

which was installed in 2010, as well as multiple other projects with the Ohio Air National Guard and ones with the city of Bryan and First Solar LLC of Perrysburg in recent years.

The zoo also has a wind turbine generating power for its main parking lot, and geothermal wells to heat and cool the aquarium.

Bill Rudolph, chairman of Rudolph/Libbe Cos., said the companies are "honored to support the Toledo Zoo's mission of environmental stewardship through this project."

The Ohio Department of Natural Resources has planted trees and shrubs near the fences to create a visual buffer and spruce up the aesthetics for area residents. Plans also call for native grasses to be planted across the site.

Union labor from northwest Ohio was used to build the project, which created about 60 temporary construction jobs.

PORT OF SAVANNAH

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, thank you for yielding me the time and for being down here with me today.

I hate that you can't see my charts today. They are not particularly colorful or exciting, but they are important in that they are going to tell the story of something that we have gotten done together.

Now, I don't want you to think I am just making something up down here on the floor of the House, Mr. Speaker. I know you are probably thinking about 326 bills that we have passed here in the House that are still sitting over there in the Senate gathering dust, having received no action whatsoever.

You might be thinking about the work going on in the Rules Committee, where we are suing the President for his failure to implement the law as he crafted it, drafted it, and signed it. You might be thinking about the border crisis that is happening right now that has been marked by so much inaction.

I don't mean to say that there are not lots of things that need to be worked on in this body. There are.

□ 1415

I wanted to take just a few minutes this afternoon to talk about some of the rare successes that we have had, and it is a success that is a long time coming.

I represent Metro Atlanta, Mr. Speaker, kind of the northeastern suburbs there in Metro Atlanta, and right down I-75 and then down I-16, you get to the great and historic city of Savannah. Folks think about Savannah for all sorts of different things. Whether it is Oglethorpe and his arrival, whether it is dyeing the river green on St. Patrick's Day, or whether it is the birth of the Girl Scouts in Savannah, lots of things do bring it to mind. But folks don't often think about the economic driver that the Port of Savannah is for the entire southeastern United States.

So often we talk about constituent interests on the floor, Mr. Speaker, what is good for this one district in Alabama or this one district in New York. What I want to talk about is the impact of the Port of Savannah on the economy of the entire southeastern United States.

You might not know, Mr. Speaker, from your part of the world, that it is the fourth largest container terminal in the Nation, and the largest single terminal operation in all of North America, the single terminal, one long dock there in Savannah. It handles 3 million container equivalents absolutely every cycle. Volume is up 7 percent this year alone.

When we talk about the number of folks it impacts, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about 21,000 companies from across the United States of America bring their commerce in and out of the Port of Savannah. Here is what is so important about our ports, Mr. Speaker. I don't know if everyone internalizes their values. Savannah is a great example. Forty-eight percent of the container traffic in that port are imports coming into America, goods and services that American consumers want to buy, but 52 percent of the traffic coming in and out of that port are exports. Forty-eight percent are things that we are buying from folks overseas, but 52 are goods that were manufactured with American hands, putting paychecks into Americans' pockets and shipping those goods right back out overseas—48 percent imports, 52 percent exports.

Now, why am I talking about that? We have got an exciting opportunity going on in this hemisphere, Mr. Speaker. You may have heard the term Panamax ships. The new Panama Canal—and you won't be able to see these numbers, Mr. Speaker, so I will just go through them briefly. The new Panama Canal is going to accommodate ships that carry not twice the number of containers that ships carry today, not three times the containers, but almost 3½ times more containers than ships carry.

What does that mean? That means if you are the fourth largest container port in the country, as Savannah is, if you are the fastest growing container port in the country, as Savannah is, you had better get to work making sure that your equipment—your port, your docks, and your channel—can accommodate the newer, larger ships.

Today, the draft on the ships coming through the Panama Canal, Mr. Speaker, is just under 40 feet. The new drafts of these Panamax ships are going to be 50 feet—10 feet more, 25 percent more. It requires major changes and renovations in our ports. And guess what. When the State of Georgia recognizes that we have a critical economic engine driving our economy, a critical economic engine to the entire Southeastern United States, we can't just get together as the State of Georgia and decide we are going to do some

dredging and make sure that our port is ready for these newer, modern, larger ships. We are not allowed to.

Why? Well, it has a lot to do with this building, the one down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, and a couple over in southwest D.C. at the EPA and our friends over at the Corps of Engineers. There is Federal law after Federal law after Federal law that says to the State of Georgia, no, you cannot expand your port without our permission.

Now, that would be a source of great difference of agreement in this body about whether we ought to have the kind of Federal regulatory burden that we do in order to make those decisions, but, in fact, that is the law of the land today and so we must deal with it.

We are talking about deeper channels, and we are talking about wider docking berths. We are talking about trying to move, again, not twice as many, not three times as many, but three-and-a-half times as many containers tomorrow as we were moving yesterday. And we have been battling as Georgians—as folks from the Southeast United States, as people trying to grow the economy—we have been battling the Federal red tape machine not for a week, not for a month, not for year, but almost a decade.

I say "almost a decade." It has really been more than a decade, Mr. Speaker. But it has been going on for a decade in earnest, and we have finally gotten to the finish line. We have finally gotten to a place where the paperwork has been signed and the checks are being written, where we are going to be able to do the kind of dredging and modernization that is necessary to continue the economic engine here in the country.

What we are going to do is deepen our port from 42 feet to 47. Now, I mentioned to you the draft of these ships is 50 feet. We couldn't get permission to dredge deep enough to actually handle the 50-foot depth there. If we can't handle that draft, then these boats are going to have to unload some of their cargo either in Charleston or down in Jacksonville, and they are going to have to come into Savannah light.

I couldn't make it happen that we could organize our port to actually handle the fully loaded ships in the new Panamax model, but we are going to deepen to 47 at a cost of about \$700 million. Now, that is real money. It is real money, and it is real money that is coming in a cost share agreement. The State of Georgia is picking up more than \$200 million of that. The Federal Government is also picking up a share, recognizing the importance of economic development across the region.

Cost shares are important, Mr. Speaker. I have been talking to some of our colleagues, and you may have had the same conversation. There is really no limit to the number of folks who are willing to take free money. If you offer free money, if there is a grant proposal

that is just going to give you something, folks are willing to raise their hand and say: Yes, give it to me.

If you ask people to put some skin in the game, then it creates a completely different dynamic for who is on board and who is thinking they want to opt out this time around.

Georgia is on board to the tune of \$200 million because it is important. When things are important, we ought to be able to come together and get those things done. Again, this Port of Savannah, this Corps of Engineers project, this bit of the WRDA bill authorized in the WRDA bill, the Water Resources Development Act, a rare episode of folks coming together and getting things done.

When we talk about what this means, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about 11,000 jobs nationwide—11,000 jobs nationwide. I say “nationwide,” Mr. Speaker. Only about 2,400 of those jobs are going to be local jobs there around the port. But we can’t get wrapped up in what is good for me and what is good for my community to the exclusion of what is good for us. We are all in this together.

Is Savannah going to have a disproportionate benefit for the investment in this port? Of course it is. They are also going to be disproportionately burdened. Their streets are going to be more crowded, and their housing prices are going to be affected. Everything is affected. But this is not a local concern. This is a national concern.

Mr. Speaker, the world is changing. The world is a dynamic place. Again, it doesn’t take much to see that what was the amazing engineering marvel that was the Panama Canal has been set aside now as being too old, too antiquated, and too small to handle modern needs. We are now talking about this Panamax canal that is going to bring ships the size of which you and I have never seen, Mr. Speaker, to American ports in record time, saving fuel, making a difference to the energy economy, and making a difference to price for American consumers.

I am a conservative Republican from the Deep South, Mr. Speaker. I have a vision of what this country ought to look like, and it is a vision of a country where every man or woman can follow his or her own hopes and dreams, wherever those hopes and dreams may take them. It is a vision where the government doesn’t put its foot on the throat of those young Americans who want to pursue those dreams.

But it doesn’t mean that there is no role for government at all. When it comes to big infrastructure projects, the interstate highway system, for example, that transportation bill that just passed this House 2 short weeks ago, when it comes to our ports, when it comes to those big issues of infrastructure that matter to us all that aren’t just about jobs in our local area but about jobs across this country, we have to come together to make a difference in those ways.

For those of us in Georgia, for those of us in the Southeast, this brought Democrats and Republicans together, Mr. Speaker. This brought State legislators together with the executive branch. This brought folks together from Alabama, South Carolina, Florida, and more. We can do those big things that matter. They are not easy. Sometimes they take a year or 2 or 3. But in my 3 years of service in this institution, Mr. Speaker, I have never seen anything get done that was worth doing that didn’t involve someone working awfully hard to make it happen. And more times than not, it wasn’t one person working awfully hard, it was two of us or three of us or ten of us or 100 of us who got together to make these things happen.

I am grateful to my colleagues for working with me to make sure the Port of Savannah is a success—again, not just a success for the city of Savannah, not just a success for the State of Georgia, but a success for the United States of America. It is an example of the kinds of partnerships that we can create and the kinds of differences we can make in the pocketbooks of families back home.

There are going to be families who receive paychecks that would not have received those paychecks otherwise because of our cooperation and success. There are going to be consumers who are saving money at the cash register each and every day because we were able to come together and build this much-needed infrastructure project.

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

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAINES). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is virtually mandatory that I come to the floor this afternoon because the two most serious, antidemocratic, and anti-home rule amendments are pending in this House. I am very hopeful that they will not be sustained when the full Congress gets a look at them, but they certainly have passed this House: an amendment from Representative THOMAS MASSIE of Kentucky that attempts to wipe out, eliminate, all the gun laws of the Nation’s Capital—the Nation’s Capital, a prime terrorist target; the Nation’s Capital, where Cabinet members lunch in our public places, go to our theaters, and walk in our streets; the Nation’s Capital, where there are 650,000 residents; the Nation’s Capital, one of the big cities of America, and it is those big cities where gun violence is most likely to occur. That is the amendment from Representative MASSIE.

Then there is another amendment from Representative ANDY HARRIS, an

amendment that flies in the face of what is occurring across the country, of course, as 18 States long before the District of Columbia decriminalized their marijuana laws. So, too, has the District of Columbia. But this Member is seeking to meddle in the affairs of the District of Columbia—the local affairs, local matters—and to somehow keep the local legislature from passing a local law just like the laws of those 18 States.

Now, I hasten to add that the Senate, the comparable subcommittee in the Senate, has considered this matter, and the Senate has passed what we call a clean bill, a clean appropriations bill for the District of Columbia.

Of course, there is a kind of anomaly here. Why am I talking about the District of Columbia at all? Well, that is an anomaly that allows the District’s budget—every cent of it raised in the District of Columbia—to somehow come here to be approved by Members that are unaccountable for having raised a cent of that budget.

□ 1430

So, yes, the Senate had to consider the District’s budget. By the way, our D.C. budget is balanced. The D.C. budget has a large amount of revenue in excess of its annual taxes, a rainy day fund that would be the envy of most Members of this House, and yet it has to come to a House that has hardly been able to pass bills much less balance its budget.

So the Senate says we recognize you can handle your own affairs, like any other American jurisdiction, and they have quickly passed or approved the District’s local budget. In addition, the Senate has also given the District both autonomy over its own budget so it wouldn’t have to come the Congress in the first place, and what we call legislative autonomy.

In addition to having to bring its local budget here, the residents of the District of Columbia, when they pass their local laws, those local laws have to rest here for a certain period of time to see if there is any Member who wants to jump up and ask to overturn them. However, usually the process of overturning a local law of the District of Columbia does not come through regular order, through the House and Senate, although there is such a process that is allowed. It usually comes in the way in which Representative MASSIE and Representative HARRIS have interfered with the District. They simply try to use an amendment to an appropriation bill in order to overturn a District law, a kind of shortcut method.

Of course, if one looks at why the District budget is over here, the American people would be, I think, pleased to know that no one, not one Member looks at the budget. They recognize that they are incompetent to do so, not because they are inherently incompetent, but because nobody would want to look at somebody else’s budget if