

front of us on the House Armed Services Committee a couple weeks ago, where they said, related to this strategy, hope is not a strategy, but it looks like that is exactly what we are relying on. We are hoping that the Iraqis have an inclusive government, which they have shown time and time again that they are failing to do.

While Iraq has their national security interests certainly in the region, we have our own interests in making sure that ISIS does not gain a strong foothold with resources and the desire to recruit, train, and inspire individuals to attack Americans and take away our way of life. This strategy has just been failed coming out of this administration.

Russia, just another example, the squadron that I commanded is soon coming back from a deployment to Russia, A-10s over in the region to help assure and train our allies against the continued aggression that we are seeing from Russia.

Our incoming potential Chairman of the Joint Chiefs declared last week in a hearing that he believes Russia is actually the largest threat that we are potentially dealing with; yet the weakness from this administration in standing up and leading to defend our national security interests and reassure our allies is allowing Putin to fill that vacuum.

The Baltics and the other allies that are in the region, after basically the Russians were able to invade Ukraine, are wondering who is next and what is at stake with our NATO partners. This is just another example.

What China is doing in the South and East China Seas is just one more example of us not leading and not being able to assure our allies, showing weakness. Our friends are wondering can they count on us anymore, and our enemies are no longer afraid of us. This is the dangerous world we are in.

Some of these factors were going to be happening anyway, but American leadership can make or break situations, and we can change the course of international events if we are leading or not leading. This administration says that they are leading from behind. In the military, we call that following. There is no such thing as leading from behind.

We need to make sure we have a strong national security strategy, that we have a capable military. The impact sequestration is having on our military, I have friends and individuals I know that are still serving and trying to serve, and they are rearranging deck chairs right now, trying to deal with the lack of resources and diminishing capabilities in training and readiness.

That is not a strategy-based budget; that is a budget-based strategy. I have been very strong in speaking against sequestration. I think we need to work together in order to make sure we can give the men and women in the military everything they need to defend America.

The last point I will make—and there are many to make, but we don't have enough time—is that we have passed the National Defense Authorization Act for the last 54 years.

□ 1700

This is an important piece of legislation that gives the troops the authorization, the pay raises, and everything that they need—combating sexual assault—all the different things that we have authorized in the NDAA, and this President is threatening to veto it.

I really hope that those around America who are listening to this will rise up and call their Members of Congress, call their Senators, call the White House and tell them that you don't play politics with our men and women in uniform. This is about national security and national defense. You need to sign that bill.

We are working through conference right now to hopefully get it done before we go into recess. This is an important piece of legislation, and we should not be playing political games with our national security.

So thank you, Madam Chairman, for organizing this. Thanks for the opportunity to come down and speak on behalf of our constituents, on behalf of those in my district right now that are serving overseas, the men and women in uniform. We owe it to them to make sure that we have a strong national security, that we have a strong military, we give them everything they need, and that we provide leadership in the world.

We have got to continue to provide oversight to the failed foreign policy and defense policy of this administration, and I look forward to continuing these discussions.

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. I thank the gentlewoman.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the members of the Republican Women's Policy Committee, I would like to end this Special Order today by thanking our troops and their families. These men and women voluntarily venture into harm's way to protect our freedoms, ideals, and way of life.

It is equally as important that we recognize the sacrifices that military spouses and children make as well. They deserve our unwavering support for putting the safety and security of our country first.

May God continue to bless this great Nation and our men and women in uniform.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time to conclude this Special Order on national security.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2898, WESTERN WATER AND AMERICAN FOOD SECURITY ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3038, HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2015, PART II

Mr. NEWHOUSE (during the Special Order of Mrs. ELLMERS of North Caro-

lina), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-204) on the resolution (H. Res. 362) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2898) to provide drought relief in the State of California, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3038) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON H.R. 3049, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

Mr. ADERHOLT (during the Special Order of Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina), from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-205) on the bill (H.R. 3049) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2722

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2722.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2722

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2722.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, we are going to spend about an hour here talking about something that is of great importance to the American people, to the economy, to the strength of America, and, indeed, the discussion we just heard about national security. It

is about how we can build the American economy and build jobs for the working men and women of this country, the great middle class.

There will be much discussion in the days ahead about the Iran nuclear deal. That will be something that is of importance. But today, one question that we ought to ask each other is: If we don't have a deal, then what? The answer to that is: Nothing good.

Let's talk about Make It In America. This is an agenda that the minority whip put together about 4 years ago, and it is about building the American economy, how we can do it. The Make It In America agenda has moved along these last 4 years, almost 5 years now, with numerous pieces of legislation, and we are going to talk about those.

Last week, the minority whip, Mr. STENY HOYER, put together a hearing on this subject matter, and those Democrats that have introduced legislation over these many years and have reintroduced that legislation testified at the hearing about their pieces of legislation.

The result of that was, wow, what if we did those things? What if we actually passed those pieces of legislation? What if they became law? Well, I tell you what it would mean. What it would mean is an enormous opportunity for this economy to grow and for the great American middle class to enjoy higher wages, more jobs, and more opportunity.

Essentially, the legislation came down in these various ways. We had trade legislation. For example, the big discussion we have had over the last 3 months about trade policy and the Trans-Pacific Partnership is extremely important for American manufacturing. Done properly, it probably would grow American manufacturing. On the other hand, what we have seen in the many years previously is that trade policy can hollow out, destroy American manufacturing. So we talked about trade policy.

One issue of extreme importance to me is the maintenance of the Buy America provisions. This is law that has been in place for more than 50 years, and it essentially says, if you are going to spend American taxpayer money, then spend it on American-made goods and equipment.

Tax policy is extremely important. You can, as present tax policy is set in place, encourage the offshoring of American jobs. American corporations are taking their capital, running off to the lowest wage rate country in the world, planting their capital there, building their manufacturing facilities, and leaving behind the American worker. So there are numerous ideas on tax policy.

Energy policy is another issue. We now know that we have had a very robust, large expansion of American energy production, natural gas and oil, so much so that we are likely to ship off in the days ahead liquefied natural gas. Well, if we do a little bit of that, it is

probably okay. If we do too much of that, we raise American prices for energy, and then we are going to see less robust American manufacturing.

On labor policy, it is about how we encourage labor, wage rates, and the reeducation for those men and women that have lost their jobs. Education and research and development are extremely important.

These are the essential elements of the Make It In America policy. We will be talking about all of these today.

As my colleagues come in, I want to welcome them to the floor. I see our colleague from the great Northeast, ANN KUSTER, here. If you would like to talk about some of your legislation on Make It In America, we would be delighted to have you join us. I know that you have been working on this a long time in your area, and you have introduced bills in the last Congress and you have new bills in this Congress.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. GARAMENDI, I appreciate you yielding, and I appreciate you taking the time to share with the American people our Make It In America agenda. I really want to thank you for the fantastic work that you have been doing on growing domestic manufacturing in the country.

We are joined by our wonderful leader, Mr. STENY HOYER, and his leadership on this issue is now legendary. So thank you for that.

New Hampshire has had a long history of being a leader in the manufacturing industry, all the way back to the paper mills at the turn of the century, the textile mills. At one point in Manchester, New Hampshire, we made a mile of cloth a day, and we were leaders in that.

So from the beginning of the time that I have served here in Congress, I have been highly focused on how we can support successful local businesses and embrace innovation to help move our manufacturing economy into the 21st century.

In New Hampshire and across the country, we have some of the hardest working and most innovative companies in the world. I have had the opportunity to visit dozens of companies in my congressional district, visiting manufacturing companies, community colleges, community groups, and organizations all across the Granite State that are harnessing these new technologies to revitalize the manufacturing sector and breathe new life into our industry.

In Keene, New Hampshire, in the southwest corner of my district, for example, we have a Regional Center for Advanced Manufacturing, bringing together leaders from the community, from the K-12 school unit there, public schools, from our community college—River Valley Community College—our State university system—Keene State University—and students and leaders from all across the region learning and teaching the trades of tomorrow.

Coming up in October, New Hampshire will celebrate a full Manufac-

turing Week. It is a fabulous program. It started out 1 day; it has now exploded into a whole week. Hundreds, if not thousands, of students from the high schools will come into our manufacturing companies and will have a chance to see firsthand what this looks like, these CNC machines and the computerized precision manufacturing.

This is not your grandfather's factory. It is not dirty. It is not noisy. In fact, it is pristine clean. The machines are run on computerized programming, and every employee in the company needs to have the latest in education and talent. People will be able to come in to the companies and see what the work is that is going on.

I have had the chance to see the CNC computerized machines working with wood, working with textiles, working in glass, even counting and organizing eggs at a wonderful Pete and Gerry's Organic Eggs farm.

The problem is that, during the last several decades, lower wages, lack of access to education and skill training, and changes in our global economy have stacked the deck against our U.S. manufacturers. These issues are standing in the way of innovation.

So that is why we have all come together with this Make It In America agenda: to make the right policy changes to help level the playing field so that our manufacturers can grow and successfully create more jobs. That is my number one priority: jobs and economic development.

As part of the Make It In America agenda that I am supporting, we have developed a strong, comprehensive plan to help manufacturers thrive in the 21st century. The great thing about manufacturing, as my good colleague, Mr. GARAMENDI, has pointed out, is whether you are working on transportation policy, education, taxes, regulatory issues, trade, or most any other issue, we can take actions that help manufacturers. And that is exactly what our Make It In America agenda is seeking to do.

One bill that I introduced—and I am working hard to include it in the agenda, and I am working hard to pass—is the Workforce Development Investment Act. What this important piece of legislation would do is create a tax break for employers who partner with community colleges to provide skill training for specific jobs in their respective industries.

As I go around visiting these companies, they do have jobs available, but they don't always have people in the community with the skills that they need. And so, for example, at Nashua Community College, we got funding to create a new program that would train people in this advanced manufacturing, precision manufacturing computerized techniques, and those people will come out with a 2-year associates degree and walk directly into jobs at \$55,000 with great benefits and a great quality of life right there in New Hampshire.

My legislation would do all of this by encouraging greater collaboration between community colleges and employers to make sure that students not only have the right skills to succeed, but are on a path to employment when they graduate.

So again, I thank Mr. HOYER, Mr. GARAMENDI, and everyone else who has worked to shape this strong manufacturing agenda. I am proud to be a part of it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Ms. KUSTER, thank you so very, very much. I think New Hampshire is very fortunate to have your leadership on manufacturing. I think I want to go up there and watch your Manufacturing Week. Now, I am not running for President, so that is not why I would go.

I notice that we have our leader, who has put together this program over the last 5 years. He has geared us up with the hearing last week with all of the members of the Democratic Caucus that have introduced legislation.

Mr. HOYER, you are our leader. You have made Make It In America an American agenda. Thank you so much for that leadership. Thank you for being here and for last week's conference. We have got more work to do. We need to get all this legislation in place. I know with your leadership we have got a good shot at it.

Mr. HOYER, welcome.

Mr. HOYER. I thank you very much, Mr. GARAMENDI. You do such an extraordinary job for California—and have for a long period of time—but you are doing an extraordinary job here in Washington on behalf of America, on behalf of America's workers, on behalf of manufacturers, and on behalf of making sure that we make it here and sell it here and everywhere. That is what Make It In America is about. Nobody, including myself, has been any more tenacious in informing people about this agenda, and I thank you for that.

□ 1715

I want to thank ANN KUSTER. Congresswoman KUSTER and I had an opportunity to visit a really neat manufacturing facility in her district not too long ago.

They were excited about what they were doing, and they were excited, as she has pointed out, about making their business more technology focused and making it more efficient and more productive and, yes, more profitable; but the good news is they were retaining jobs in that effort. I thank Congresswoman KUSTER.

I want to thank DON NORCROSS, who is a new Member of the Congress, but not new to supporting Make It In America—he may not have called it Make It In America in New Jersey—but Make It In America legislation and policies. DON NORCROSS comes from a background of a working family, and he has made them proud and made us proud, and we welcome him to this effort.

I noticed also that SHEILA JACKSON LEE from Houston is also on the floor, who has been a tenacious and very, very faithful spokesperson and worker on behalf of Make It In America.

I am proud to share with my colleagues that House Democrats held a hearing, as has been mentioned, this past Thursday to begin exploring how to improve, expand, and adapt the Make It In America plan to meet the needs and challenges of 2015 and beyond.

As a matter of fact, one of the things we want to find out is how we can better create an environment for new technologies, for new ways of doing business, for new ways of making it in America.

Representative GARAMENDI was one of 34 Members who participated at last week's hearing. For the past 5 years, we have worked together in a bipartisan way to enact already 16 Make It In America bills into law.

These bills included measures to clear the backlog of patent applications, reauthorize the America COMPETES Act, and expand investments in workforce development, which is what Mr. GARAMENDI was talking about and Ms. KUSTER was talking about in terms of training people for the new technologies.

If we are going to compete worldwide in this global marketplace in which we now find ourselves, America is going to be the high value end of the global marketplace. As a result, we need to make sure that we educate and train people to effectively participate and compete and succeed in that high-tech environment.

For the past 5 years, Make It In America has been focused on creating the conditions that encourage, as I said, business to innovate, manufacture, and create jobs here in the United States of America.

Now, with the rise of new technologies with the potential of transforming our economy, it is now time to update the Make It In America plan to address today's challenges and build on past successes.

That is why, Madam Speaker, the hearing that House Democrats held on Thursday was the first in what will be a series of hearings to solicit feedback from Members, entrepreneurs, job creators, in other words, economists, innovators, and others who have insights to share how we can be more successful in creating jobs and competing. These hearings are entitled: "Make It In America: What's Next?"

Five years have gone by. Circumstances have changed. Challenges have changed. Opportunities have changed. We need to be making sure that we are in a position to seize those opportunities on behalf of all of our people. This is a process of listening, learning, and then implementing the best ideas that emerge.

Thursday's hearings—Mr. GARAMENDI, you participated in them; you were one of the leaders there,

which highlighted Members' ideas and feedback they have received from speaking and meeting with constituents back home—was a great success.

I want to emphasize that. We take, from time to time, breaks, and we call them district work periods, and some people call them vacations.

Almost every Member on both sides of the aisle use a district work period to go among their constituents, go to businesses, go to schools, go to construction sites, go to offices, and talk to people about what they think.

That is what our Founding Fathers had in mind: House Members, close to the people, listen to the people, bring their views here. That is what we did at this hearing.

We heard about the economic impact of the so-called Internet of things, which—in my generation, what language are you speaking, Internet of things—which uses wireless technology to connect everyday objects, your home, your refrigerator, your air conditioner, your television, everyday objects; we are all connected now.

We also heard about maker faires and fab labs, where students and professionals alike can transform tinkering into innovation. I sometimes say, Mr. GARAMENDI, that one of the policies that we ought to do is we ought to—a previous President talked about a chicken in every pot.

We ought to give a garage to every graduating high school student. It seems everything is generated in a garage in America. Although, as BILL FOSTER pointed out, these fab labs and maker faires were perhaps the new garages of our time.

Representative GARAMENDI, as I said, was among those who spoke about new ways to help traditional manufacturing, when he discussed the role our shipbuilding industry plays in helping American businesses move natural gas and other goods to market at home and abroad.

That shipbuilding industry was critically important to us winning in World War II. Now, as Mr. GARAMENDI pointed out, it is a shadow of its former self, and we need to rebuild it, and we need to be shipping goods on American fleets.

These were just some of the things that came up in the hearing, and I encourage all of my colleagues and all Americans to go online to democraticwhip.gov and read Members' testimonies.

Ms. KUSTER's testimony is on that, Mr. GARAMENDI's, and Mr. NORCROSS' testimony is on the Web; and you can see their perspective, add them all together, and we come up with a powerful agenda to create jobs in America.

That is what we are focused on; that is what the people want us focused on, and that is what we are going to work on. That is what Make It In America is all about.

I want to express my gratitude, again, to all the Members who participated in the first hearing, including, of

course, the leader of this Special Order, Mr. GARAMENDI from California, and I thank him for yielding.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. HOYER, none of this would be happening were it not for your leadership. You brought us together, 34 Members of the Democratic Caucus, each with one or more specific pieces of legislation to move the Make It In America agenda, so that Americans can have those middle class jobs and beyond and above and, in the process, grow the American economy. It is the fair way to do it. It is the right way to do it; grow the American economy in a fair way so that those middle class jobs are there.

It is the future; it has been the past; it can be the future with the legislation, and each one of these ideas—trade, taxes, energy, labor, education, research and infrastructure—the 34 Members of your caucus brought forth legislation in each and every one of those areas.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. The last item on there is infrastructure. When you build infrastructure in America, you don't create jobs any place other than America.

We are hopefully going to have a highway bill; and we need a permanent highway bill, a long-term, 6-year minimum highway bill, so that we lend confidence to the marketplace that the infrastructure is going to be in place because, if we are going to Make It In America, a good, solid competitive infrastructure is absolutely essential.

I thank the gentleman for that list. I thank him for his work. I thank him for the—I will say a few things while the gentleman is restoring Make It In America to its rightful place.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I am going to move this thing along. I see several of our other colleagues have joined us here.

SHEILA JACKSON LEE, you said you had a brief presentation. Please take the floor, then Mr. NORCROSS, and then we will—MARCY KAPTUR is here from Ohio. Here we go.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me add my appreciation as well to be one of those Members who joined Mr. HOYER 5 years ago to emphasize that Make It In America is a double win. Make It In America, and we will make it in America, and that is what this message has been. I want to thank my good friend from California for leading this effort.

I just want to read what many of our constituents appreciate as being part of this Make It In America. The fair trade concept, taxes, energy, labor, education, research, and infrastructure, all of these are part, if they work fairly for the working man and woman.

I highlighted The Wall Street Journal earlier this year, 2014 marked the best year for job growth in 15 years, with employers adding 2.95 million jobs, and the unemployment rate falling to a postrecession low of 5.6 percent.

For the first time since the recession ended, payrolls are expected to grow. In all of America's cities and throughout the U.S., they are expected to add another 2.6 million jobs.

Houston is ranked as a top city for STEM occupations, jobs requiring a degree in science, technology, engineering, and math. Of course, we are engaged in the energy sector, and for that, we need employees.

All of my colleagues who believe in Make It In America collectively have put in place nearly 100 additional bills that have been introduced to focus on Make It In America. As well, all of us have focused on this concept of skills training.

I introduced H.R. 73, the America RISING Act of 2015, which stands for Realizing the Informational Skills and Initiative of New Graduates, establishing a grant program for stipends to assist in the cost of compensation paid by employers to certain recent college graduates and provide funding for their further education in subjects relating to mathematics, science, engineering, and technology.

What I want to say this evening is that this is a movement that should continue. I am very delighted that America recognizes that manufacturing is an economic engine.

I want to make mention of the Houston Community College, that I have had a meeting with over the last week, to particularly focus on a new facility that we hope will be finalized that will have automotive technology at the highest level and manufacturing as part of its training.

This is to help not only recent graduates or individuals in what we call early college, but it is to help adults to be retrained for important elements that will manufacture, something I want to see increased in Houston, and as well will have us at the highest levels of technology.

It is no longer the auto mechanic; it is the automotive engineer, the person who knows how to deal with sophisticated electric cars, solar-driven cars, and others that make a difference in our lives.

I want to thank the gentleman for having this very special Special Order, as he has done over the years and months, and to say that we are committed to passing legislation, building infrastructure, increasing our education and research, and particularly providing a new generation an opportunity for creating jobs and putting America, as it has been in the past, at the top in production; manufacturing; research; and, certainly, technology.

I thank the gentleman.

Thank you Congressman GARAMENDI for anchoring this Special Order and yielding me time to share with our colleagues legislation I have introduced that comports with the principles underlying our Make It In America agenda.

Our Make it in America plan sets forth four central guiding posts: 1. We must adopt and pursue a well-developed national manufac-

turing strategy that begins right here in America. 2. We must promote the export of our manufacturing goods so that businesses can compete domestically and internationally. 3. We must also encourage businesses abroad to bring jobs and innovation back to the United States. 4. Lastly, and most importantly, we must train and educate a workforce that will secure the sustainability of this plan.

As we continue this critical work of identifying and advancing effective policy change for our communities and collectively throughout the nation, it is important that we acknowledge the great progress we have made.

I supported the 16 Make It In America bills that have been signed into law by our President.

Additionally, as highlighted by the Wall Street Journal earlier this year, 2014 marked the best year for job growth in 15 years, with employers adding 2.95 million jobs and the unemployment rate falling to a post-recession low of 5.6%.

For the first time since the recession ended, payrolls are expected to grow in all of America's cities and employers throughout the U.S. are expected to add another 2.65 million jobs this year.

Houston is ranked as a top city for STEM occupations, jobs requiring a degree in science, technology, engineering and math related subjects.

Known as the "Energy Capital of the World", Houston has core strengths in the energy sector, import/export trade activity, medical advancements and a diverse population that supports innovative growth.

However, Houston and other cities across the nation remain at risk of stalemating any progress we have made or are projected to make if we do continue to open up our job market and expand opportunities in all cities across the nation.

As we look to the pillars and priorities of our plan, which aims to ensure that these jobs are permanent and sustainable throughout all sectors and populations of America, it is important to keep sight of the nearly 100 additional bills my colleagues and I have introduced calling for strategic action and fair enhancement of our economy as we continue to experience this growth.

American businesses can only remain competitive when they have the trained and educated workers they need.

This is why I have introduced legislation that will help strengthen our education and skills-training programs to make sure our workers are getting the preparation and certifications they need while also providing an opportunity to find and retain work once trained with those high-demand skills.

H.R. 73, the "America RISING Act of 2015" which stands for Realizing the Informational Skills and Initiative of New Graduates, establishes a grant program for stipends to assist in the cost of compensation paid by employers to certain recent college graduates and provides funding for their further education in subjects relating to mathematics, science, engineering, and technology.

ABOUT H.R. 73, THE "AMERICA RISING ACT OF 2015" AND THE PROBLEM IT ADDRESSES

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in 2012 the national unemployment rate for persons with a bachelor's degree was 4.5% and 6.2% for those persons with associate's degrees among college graduates aged 25

years and older. For college graduates aged 18–25 these percentages were higher at 7.7%.

Because the typical college graduate leaves college owing an average of \$29,400, in student loan debt, a rate that has increased 6% every year since 2008, the current job market offers exceedingly few opportunities for them to obtain employment at a salary adequate to service their college loan debt.

There are more than 26 million small businesses in the United States, of these more than 4 million are owned and operated by members of economically and socially disadvantaged groups.

In the current economic climate, small businesses are experiencing difficulty in finding the resources needed to increase sales, modernize operations, and hire new employees.

Recent college graduates need the experience that can be obtained only in the workplace to refine their skills and lay the groundwork for productive careers.

Small and disadvantaged businesses need the technologically based problem-solving skills possessed by recent college graduates, particularly those with training in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

Enabling recent graduates to obtain employment with small business and companies operating in economically distressed areas benefits the national economy by granting graduates deferred payments on their student loans with frozen interest rates while they gain essential business management experience that they can put into practice throughout their careers, while at the same time providing businesses the human capital and technical expertise needed to compete and win in the global economy of the 21st century.

The key elements of the program would be that the federal government would provide relief to a corps of recent college graduates in order for them to be deployed to assist struggling small and minority businesses in located in disadvantaged or economically depressed areas.

These are the types of business that are most in need of the technical and knowledge-based skills possessed by recent college graduates but least able to afford them.

The benefit to participants is three-fold: 1. The federal government would provide relief from the piling interest rates of graduates' student loans by instating a freeze on their payments for two years while graduates who have not obtained a STEM degree are able to pursue a second training course or certification program in the STEM fields with eligibility for federal financial assistance. 2. Those graduates, who would have completed a degree in the STEM fields within the past 24 months, will be eligible to receive deferment of the cost of previous school balances by obtaining two years of additional education in the STEM fields as well as federal financial aid to complete the training. 3. The program participants will gain valuable experience applying the knowledge learned in college to the workplace after graduation or during their re-training.

In the long run the best way to guarantee America's future economic prosperity is to develop and grow an entrepreneurial class of Americans that is broadly represented among all demographic groups.

It is not enough to provide jobs that can be performed by the millions of low-skilled workers who need employment now.

In a global economy, any such job provided cannot be protected over the long haul and cannot be made lucrative enough to sustain a middle class standard of living.

Therefore, it is critical that there exist job training and retraining programs to enable workers to upgrade existing skills and to learn new ones.

I invite all my colleagues to join me in co-sponsoring H.R. 73, the "America RISING Act of 2015," which will help create the next generation of entrepreneurs and businesses that will provide good-paying middle-class jobs for America.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Ms. JACKSON LEE. I really appreciate it.

As we talk about each of these things, you are talking labor and education and the way they come together and, in doing so, increasing the productivity and the ability of an American worker to get a job in the new manufacturing world in which we are living.

These things do come together, all of these pieces of the puzzle, 34 Members of the Caucus, over 100 pieces of legislation in all of these areas.

Joining us, Mr. NORCROSS, thank you very much for joining us today. You were, I think, introduced very nicely by the minority whip. Welcome.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

Mr. NORCROSS. Thank you. Certainly, we appreciate what you are doing here today, and that is highlighting what is going on in America. In south Jersey, where I am from, born and raised, a half century ago, we knew what it was like to Make It In America.

I live in the Victor building, where the Victrolas used to be made. We are not making Victrolas anymore. The Victrola turned into RCA and then went on from there. My father's first job was in the building I now live, which means they are not manufacturing Victrolas there anymore.

During the heyday, we built ships at New York shipyard. In fact, New York shipyard was where the very first nuclear-powered merchant ship was made.

Campbell Soup, who is still in our city, made soups, which now are known around the world.

□ 1730

But we look back over the last half century and see how things have changed. Many of those jobs have moved out because of bad trade deals. I had many, many empty warehouses and manufacturing plants where once thousands of people worked.

But we are on the rise again. And I just want to highlight a couple of items that are going to help us make it in America again.

We have a startup company by Dr. Singh, who was educated at the University of Pennsylvania, and he is now going to make SMR, small modular reactors, unconditionally safe, clean, carbon-free.

He was looking for a place to make them. And he literally could have gone

anywhere in the world, where many of his products currently go. He is coming to Camden, New Jersey, here in America.

Why? Because of the educational system. Because those men and women that are going to be trained there are here in America and understand that.

Because we know in education not one size fits all. Most parents—and you hear it day in and day out, that they want to send their children to college. Well, the fact of the matter is not everybody wants or needs to go to college.

We have those who are serving in the military, those in our trade programs. And we take a look at those trade programs, they are the backbone of what is going to be happening in the next generation of making it in America.

Because Dr. Singh is going to start out with 400 new employees and go to 1,000 after a few years, creating these new SMRs, which is high tech, but very labor intensive, whether it is arc welding, electricians, carpenters.

And they all have to have an education. Not all of them have to go to college. Those who are going to engineer this obviously do.

But working with your hands is a noble trade. I like to tell people, as I started out as an electrician, that I am still an electrician. I just wear a tie.

But that adult learning and having a flexible way to learn, whether—we heard a few moments ago about the community college system, which I firmly believe is the most affordable quality education that somebody leaving high school can go to.

You know, not everybody understands when they get out of high school where they want to go. But having that educational system, whether it is through the community college or through an apprenticeship program, is the way you can make it in America.

Now, when we take a look back over the last 50 years, we have had our ups and downs in America, but we always know the best social program is a job.

When you have a job, many of those other issues that you are facing when you are unemployed tend to go away. And when you have that job, you can make it in America.

I would like to thank my colleague from California for having us down here today and talking about this very important issue. Making it in America is about having a job. And when we stay focused on that here in Congress, America will win.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you very much, Mr. NORCROSS. I knew that you had come out of a family that was in the building trades. You are an electrician, and you are also a Member of Congress.

So you are bringing something very valuable, and that is hands-on experience in the working world, where the middle class has seen their part of the American economy stall out, not able to climb ahead.

But over the last 20 years, we have seen this American middle class basically just barely able to hold its

ground. And one of the reasons is the enormous decline in the manufacturing industry in this Nation and, also, that this Nation has not been keeping up with the needs of infrastructure.

So as we look at the Make It In America agenda, yes, education is absolutely important so that the workers of today and tomorrow are prepared for the kind of jobs that are out there.

Electricians—I am sure you can speak to this—when you started in the business, it was one kind of skill set and, as you proceeded, you have found a need for additional.

Would you like to talk about how that works and the way it might integrate with the small modular reactors?

Mr. NORCROSS. Certainly. And I appreciate you yielding.

When we look at the educational system, apprenticeship programs have been around since the beginning of time, whether it was the shoemaker or the carpenter.

When I started out, it was a 4-year apprenticeship program. Today it is up to 5 years plus, depending on what specialty area you would like to focus on.

But those are the jobs that, when you are working, you are going to school, you are paying your taxes. When you are not working, you are not paying your taxes, and the system is a drag. You can't find a better life.

So when I say the best social program is a job, it is good for America. It pays the taxes. That means you are going to afford to send your kids to college if they want to go to college.

I have three children. Two of them wanted to go to college. One wanted to become an electrician. They each value what they do so much, and they are proud of what they do.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Perhaps it was your testimony at the hearing that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) put together, and they were talking about job training programs.

And I believe one witness, maybe you, said that the largest technical training program in the Nation are the apprenticeship programs that the unions run.

So the electricians union, IEBW, their apprenticeship program, the plumbers union and steelworkers and so forth each have an apprenticeship training program. And, when taken together, it is the single largest job training program in the Nation.

You said you spent some time at that?

Mr. NORCROSS. Well, it is interesting you are bringing that up. There are 15 different craft unions. And the fact of the matter is sometimes we can't see the forest for the trees.

They are the largest training—\$1.9 billion a year, privately funded, not through any government funds—through the apprenticeship training program of those 15 different craft unions.

It is so important because it is in place. That means that, when they are working, they are putting that next generation of people to work.

We need people to be in the STEMs, the engineers. But these apprenticeship programs, over 900 sites around the country, are training carpenters, plumbers, cement masons, laborers each and every day, and they have been doing it.

The way we can help them make it in America is to start the infrastructure up so that they can start that next generation of folks because an apprenticeship program only works when the journeyman is teaching the apprentice.

Mr. GARAMENDI. In terms of public policy, we have passed a new piece of legislation, the Education and Workforce Innovation Act, last year.

And it seems to me that that piece of legislation, which provides Federal assistance for various kinds of workforce preparation, education, and other activities, to the extent that that can be brought into and connected with the apprenticeship programs that those labor unions that you just described are running out there, we might see even a more robust program within these. And these are employer and union, both of them participating in the apprenticeship programs.

Mr. NORCROSS. It is interesting you brought that up.

Today I spoke in front of the Building & Construction Trades Council. They have a program called Helmets to Hardhats, which is taking those veterans who are returning home and looking for an opportunity.

And those opportunities aren't always there, but those building trades in New Jersey alone over the last 4 years have taken 500 veterans into their apprenticeship programs.

So it is taking an existing program, giving not a handout, but just an opportunity to those vets. And they are some of the best apprentices that we have ever had, and it works extremely well.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We had a job fair out in California 2 weeks ago, and I was talking to some of the folks that were looking for a job.

Many of them had gone to the community college, taken a preapprenticeship training program so that they would be prepared and have the necessary education to go into the apprenticeship program.

That is a very, very important part of the Make It In America agenda: education coupled with labor. It is a very, very powerful piece of this.

Thank you so very much for participating today.

Closing comment?

Mr. NORCROSS. You bring up a good point.

The one issue, the preapprentice program is giving an opportunity to those who might not normally look into it: Women, minorities, and those who haven't been exposed to the trades. And I think that is a great point.

Do you want to be out there when it is in the middle of the summer? Do you want to be out there in the cold? So the preapprentice program exposes

them to all the different crafts to see if this is what they want to do. It is a great opportunity to make it in America.

I thank you for the time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, I am going to pass this discussion on to a lady who knows a lot of manufacturing.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the heart of the manufacturing center in the United States.

Thank you so very much for joining us this afternoon.

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to thank you, Congressman GARAMENDI, for your continuing leadership on jobs in America and Make It In America.

It is a pleasure to join also with Congressmen NORCROSS and SHERMAN, who are here tonight after hours as we attempt to bring the cause of the American people here to our Nation's Capitol.

I want to thank you for the logo of "Make It In America." We in the Midwest would also say "make it and grow it in America" because agriculture is a major underpinning of Ohio as well, and I know it is of California.

I want to begin my remarks tonight by saying that the American economy, in a way, is upside down. We have seen two-thirds of the manufacturing jobs in America eliminated over the last three decades, and it isn't just because of technology.

It is because those jobs have been outsourced to third-world environments, where people work for penny wage jobs, and their livelihoods don't really increase. They aren't bettering themselves. They are basically not starving. They certainly don't live a middle class way of life.

But two-thirds of the manufacturing jobs, gone in America. And at the same time, we see the financial sector growing in power. Six banks headquartered on Wall Street mainly controlling the investment that occurs that allows the outsourcing, the very same characters that brought this economy down and hurt the world through the development of derivatives.

It has been interesting to read about the Greek financial crisis and to see that Goldman Sachs is right in there again, creating a derivative instrument that can't hold water. So the inner tube is just leaking all over the place.

It is important for the American people to see that manufacturing jobs have gone down. We have lost two-thirds of them. And the financial sector, meanwhile, has gained power, the very same characters that are outsourcing these jobs.

Because who has the money to invest in third-world environments? It sure isn't the community banks that I represent.

Let me point out that, over the last 30 years, we haven't had a single year where the United States was able to send more out—export goods—than import from other places.

So we have been upside down as an economy now for going on 30 years.

And from my region, that means the average family has had their income go down, their net effective buying power, \$7,000 as the middle class hemorrhages.

Let's look at the numbers. We have had over \$10 trillion of trade deficit since the mid-1970s, when the first free trade agreement was signed. That \$10 trillion probably translates into a loss of over 40 million jobs over that period of time.

We are growing now sluggishly, sluggishly, because the "make it" and "grow it" parts of America have been very, very trimmed back.

If you lose two-thirds of your manufacturing jobs, you have growing poverty and you have sinking wages and sinking buying power across our country.

Now, there is a book. I recommend it to everybody. "American Theocracy" by Kevin Phillips. In chapter 8, he talks about the financialization of the U.S. economy: loss of manufacturing jobs, increase of jobs in the financial sector, high rewards for the people that sit at the top, but for everybody else, sinking wages and a shrinking middle class.

The derivative instruments that hurt our country and the collateralized debt obligations that threw us into a spin back in 2008, those weren't invented by people in Toledo, and I doubt they were invented by people in Cleveland or central California. They were invented by money-changers.

And they had figured out how to trade away American jobs, make huge, huge profits for their shareholders at the expense of the rest of the American people, the 99 percent.

On agriculture, I want to say that what has happened over the same period of time—because we have a vast underpinning of agriculture in this country. But even with it, 15 percent of our food is now imported. It used to be about 3 percent.

Start looking at the shelves and you are going: Oh, what did we trade away for that or that or that? And certainly, in pharmaceuticals, we have traded away most of those jobs someplace else.

And isn't it interesting that the cost of pharmaceuticals hasn't gone down, as we have just seen an avalanche of drugs coming in here, whether they be generic or brand-name.

There are people who are financing this outsourcing, and they are sitting fat and happy in the major financial center of our country.

I can go through my region. I can look at companies like Dixon Ticonderoga. It didn't close its doors in Sandusky, Ohio, because it couldn't make its crayons and school supplies anymore. It was moved to Mexico, where it sits near Mexico City. It moved from Sandusky, Ohio, down there.

Delphi moved from the same general area, Port Clinton, Ohio. Ford Focus just last week announced 4,000 jobs out of suburban Detroit down to Mexico. Champion Spark Plug in Toledo,

closed. Acklin Stamping in Toledo, closed. Dura, Dana, Chase Bag, Textile Leather, the list goes on and on. Ford's Maumee Stamping, there couldn't be a better Ford stamping plant in America than the one in Maumee—doors shut, jobs gone.

Two-thirds. That is just one part of America. Two-thirds of the manufacturing jobs of this country, lost.

Our economy is lopsided. It is benefiting a few. We are seeding the field, and that is why the American people feel the pinch.

I just wanted to make one other important point where the gentleman references research and innovation. There will be a patent bill coming up here very soon which I hope people will vote against because it will further dampen the ability of individual inventors and those working in our universities inventing the new products of the future and will reward only the big companies.

And I say to my colleagues, if you haven't decided how to vote on H.R. 9, I hope you will vote "no" on what is being called the Innovation Act because what it is, it is a transfer of more power to the biggest global corporations to say to their patents: Full steam ahead.

But if you are an individual out there in America or you are a person who doesn't have a whole legal team of lawyers who are being paid at your behest, you don't have a chance. You won't have a chance with H.R. 9.

We have a bill, H.R. 2045, that I hope people will look at as an alternative. It is supported by all of the research universities, small inventors across our country, who can't afford any longer to put their invention out there because they don't have the legal or financial capacity to defend it.

There is something really insidious about what is going on with our patent system and will make it so much harder.

And I give as proof, I read in our local newspaper the other day—they listed all the patents that had been approved this year over the first half of the year from my part of the country. There wasn't a single individual patent approved. Every single patent that was approved belonged to a company that had already been successful.

There wasn't even a university patent approved. I thought: Oh, my goodness. This is really not going to support innovation. This only supports the very same big-pocketed folks who already hold all the power in this society and have far too much sway in this Congress.

So I thank the gentleman for allowing me to add my two cents to the discussion this evening and to say the American people deserve a better deal than this.

I hope that Members will look at our Glass-Steagall Act as well. That is my bill, ELIZABETH WARREN's bill over in the other body, to break up the big banks and to have more democratic ac-

tivity among the financial institutions of this country and not just lodging over two-thirds of the power in the big six.

It is really warping our society, and it is making it much less representative. It is harming manufacturing. It is harming agriculture. It is harming innovation.

Thank you, Congressman GARAMENDI, for the phenomenal work that you do in allowing all of us whose districts have been so impacted to add to the American fabric and represent all of America, not just the wealthiest part of it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Ms. KAPTUR, thank you so very much for bringing us the message from America's heartland. And, by the way, agriculture is also a manufacturing industry. The farmer grows, but then the food processors are manufacturing that and bringing added value and a major part.

You are quite correct about the escape of capital, using tax policy and trade policy to encourage American companies to take their capital and build overseas, leaving American workers behind.

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I just want to place on the record that our Glass-Steagall bill to essentially break up the big banks and take the investment side of the operation away from the prudent banking portion of it is H.R. 381.

We have over 60 cosponsors of our bill here in the House, and I am hoping, as the American people hear our message tonight, they will encourage their Members of Congress to sponsor our Glass-Steagall Restoration Act, H.R. 381.

□ 1745

Mr. GARAMENDI. Ms. KAPTUR, thank you so very, very much. You talked about things that are extremely important along the way: the trade policy, our tax policy, the escape of American capital, leaving American workers behind, economic theory, and capital and labor resources. If one of those leaves—in this case, capital—then the American worker is left behind.

Mr. Speaker, the Make It In America agenda is all about rebuilding the foundation of America's economic growth. We can do that in several ways. I am going to wrap up with a very quick rendition of several policy opportunities that present themselves to us.

First of all, at the bottom of that list—not because it is at the bottom, but because it is just there—is the issue of infrastructure. We are faced with a huge challenge, one that, unfortunately, I am afraid the Congress will, once again, duck the challenge of creating a robust program to revitalize the American infrastructure.

Infrastructure is the foundation. It is the sanitation, the water systems; it is

the roads, the airports; it is the rivers, the ports, and transportation system.

The President has introduced, in the last Congress, the GROW AMERICA Act. We now call it the GROW AMERICA Act 2. Unfortunately, this week, tomorrow, our majority, our Republican colleagues, are failing to address this issue.

Instead, they are going back to a childhood game called kick the can—in this case, kick the can down the road for another 6 months instead of putting in place a long-term, 5- or 6-year transportation program that can accomplish all of these things—the rail, the buses, the ports, the bridges, the highways, the sanitation systems, and the communications systems. The leadership in the House on the Republican side is simply missing the fundamental necessity of infrastructure.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, this goes back to the Founding Fathers. George Washington asked Alexander Hamilton to develop an economic plan. He came back with one called manufacturers; in that was an infrastructure. Alexander Hamilton, the first Secretary of the Treasury, said that we must build the roads—postal roads at that time—we must build the canals, and we must build the ports if we are going to have a strong economy. The infrastructure is critically important to the Make It In America agenda.

Another one, Mr. Speaker, is using our tax dollars to build the American economy to make it in America. This is a story of two bridges. Very, very quickly, one bridge on the West Coast, this is called the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, a multibillion dollar project, the other one on the East Coast, and this is on the Hudson River in New York City, the Tappan Zee Bridge.

The San Francisco Bay Bridge, in a fit of what I call stupidity, the State of California decided that they would seek Chinese steel because it was supposed to be 10 percent cheaper to build the bridge. Well, the result was 6,000 jobs were in China, a brand-new steel mill, the most high-tech steel mill in the world—and, for America, taken to the cleaners.

It was a significant overrun of multi-millions of dollars, a delay of years and years, steel that was shoddy, welds that were shoddy, and a lesson for America: spend our tax money on American-made equipment and supplies. Buy American steel. Those 6,000 jobs could have been in America. That steel mill could have been in America, and the shoddy work would not have occurred.

New York decided to buy American steel. So what happens—on time and under budget and 7,728 American jobs were created. It is the story of two coasts: California, stupid policy; New York, wise policy. Spend the American taxpayer dollars on American-made goods and equipment.

One final thing, Mr. Speaker, and then I am going to return this over to

the speaker. I don't know if you can see that, but that is a liquefied natural gas tanker. America later this year will begin to export natural gas in the form of LNG, liquefied natural gas. This is a big deal and a big potential for the gas industry.

They are going to make a lot of money because the cost of natural gas around the world is maybe twice to three times what the price would be in the United States, so the gas companies are all for shipping gas overseas. We need to be careful about this because, if we ship too much overseas, then we are going to raise the price.

The Cheniere facility in the Gulf Coast will take 100 tankers, and I have legislation that says, if we are going to ship a strategic national asset overseas, then we ought to take care of the rest of the national security.

Shipbuilding is absolutely essential. American mariners, captains, and seamen and -women are absolutely essential for the American defense and security. Make it in America, ship it on American-built tankers—we are talking about tens of thousands, indeed, over 100,000 jobs and a supply chain for jobs all across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I have got just a few minutes, and I notice that my colleague from New York is here. The East-West show is back in force.

Mr. TONKO, thank you for coming in so quietly. I didn't see you on my left side. Please join us, and let's talk about Make It In America.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI. It is always a pleasure to join you on the House floor to speak to any issue, but in this case, to Make It In America.

I am certain through the hour you have talked about the capital and physical infrastructure demands, but we also have to highlight the human infrastructure portion of the equation that will resound in the greatest success for the Make It In America agenda, and that is training the skilled talents that we need.

We need to promote the development and the advancement of manufacturing—advanced manufacturing, as it has been coined of late—but also to understand that it is an innovation economy, and so that means dealing with issues in production with great precision.

That great precision requires extremely gifted skill sets and education, apprentice programs in higher ed, making certain we have a growing force of engineers, where we are woefully underproducing the amount of engineers we require.

There are bits of legislation that all of us have cosponsored, that perhaps we are leading as sponsor, that will encourage the development engineers that we require for our being able to be a great manufacturing nation as we move forward.

Those are important elements, making certain that we have the precision instrumentation that will enable us to,

again, compete because it is not the cheapest investment, but the wisest investment that is made.

It is not going to be significant by the dollar only, but what is the best product, what is the most thoughtful product that is developed for whatever needs society may have. The engineering components of all of this is very important, and the skill set component is very important.

As we go forward, we want to make certain that that human infrastructure is geared up and ready to go with cutting-edge skill sets that speak to today's economy. That is very important.

Mr. Speaker, we have always prided ourselves on a strong workforce, a well-trained, well-educated, and well-equipped force that goes out there and enables us to compete and compete effectively in a global race on innovation. That has grown significant over the last decade.

We see more and more investment coming in, that human infrastructure from nations around the world that will then be competing with this Nation to be able to export its goods, so a full complement of programs that are essential in policy format and resource advocacy and investing in that Make It In America agenda, investment here where there are rightful anticipations of lucrative returns on the taxpayer dollars that are invested.

I thank you for the laser sharp focus you put on to Make It In America as an agenda and the underscoring of importance that you have drawn to manufacturing as a sector. It was walked away from by previous administrations.

This administration, the Obama administration, has talked about sound investment in advance manufacturing will enable us to stop bleeding the loss of manufacturing jobs where we are losing, at one point, one out of four.

□ 1800

We are still perched pretty high in terms of manufacturing jobs, but we have to stop that bleeding, and the way we do it is by turning it around with policy and resource advocacy. And I thank you again for your leadership in this regard.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you. I know that your previous work before you came to Congress several years ago was in the State of New York working on the innovation economy. You certainly have ramped up innovation economy in the State of New York, and now you are bringing that experience here with legislation.

The Make It In America agenda, I am going to put it back up very, very quickly here because you talked about this. The Make It in America agenda is about the middle class; it is about rebuilding the middle class.

Thirty-four members of the Democratic Caucus talked last week about their legislation dealing with trade and taxes, energy, labor, education, research, and infrastructure, about how that constellation of issues comes together to boost the American middle

class, to give every American an opportunity for that middle class job. So it is there.

I see we are about to be out of time, or maybe we are already out of time, so I am going to say I want to thank my colleagues and Mr. HOYER for leading us in this.

Mr. TONKO, you have got 30 seconds to close.

Mr. TONKO. Well, I just say, let's move forward with investment. It happens when we have a laser sharp focus on just where to apply our resources to capital, physical, and human infrastructure, so as to be the strongest competitor out there in a global race for kingpin of the innovation economy, and whoever wins that race, becomes the go-to agent for the worldwide economy. So we can't afford to hesitate or fail in our attempt here.

Thank you, again, for leading us.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. TONKO.

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

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by praising Mr. GARAMENDI, the gentleman from California, for this excellent presentation on why we should make it in America.

But I am here today to talk about something that was made in Vienna, namely, the Iran nuclear deal. I am going to start with a few observations and then get to the heart of my remarks.

The first observation is that we ought to set the record straight. The sanctions that brought Iran to the table were imposed by Congress over the objection of the executive branch of government.

For 30 years, Congress had it right, and for 30 years, the executive branch had it wrong. For 30 years, every time we passed sanctions acts, they would be argued against and thwarted and watered down due to the efforts of several administrations.

The only time Congress got it wrong is when the House of Representatives got it right and passed tough sanctions legislation that went over to the Senate where, unfortunately, some in the senior body listened to the administrations at the time and failed to pass our legislation.

The second observation I would like to make is that the deal in Vienna lifts a number of sanctions which were not imposed as a result of Iran's nuclear activity. It provides greater sanctions relief than that which was supposed to be provided.

I, in particular, note that the arms embargo against Iran, an Iran that has created so much mischief in Syria,

Yemen, and elsewhere, will be phased out and the Iran Sanctions Act will be waived. The Iran Sanctions Act was passed by the Congress in the early 1990s.

A review of that bill indicates that only one of three reasons it was passed was Iran's work with WMDs. And, of course, weapons of mass destruction come in three forms, not only the nuclear, but also the chemical and the biological. So I would reckon that only one-ninth of the reason Congress passed that bill was Iran's nuclear program, and yet those sanctions are being waived.

And finally, we see that the sanctions relief is so complete that not only are we waiving our secondary sanctions and allowing Iran to do business with the rest of the world, we are even allowing Iran to export to the United States. We won't buy their oil, but we will buy the things that we don't need and they couldn't sell anywhere else.

The next observation I would like to make is that there are those who say this deal may only work for about 10 years, but the Iranian Government will get better over the next 10 years. Do not hold your breath. The whole purpose of sanctions is to put pressure on the government, which either causes it to change its policy or creates a change in regime. That is what you do when you are trying to force a change in government.

Showering this government with economic benefits is not going to lead to its destruction or its eclipse. Look at Tehran. What you see is what you get.

Another observation is about missiles. It is unfortunate that this deal will allow Iran, in 8 years, to get more missile technology. There is only one reason for them to be working on intercontinental ballistic missiles, and that is to deliver a nuclear payload to a different continent than their own—namely, ours; namely, Europe. There is no other reason. Iran is not trying to fly to the Moon. They are trying to get a nuclear device to North America or Europe.

But let us not be sanguine one way or the other about missiles. A nuclear weapon—they vary in size, but they are about the size of a person, and you can smuggle one into the United States inside a bale of marijuana.

So while we should be doing everything possible to stop Iran's missile program, the heart of our effort has got to be to stop their nuclear weapons program. The heart of my speech is to focus on the deal from a nuclear weapons perspective.

Now, the political pundits outside this Capitol are all trying to make this an "evaluate the President": Are you for him or are you against him? Is this a good deal? Did the President do a good job?

Those questions may be relevant to those seeking ratings on this or that cable television channel, but we in Congress have got to deal with a com-

pletely different question: What should Congress do at this time under these circumstances in the real world as it exists today where the President has agreed to sign this deal, not as it existed 2 days ago, not as it existed a decade ago when we should have been enforcing sanctions laws, but what should Congress do today?

Now, in order to reach that conclusion, we need to look at the overall deal and realize that it has different phases. It is a different deal over time. So let us look at the deal from the good, the bad, and the ugly.

In the first year, the most important good parts occur. Iran must ship 90 percent of its uranium stockpiles out of country and mothball two-thirds of the centrifuges. As we craft our policy, we should be loathe to give up those two advantages. We must, whenever we focus on anything, say, yes, there are some bad parts of this deal, but two-thirds of the centrifuges, 90 percent of the stockpiles, that is something we need to be focused on. So that is the good.

The bad also occurs in the first year. Iran will get its hands on \$120 billion plus of their own money that we have under the sanctions been able to freeze in various money centers around the world.

What will they use this \$120 billion for? Part of it will go to help their own people because they have raised expectations. A good chunk of it will go to graft and corruption in the Iranian regime because it is, after all, the Iranian regime. A large portion of that money will go to kill Sunni Muslims. Some of them deserve it, most do not. And what is left over will be used to kill Americans and Israelis.

So there is bad in the first year and good in the first year.

But what is truly ugly occurs after 10 years. After year 10, Iran can have an unlimited number of centrifuges of unlimited quality. As the President himself says, at that point, their breakout time, the amount of time from the day they kick out the inspectors to the day when they have enough fissile material for a nuclear weapon, shrinks to virtually zero days for the first bomb, a few more days for the second bomb.

Why is this? Because after 10 years, Iran will be allowed to create a huge industrial facility capable of supporting several electric generation nuclear plants. It is counterintuitive, but true, that it takes an awful lot more enrichment to power a nuclear plant than to create a nuclear bomb. In effect, we will be in a situation where it is as if Iran has an industrial-sized giant bakery capable of feeding many of their cities, and all they need for a nuclear bomb is a bag full of bread-crumbs. Obviously, once they go big, once they go industrial, once we get to the ugly part of this deal, Iran is a nuclear power—perhaps not an admitted nuclear power, but a nuclear power nevertheless.