfare, and make certain we go forward with an agenda that is truly all-American, driven, ignited, and lifted by the American Dream.

□ 2015

Our days, Representative GARAMENDI, that lie ahead hold great promise,

great hope. I'm convinced that our best days lie ahead if we allow history and science to instruct us and to reach our hearts, our souls, and our minds as we go forward with the development of a budget that will be sound and reflective of all of America, with every one of her daughters and sons reflected in those decisions.

So I thank you for bringing us together this evening.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you very, very much. Indeed, our best days are ahead of us. Even in the dismal days of the Great Depression in the thirties, Franklin Roosevelt laid it out very clearly when he said:

The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

If 95 percent of the wealth that's been generated over the last 5 years winds up with 1 percent, we've got a problem, because the economy isn't going to grow and what will happen is this: hunger in America.

Later this week, we'll take up the nutrition bill for this Nation. There are those who want to remove \$40 billion from the nutrition programs for our children, for our seniors, for those that are unemployed, and for those that are searching for work. We can do better; we really can.

The best days are ahead of us if this Congress and the Senate, together with the President, work together and lay out those plans that have informed us historically that they work.

Investment—investments are those things that make America strong—infrastructure, research, education, those are things that are timeless and work year after year. They're also things that have recently been reduced and cut.

We can't let this happen in America. We cannot allow that to happen.

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

SURVIVAL OF THE COAL INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it's an honor to be standing before the House this evening to talk about a very, very important issue, an issue that is important not only to my constituents in eastern and southeastern Ohio, but to Americans across the Nation, and the issue is the survival of the coal industry.

Coal has provided America's energy engine for generations, and can for many future generations if we have policies out of this administration that reflect the value that the coal industry has meant to America and the future that it has in front of us.

Coal is an abundant, affordable, and reliable form of energy. Coal directly

or indirectly employs nearly 800,000 Americans and supplies approximately 40 percent of our Nation's power generation. Coal mining employees across my district number in the thousands in eastern and southeastern Ohio. It also provides nearly 80 percent of Ohio's electricity, and it's the energy engine for Ohio's manufacturing industry which so many of my constituents depend on for their livelihood.

I'm very proud to be joined tonight, Mr. Speaker, by some of my colleagues who are equally passionate about the coal industry and its value to America, both in the past and in the future.

At this point, I yield to my friend and colleague from the great State of Kentucky's Sixth District, Representative ANDY BARR.

Mr. BARR. I thank the gentleman, my friend from Ohio, for yielding and for organizing this Special Order on coal.

This fall marks the fifth anniversary of the financial crisis. We remain burdened by a weak economic recovery, with unemployment still lingering above 7 percent, two-thirds of the American people living paycheck to paycheck, and only 58 percent of the working-age population in this country employed. But this does not seem to concern this President or this administration. Unable to wage a war in Syria due to immense public opposition, the President, for some reason, seems intent on conducting a war on jobs.

Whether it's driving up the cost of health care with the disastrous Affordable Care Act or burdening community banks with mountains of bureaucratic red tape from the Dodd-Frank Act, this administration is seemingly intent on doing everything in its power to ensure this recovery remains slow and painful.

The finalization of the New Source Performance Standards rules from the EPA for greenhouse gas emissions this week will represent the latest and perhaps the most damaging barrage in this war on jobs. This regulatory carbon tax is the keystone of a radical environmental agenda, the disastrous results of which are already known in my district of central and eastern Kentucky. The consequences of these regulations have echoed throughout the hills of Appalachia, and they will reverberate across the country in years to come.

The New Source Performance Standards will finish the job that a deadlocked permitting process and multi-billion-dollar regulations like Utility MACT have started: killing the coal industry and driving up the cost of energy, a top-line budget item for families already struggling to get by in this President's economy.

But then, no one should be surprised. This is the one promise the President made and has kept. When running in 2008, President Obama, then Candidate Obama, said his policies would make the cost of electricity "necessarily skyrocket." More recently, White House climate adviser Daniel Schrag

recently admitted this administration's previously only thinly veiled position. Mr. Schrag said, famously now, "a war on coal is exactly what's needed."

Mr. Speaker, I can't think of another example of a Presidential administration pledging to put hardworking Americans in a centuries' old industry totally out of work, apparently for the crime of providing low-cost energy that drives the engine of our economy.

The damage of these policies is already clear in Kentucky. Just yesterday, another 525 coal miners employed at three eastern Kentucky mines operated by the James River Coal Company were given pink slips. My heart goes out to these miners and to their families. And I have met some of these people. They're just trying to follow their ancestors by digging up a piece of the American Dream in the Appalachian foothills.

Last month, the Commonwealth of Kentucky released statistics on the health of the coal industry for the second quarter of this year, and the story they tell is dire, even before yesterday's news of another 525 layoffs. Eastern Kentucky coal mines facing the brunt of this President's regulatory overreach shed another 851 jobs last quarter, leaving the total number of Kentucky employed at the mines at just 12,342. That is the lowest number since Kentucky began keeping such statistics in 1927. Eastern Kentucky coal production is down a whopping 41.4 percent in just the last 2 years. And with those reductions, we have lost over 5,700 mining jobs.

And now the New Source Performance Standards will prohibit coal from even competing in the energy marketplace, even though the final regulations have now been delayed a year due to industry and public opposition, as so often before this administration has brushed those concerns aside and proceeded apace. The EPA even forecasts, given the regulatory environment, that there will be no new coal plants built after this year.

Rather than phasing in rules to allow all types of fuel to adapt, these regulations on new and existing plants single out coal, stifling the promise of carbon capture in its crib, a technology that could have provided the United States with a revolutionary technology on the magnitude of hydraulic fracturing that could have changed the course and shape of our economy, driven exports, and paid real benefits in terms of carbon emissions reductions. Instead, the United States will endure unilateral economic disarmament while our international competitors continue to pursue growth-oriented energy policies.

Over the next few years as these policies take hold, the rest of the country will be made aware of this disaster that is already taking place in Appalachia. Already, one-fifth of the Nation's coal-fired plants—204 plants across 25 States—closed between 2009 and 2012. The rest will shutter prematurely in