

wrongdoing, misconduct, within the very department that raided her home and took her records and won't give them back.

At the same time, this administration continues to send people to the nation of Israel, the Jewish State, the home where people could come by the millions after 6 million were killed in the Holocaust of World War II.

We have the nerve to send people over to the leaders of Israel and tell them they have got to give away more land, when every time they have given away land, whether it was northern Israel, that is now southern Lebanon, or whether it is the Gaza Strip, anything they have given away ends up being used as a staging area from which to attack it; and those to whom the land is given use our money we provide for books to teach their children to hate Jews, to hate Israelis, and to hate the United States.

As I have said for years, you don't have to pay people to hate you. They will do it for free. We could make our word good to our veterans if we just quit paying the people that hate us. Let them hate us for free. Maybe they would learn to like us and come ask to work with us and find out we are actually pretty decent people if we quit paying them to hate us.

The Palestinians, was reported, January 1 in this Jerusalem Post article, said Palestinians reiterate plans to reject any framework accord presented by the U.S. And yet we send over a Secretary of State, well-meaning, and others, to demand Israel give up more land to people that say they will reject it, but give us more land from which we can attack you.

I think about the verses in Jeremiah, where the prophecy is there that there will be grapes grown in the mountains of Samaria, that some are saying doesn't belong to Israel. Well it used to; 1,600 years before a man named Mohammed was born, King David was ruling in that region.

But over the years, over the decades and centuries, people have said, look, that area, those mountains of Samaria will not grow grapes. That is ridiculous. And yet in the past couple of years, I have tasted those grapes. The vineyards are beautiful. They are Israeli, Jewish vineyards in the mountains of Samaria, just as Jeremiah prophesied would happen, that God would make it happen.

And we send a Secretary of State over saying, you have got to give away what you believe God providentially provided to you. We, the United States, know more than any god you believe in. Give it away.

It has been prophesied. I would hate to go against prophecy.

And yet this article from the Telegraph, Iran Nuclear Deal, Saudi Arabia warns it will strike out on its own. As STEVE KING, MICHELLE BACHMANN and I, ROBERT PITTENGER, traveled to some of the countries in the Middle East, as others of us traveled around the Middle

East back in September, it is incredible, but this administration, with what it is doing in Iran, the rest of the Middle East believes is going to allow Iran to have nukes and Saudi Arabia and our other allies and our enemies all want nukes, and nuclear proliferation will become just a rule of thumb, which is why I think this article appeared January 2 in the Washington Times, showing a comment that makes sense now, but "Anti-Communist Icon Decries Obama: U.S. No Longer Leads the World."

This was from Lech Walesa, and he had great hopes for the United States. He obviously had great hopes for this administration.

He said whatever hope in the world existed that Obama would reclaim moral leadership for America when elected in 2008 is gone, and instead the President has failed to bring that dream to fruition, he told CNN.

We have to do everything we can to recreate, to reclaim America's role, and it seems that Obama would manage that, but he didn't accomplish that. America did not regain its leadership status. We're just lucky there were no bigger conflicts in the world, because if it had had bigger conflicts, then the world would be helpless.

The trouble is, 2014 will be a year in which there are bigger conflicts, bigger issues. It is time we did the moral thing by our military veterans. It is time we did the moral thing by stopping the spending of children and grandchildren and great grandchildren's money. And it is time we did the moral thing by our friends and quit helping our friends' enemies hurt our friends.

□ 2030

We need to regain, as Lech Walesa said, the moral authority we once had. That can be done, and we need to seize the day and do it.

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

JOBS

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. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is good to return from our 3 weeks back in our districts. I suspect that most of us spent time talking to our constituents, observing the good and the bad and the cold and the wet—not in California, where we have been in the midst of a drought—but working, as we should, back in our districts and also spending some time with our families along the way. For me, it was one of those periods of time where we were reaching out, trying to gain an understanding of the challenges that face our constituents.

As I returned here today, I realized that in 1964, Mr. Speaker, right below you on the podium where one of our key assistants is now standing, a fellow by the name of Lyndon Baines Johnson gave a speech—here is a picture of him—on January 8, 1964, speaking to a joint session of Congress. I think it was his first speech after becoming President, following the tragic assassination of President Kennedy. There he stood. And among the things he told America was that it was time for a war, a war on poverty, and he urged the United States to take on the troubling and continuing issue of poverty in the United States.

I remember that speech. I was in college at the time. I remember him standing there, and I remember that challenge, following shortly upon the challenge that President Kennedy had given us to ask not what our country could do for us but, rather, what we could do for our country.

So those two things came together, and they have been with me these many, many years, together with one other very famous and very important challenge. And this was from Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It is etched into the marble in his memorial here in Washington, D.C. President Roosevelt 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.

That ethical moral position was taken up by Lyndon Baines Johnson when he declared the war on poverty 50 years ago—50 years ago—at a time when seniors in the United States, 47 percent of them, were impoverished.

I remember well during those years when my father took me to the county hospital to visit a neighbor, the poverty, the ward, the odor, the hopelessness.

So what did America do? What did America do to face this challenge? Well, Social Security was already in place, one of the fundamental pillars to deal with poverty among seniors. In this Chamber, in the Senate Chamber, the men and women who then represented the American people put forward an extraordinary effort to deal with poverty in the United States. And one of those major second pillars to address poverty was the establishment of the Medicare program for seniors. Men and women over 65 years of age were guaranteed that, if they lived to 65 in the days and years following, they would have a health insurance program, which was an incredible step forward.

Many other things were done. Programs were put in place for jobs, job programs across this Nation, in Appalachia, in the Central Valley of California, and all across this Nation. There was an outpouring of sympathy, an outpouring of the basic morality of this country took place.

In 1967, 29 percent of the children in this country were in poverty. In 2012, it was 19 percent, one out of five. That is

far too high. It is a challenge for our generation.

How did they bring it down from 29 percent to 19 percent? They did it with government programs of many kinds—Head Start, food stamp programs, programs dealing with earned income tax credits, which, by the way, was added during the Nixon period. All of those things together reduced the poverty. Today, take away those government support programs for children and we would have 30 percent of the children in the United States living in poverty.

I would just like to remind my Republican colleagues that what they have attempted to do this year in their budgets, in their appropriation proposals, is to reduce those programs that 30 percent of the children of the United States—nearly one out of three—depend upon to stay out of poverty. That is not a good idea.

If this is one of our moral compasses, adding to the abundance of those who have much or providing for those who have too little, if that is a moral compass, how are we doing? Well, let's look at it. Let's look at how we are doing.

One of the things that FDR said from the four freedoms: the freedom from want. As a result of the Great Recession in 2010 and beyond, 46.2 million Americans live below the poverty level, the highest number in 52 years. Food lines in America today are as they were in the 1930s. Men and women are lining up at the various food programs to get food. That is America today.

How about the children? How about the children today, those one in five? Well, let's see. If FDR says the test is not how well the wealthy are doing but, rather, how the poor are doing, in 2012, the wealthiest Americans took home the biggest share of income—the biggest share of income, in 2012—ever recorded in America's history. One out of every four children in America go to bed at night not knowing where their next meal comes from.

In my own area, Sacramento, California, as reported by the Sacramento Bee, the capital's newspaper, the bottom 20 percent of the region's people lost 27 percent of their income between 2007 and the beginning of 2013. The bottom 20 percent earned less than \$23,000 a year, yet they lost 27 percent of their income. The next 20 percent, those making \$43,000 down to \$23,000 lost 22 percent of their income. The next 20 percent—we are now up to 60 percent—those making between \$43,000 and \$71,000 in annual income, lost 15 percent of their income. This is America today in my area, where the bottom 60 percent have not moved forward but, rather, have moved backwards. Oh, but if you are in the top 20 percent, these folks here, they took in 50 percent of all of the income generated and earned in the Sacramento region. The bottom 20 percent took in 3 percent.

So Franklin Delano Roosevelt, how are we doing with our moral compass? How are we doing? Are we adding to those who have little or are we adding to those who have much?

It is clear that, not just in the Sacramento, California, region but across this Nation, those who have much are doing extraordinarily well while those who have little are falling further and further behind. Hmm.

Fifty years ago today, President Lyndon Baines Johnson stood right there and he declared a war on poverty. And where are we today? We are not winning that war at all. But there are solutions. There are ways in which we can deal with this, and one of them is to put a stop to this kind of situation.

This is a photo taken outside of a workshop that I conducted in Fairfield, California, for the unemployed. It is a jobs workshop. In a town of less than 100,000, 1,000 people showed up seeking a job. Unemployment is very real, and unemployment is a specific cause for the statistics that indicate growing poverty in America.

These folks want a job. But yet on December 28, 1.2 million Americans—some of them here in this line—lost their unemployment insurance. So are they wealthier having lost an average of \$265 a week on a long-term unemployment insurance check or are they poorer? What are they going to do? Of every one of these people, 2.9 of them are looking for the one job that exists. So one out of three will find a job, maybe.

The long-term unemployed have an even greater challenge, and we will talk about that tonight. We have an enormous challenge here in America. We have got to put people back to work.

In Solano County, where Fairfield is, 2,640 of the folks that stood outside searching for a job in early December—by the way, the temperature there was not below zero, but it was below freezing—they were standing in the cold, below freezing temperatures for more than an hour to get in just to have a chance to talk to the 50 or some employers that were there.

By the way, 50 veterans did get an opportunity to get a job that day. 2,640 long-term unemployed lost their unemployment insurance, and they don't have a job today. So what of them?

Colusa County, which I also represent, is one of the poorest counties in America and is also one of the wealthiest counties for those at the top. A population of 21,244 people lost their unemployment insurance.

□ 2045

The stories are in the faces of these people desperate to go to work. We're going to talk today a little bit about that with my colleagues.

A second way in which we can deal with this poverty issue is to deal with the minimum wage. Yesterday, I had a meeting of my agricultural advisory committee. I have a very big agricultural district, \$3 billion farm gate. One of the farmers, a conservative fellow, came up to me, and he talked to me about food stamps. He said, hey, listen. I know you're working on the farm bill,

and I know this issue of farm subsidies is very much in play, but I'm telling you where I'm coming from. You can reduce the subsidies, but make sure people have food. Make sure that the SNAP program, the food program, is in place. I'll trade the subsidies so people have food. He said—and this was the interesting part, because I had not heard it from a conservative before—he said, and raise the minimum wage. Raise the minimum wage.

Interesting. Today, the Federal minimum wage is \$7.25. If you were to use equal dollars, take out the inflation, \$7.25 equates to a minimum wage in 1978—this is Ronald Reagan period, 1978—of \$10.60. So in equal dollars in 1978 the minimum wage was \$10.60. Today, it is \$7.25. So you wonder why, why is it that in America today we have food lines? Why is it in America today that one out of four children goes to bed hungry worried about where their next meal is going to come from? Why in America after 50 years with LBJ standing right there and declaring a war on poverty, that we are where we are today?

Does minimum wage have something to do with it? Oh, yes. Does unemployment have something to do with it? Oh, yes—and it's going to be worse tomorrow, as it was on December 29, January 1, January 5, 6, today the 7th and tomorrow the 8th, when 1.2 million people don't have that unemployment check and unemployment insurance is gone. By the way, it will get worse unless this Congress acts on the unemployment insurance. The statistics are there—right there. By the end of this year, unless Congress acts to put people back to work—and we can, and we will talk about that tonight—unless Congress acts to extend the unemployment insurance, 4.9 million Americans will lose their unemployment insurance, and this will be the face of America: hungry children. This will be the face of America: hungry adults and families without jobs.

This is America. This is the place where we can solve problems. We have it within our capability as a nation and as an economy to put people back to work. We can do it if we have the will to do it. It's up to us to look into the faces of poverty in America, to look at the children of America, and say, we can address this issue.

We can put people back to work. We can do it now by rebuilding America's infrastructure. We can pay for the unemployment insurance by not spending nearly \$90 billion this year in Afghanistan for the most corrupt government on the face of the Earth, \$6.8 billion needed to keep Americans with food, shelter, and clothing. We can take it out of the pocket of Mr. Karzai and his cronies and still meet the challenges that my colleague spoke about earlier this evening.

We're making choices here. We can build our infrastructure. We can pay for the unemployment insurance. We can educate our children. For those

long-term unemployed that need a re-education, need to have that job skill, we can do it. When we do it, this economy will grow. The taxes will flow into the governments of the United States, including the Federal Government. The deficits will shrink. You leave that long-term unemployment as high as it is today, and we have put an anchor out the back of the great economic ship of the United States, and we will not be able to move forward in a way that addresses this issue, this fundamental, moral issue of America. Are we providing enough for those who have too little? Today, we are not, but we can.

Joining me tonight are two of my colleagues. From the east coast is PAUL TONKO. You and I have spent many hours here on the floor discussing these issues. Joining me is our new colleague from the State of Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD). I'd like you to start. I know you had an experience this last week in your district when you met with people that were unemployed. Please share with us your view of this issue from the State of Nevada.

Mr. HORSFORD. Thank you. First, I'd like to extend my appreciation to my colleague, Mr. GARAMENDI from California, for laying out the case for economic mobility. I'm glad that we're beginning to have this discussion at the beginning of this second session of the 113th Congress because it's the discussion that the American people desperately need this Congress to focus on, and you touched on it. Are we providing enough for the people who have too little? Are we focused on those who are in the middle class and are striving to be part of the middle class?

I'm from Nevada. Nevada is currently tied with Rhode Island for the highest unemployment in the Nation at 9 percent. This is not something that we're proud of. We like boasting about being the entertainment capital of the world and the fact that we have some of the most magnificent natural resources. Unfortunately, the prolonged recession has hit our State and the people of Nevada to our core, and it's because, in large part, our economy was a growth economy. For nearly 20 years, year over year, we had double-digit growth, and people were moving to the great State of Nevada to help us build and to grow. During the recession, that changed. So, now, thousands, over 100,000, Nevadans are unemployed and have been, primarily from the construction, engineering, and architecture sectors of our economy.

Thousands of Nevadans have spent more than a year now doing what many of us here in Congress maybe haven't had the perspective of experiencing. So my question to my colleagues tonight is, have you ever been unemployed? Do you know what it feels like to have to go to a work center or to spend your days full-time looking for work? Do you know what it means to submit resume after resume, never to get a call back, not knowing if it's your skills or

some other issue as to why you're not getting that interview?

Well, thousands of Nevadans have the full-time job right now of looking for work, and I recently held a meeting at a local work center, Workforce Connections, and met with constituents who are affected by this prolonged recession and the discussion that we're having here tonight about the need to have a priority and a focus on creating jobs in America again.

They've been affected by the downturn in the economy, and they've been affected by the expiration of unemployment benefits, many of them. I promised that when I came back to Congress today that I would share the story of several of these constituents because too often we talk in this Chamber as if there aren't people behind the numbers.

There are 1.3 million Americans, our neighbors, who are without unemployment insurance. Think about that term—insurance, of the unemployment insurance program, who are relying on this Congress to do its job so that our neighbors, our friends, and some of our family who are unemployed cannot be left out and without.

So I just want to share the story of several of these constituents because I want to put a perspective on who we're talking about. One of the constituents, her name is Pauline. She's worked in a warehouse customer service position. She has a degree in bookkeeping. Unfortunately, after more than 20 years in serving as an accountant, her skills are outdated, and so as she has looked for current jobs, she hasn't been able to land one. She was laid off because technology devalued her position, and there was no longer a need for her services. She currently lives at a home with her husband and two adult offspring, who are also looking for work. One of her daughters just got hired, actually yesterday, as a teacher. She was very proud of that. So do you know what she is doing after 20 years? She has enrolled in a training program to update her skills in QuickBooks so that she can add that certification to her resume, because that's one of the things that the employers that she's applying for say that they want her to have, this certification. She's using the unemployment insurance as a bridge while she's in training to allow her and her family to meet their basic obligations to keep a roof over their head, to provide food on the table and to keep the lights on. Those are the basics that are being funded because of unemployment insurance.

Then there is Alfordeen. She was laid off from the medical industry after more than 20 years as an administration person. She handled all of the admissions for this local medical company in southern Nevada. She is currently looking to obtain her certification for her to meet the minimum requirements for current positions in her field. She is also a cancer survivor. She found out she had cancer after she lost

her job, the job that provided her health benefits. She was thankful because of the Affordable Care Act she now can get insurance again that she lost because she lost her job. After more than 20 years of caring for people in the health care industry, she is now relying on unemployment insurance as a bridge so that she can meet her obligations while going to school so that she can get back into the career that she loves, helping other people.

Teresa also was laid off from the medical industry. She is in need of updated skills and certification in order to find gainful employment. One of the things that struck me about the stories, listening to Teresa, Alfordeen, and Pauline, is they all expressed the same concern that because they've been in the workforce for 20—one was in the workforce for 30 years—that they feel that they're not being given an equal shot now in competing for jobs when they go to apply, that they feel like because of their age, maybe, that they're being looked over for possible positions.

I think that's a real issue that this Congress needs to confront. I know that there is legislation by people like Representative SCHAKOWSKY and others who want to bring this issue to this body, and I ask the Speaker to allow that legislation to be considered.

□ 2100

There is James, who worked also as a customer service representative and who is enrolled in a training program to become a medical biller because he knows that is a demand occupation right now and there are a ton of openings. Again, he needs to have a certification in order to get the job.

Then there is Susan, who is currently unemployed, and her unemployment funds stopped 3 weeks ago. She is a single mother who is caring for her daughter and receives no child support. She has no family to rely upon, and she is not eligible nor seeking welfare.

All of the Nevadans that I have met with have had their unemployment insurance lapse, and they are scrambling to make ends meet. No one, none of them, wants to live on unemployment insurance forever. In fact, they all said to a person that they wanted to go to work. Some of them were in training, and they were using unemployment as a bridge. Others go to the Workforce Connections office on a regular basis every week looking for jobs to apply for. None of them are lazy, Mr. Speaker.

When unemployment insurance expires, it doesn't just mean those struggling to find work won't be able to put food on the table or pay the rent; it means money that is pumped into our local economy will also be lost, and that is a serious drag on the economy. So if you don't want to listen to me talk about the people who are affected behind the 1.3 million who are losing their unemployment insurance, the 20,000 Nevadans, then maybe you will

care that this is a drag on our economy, and you will do the right thing by extending the unemployment insurance.

Overall, failing to renew the emergency unemployment compensation program will cost the economy 200,000 jobs this year, according to the Congressional Budget Office, including 3,000 jobs in my home State of Nevada. The expiration of Federal unemployment insurance at the end of last week is already taking more than \$400 million out of pockets of American job seekers nationwide and in local and State economies. In Nevada, the total economic benefit lost during the first week of the insurance expiring was \$5.4 million. For every \$1 spent on unemployment insurance, it grows the economy by \$1.52, according to Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody's Analytics. So there are some 17,600 unemployed workers in Nevada who have lost their unemployment benefits because this Congress failed to do its job in December when we had an opportunity to do it.

I urged the Speaker, along with 170 of my colleagues, to not adjourn, to not go on recess until we completed the work of extending the unemployment insurance, but that request was not acted upon. So we are here, and as my colleagues have said, there are things, there are solutions that we can do to extend the unemployment insurance.

If you want to offset it, if you want to have pay-fors, I would like to offer a couple of suggestions on how to pay for it. In order to offset funding for unemployment insurance, Congress could close a number of corporate tax loopholes, such as eliminating tax incentives for companies to move jobs overseas. Why is it that we continue to incentivize major corporations, based on U.S. tax policy, for shipping jobs overseas when we have Americans who are desperate for work right here? Why should big CEOs get corporate bonuses at the end of the year for sending our jobs to other countries when the people in our own neighborhoods could be performing that work?

The United States loses an estimated \$150 billion annually to tax-avoidance schemes involving tax havens. Many of our largest and most-profitable corporations paid absolutely no Federal taxes at all in 2011. So Congress could also find revenue by placing caps on commodity payments or eliminating or reducing subsidies to mega-farms in the farm bill that is currently being negotiated. So for whatever reason, if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle think that it is the constituents I talked about, who get \$300 or \$400 a week, who are the problem with the Federal budget, that they are the reason that we have a Federal deficit, then I would urge you to consider these pay-fors. Let us end the corporate tax subsidies. Let us end the policies that ship our jobs overseas, and let's start investing in America and Americans again. There are reasonable solutions,

but that means we have to come together to get it done. We can't let rigid ideology trump the practical need to help those in need.

I thank my colleagues, Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. TONKO, for being here tonight, and I am hopeful that the Senate, under the leadership of Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID and my U.S. Senator, Republican DEAN HELLER, who is a cosponsor on the unemployment insurance bill, extend it for 3 months. They are working in the Senate to reach an agreement. I hope that the Speaker and my colleagues in the House will take it up and vote on it so that none of our neighbors go without unemployment insurance to provide for themselves or their families.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. HORSFORD, thank you very much for bringing to us the message from Nevada, the message of compassion and the message of hope and the challenge that we face. This House is fortunate, as are the constituents that have elected you, to have your voice heard on the floor and heard across America.

Now, over the last 3 years, my colleague from New York and I have talked about jobs, talked about making it in America, and talked about this problem of unemployment. So joining me now is PAUL TONKO from the great State of New York.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI, for leading us in this discussion for an hour of focus on solutions that are possible out there, within our grasp, easily within our grasp. As you and the gentleman from Nevada (Representative HORSFORD) have highlighted with a very, very strong context placed in terms of the human impact here, and the great compassion with which you spoke, I couldn't help but think that we are challenged in this given moment by a very daunting series of questions, most notably: Do we reject our history, or do we respect our history?

Our history, replete with success stories, perhaps in some of our darkest, deepest, painful hours, should inspire and direct and challenge us, guide us in a way that enables us to embrace the progressive voices of the past and use that in an instructive measure to move forward with the socially correct thing to be done so as to respond to those needs of the many, the bulk of the middle-income community that beacons us to be there and to be there in such a measure. Do we respect that history? Representative GARAMENDI shared the words of President Franklin Roosevelt. Are we willing to add to those who have plenty? We were challenged by President Johnson in his message addressing the war on poverty.

Today, as all of these statistics were exchanged by my two colleagues, I couldn't help but recall the fact that we are reaching some of the greatest measures of productivity in our business community, in our industrial settings today. Where is the sharing of success? Where is the sharing with the

middle-income community, the workers who have produced that sort of productivity? So let me understand this. The growth of the top 1 percent, the top income strata of our society, has been exponentially strong, all while we have seen a diminishing of the growth, the potential growth of our middle-income community or a flat-lining, all while we have been most productive in our industry and business settings. Where is the economic justice? Where is the sharing that allows for us to enhance that purchasing power of the middle-income community? That is the economic engine of this Nation.

So as we are faced with these given statistics, as we are challenged with these economic times in the post-recession recovery, the moral compass should guide us, if not our history, replete with success stories. Do we respect our history or do we reject our history?

I would suggest those progressive voices of the past that led us through our darkest hours envisioned an outcome that strengthened everyone in the equation, not playing toward favorites, because, in my opinion, catering to a small percentage of the population is a dangerous outcome for them. In order to succeed, in order to continue to grow and survive, you need to have that strong purchasing power.

We know, we know from statistics, we know from past history that we should be guided by those economic reforms that enable social and economic justice to take hold. I look at the impact in New York State: 127,000 people affected when I look at the 20th Congressional District. In all of the statistics, the numbers swell from 127,000 to another series of 133,000 that will be affected. As it has been stated earlier tonight, some economic consequences of \$400 million and 200,000 jobs lost. Are we willing to endure that simply by our lack of professionalism here? The willingness to walk past those who, through no fault of their own, are unemployed. Three people pursue every one available job, and that statistic also is accompanied by the requirement that you must actively pursue employment. It is part of the program.

I was visited today, Representative GARAMENDI, by Vice President BIDEN in the 20th Congressional District. He and our governor, Governor Andrew Cuomo, and our State leadership, Shelly Silver, speaker of the Assembly with whom I had the pleasure of serving, who has been a great leader for New York, as has the Governor, and the Senate majority leader, Dean Skelos, all of whom have shown an interest in infrastructure, all gathered today in New York in the 20th Congressional District, specifically at Albany, our State capital. It was about Superstorm Sandy and the impacts of storms Irene and Lee that in 2011, for Irene and Lee, and in 2012 with Superstorm Sandy devastated various regions of New York State. Yes, we need to rebuild, but you need to do it

intelligently and with an order of academics, and certainly with a strategic planning that accompanies all of that effort that is effective, efficient, smart government. The Vice President spoke to the wisdom of investing in infrastructure because commerce requires it.

Across this great Nation, talk to the midland of America. Without the appropriate infrastructure, they can't send forth their agricultural produced products or their manufactured goods. They cannot ship forward, and so commerce is crippled by our lack of investment in infrastructure.

□ 2115

And so with great sensitivity the Vice President spoke, spoke to the infrastructure needs of New York and that we will utilize these efforts with the guidance of New York State, with the Governor and the legislature, to make certain that it is not merely replacing infrastructure damaged by the ravaging of Mother Nature, but rather restructuring and reorganizing how we respond to that.

Much of our energy infrastructure, our water-sewer treatment infrastructure, our manufacturing infrastructure, are along water's edge, either intercoastal systems or the coastal system itself. We extended our land into the coastal system and now Mother Nature is saying, whoa, push back.

But that urgency that came with those storms has us now struggling with infrastructure investment. Is that what we require in order to invest in infrastructure? So we need to go forward and make certain that these down payments on the future strength of this Nation are made and made sensibly and made in an order of investment, not spending but investing, where reasonable expectation, justified expectation, of a return on those hard-earned tax dollars is there. We will see that with the infrastructure improvement. So much can be done.

I will close with this—not close with this, but—

Mr. GARAMENDI. Take a break.

Mr. TONKO. Take a break, as they say.

You can't have it both ways. You can't deny all these legislative bills that are advanced to the Congress or initiated by Members of the House that would speak to job growth. The President has sent forward on behalf of the administration a number of bills that would grow our economy, grow the climate to enhance job growth.

You can't reject that agenda and then not reauthorize the unemployment insurance benefit package. If you are going to do that, if you are not going to reauthorize, then you need to do the jobs packages that have been sent here. But to do both, to reject the job packages—the legislation that would grow that climate—and also reject the reauthorization of unemployment insurance, reject minimum wage, reject the SNAP programs, that is

harsh. That is not being guided by a moral compass, and that is not America at her best.

So I would implore with my colleagues on this floor this evening, with Representative GARAMENDI, Representative HORSFORD, I would implore the leadership of this House to pursue that agenda that provides for job creation and that speaks to economic justice and that responds with insensitive measure to those who are unemployed through no fault of their own who are actively searching for employment.

We need those job-training programs. We need the assistance programs, so as to maintain the economic comeback from the recession.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you so very, very much. We have got about 10 or 12 minutes here. Let's do kind of one of those back and forth real fast.

I am going to go through a bunch of placards here very, very quickly. This is part of our job agenda. It is called the Make It In America agenda. They are trade policies, and we are going to be dealing with a major one of that.

Mr. HORSFORD talked about tax policy, critically important; energy policy, which we have not come to tonight; labor issues; we have definitely talked about the minimum wage, critically important; equal dollars. Minimum wage in 1978, Ronald Reagan, was \$10.60. Same purchasing power today at \$7.25. Education. We talked a little bit about the education—not a little bit, Mr. HORSFORD. You talked a great deal about the education, reeducation programs. Research, which we haven't covered today. And, of course, the infrastructure issues.

And by the way—you are using American taxpayer dollars for all of these things—we ought to be buying American-made products. So we will make it in America using American taxpayer dollars.

We talked a lot about infrastructure. Every dollar you invest, \$1.57, pumped into the economy, jobs created. Mr. HORSFORD, you talked about the unemployment in the building trades, very important. Most people can go back to work, and this can go immediately.

Oh, by the way, August of this year, unless we fund and expand the transportation programs in the United States, there will be no more new bids for transportation programs. This issue is before the Congress today.

This one, this is what happens when you don't invest in infrastructure. This is the Interstate 5 bridge in Washington just near the Canadian border. You talk about commerce, it came to a halt. This bridge collapsed. More than a couple of thousand bridges in the United States are in similar jeopardy and could collapse. Major infrastructure needs to be done.

This is my district. I have 1,100 miles of levees, floods. We have a Resource Development Act bill in conference—I am fortunate enough to be on that conference committee—and this is what

we must do. We must improve our levees, we must deal with Superstorm Sandys, and we must make sure that we are protecting our citizens.

Once again, how do we pay for it? Why are we giving the Karzai government \$3 billion not knowing how they are going to spend it? I will tell you where you can spend \$3 billion. You make sure our levees are sound and up to date.

Mr. HORSFORD, would you like to join us and we will do the quick minutes here.

Mr. HORSFORD. I want to just accentuate—thank you for yielding time—the need for infrastructure. In my home State of Nevada, as you indicate, the lifeline of our primary industry, the gaming and tourism industry, is largely dependent upon a strong infrastructure for people being able to get to our State to be able to enjoy our entertainment.

We have legislation before this Congress that would do just that by helping to build a new interstate between Phoenix and Las Vegas, the two major metropolitan communities in the intermountain west that don't have a major interstate between them that would help create a corridor between Mexico and Canada and provide the type of trade and commerce that would grow our economy. Those are the types of investments that we desperately need, as well as an investment in our veterans.

A third of my population in the Fourth Congressional District of Nevada are veterans, people who have served our country with distinction and honor and now have come back home and cannot find work. It is why we need to reauthorize the Veterans' Employment and Training Act, help to provide entrepreneurial and small business funding for veteran-owned businesses so that they can compete and participate in the Make It In America agenda that Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. TONKO and other leaders in this body have worked so hard to bring forward.

So I urge the House Republican leadership, we are serious about solutions for the American people. I didn't come here to be a "no" vote or a "yes" vote for every piece of legislation. I came here to work with my colleagues to find solutions to complex problems.

One of the biggest problems that we face is that not enough of our friends and neighbors can find work. The way to address that is to make it in America and to support our agenda.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I am delighted that you came here. I think the people of America as they come to know you over the years that you will serve here in Congress will share that delight, your wisdom, your ability to articulate key issues. Thank you so very much for joining us tonight.

Continuing our lightning round, Mr. TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI.

Quickly, the infrastructure issues are heavy duty. It is not just traditional

roads and bridges. It is airports and rails and subway systems, it is mass and public transit, but it is also communications, it is also the energy grid.

We have a system that was designed for regional activity with monopolies, and now we are transmitting electrons, wheeling electrons from region to region, State to State, nation to nation. So upgrades are essential. An infrastructure bank bill could assist in great ways to make that all happen.

Today, again with the visit of Vice President BIDEN to the 20th Congressional District of New York, specifically to Albany, the history of the Erie Canal was addressed. In the early 1800s, a huge effort was made, a difficult task, to sell an idea in very difficult times. But it was again in those difficult times that we had our shining moment, and what we did was create out of a small town a huge port. We developed a New York City that we know today as a robust area, metropolitan area. And the corresponding result: a necklace of communities dubbed "mill towns" that became the epicenters of invention and innovation that allowed for a manufacturing boom to take hold. While we addressed quality of life to people, not just in New York, not just in this country, we inspired a westward movement, and we affected the quality of life of people around the world.

Often-times—often-times—that growth, that innovation came from blue collar workers who gave it their all and who suggested to management, here is a new idea, here is something we can produce in addition to our ongoing ordinary business.

So what that strikes in my mind is the need to invest in R&D, research dollars that translate into jobs, taking that innovation, that intellectual capacity of this Nation, taking all of that brain power we develop through education and higher ed investment and putting it to work and allowing us to grow our energy independence by innovation, by producing energy supplies here as American power and delivering in more effective, efficient ways where there isn't line laws, where perhaps there is grid system activity that is localized close to the source that requires that electricity. Many, many things that we can respond to if we open ourselves to the innovation, the reform that is essential, and if we attach to that tax reform policy that is so long overdue.

It has been a pleasure to join with my colleagues here this evening.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, somehow I knew from previous experience here on the floor that you were going to mention the Erie Canal.

Mr. TONKO. The Vice President mentioned it too.

Mr. GARAMENDI. And he did too.

So actually, before the Erie Canal it was George Washington that laid out an economic growth agenda for the United States. He asked Alexander Hamilton to prepare a policy on manufacturing, or manufactures as they called it there. Part of it was the development of a canal system, in other words, the infrastructure the ports, the canals, and the roads. In fact, the Constitution says there should be post roads in the United States.

Much to talk about. Make it in America. Use our tax dollars to buy American-made products in these areas: trade, taxes, energy, education, and research.

Oh, by the way, 2 years ago, the President of the United States stood right there in his State of the Union and said, here is an American jobs program. Do you know what he talked about? Every one of these issues.

If this Congress had acted, trains, locomotives, 100 percent American built in Sacramento, California, and a new contract coming up for even more of these state-of-the-art locomotives.

Mr. HORSFORD, end the lightning round, and then we will turn this back to the Speaker.

Mr. HORSFORD. I just want to conclude by ending where you started, which is on creating economic mobility for all Americans.

When we talk about innovation, job creation, growing the economy, we are talking about growing an economy that works for all Americans, for people who are in the middle class, most importantly, because they are the engines of our economy, but also those who are striving to be part of the middle class.

That is why assistance for unemployment insurance and extending unemployment insurance is so important. It is why providing nutrition assistance programs for families when they are in need is important, because they are creators in moving people out of poverty and into the middle class; and it is what we are focused on when we talk about making it in America.

We are not saying make it in America for the top 1 percent of the wealthy-

est, the elite. We are focused on those who are the engines, who are the backbone, who have made America great. We can do big things if we work together as a body to do that.

□ 2130

I know that is what my colleagues are aspiring to do. I am proud to join you here tonight, and I will continue to work with you and with anybody from either party who is focused on growing our economy and on creating true economic mobility for all Americans.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. HORSFORD, thank you so very, very much.

Mr. TONKO, thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to present a true American agenda.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HECK of Nevada (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of mandatory military duty.

Mr. JONES (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today through January 16 on account of surgical recovery.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the remainder of January on account of medical reasons.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of family medical emergency.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1614. To require Certificates of Citizenship and other Federal documents to reflect name and date of birth determinations made by a State court and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 8, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the fourth quarter of 2013 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, ROBERT KAREM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 31 AND NOV. 9, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Robert Story Karem	10/31	11/2	Lebanon		425.40						425.40