

would have had 6,000 jobs in America; the inspectors would have been American; and there would be American jobs.

So my legislation, H.R. 613, says this:

If it is your tax money, it's going to be spent on American-made equipment, American-made steel, and the jobs will be in America.

Where is that bill? It hasn't even been taken up for a hearing in the Transportation Committee.

We're nibbling around the edges here. Of every bill that comes through this floor that's relevant to this issue, we try to shoehorn into it a Buy American provision. We try to increase the Buy American laws. We try to make certain that your tax money is going to be spent on American-made equipment. That's our agenda.

Have we been successful? No. No, we've not.

When the half-baked, worthless transportation bill was brought to the floor by our Republican colleagues, who could not even get agreement in their own caucus, we tried to put a provision on, an amendment on, and it was rejected. It was rejected.

Americans want to go to work. Public policy matters. Will your tax dollars be spent buying Chinese steel? I'll give you another example.

In Los Angeles, they went out to buy new light rail cars. Two bids were the final bids. One was by Siemens—yes, a German company that has a manufacturing plant for light rail cars in Sacramento, California. Siemens said that their light rail cars would have a minimum of 80 percent American-made content. A Japanese company came in and said, We'll do it for 60 percent. There was a slight difference. I think there was about a 2 percent difference in the bids.

So what did the MTA, the Metropolitan Transportation Authority, do? It chose the Japanese company. American jobs were lost immediately in Sacramento as a result of that decision.

Now, whose money is going to be spent buying those cars, those light rail cars? Whose money is it? Your money. It's your tax money. Good for Japan. They're going to get some jobs. Bad for Sacramento. Layoffs have already occurred, and there are more to come.

Do you want another example? I'll just use California. That's where I'm from.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit System, BART: \$3.2 billion for new trains over 10 years. \$3.2 billion. Two bids. One, Bombardier, a fine Canadian company, said they would build them with 66 percent American-made content. Okay, that's good. It's not good enough because Alstom, a French company, said they would build them with 90 percent American-made content. Yes, it's a little more expensive, but we're talking \$1 billion of American jobs here.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit System said, Well, the Federal Government says it's 60 percent, and we're going to

have to go with 66. I said and thousands of Californians said and New Yorkers, which is where most of these jobs would be, that Alstom has a plant in New York to manufacture light rail and heavy rail cars. They said, Wait, let's take 2 months—2 months—and let's rebid this, and let's see what we can do. Alstom was prepared to lower their bid if they would have had an opportunity, and \$1 billion of American jobs are not here. They're somewhere else around the world.

Public policy matters. Public policy matters.

I think it's about time to wrap up here, so I'm going to go back to where we started.

What if the House of Representatives under the control of our Republican colleagues—totally under their control and the Senate also under the control of the Republicans because it takes 60 votes there—what if the President's American Jobs Act had been taken up and passed? We'll modify it, and don't forget it was fully paid for, 100 percent paid for with no increase in the deficit. The economists said clearly that 1.3 million would immediately result from the President's American Jobs Act. What if?

What does it mean to you in your community? Would that road have been built? Would you have had the job paving that road? repairing and painting that bridge? down at the local school, painting the school? cleaning up the playgrounds? putting new toilets into the restrooms or, specifically, a new laboratory in the high school—not a lavatory but a laboratory? What if?

What if we had put aside partisan politics?

Keep this in mind that the Republican leader of the Senate, on the day or shortly after President Obama was inaugurated, said that his number one goal was to make sure that this was a one-term President. So how do you do that? Well, when the President proposes an American Jobs Act that would employ 1.3 million Americans immediately, you make certain that it doesn't become law. You slow it down. Everything has to be 60 votes in the Senate; and here in this House, you do not even take it up. You don't allow a vote on it.

You don't do a transportation bill. You don't take the \$50 billion injected immediately into infrastructure—totally paid for. You don't do it even though that would employ tens of thousands of Americans. You make certain that the 288,000 teachers who have been laid off across America are not rehired so that my daughter's classroom is not 22 students but 35 students.

How do you destroy a President? You make certain that this economy doesn't move. You take his American Jobs Act, and you sit on it. That's what has happened. The great "what if."

What if we put Americans back to work? Yes, maybe Obama would get re-

elected—maybe I'd get reelected—but I'll tell you this: Americans would be working. Americans would be working. What if?

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CICILLINE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 11 a.m. on account of official business in district.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5883. An act to make a technical correction in Public Law 112-108.

H.R. 5890. An act to correct a technical error in Public Law 112-122.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, June 12, 2012, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6381. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Acetone; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0039; FRL-3944-2] received May 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6382. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluxaproxad; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0421; FRL-9346-7] received May 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6383. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Penflufen; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0425; FRL-9341-8] received May 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6384. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Propylene oxide; Tolerance Actions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0253; FRL-9346-8] (RIN: 2070-ZA16) received May 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6385. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to Sterility Test Requirements for Biological Products [Docket No.: FDA-