

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT WEAPONS FUNNELED TO LAW ENFORCEMENT

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Republican border bill, originally scheduled for this week, contains a provision buried on page 78 that would expand the Pentagon's 1033 program. This program transfers billions of dollars of Defense Department equipment to law enforcement agencies without any congressional oversight or community input. The bill adds a border securities activities priority to the program that will quietly funnel military-grade weapons to law enforcement for this new, fully defined priority.

It appears some of my colleagues did not learn the tragic lessons of Ferguson, Missouri, last summer as the Nation saw the devastating result of a militarized police force. If this bill is brought back up, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment in order to curb the expansion of this program.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA: INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia). 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. Mr. Speaker, this chart has been up, really, for the last 4 years, and I keep bringing it back because it is pretty important. This is about American jobs, about how we can rebuild the American economy, and about how we can, at the same time, provide employment opportunities—those middle class jobs that we all want to talk about—and do it in a way that actually improves our environment.

Today, I want to focus on one part of this. I have asked some of my colleagues to join us, and Congresswoman HAHN will be joining us in a few moments to talk about a piece of this.

In the Make It In America agenda, we have these items: international trade, which is critically important that we do right; tax policies of all kinds; our energy policy. Oh. By the way, in the last 5 years, the energy policy of the administration's has almost made the United States energy independent. We are actually producing 4 billion more barrels of oil a day now than we were 6 or 7 years ago, so we do have an energy policy—green energy, moving away from the greenhouse gasses; a labor policy; education, the training of our workers; research, which is critically important. We may come to that later today, but I really want to focus on this one which is at the bottom because it is foundational. The foundation of the economy of the United States is the infrastructure.

Way, way back, the Founding Fathers—everybody around here wants to talk about the Founding Fathers and what the Founding Fathers would do and how they would act. I will tell you what George Washington did in his first weeks in office.

He turned to Alexander Hamilton, the Treasury Secretary, and said: Hey, Alex. Develop an economic development plan for me. How are we going to grow our economy?

Treasury Secretary Hamilton came back—he formed a committee of one, and he came back with a plan of, maybe, 30, 40 pages, and in that plan was fundamental infrastructure development.

He said the role of the Federal Government is to make sure that we have postal roads, to make sure that we have ports and canals—the infrastructure of the day.

So, for those who like to harken back to the Founding Fathers—they ought to also consider the mothers. In any case, infrastructure was fundamental. Today, I want to talk about infrastructure, and I want to do it in a way that will really, hopefully, excite this body into passing a very robust, complete surface transportation infrastructure bill.

Now, President Obama and Department of Transportation Secretary Foxx have made a proposal called "Build America." It is a good proposal that covers all of the elements that we need—the highways, the ports, the railroads, freight. All of those things are in that bill. Unfortunately, it didn't have a hearing last year. Hopefully, it will be foundational this year as we consider in the next 3 months a surface transportation infrastructure bill for the United States because, in May, the world comes to an end as the programs of the Federal Government's for transportation expire. We need a new law going forward, so what we want to talk about today is that issue.

I am going to take just a few seconds. Every now and then, somebody sends brochures and studies to us. This one came from Duke University, the Center on Globalization, Governance & Competitiveness: "Infrastructure Investment Creates American Jobs," and they have got this little executive summary which is really helpful to us:

Old and broken transportation infrastructure makes the United States less competitive than 15 of our major trading partners and makes American manufacturers less efficient in getting goods to market.

Representative HAHN, that is where you want to come in and talk about ports.

This is Duke University:

The underinvestment of infrastructure costs the United States over 900,000 jobs, including 97,000 American manufacturing jobs.

Maximizing American-made materials when rebuilding infrastructure has the potential to create even more jobs. Relying on American-made inputs can also mitigate safety concerns related to large-scale outsourcing.

□ 1700

One of the things that really, really bothers me about my home State of California is the way in which the State of California decided to build the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge. We are talking about a multibillion-dollar project, \$3.9 billion over budget, 12 years late, and the steel in that bridge came from China. How brilliant was that?

One of the principal reasons for the delay was the steel was delayed, the steel was faulty, and the welds were faulty. There were 3,000 jobs in China and zero jobs in the United States. By the way, the Chinese demanded that they be the inspectors on the job—not good at all. This kind of tells us about why making it in America is important.

There is another example. I don't like to brag about New York, since that is a long, long way from my district, but the Tappan Zee Bridge in New York was built with American steel, had a \$3.9 billion total project cost, 7,728 American workers were hired, and it was designed to last 100 years without any major structural maintenance.

I know Ms. HAHN is going to come up here and probably carry on some bragging. We have got a lot to brag about in California, but we cannot brag about what happened with the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge because it was a financial disaster. It was a jobs disaster for the United States, for American workers. Even today, there are continuing reports coming out about the faulty bridge construction.

Infrastructure investment creates American jobs, and if we require that those investments be made in America, we are going to be talking about Americans going back to work. All of us talk about the middle class. Well, let's build the infrastructure, let's use American-made materials, and let's really build American jobs for the middle class.

Ms. HAHN, I believe you have something to say about ports. The fact is that you represent the two biggest ports in America, you will argue: Long Beach and the Port of Los Angeles.

Ms. HAHN. Thank you, Mr. GARAMENDI, for having the leadership, certainly, on Make It In America, but really reminding our colleagues and all Americans how important these projects are in terms of repairing our infrastructure, as well as creating good American jobs.

I am here today to join you and many of our colleagues in really pressing Congress this year to take action to improve our Nation's outdated, underfunded ports and to repair and replace crumbling roads and dangerous bridges.

I serve on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. I founded and cochair our congressional bipartisan PORTS Caucus, so I work closely with not only Democrats, but I am working very closely with Republicans.

I do know—and I believe this to be true—that this is one area that we can

agree on, and that is our infrastructure and transportation. I am really hoping that we can work together across the aisle and understand that making these essential investments in America's transportation and infrastructure will create good-paying jobs, will help American businesses to compete globally, and it will improve the quality of life for families in every single congressional district.

As you said—and I will take bragging rights—I represent the Port of Los Angeles, and ALAN LOWENTHAL represents the Port of Long Beach. Together, we consider them America's ports. They are the largest port complex in the country. They account for about 40 percent of all trade that comes through this country, it comes through our ports.

I am a big advocate for these ports. As the cochair of the PORTS Caucus, I am an advocate for all ports in this country because the entire port network, the entire network of highways, roads, bridges, and infrastructure that move freight across this country, needs some champions here in Congress.

This freight network is important for moving goods across our country. It is important for small businesses, and even if you live hundreds of miles from the nearest port, whether you realize it or not, everyone depends on our ports to get the goods to the stores, to the factories, and to the businesses that many of our colleagues represent.

Maybe you live or work in an agricultural or industrial area. We know that they produce something that America exports to foreign markets.

You may also have a direct interest in making sure that our freight network—our Nation's transportation system—is in good condition, is modern, efficient, and safe so that cargo can travel to the ports where it is loaded on the ships to get overseas.

I loved that in the State of the Union last week, President Obama said that "21st century businesses need 21st century infrastructure." The deteriorating infrastructure, crumbling roads, and collapsing bridges that are part of our current national freight network are a threat to America's prosperity and our global competitiveness.

Policymakers here in Congress need to recognize the need to make repairs and upgrades, but we have been stuck on how to pay for them.

I introduced a bill last Congress that I am going to reintroduce this Congress that will create a dedicated funding stream for these vital projects—and listen to this—without raising taxes or imposing any additional fees.

I have come up with an idea how to fund our national freight network, and I am hoping I can get broad support in this Congress. Let me repeat: it does not raise taxes one penny, and it does not increase any fees to any businesses in America.

What it does is divert 5 percent of the fees that we already collect on imports in this country—money that currently

goes to the U.S. Treasury's general fund—and we can create a new national freight trust fund.

We collect \$39 billion a year nationwide in these import fees. Setting aside just 5 percent of those would give this national freight trust fund about \$2 billion a year that we could use to repair roads, highways, and bridges—the last mile to ease congestion into our ports across this country. Again, it is not going to raise taxes or fees.

I know, as you mentioned, Mr. GARAMENDI, we need to pass a surface transportation bill. I am working with Chairman SHUSTER and some of the committee members on our Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to see if my legislation can be a part of that as a way just to fund our freight network.

It is different than funding the highway trust fund, which is our normal roads and bridges. This is different. This is about the network that moves goods in this country. I hope you will support me.

Thank you for allowing me to speak on this very Special Hour. This is an issue, Mr. GARAMENDI, I know that we agree on. I know that our Republican colleagues will agree with us on this.

Maybe this is the one thing that we can do as a huge gift to the American people: find something in a bipartisan way, some common ground that we agree on, that will really repair infrastructure and create good jobs here in America. I think this is an issue that will, I believe, make the American people happy.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you so very much, Ms. HAHN. The proposal that you put forward almost seems magical. If it was magic, you would have figured it out—and you did—but to use money that is already going into the general fund and divert it back to what it was really intended to—that is the enhancement of our ports—is entirely sensible.

I suppose that I am a coauthor.

Ms. HAHN. I am sure you are. If you are not, you will be.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I am sure I will be.

The rest of the story that we have is that we need to take a look at our transportation infrastructure specifically in a very holistic, universal way. It does us no good to improve the interstate highway system when the link between the ports and the interstate highway system doesn't work.

For example, I-10 in southern California that you and I know so very well is the way you get out of those two ports onto the interstate highway system. It is rather inadequate. That is an example of that linkage that you are talking about.

We have many, many more things to talk about here. I welcome you to stay. We will probably circle back on it.

I see my colleague from Ohio. I think there are some ports in Ohio that quite possibly are in MARCY KAPTUR's district.

Ms. KAPTUR, if you would join us on this issue of infrastructure and jobs and making it in America.

Ms. KAPTUR. What a pleasure it is to join you this evening, and thank you for your continuing leadership on jobs, infrastructure—jobs in America, not outsourcing our jobs elsewhere—and to also be joined by Congresswoman HAHN, such an incredible leader who has made such a difference not just in California, but in communities across this country.

We really appreciate everything that she has done legislatively over these last 5 years to help our ports develop, to connect rail to ports, highway to rail. It is really amazing what her leadership has done in forming the PORTS Caucus. Thank you very much, Congresswoman HAHN.

I rise this evening to join both of you. Obviously, I am in a different part of the country, but we understand what it means to Make It In America. I think the last company in Washington, D.C., our Nation's Capital, was the old Government Printing Office that used to print some of its goods here, but it doesn't anymore.

To Make It In America creates jobs here, and what is interesting to look at, Congressman GARAMENDI talks about the transportation and infrastructure bill. No bill that this Congress could pass would create more jobs than that bill. We hope to have it cleared.

I know Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO are working very hard on that. I know Members like Congressman GARAMENDI are helping lift them across the finish line.

The Make It In America agenda will create tens of thousands of jobs across this country. Look at every community you go to, and look at what is unfinished. Old bridges are falling down. There used to be a song, "London Bridge is Falling Down." Well, I think they are falling down in America now. Highways are not complete. We have old airports.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Speaking of bridges falling down, this is the Interstate 5 bridge in northern Washington State that fell down 2 years ago. Interstate 5 is the main intercontinental highway from Mexico to Canada through California, Oregon, and Washington. It created a bit of a traffic jam when it went down.

Ms. KAPTUR. I can only imagine. We have so many unmet needs in my own community that spans a river called the Maumee River, the largest river that flows into the Great Lakes.

We built a new bridge, but the challenge there today is with the weather. Ice is forming on the tensile spans, and they have had to close the bridge for 3 or 4 days at a time, for fear that these ice plates will fall on trucks and cars. We have to fix this problem.

All these issues are all over the country, so the transportation and infrastructure bill is essential. I thought in discussing this tonight that I would put a couple of really important figures on the RECORD.

Congresswoman HAHN talked about ports and her championing the PORTS

Caucus here and how much gets imported into our country and what gets exported. Well, here is a chart that gives you a sense of how many more imports come in here than exports go out.

Since the mid-1970s and then the passage of NAFTA here, this represents the growing share of imports over exports into our country. Since about 1975, our country has amassed \$9.5 trillion in red ink with the world.

That is hard to imagine for most people, but that translates into 47.5 million lost jobs in our country just due to trade—not technology, but more imports coming in than exports going out. We have lost two-thirds of our manufacturing jobs.

□ 1715

So when the gentleman champions development in America which yields jobs in America, these are just the figures relating to one country with which we have held a massive deficit since the passage of NAFTA. NAFTA passed back in 1993. Our country moved into a gigantic deficit with Mexico.

Recently, I don't know if the—and this means lost American jobs, to other places, and our people struggling, wages not rising, more part-time work, fewer benefits.

I don't know if the gentleman was able to see what happened with the recent Department of Transportation ruling. They gave a green light to long-haul, cross-border trucking by Mexican-based carriers, despite lingering safety concerns.

It is the jobs, but it is also the safety that you talk about. The Department of Transportation simply looked the other way when the inspector general found serious flaws in the pilot program meant to test this new authority.

Once again, NAFTA led to the lowest common denominator for the continent. Foreign corporate interests trump the safety of the American people. And we know that flawed trade deals cost us jobs. They harm our economy, and they put people at risk on both sides of the border.

So it is time to start fixing the damage, not creating more. I thank the gentleman for allowing us the time to express our views this evening.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you so very much, Ms. KAPTUR.

You notice our Make It In America agenda, they have trade up here at the top, and you very well pointed out the problems that occur with an unfair trade deal, NAFTA being but one.

At this moment, the President has asked us, Members of Congress, to pass what is known as the Fast Track, which basically gives authority to the President to cut a deal and then bring it to Congress, and we don't get to amend it. It is either an up-or-down vote. They say that is the only way they can negotiate.

Well, if that is so, then that is no way to negotiate because we are the representatives—actually the Constitu-

tion very clearly leaves to Congress the issue of international trade negotiations.

It is our responsibility, and I am not about to find a situation in which we give to the administration unfettered authority to cut a deal on international trade when you consider what happened with NAFTA, when you consider some of the other trade deals that have hollowed out the American manufacturing sector.

You put that chart up so very clear. Associated with that chart are real lives, real middle class families. We had just over 19 million middle class families in manufacturing in 1990. It went down to just over 10 million as a result of these trade deals that you talked about. We are now beginning to come back up, principally because of cheap energy in the United States, natural gas specifically. So we have got a ways to go here.

We need to be really, really careful, as Members of Congress, representatives of the American people, that we don't give away even more American jobs.

Ms. KAPTUR. Yes, I thank the gentleman so much for pointing that out.

You know, when the administration and others talk about this latest NAFTA deal, they are calling it the TPP now. They always give it initials or something—NAFTA, CAFTA, KORUS—it is always initials so the American people really can't quite understand what all that is about.

This one they are calling TPP.

Mr. GARAMENDI. The Trans-Pacific Partnership.

Ms. KAPTUR. And the last deal we had was Korea. With Korea they promised, they said, we will be able to sell 50,000 American cars in Korea.

Well, what has happened is they have sold, the Koreans have sold 500,000 here. We never got the 50,000 in there, didn't get it—closed market, deal not kept.

I have a bill that I have introduced in several Congresses called the Balancing Trade Act, which basically says to the executive branch, for any country with which the United States has amassed a \$10 billion trade deficit, let's go back and figure out what is the problem? Why do we have a deficit rather than a balance or a surplus? And before we pass any more trade deals, fix that first.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, one of the problems—we spent a lot of time talking about this 2 years ago, and it has dropped off the discussion table, although it should come back—is the manipulation of the Chinese currency so that China is able to maintain a very, very significant trade advantage vis-avis the United States by the pricing of the Chinese currency. Grossly unfair, something that we need, as representatives of the American people and the middle class and the manufacturing sector, to forcefully address in legislation such as you have just described, where the administration is required to

look at the problem, and then make suggestions, or correct the problem if it does not take an act of Congress.

We just can't give it away. We are talking about American jobs. We are talking about the middle class.

The President stood here less than 10 days ago in his State of the Union and talked about the middle class. He called it a middle class economic policy—absolutely correct.

But, at the same time, this trade issue intervenes in that program and, quite likely, will further harm the middle class by hollowing out the American manufacturing sector. So let's be careful here about these trade deals.

You talked about the transportation from Mexico. A few years back, I was the insurance commissioner in California, elected by the people of California, and we were discussing with Mexico the insurance on those trucks that, under NAFTA, were supposed to come into the United States.

At that time, and hopefully this has been solved—I am not the insurance commissioner now, but I remember very well—we were unable to develop with Mexico an insurance policy in Mexico that would transfer into the United States and cover these trucks that were in the United States. They said it wasn't necessary.

Well, my staff and I looked at the details of the insurance and we said, this isn't worthy insurance. This isn't going to protect somebody that is run over by a Mexican truck. So we demanded, and at that time, we actually stalled.

But it appears now that the Department of Transportation is moving forward, and I surely hope that this insurance issue has been solved.

Now, if I might go back to a little bit of infrastructure and the transportation issue, as we pointed out in our discussion thus far, we have to come to grips, within the next 3 months, with a new transportation, surface transportation program for the United States.

And these are real jobs. For every billion dollars—again, this comes from Duke University, which produced this report, “Infrastructure Investment Creates American Jobs”—the Duke Center on Globalization, Governance and Competitiveness, in their summary, they point out that for every billion dollars invested in transportation infrastructure, there are 21,671 jobs created.

For every dollar invested in transportation infrastructure, \$3.54 is returned to the economy.

I have one of those little charts here. This is an older study. I used this 2 years ago. I am going to have to rewrite this because this one says, for every dollar invested in infrastructure investment, \$1.57 is pumped into the American economy. That came from Mark Zandi. But this now is 3 years old.

This new study by Duke University indicates that this number, \$1.57, really ought to be \$3.54. So, wait a minute, fellows. This is even better.

So let's get this transportation bill done. Let's pump it into the economy. And if we just met the minimum needs, as we see them today, it is about \$111 billion a year for the next 5 years that we should spend on this infrastructure for transportation.

That is a lot of money. But even \$100 billion, we would find that we would create 2,470,000 jobs. That is 58 percent more jobs than the current funding level would provide and over \$400 billion in total economic impact.

So if we want to build the economy, if we really want middle class jobs, we would pass a very robust surface transportation program so that the ports, as Ms. HAHN talked about, so that the highways and the trade programs that you talked about, so that all those things could come together, and we could really jump-start the economy and provide that middle class economic impact that all of us are now talking about, including the President. So this could be done, and we fully intend to do it.

I want to pick up another piece. If you would like to join our—to come back into our discussion, Ms. KAPTUR, please do.

Ms. KAPTUR. Well, I wanted to divert just a moment, if I could, to tell the story of one valiant American who is a very hardworking American, and when we don't make it in America, what happens to our people.

And I want to encourage citizens who may be listening to call their Member of Congress if they have a story like this from someone in their family, to please share it with us so that we can be a voice for these families across our country who have been harmed and are waiting for a transportation bill to be passed so they can go to work rebuilding America but, meanwhile, being hurt by international trade agreements that have outsourced their jobs.

Tonight, I would like to tell, very briefly, the story of Richard Hahn, a tradesman from northern Ohio whose job was outsourced to Mexico, one of the countries we talked about, and whose current job faces new trade threats as foreign steel floods our market.

Richard Hahn spent a long career with York International as an electrician, 23 years to be exact. He rose through the ranks to the status of 100th in seniority from his dedication and commitment to York International.

But in 2001, York International closed its Elyria, Ohio, facility and moved production to Monterrey, Mexico, leaving 900 workers without work, without a paycheck, without any assistance to move on.

After uprooting production to Mexico, York reached status as the world's largest independent manufacturer of air-conditioning, heating, and refrigeration machinery, and this left it as a prime buy for Johnson Controls, which acquired the company in 2005.

Mr. Hahn and many of his colleagues were given no training or retraining to

find a replacement job, but York International continued to thrive. Its parent company, Johnson Controls, even continues to receive Department of Defense contracts to manufacture the same air-conditioning, heating, and refrigeration machinery.

For nearly a year, Mr. Hahn was forced to accept unemployment as he desperately sought work in Elyria, Ohio. Many of his 900 colleagues moved their families out of Ohio, not finding any hope for reemployment in their hometown where they wanted to stay.

Fast forward, a little over a decade now, and Mr. Hahn is facing the trade theft of his job all over again. Although currently employed with U.S. Steel as an electrician, his and 614 colleagues' positions are under threat of layoff. U.S. Steel will have to idle its plant in coming months because they cannot continue to secure contracts to keep it running.

They have had international trade complaints about foreign-dumped steel and, unfortunately, Mr. Hahn's story is not unique. In fact, he said, his story is depicted best by quoting Billy Joel: "We're all waiting here in Allentown, but it sure is getting hard to stay."

The promise of jobs and lives better than your parents' is dissolving, and free trade deals are to blame for the shuttered factories.

Millions of Americans from across this great land have lived their own tale, in their own Allentown, and I encourage them to write or call their Member of Congress, just as Richard Hahn has bravely shared his story with me.

Tell us, tell the Members how trade has impacted your life and your ability to provide for your families. The more stories we receive from the American people, the more tales we can tell here on this floor and work with Congressman GARAMENDI to free our Nation from these flawed deals and make goods in America again so that our people can lead a decent way of life and not have their futures taken from them.

So I wanted to thank the gentleman for holding this Special Order tonight. I used Mr. Hahn as an example of someone who has the finest work ethic, so highly trained, struggling out there to try to maintain work. It shouldn't be this hard in the greatest nation in the world.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you so very, very much for bringing to our attention one of your constituents who faced this situation. There were 8 million other American workers who found themselves unemployed as these trade deals went into effect and American jobs moved to Mexico, to China, and other places around the world. So we must focus on Mr. Hahn and on those who share that.

□ 1730

Earlier, I think before you actually came in, I talked about steel. Again, this article was from Duke University,

and they have a chapter here, "A Tale Two of Bridges." One is the San Francisco/Oakland Bay Bridge—they have the Chinese flag behind the bridge—built with Chinese steel, almost a \$7 billion project, of which \$3.9 billion was over budget. It was 12 years late. There were 3,000 Chinese workers hired. Very serious questions have been raised about the quality of the construction.

The State of New York, the Tappan Zee Bridge, built with U.S. steel. The total project cost \$3.9 billion. 7,728 workers were hired, and it is designed to last for 100 years without major maintenance. There is Mr. Hahn's job. It is that U.S. steel, made in America.

I very quickly want to give two examples of where Make It In America really, really counts. This is one I have often used. This is near my district—in fact, about a mile or two from my district in Sacramento, California.

In the stimulus bill, in 2009, there was a provision for some \$600 million, \$700 million for Amtrak to buy new locomotives for the east coast here. This is an electric locomotive. There was a sentence added to that \$600 million, \$700 million law for it to be 100 percent American made.

Now, nobody was making locomotives in the United States at the time, nobody. But Siemens, a German company, looked at it and goes, 70, 80 locomotives; a \$600 million, \$700 million contract; made in America—we could do that. So the German company, Siemens, used a plant that they had in Sacramento that was making light railcars and said: Okay. We are going to make light railcars, and we are going to make locomotives.

They are now producing the locomotives 100 percent American made. Hundreds of jobs in the Sacramento area. And then all across America, there are manufacturers that are making the wheels, probably making the doorknobs or the system that attaches to the electrical line overhead.

Made in America. Why? Because Congress wrote a law—by the way, no Republicans voted for it; this was the stimulus bill—made a law that said it must be 100 percent American made.

I don't have a picture. I wish I did. If I had thought about it earlier, I would have brought one.

We are now in the process of deciding how much of our natural gas we are going to export. It is called liquefied natural gas, LNG, liquefied natural gas. There is an export plant, a \$20 billion export plant built on the gulf coast in Texas, owned by a company called Cheniere. They are 3, 5 months away from the first export of that natural gas. There is a lot of discussion about how much we can export without driving up the price, and that would be very harmful to American consumers—home heating, manufacturing, and the like. But what they do export will take 100 ships to export from that single export terminal, 100 ships.

And I am going: Let me see now. Natural gas is a strategic national asset

that has allowed for a reduction in the cost of energy in the United States, extremely important. American mariners are absolutely essential to our national defense, as are the domestic ships. Thirdly, the shipyards are essential for the U.S. Navy. These are three strategic assets that the United States has.

I proposed an amendment last night in the Rules Committee that almost was adopted that said, if we are going to export a strategic national asset, then let us also build two additional strategic assets. The mariners, the captains, the mates, the seamen, let them participate in this export of natural gas, and let's build the ships in America.

There are five terminals that are presently authorized for construction. Cheniere has completed a second terminal of about the same size. It is going in near Corpus Christi, Texas. And there are three others. So we may be talking somewhere between 300 to 400 ships needed to export a strategic national asset.

So my legislation would say, okay, then let us enhance our Nation's security by building those ships in America. We are talking about hundreds of thousands of American jobs in our shipyards, in our manufacturing facilities in Ohio, building the pumps and the pipes and the valves and the compressors that are necessary. This is a big, big deal. And while we guarantee those jobs for the American shipyards, we also strengthen the U.S. Navy's ability to build ships at a reasonable cost.

We could do it. We could actually do this with one simple piece of legislation that isn't more than 20 lines long. Now, that is exciting.

Trains, planes, ships. It is in America's future. It has been in our past. And it is the policies, the policies of the American Government, that set these in place and in motion.

Isn't that exciting? We can do that, Ms. KAPTUR. We can do that. And we can move production to Ohio manufacturing, the shipyards on the gulf coast, the east coast, and the west coast. It is all there for us.

Ms. KAPTUR. That is really exciting, Congressman GARAMENDI. And when you think about our strategic reserve in terms of the military, if America enters conflicts, often we don't have those fleets within the Department of Defense. We have to lease them from the private sector. So we would modernize that capacity for our country in the event it would be needed.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Exactly so. Exactly so. It is absolutely critical to our national defense that we have a strong maritime industry. We used to have the biggest maritime industry in the world. We have just given it away for many, many different reasons. But it can be rebuilt.

I want to give one more example, and then I am going to wrap. And if you would like to participate in the wrap, then we can do that.

At this moment, Amtrak is out with a request for a proposal to build 30, 33 new trains, high-speed rail trains for the northeast corridor, from Washington, D.C., to Boston, high-speed trains that can go 160, 200 miles an hour, reducing the commute time. That request for a proposal to manufacturers around the world is coupled with a waiver of the Buy America requirements. We are talking about hundreds of millions of dollars of American taxpayer money and a waiver of the Buy America requirements because Amtrak said they don't build them in the United States. Well, that is true. We don't build high-speed rail in the United States, and we never will if we give waivers.

But if we set in place a solid requirement that American taxpayer money is going to be spent on American-made equipment, we will build in the United States facilities to manufacture high-speed rail. The same thing applies in California with the California high-speed rail system.

In our future, we will have high-speed rail. The question for us in our policy debates is: In our future, will those high-speed rail trains be built in America, or will they be built in China or Korea or Japan or Europe?

I want them to succeed. But, by God, I want America to succeed, too. And I know that if we stick to this Make It In America agenda, we will rebuild the American middle class.

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to say, Congressman GARAMENDI, you are such a leader for jobs in America. I am sure your constituents are cheering not just tonight but every day for you and for your work here. You keep the Congress focused, both sides of the aisle, on Make It In America, on trade, taxes, energy, labor, education, research, infrastructure, and, over them all, jobs.

As we close this evening, let me say, this is what the trade deficit looks like today when we know we aren't building, whether it is tubes or whether it is trains or whether it is enough trucks in this country, cars. Imagine if we were to turn it the other way and America started making it in America and exporting to the world rather than the reverse. We would have such an economic recovery, it would astound the American people. It is amazing what we have been able to retain, even with this hemorrhage that has occurred over the last three decades.

Thank you for drawing our attention to the importance of transportation and infrastructure as a key job creator in this country. If we could pass that bill early this year, what we would do for this economy, and add Buy America provisions to several of the bills that will be coming before us. I will join you in that effort.

Mr. GARAMENDI. It is exciting, Ms. KAPTUR. It is very, very exciting that a policy statement, a law put forth by 435 of us here and 100 over in the Senate can really dramatically alter America's economy and do it in a way

that doesn't really cost us more money but simply requires that our tax dollars be spent on American-made equipment so that American workers can prosper.

Now, if somebody wants to go out and use their own tax dollars to buy goods from China, that is their business. Fine, go do it. But if it is your tax dollars and my tax dollars, then it ought to be made in America.

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

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING OUR LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

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

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to take some time on the floor of the United States Congress—the House of Representatives, to be specific—to honor and recognize the service of our law enforcement agencies across this great country.

You know, we have been dealing with the reactions from the tragic death of Michael Brown last August. Almost continually, every week, we hear of some tragic death, a shooting incident across this country. And we all understand and realize that all loss of life is a tragedy, but there has been an outbreak of violence across this great country that is equally disturbing, resulting in the brutal assassination of two law enforcement officers just before Christmas.

Mr. Speaker, I was a law enforcement officer for 33 years in King County, which is a county in Seattle, Washington. I started when I was 21 years old in 1972. I worked in a police car, and I was a detective. I worked the street undercover for a short time. I never knew when I left home if I would see my family, when would be the next time that I would see my wife, my children. When I told them good-bye for a day at the office, I didn't know if I was coming back home and neither did they. But every law enforcement officer across this great country lives with that knowledge, and every family member lives with that fear.

I have missed holidays, birthdays, anniversaries. I would be called out in the middle of the day or the middle of the night or on the weekend. I remember one day missing my daughter's birthday. On Christmas Eve, I remember driving around in the middle of the