

actually a Republican-controlled senate—together, we worked on a package and we invested \$16 billion into infrastructure because we knew that that was good for Republicans and for Democrats.

If you look at what this President has to say, this was a tweet that he just put out:

“Really great numbers on jobs and the economy. Things are starting to kick in now. . . .”

But the thing is that, this week, the White House is calling this “Made in America Week.” Well, maybe somebody should let the President know that everything should be made in America, because I happen to take a look at some of the products of the Trump Organization—and I am talking about Ivanka Trump’s products and all of the President’s organizations’ products—and here is what I found:

Here is one of the products of Donald J. Trump’s signature collection, made in Mexico.

Here is another one from Ivanka Trump, made in China.

So if the President is so incredibly committed to making things in America, I have a proposal—and perhaps we should have an amendment to this effect—that he should start with the Trump Organization. In fact, much of the steel that was put into buildings that were built by the Trump Organization was not steel that was made here in America.

I actually have one of the largest steel manufacturing plants in my district in Washington State. Nobody ever thinks about it that way, but we do have steel being manufactured in Seattle. And we are in a situation now where this President and this Republican-controlled Congress has yet to introduce a single bill that would actually invest in jobs or infrastructure.

In fact, the budget takes money away from job training. It takes more money out of infrastructure investment than it puts into infrastructure investment. And when you think about the Federal Government’s role in infrastructure—of course, we all want public-private partnerships, where possible—the Federal Government has a very strong role in making sure that we are investing in all of our infrastructure, not only our roads and our bridges, but also all of our water sources, and making sure that we are investing in transit. These are all ways to put Americans back to work.

Yet, for a President who ran a campaign based on jobs and infrastructure and a Republican-controlled House, we have yet to see a single job emerge. And even the jobs that he says he has created, recently reports that he had created 45,000 coal mining jobs, but, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, what we have seen is the numbers show only 800 jobs created in the coal mines.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Would the gentlewoman be surprised that last night in the Appropriations Committee, we marked up the T-HUD bill—the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development bill? And for all the talk about making it in America and investing in infrastructure and transportation and making sure that we can create jobs through those vehicles, will the gentlewoman be surprised that the Republican majority actually zeroed out TIGER grants?

Those are the transportation grants that go directly to projects in communities across this country, to help move people around through people movers and investments in roads and bridges.

In my district, a TIGER grant was granted last year for complete streets because we have the highest number of pedestrians and bicyclists killed in the country, unfortunately, in Broward County.

So would the gentlewoman be surprised to learn the so-called big commitment to creating jobs and investing in infrastructure actually resulted in massive cuts in the very legislation where we would be investing those resources and infrastructure?

Ms. JAYAPAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. I thank the gentlewoman for raising that because this elimination of TIGER grants affects cities across the country—red States, blue States, Republican, and urban. We have a lot of those TIGER grants that have paid for our roads, rails, transit, ports, and new transportation projects.

Perhaps I will turn it back to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin. Would you be surprised to know that the budget actually slashes job training programs for distressed workers by 65 percent?

Ms. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. I would be stunned to think that any party or any President would do that.

Infrastructure has been the bread and butter, and it has been one of the most bipartisan things that we have.

When you talk about the need to expand our economy, expand the gross domestic product, one of the sure-fire ways to do that is through infrastructure projects. Not just building roads, but we need water treatment plants, our new energy economy, we have bio technology, and a number of other ways.

But I hail from Milwaukee, Wisconsin, which is still very reliant on the manufacturing industry. But I am wondering if my colleagues would be surprised to know that healthcare is one-sixth of our economy, and that if we were to repeal the Affordable Care Act and then slash the growth of Medicaid by one-third over the next decade,

that there will literally be millions of jobs that are lost?

I mean, everybody depends on the healthcare system, whether you are the brain surgeon or you are the guy that is mopping up the ICU; whether you are the person who is dispensing pharmaceuticals at CVS or whether you are the receptionist at the community health center.

And by destroying the Affordable Care Act, we are going to cost shift a lot to our States. Just over the next decade, it is \$68 billion of unfunded mandates shifted to the States so that they won’t be able to fund things.

And I just want to point something out before I finish. There are a lot of people who think that this just doesn’t matter to me. Those 24 million, 22 million, whatever number people agree upon that the CBO says that will lose health insurance if the Affordable Care Act ends—those people who are in nursing homes—that doesn’t matter to me. Forty-nine percent of the folks in this country receive their healthcare through their employer and your premiums will go sky high, unlike what President Trump says, because you will have to pay for all of the uncompensated care that this country will see after we destroy Medicaid in the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I hear you. I wanted to give Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I just wanted to, again, place these items on the table and demonstrate the grave impact that will take its toll on the American people if the cuts that have been proposed by the Trump administration and the Republican majority go through. And we will stand together fighting every step of the way to make sure that—instead of galoshes, a life vest, and a surgical mask that we see so many citizens of other countries have to walk around their streets using because their air quality is so poor, we will stand together to continue to fight to make the kind of investments that will help improve, not detract, from people’s quality of life.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CUMMINGS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for July 11 through July 20.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o’clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 19, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.