minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, we are some 11 weeks into a new Congress and still we have not seen a single bill focused on job creation from the other side of the aisle. What are they focused on? Allowing big polluters a free pass to pollute the air we breathe and poison the water we drink.

In the pockets of Big Oil and Big Polluters, Republicans are advancing the Dirty Air Act, a radical bill that would undo over four decades of public health, scientific advancement, and pollution standards. The Dirty Air Act would ban EPA from exercising its role as the protector of our air and as the protector of our water.

For decades, the Clean Air Act has protected children from asthma and seniors from emphysema, while reducing our dependence on foreign oil. It has created jobs, and we simply cannot undo it.

My friends on the other side of the aisle should be focussed on America's priorities, that being job creation and economic growth. Instead, they remain committed to the deep pockets of the dirty energy industry.

What is more important, public health for our children and seniors or lining the pockets of the oil industry? I think the choice is very clear. I rise today in support of the Clean Air Act.

THE FEDERAL BUDGET

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to reiterate some statistics that I entered into the record earlier today as we try to balance the Federal budget. Let's look at who has the money.

If you look at the big banks from Wall Street that took us down this dangerous road, six banks—among them Citigroup, Goldman Sachs, JPMorgan Chase, Wells Fargo—made last year $51.5 billion in profits. That's with a ''B,'' billion. Today, the majority passed a few billion dollars in cuts, and they took it out of the hides of ordinary Americans who are paying the price of this recession. But imagine if you worked for a Wall Street bank and only had to pay an effective tax rate of 11.5 percent or 11 percent when most businesses in America have to pay 35 percent. They are getting a really good deal. We didn't nick their bonuses a penny, and the top executives walked home with $26 million.

If you really want to ask yourself the question how to balance the budget, why don't we look at where the money really is, and none of that is on the table. And while you're paying those high gas prices, take a look at Exxon. They have the largest profits in American history: $9 billion last year in one quarter. Paid no taxes.

American people, wake up.

JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to talk about what's on the minds of the constituents in my district, and that's jobs. They're worried about the economy, they're worried about jobs, and they want to find an opportunity to get a job.

Unfortunately, it's actually 11 weeks since the Republicans took control of this House, and there's not been one job bill. The big bill that passed here 4 weeks ago was the continuing resolution for the year, and that piece of legislation actually disposed of 700,000 jobs. It was all couched in the terms of how we're going to solve the deficit, but the reality is you're not going to solve the deficit by making small cuts through multiple programs, and that's what it did. What it actually would have accomplished is to destroy 700,000 jobs here in America.

What we need to do is to take the long view. We need to look at the overarching problem, and we do have a deficit problem. Most of it, frankly, was created during the George W. Bush administration. If you look back to the year 2000 when the Clinton administration ended, there would have been, if the same policies had continued, a $5 billion surplus. We would have wiped out the American debt. That didn't happen. Policies changed, two wars, tax reductions, and an incredible deficit, and the collapse of the American and the worldwide economy.

So where are we today? We're left with a problem. We're going to talk about that today.

I've asked my friend from New York (Mr. TONKO) to join us and my good friend from Illinois, JAN SCHAKOWSKY, to join us.

Mr. TONKO, if you would start us.

Mr. TONKO. Sure. Absolutely my pleasure, and, Mr. GARAMENDI, thank you for bringing us together during this coming hour so that we can address what is the most critical issue: the jobs and the economy.

The American public speaks out overwhelmingly to make certain that that is our highest priority here in Congress. In every public opinion survey that you have seen in the last several months, it's about jobs. It's the pledge that we have made since I've been here as a Member of this House. As Democrats in this House, we have been pushing the agenda for jobs. We believe there's no other higher priority.

I think of the 8.2 million jobs lost during the Bush recession when there was a willful neglect of the manufacturing sector, of the ag sector of our economy. It was dedicated and directed towards service sector, primarily the financial industry and the investment community. We know what happened. There was not stewardship over that arena. There was not the sort of watchdog application, and we allowed for many people to be hurt by that painful recession, where their lifetimes' worth of savings were invested through portfolios of investment on Wall Street, and because of the greed, they got brought down, and people were left hurting, losing their homes, losing their lifetime savings, and 8.2 million jobs lost to this American economy.

So we have got to turn that around. We have begun carefully with the programs and the policies, working with this President, starting in the 111th Congress over a year or two ago where we made certain that jobs, jobs, jobs were the highest priority. We put together a package a policies that would make certain that we would grow jobs in America.

We began with some very strong efforts to invest, through the Recovery Act, in those industries that need that sort of launching, that we could somehow take this clean energy agenda, their industry, the innovation economy, and make it work for America, and that affects people in the elements of trades on over to the Ph.D.s. And we saw what happened. In the last year, for instance, 1.5 million jobs added from the private sector column. Now our friends want to put on this cut in domestic programs that every think tank has forewarned would cost us jobs. In fact, many are suggesting 700,000 jobs would be lost if these cuts to the domestic investments that are so important to America's working families would be allowed to have happen.

So we need to go forward with a very thoughtful plan that enables us to not only grow jobs, in fact, jobs not yet on the radar screen, but to grow jobs in a way that can allow us to compete, and compete effectively, on the global scene, in that global marketplace; because I agree with the President on this notion: Whoever wins this race on clean energy, the global race on innovation, will become the exporter of energy intellect, energy ideas, innovation.

We saw it happen decades ago with the global race on space, and America embraced that with passionate resolve and said we are going to win this race; we're going to invest. President Kennedy set a tone that was a winning tone. It engaged everybody. We worked as a team in this country. People came together in a bipartisan, spirited way, and all we talked about was investing in science and technology and engineering. And guess what? We won that race because we embraced it with passionate resolve. And it wasn't just the poetry of landing a person, an American, on the Moon first where he was quoted as saying, One small step for man; one giant step for mankind, but it was the unleashing of several elements of technology that pervaded every sector of development out there from

health care to education to communications to energy generation.

□ 1600

And it was using new technology, making the difference by embracing that technological advancement.

We not only won the global race on space but created all sorts of technology, science and tech investment in our American industries and our American fabric. That made a difference. And that's the sort of synergy, that's the sort of focus, laser-sharp focus we need today; not the cutting and dismantling of R&D investments that enable us, empower us, give us the muscle to win the global race on innovation, but also to have the sort of human infrastructure developed through investments in education. That's where we need to be.

This conference, the Democratic conference in this House has made it its mantra: Make it in America. Bring it back. Rebuild America. Let's show the hope to the American public. Let's make a difference. Let's win this global race on innovation. We can do it. But we won't do it if we disinvest in America, which is happening on this floor. The attempts to disinvest in America will set us back.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. TONKO.

I would also point out that in the continuing resolution, H.R. 1, that passed this House by the Republican Party, the innovation was essentially destroyed. There had been a layoff of over 6,000 researchers at our national laboratories; money for the ARPA-E, which is the advanced energy research program which was decimated, literally stopped, so that the energy issues you talked about would not be funded going forward. And in the National Institutes of Health, cancer research, heart ailment research, those were also cut. So one thing after another, all that new technology, including technology for the health of Americans, was defunded.

Mr. TONKO. Representative GARAMENDI, I would add to that public safety. We even dismantle the efforts to forecast tsunamis. We just saw the devastation in Japan with this horrific earthquake. We take away the opportunity for science to work for us, to address our own public safety. How long can we be here?

Mr. GARAMENDI. If the gentleman will yield, not more than 23 minutes ago, the House, under the Republican leadership, voted to remove almost $120 million of funding for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. That's where the information comes from about the tsunami. The tsunami warning came from that agency. And here we find the Republicans pulling money out of that not more than 25 minutes ago here on the floor.

I would like now to turn to our colleague from the great State of Illinois. JAN, if you would share with us. I know that you have got a project underway, a bill that you are about to introduce. Perhaps you can share it with us.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I do. First of all, let me thank you for focusing not just tonight but so many days on the floor of this House on jobs, especially since the new majority has done nothing, absolutely nothing to create jobs for the American people since they have been in charge and, instead, want to gut Federal programs in a way that economists say will eliminate jobs and slow our economic recovery and put hardship on the American people.

Yes. I do want to say, first of all, that Democrats have a plan, and we know what it takes to make investments by building strong infrastructure and what our plan is called. And I want to thank our leader, the whip, STENY HOYER, for summarizing it in the best way possible, and that is: Make it in America. I know he will talk about that, that we mean both making stuff here, which we ought to do, and I think Americans everywhere—and certainly in my district, they start nodding as soon as I say, ''We need to make it in America,'' and everybody, regardless of party, regardless of income starts to nod.

But this week, I am reintroducing a bill that I have had called the Patriot Corporations of America Act, which provides incentives to and rewards companies that are good corporate citizens of the United States of America. Right now, sadly, the United States gives billions of dollars in subsidies and tax breaks and government contracts to companies that outsource jobs, that exploit workers, that avoid their fair share of taxes. And this only encourages those companies to invest abroad instead of making it in America and using the best workers in the world—American workers.

The Patriot Corporations of America Act would help us reverse course by providing incentives to companies that create a real partnership with American workers and invest in our economic future. It would be paid for, this legislation, by closing corporate offshoring loopholes and reining in some of the new tax breaks for millionaires.

This bill would reward companies that voluntarily meet the following patriotic standards by moving them to the front of the line for government contracts and giving them a 5 percent reduction in their taxable income. To qualify as a patriot corporation, businesses must produce at least 90 percent of their goods and services in the United States; spend at least 50 percent of their research and development budgets in the United States; limit top executive pay to no greater than 100 times that of their lowest compensated full-time workers—pretty generous, actually; contribute at least 5 percent of payroll to a portable pension fund; pay at least 70 percent of the cost of health insurance premiums; maintain neutrality and employee organizing drives; and comply with Federal regulations regarding the environment, workplace safety, consumer protections, and labor relations, which they're supposed to do anyway.

So I think it's time for the United States to reward companies that show a dedication to the American workforce, and that's why I call it the Patriot Corporations of America Act. I certainly would invite all my friends on both sides of the aisle to support this kind of legislation that helps to make it in America.

Mr. GARAMENDI. That kind of legislation is the type of policy we ought to be pushing forward here, one that rewards American corporations that are actually making things in America and employing Americans.

I'm going to turn to our minority whip in just a moment, but this Make It in America slogan was created by STENY HOYER, and there are about six, seven different policies, some of which we have already covered. We haven't talked about trade yet, but tax policy, which is what you just brought forward, a tax incentive for corporations to be good citizens here. Mr. TONKO talked about energy policy. Labor, certainly that's part of what you talked about; education, which we haven't yet covered; intellectual property, which is, in fact, that research agenda; and the infrastructure. These are all elements of the Make It in America agenda.

Mr. HOYER, this is your concept of using this term ''Make It in America.'' Would you share with us where we are today with this whole agenda and how things are moving along.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI has been as faithful in bringing before the American people the concept of the Make It in America agenda. And, of course, the gentlelady from Illinois pointed out that it means two things: that we're going to succeed. We're going to grab opportunity. We're going to expand our quality of life. We're going to make it, in other words. And we're going to make it in America. We're going to manufacture it in America. We're going to grow it in America, and we're going to sell it here and across the world.

We can compete with anybody in the world, frankly, given the proper environment. And I have talked to numerous members of the corporate community. I have talked to labor. I have talked to the National Association of Manufacturers. And we are going to pursue this Make It in America agenda because Americans know that we need to be focused on jobs, on expanding opportunity and providing for good wages and good benefits for working American families so they can provide a good life for themselves and their families; and, as a consequence of doing so, will create communities and States and a Nation which will be and will continue to be the envy of the world.

Democrats believe, Mr. GARAMENDI, that when more products are made in

America, more families will be able to make it in America, as I said. That's why we've worked hard since the last Congress to advance the Make It in America agenda—nobody has worked harder than you have to do that—a legislative agenda that helps create conditions for American companies to stay here, innovate here, and create jobs here. When more products are made in America, more families have access to well-paying middle class jobs. And when more products are made in America, we are able to turn expertise in manufacturing them into the new products and new industries of the future.

□ 1610

''Make It in America'' is about creating middle class opportunity and about keeping America's innovators here and keeping our innovative edge.

Mr. Grove, who founded Intel, made the observation that the problem that we have in America today is we are still the inventive center of the world. We're still the innovative and development center of the world. But too often what we're doing is taking the products that we've invented, innovated, and developed and taking them to scale overseas. His proposition is—and I think Andy Grove is absolutely right on this—if you continue to do that, the inventors, innovators, and developers will move to where the product is being taken to scale.

The president of Dow recently wrote a book—by the way, in January, the publishers named it—and the name of that book is ''Make It in America.'' As a matter of fact, I think I am going to get copies of that book for all our Members.

So far, President Obama has signed seven Make It in America pieces of legislation that we passed last year. They speed up the patent process for inventors; help small businesses with loans and tax cuts that enable them to innovate, grow, and create new jobs; and strengthen science, technology, engineering, and math education, much of which is on your poster there.

One thing I would add that I'd say to my friend is, and I'm not sure where you want to add it, but regulatory policy is going to be critical. And what I have said is that in the last administration the financial community got way out of hand. Why? We took the referee off the field.

We need to put the referee back on the field but make sure the referee doesn't get in the way of the game being played within the rules. And that's of a critical nature.

Some people want to take the referee off the field and forget about the environment. Some people want to take the referee off the field and forget about fair wages. Some people want to take the referee off the field and not worry about a safe working place.

All of those things are important, but it's important to make sure that, within the rules—and we can do so profitably in America. I've talked to Alan Mulally at Ford. Whirlpool has brought enterprises back from offshore. GE has brought enterprises up. They still have a lot offshore, but they brought some back.

And the proof of the pudding is foreign manufacturers have come to the United States and are exporting their cars to other places. They're selling them here but exporting, which shows, clearly, that you can make it in America and do so profitably.

In the weeks to come we will be proposing more ''Make It in America'' legislation. And we hope that it will win support of both sides of the aisle. This is not a partisan agenda. There's not a Republican who doesn't want to make sure Americans make it in America.

But we haven't, frankly, in the first 3 months of this session, and we're about to leave. But there's nothing on the schedule that's focused on jobs. So we will have taken up January, February, and March, and not focused on jobs.

As a matter of fact, as the gentleman knows, the only thing we have done is pass H.R. 1, which, Mr. Zandi, JOHN MCCAIN's advisor, says will cost us 700,000 jobs.

So I'm hopeful that we can pursue, in a bipartisan basis, the Make It in America agenda, expand our manufacturing capability, grow those jobs that pay well, and provide good benefits, and make America the kind of country it has been, is now, and we want to be in the future.

I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for focusing America's attention on this critical agenda.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you very much, Mr. HOYER. And we thank you for your leadership on this entire agenda because this is about middle class America. This is the middle class America that was rapidly disappearing over the last 15 to 20 years as we exported American manufacturing jobs. Your agenda, the Make It in America agenda, brings those jobs back to America.

I will note that there are a couple of pieces of legislation that you could add to that list.

Mr. HOYER. These are, of course, the ones that we have already passed and that have been signed into law. But you have a very important piece of legislation.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I'll come to the future, but I'd like to add one to the past, and that is, in the legislation that we passed last December, without any Republican votes, there was a provision that gave to every business in America the opportunity to immediately write off, against their taxes, 100 percent of a capital investment. So if they wanted to expand their business they could write off immediately, not depreciate over several years, but immediately. Not a Republican vote for that.

There was also in that piece of legislation, actually in a previous piece of legislation, a tax provision, one of the things we talk about here on our agenda, that would eliminate a tax break that American corporations had when they offshored a job. When they sent a job offshore, American corporations received about $12 billion in tax breaks every year. Well, what's that about? We eliminated it. Again, we had no help from our colleagues on the Republican side.

So our agenda started way before this year. We're going to carry it forward with your leadership. And we've got an agenda here of seven different elements in that, tax policy being one of them.

Thank you so much for your leadership on all of this.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. I thank you for yielding again, but simply to say I thank you for your leadership. You have been one of the most faithful, effective, and articulate spokespersons for an agenda for middle and working class Americans.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You're kind, but Mr. TONKO's been there this entire time. Let me turn back to Mr. TONKO.

Thank you very much, Mr. HOYER.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, STENY. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI.

I think the tragedy that results from the lack of vision by the new Republican majority in this House, the sadness that results, is that not only is it near 3 months of a new regime with zero numbers of bills as a number of bills that's been approved that would create jobs—that would be bad enough. But it's dismantling success that's been achieved in the last couple of years. That translates into jobs, the health care industry, the innovation economy, dismantling that, disinvesting in America. That's even worse. Instead of standing still, which is tragic, we're going backward, backward, that takes us into what could be the recession of the recent past that was 8.2 million jobs lost.

We need to invest. Now, it's a no brainer to assume that if you put R&D into play—and they've dismantled R&D, education, higher education, health care—all of this impacts jobs and the potential to compete with the muscle that America needs.

The American public is asking for hope to be built into the fabric of this Nation. We have advanced that message of hope. We're talking about making it in America. We're talking about investing in R&D. Why? Because where R&D takes place is probably where manufacturing follows.

It makes sense to incorporate the R&D elements with the manufacturing sector. That's a given in the current economy, in the present day industry. So we need to invest. We need to invest in R&D, rather than cutting drastically the programs that will lead to energy research.

I served at NYSERDA as president and CEO, the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority. I saw what happened with job creation when you create new shelf opportunities, new product lines. And this R&D

effort is about taking ideas and moving them along. You prototype, you test, you evaluate, and then you manufacture. And we need to carry those steps through. We need to fund them, we need to invest. It's going to take that kind of effort to grow the economy and grow it in a way that allows us to have reasonable expectation to win the global race on energy, clean energy, and innovation.

You don't dismantle education by making drastic cuts. You don't undo the opportunity to dream of a higher education and advance your skill set and allow your dreams to be met, to be tethered.

□ 1620

Instead, you invest. We have not done that. I represent a necklace of communities called mill towns that were established with the Erie Canal, Barge Canal District. We created a port out of a little town called New York City, and we developed the westward movement through the mill towns that were established in the district that I represent.

That pioneer spirit where these mill towns became the epicenter of invention and innovation still exists. It is still part of the American DNA. And America knows that if we invest, if we instill hope into the equation, they are there. We know that we can make it happen, but it takes the sort of investment and not the denial that we have seen in this House where zero jobs are the result of zero bills being passed here that would promote an American Make It in America campaign, where we would have an American industrial bolstering by this kind of effort.

America knows that this is not the action that they called for. This kind of standing still is not good, because it takes us backwards. It takes us backward when we need to build upon the progress that was achieved over the last year where 1.5 million sector jobs were added to the equation. We can do it. We can do it in significant measure. We can do it in cutting-edge fashion where we advance the intellectual capacity of this great Nation, where we are continually investing in the brain power, and we are not tapping into it.

Patents are going off shore. Why are we standing here now talking about continuing the mindless effort of subsidies, handouts to big oil companies to the tune of $100 billion, when that could be denied and we could invest, fungibly move those dollars over to investing in R&D for new product delivery so we are not dependent on an oil industry, we are not dependent on disruption in the Mid East, but rather controlling our own energy future, self-sufficiency energy independence.

Those are the thematics. Those are the dynamics that should guide us. I don't see that here. We are walking away from it. We are walking away from the sound faith we should have in America's workers.

Look what is happening in Wisconsin. Workers are revolting. We need to respect workers. We need to understand that they are the solution.

Let's invest in America. Let's invest in Make It America, and let's turn this around. America is placing its hope in the leaders here, and to have the results be zero jobs because zero bills were introduced and passed is unacceptable. And the majority needs to account for the 700,000 jobs they want to kill simply by the cuts they are making to the budget that has been presented.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, your passion and knowledge on this is extraordinary and so well placed.

If we look at what has happened here on the floor in the last 11 weeks, it has only been about destroying jobs immediately. The continuing resolution that was passed by the Republicans 4 weeks ago actually would destroy, if it became law—fortunately, it hasn't—would destroy 700,000 jobs.

And it's not just those immediate jobs that are lost. As you so correctly point out, the key investments in tomorrow's economy were similarly destroyed. The research agenda for the energy economy was wiped out. The program called ARPA-E, Advanced Research in Energy policy, the program, was wiped out. Those are where the clean energy jobs, those are where the conservation, where the new lights, the new energy systems that we need to deal with the reality of our dependence on foreign oil and the climate change issue, just wiped them out.

Similarly, in the National Institutes of Health, where you are talking about cancer research, research in diabetes, the things that hold back the American economy, because people do get sick. And when they are sick, they are not able to work. So this whole array of research, which is one of the fundamental ingredients of future economic growth, was wiped out by the Republican agenda.

Just today, if I might just add this piece to it, I was looking at the details of the continuing resolution which passed this House some 50 minutes ago. On agricultural research, we know that we have a food crisis coming up. There are going to be 7 billion people in this world. We have a food crisis that is imminent; and in fact, much of the disruption that is going on in the Middle East is in part due to the price of food. There are food shortages. Agricultural research to the tune of over $220 million to $230 million wiped out. Where are we going to get the food for future generations? They like to talk about that.

One final point before I turn it back to you is all of this discussion about the deficit. We have to deal with the deficit. But you can't deal with the deficit by cutting off the ability of the American economy to grow and to perform in the years ahead. So it is the research, it is the Pell Grants for education. All of those things are critical for tomorrow's economic growth.

And you cannot deal with the deficit in 1 year. This is a multiyear program. Therefore, we need to be very careful where we are spending our money so that we create the jobs for tomorrow and we create the opportunity for America to make it, to make things in America once again.

Mr. TONKO?

Mr. TONKO. I will make this one point. Obviously, it is about investments. Not spending, investments. Expecting lucrative dividends, lucrative returns. And who is this cutting frenzy an attack on? It is an attack on middle class America. It is an attack on children, it is an attack on working families, it is an attack on our seniors. And we only get here what we are wanting to invest here. I think that we can go forward with the soundness of policy and a resourcefulness of investments made that allow us to carry us, transition us into a new economy designed intentionally to grow the potential of this Nation.

That is what America wants from us, and I think this attack is a tremendously cold-hearted attack on America's working families. It is going to destroy our middle class. Without a strong middle class, there is not a strong America.

Someone needs to create the products, build the products; someone needs to purchase the products. And without a strong middle class, without strong purchasing power for that middle class, that story is over. So let's move on. Let's march forward with Make It in America.

It is great to join you, Representative GARAMENDI, for this Special Order.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, if I could just pick up on one of the issues you raised, which is the ways in which we spend our money.

Now, we all pay gasoline tax. Right now, it seems as though we are being taxed by the oil companies an extra 50 cents or $1 because the price of gasoline is way up there, but actually the Federal tax on gasoline is about 18.5 cents and on diesel some 25 cents. That money is used to build our infrastructure, our streets, our roads, the interstate highway system, as well as trains, buses, and the like.

The question is, where do we spend that money? Now, previously we would spend that money on buses that were made overseas. We would spend that money on trains and light rail cars that were made overseas. But our agenda here is to bring it home to America. If it is our tax money, we want that money to be spent on things that are made in America. Let me give you a couple of examples on transportation.

Buses: Are they made in America? Our tax money, is it being used to purchase buses that are made in America? It can be. I have a bill that I have introduced that says if it is our tax money, it is going to be spent on American-made equipment. It happens to be the exact same policy that China is following, and it is a good policy.

You have talked about solar and you have talked about wind, the energy future of tomorrow. People and economists that look at the energy issues say that if we go to renewable energy, clean energy sources, we can have an enormous new economy in America. But if we fail to take up the challenge, that economy will be overseas.

How can we jump-start the American economy in the new energy sector? We can do it by using our tax money to support American-made solar systems, whether they are panels like this or the new solar thermal programs, the wind systems. It's our tax money that is allowing these systems to be built.

But are those American-made? My legislation would say, yes, they must be American made. I will give you one example of where this has worked, and this is the President's agenda on high-speed rail. It happens to be mine. I introduced a piece of legislation in California in 1989 that established the High-Speed Rail Commission. We need to do that. And in the legislation, and this was the Recovery Act, the stimulus, it said: money for high-speed rail must be spent on American-made equipment. So Siemens, Austin, other companies are establishing manufacturing facilities in America. We can do it with wise public policy.

I know that you have talked about this and you have introduced some legislation of your own. So if you would share with us your views on how this is working.

Mr. TONKO. Well, I think that it is important for us to make certain that we create the renewable industry here in this country.

You talked about the challenges of competing with China. Let's look at the proof in the pudding. Let's take a look at what it looked like in 2008.

Private sector investment in the United States was at some $32 billion and China was at about $23 billion in terms of private sector investment and renewables. Then fast forward to the next year in 2009, and it flipped. China was at $35 billion, and we are down to $19 billion. We need to be certain we can compete, and we can compete effectively by investing.

It is there. The clarion wake-up calls are sounding, and we need to heed them. We need to listen to those alarms that are going off, telling us that without investing into the future, we are going to lose the race.

So I want to put a hopeful spin on this. I think that our efforts as Democrats in this House to make it in America are right on. It is what the doctor ordered. We are talking about investing in a clean energy innovation economy, we are talking about investing in higher ed, in R&D. That is how we win it. We win it by a complete commitment to an agenda that is well documented through the years.

It is no different now. If we want to win this global race on innovation, we need to march forward aggressively with the resources and with passionate resolve, and we can win it. I believe in my heart we can win it. We just need to commit to the American public that is counting on us to provide the hope at their doorstep.

□ 1630

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Mr. TONKO. You are a tremendous representative of New York State and America. Your passion for the build it in America, Make It in America agenda, is so very obvious. We thank you for that.

I want to wrap this session up by going back to what we dealt with on the floor earlier today. Earlier today, we dealt with a continuing resolution that would go for 3 weeks, and it has a series of cuts in it. Some of those cuts are appropriate. Some of them are very, very detrimental.

For example, about $120 million of reduction in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. That is where we get information on tsunamis. That is where we get information on hurricanes. Why we would cut that out, I have no idea. It is going to be very, very detrimental to America.

On research, we have talked about that, not only in this bill. Agricultural research, so we can move forward once more with a new green revolution so that there will be food for the people of this world and for ourselves, that was cut out of this budget.

And if you love to have germs and other problems with your food, well, you will love what the Republicans did earlier this afternoon when they cut some $24 million out of the animal and plant inspection services. Why we want to have contaminated food, I don't know, but apparently our Republican colleagues do know. So, anyway, that has been done.

But if you take the whole thing in context, I want to point out here that in December, with the continuing resolution in December that was a Democratic-sponsored resolution to continue funding the government for about 3 months, we cut $41 billion out of the budget; $41 billion out of the budget.

Now, when the Republicans came in, they decided to do a new resolution a couple of weeks ago, and that resolution would actually eliminate some 700,000 jobs in America. Is it going to lead to a solution to the deficit? Not really, because we are talking about the discretionary spending, which is a very, very small part of the American budget. As such, there is no way you can really solve the deficit problem in that way.

Yes, we need to make reductions. That is why we did $41 billion back in December. But those were targeted cuts that continued to allow America to invest in those things that create jobs.

We are now into a new set of continuing resolutions, 2 weeks 2 weeks ago, another 3 weeks this week. That is no way to run a government, but that is apparently what we have been reduced to.

Now, I understand the argument that we didn't get an appropriation bill last fall. Why wasn't there an appropriation bill last fall? The reason is that it was blocked in the Senate by a handful of folks that threatened a filibuster. That is why we don't have a resolution. That is why we have been thrown into this continuing resolution problem.

What we need to do is take the long term. In President Obama's budget, the long-term deficit is dealt with over a period of 5 years, bringing down the deficit to a point where it is an acceptable part of the American economy. It allows the economy to grow with investments that are made now in infrastructure, education, investments made in research and development, so that we can grow the economy for tomorrow. That is a wise way to do it. But a feeding frenzy of cuts that actually would eliminate 700,000 jobs is not the way you grow the American economy.

We have to be wise. We have to have the long term. And we have had the long term before. During the Clinton administration, we actually balanced the budget for the last 2½ years of that administration; and had those policies gone forward during the Bush administration, had those policies been kept in place, we would have eliminated the American debt. It would have been gone.

But those policies were radically changed by the George W. Bush administration; two tax cuts, not paid for, most of those benefits going to the high end of the economy, to the very, very wealthy, resulting in a significant increase in the deficit; and then an increase in the Medicare program for drug benefits, again not paid for, increasing the deficit; and two wars, neither of which were paid for, the Afghanistan war and the Iraq war, not paid for but, rather, borrowed money from China and other places.

The result of that was an enormous increase in the deficit followed by the Great Recession, which was basically caused by greed, Wall Street greed and the elimination of regulation. It was as though you had an NFL football game and you wiped out the sidelines, you took the referees off the field, sent them back to the locker room, and said, Okay, play ball, boys. You know what would happen. Chaos. That is what we got in the financial sector when regulation was removed, and we wound up with the Great Recession.

We need to put in place sound regulation, good regulation, and we need to have the referees on the field. We also need to have a long-term vision on how to deal with the deficit, and you cannot do it by just, in a feeding frenzy, wiping out critical programs that create future economic growth. Unfortunately, that is what our Republican colleagues have suggested we do.

We are not there yet. H.R. 1, the resolution that would have lost 700,000 jobs, was stopped in the Senate. We are now into a process of short-term continuing

resolutions to keep the government going.

Be wise as you put forward those resolutions, I would ask my colleagues on the Republican side. It is a great challenge. It is a challenge that we must and we will meet. We need a balanced, long-term vision, bringing the economy along, allowing it to grow and to build in the future, whether that be the green tech economy of the future, the medical systems, the health care systems. We have great opportunity, but those opportunities will not be met if we are not wise and if we have the wrong kinds of deficit reduction plans, which, again, we saw today on this floor not more than an hour ago.

I thank my colleagues for their participation.

CELEBRATING WOMEN'S HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me this opportunity to talk about a subject I really love, and that is history, especially women's history.

I think all too often as we grew up as children, our history books failed to mention the courageous activities of women throughout the Nation and throughout the world. Somehow we learned about men, but all too often not about women. But when we did learn about women, we didn't learn what they really were all about.

Growing up as a little girl, I grew up in an era where women were not really allowed to do all the things we could do today. We weren't allowed to run marathons or drive race cars or be in the pits at the Indianapolis 500 as a press person. We weren't allowed in Rotaries. It was just not something women were allowed to do. Why, shoot, women weren't even allowed to vote until 1920. In fact, the first woman that served in this House served there 2 full years before women had the right to vote.

And when you think about all the things that happened in this last century, we have to look to a century before to see, wow, who were the folks that really made this happen, because it just didn't happen overnight.

In the hallway out in the Rotunda there is what I think is the best statue, and it is the statue of the pioneers for women's suffrage. It is an extraordinary piece of artwork, one that depicts the likenesses of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucretia Mott, and Susan B. Anthony, arguably the women who pushed the button for women today to have true equal rights with men.

□ 1640

These were the most pro-women feminists in the history of America. And as you will see in a few moments, the rest of the story, as Paul Harvey would say, for Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony was just not written when I was a little girl.

I would like to begin this hour by referring to a few quotes from a couple of these four mothers that truly show where they stood in history with what I believe is the most pro-feminine issue, and that's the issue of abortion. You see, Mr. Speaker, every one of us has the right to life, born and unborn. And it is the women who have the responsibility to make sure that that baby is born. Unfortunately, our courts over 38 years ago decided to change that and said that women had the right to end that life. But, Mr. Speaker, we don't have that right. It is our responsibility to bear those children. And these four mothers knew that.

In a letter to Julia Ward Howe in 1873, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, the woman who shocked society, Mr. Speaker, by daring to leave her house proudly showing her pregnancy—because that was just not done—wrote: ''When we consider that women are treated as property, it is degrading to women to treat our children as property to be disposed of as we see fit.''

When I was a child in school learning about the issues of women's suffrage and women's rights, I knew Elizabeth Cady Stanton was pro-woman, pro-freedom pioneer, but I didn't know she was pro-life. I didn't know she was pro-life until a few years ago. She was hardly alone in her pro-life views. As you can see, Susan B. Anthony also expressed her thoughts about pro-life in the publication ''The Revolution'':

''Guilty? Yes. No matter what the motive, love of ease, or a desire to save from suffering the unborn innocent, the woman is awfully guilty who commits the deed. It will burden her conscience in life; it will burden her soul in death.''

Mr. Speaker, those words were written over 150 years ago, and yet they could easily be written today. Because today, Mr. Speaker, we hear from women who have had the painful tragedy of abortion on their soul, and they talk about how their heart weeps because of the life that they gave up and how they want not just to forgive themselves but to protect women from that awful decision that they made to protect other women from the suffering that they have. And yet Susan B. Anthony knew that years ago. So, you see, in history, pro-life was an issue.

You have to think about it, Mr. Speaker, and you have to think it makes sense because the whole issue of abortion, it just didn't come about in the 21st century. It came about centuries ago. Unfortunately, indiscretions have happened throughout history. And when indiscretions happen, babies are created, and then the issue becomes what do you do to hide the dirty little secret. Are you like Hester Prynne in Nathaniel Hawthorne's, ''The Scarlet Letter,'' where you put her in prison and then put her out into the wilderness, trying to hide Pearl, her beautiful daughter; in the end, only knowing that Pearl became the most beautiful little girl?

What was Nathaniel Hawthorne saying about the pregnancy? What was he saying about the birth of that child? Was he saying that child had the right to life or was Nathaniel Hawthorne thinking other things? We don't know. We can only wonder why he put her in prison and why he chastised her to the wilderness, but the point was they wanted to hide the secret. And because she chose to have the child, that secret was going to be born.

So for people like Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton in the 1860s to say, wait a minute; women should have the right to get married, to get divorced, to raise their children, and, oh, by the way, have their children, own property, be able to vote; we shouldn't be surprised that protecting the child and the birth of that child was part of their platform.

Today, in 2011, I am very proud to stand here and carry on with their message, because today, ever more so, the assault of life is all around us. And I believe that assault to life is there because we don't recognize the meaning of life at its conception. And when you compromise it at its conception, I think you question the validity of life all the way through to its end.

Each year—and I'm so proud to represent the Second Congressional District of Ohio—I am really proud of the hundreds of thousands of people that come out to the lawn on the Capitol on probably the coldest day in January to petition Congress to end abortion. It's called the Right to Life March. In the 5 years that I have been in Congress, standing with them, we've yet to have a decent day. Sometimes it's just cold. Sometimes it's cold and snowy. Sometimes it's cold and rainy. But it's always cold.

And I stand out on a platform, and I'm there for maybe an hour, but they're standing there for hours. Kids from schools are coming up in buses, traveling all night, getting off the bus, only to stand on cold ground, only to get back on that bus and go right back home and go right back to school. Parents are coming with small kids, buses, cars, airplanes, caravans asking Congress to end something that is so wrong.

And as I look out on the lawn and I see these brave people, I say to myself, Wow, that's what America is all about. And among the crowd I see so many women. I believe more women than men, because women, we have the privilege to experience childbirth, and we understand firsthand what that life is like inside a womb. And I think when we do have that experience and we understand the meaning of life, it makes us want to get out and protect it so that it can have its natural right to come into the world and be the person God wants it to be. And I do this because I'm so proud of the folks that are out there, but I also do it for some folks back home.