

jobs back to America, and end the remaining tax breaks that corporations get for off-shoring. In so doing, we build our economy and we help to balance the budget by bringing tax revenues back to this Nation.

□ 2110

Manufacturing matters. Billions of dollars of our tax money are spent every year on goods and services, many of which are not made in America.

Why in the world would we spend our tax dollars on steel that's manufactured in China to build the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge? This is 43 million tons of steel, maybe 3,000 to 6,000 jobs in China, not in the United States—American tax money spent. It goes on and on. We need a strong Make It in America, Buy It in America policy so that our tax money is spent on American-made products and services, not on foreign made. Now, if you want to spend your own money out there, fine—buy whatever you want to buy—but if you're going to spend American taxpayer money, then we should spend that money on American-made equipment.

That is precisely the policy that we are offering here in the United States as we move our infrastructure programs forward and as we move forward with our energy development—our solar and our wind and other advanced energy systems. It is to use our tax money to build American manufacturing, once again, here in our Nation. So manufacturing matters, and we will Make It in America when, once again, it is made in America. It is very fundamental.

So these are the things: education, infrastructure, research, manufacturing, and change. We have to be willing to change in many, many of our policies.

How can we pay for this? Here is one novel idea. We can end those tax breaks that are given to individuals and to corporations that are no longer necessary.

The oil industry over the last decade earned \$1 trillion in profit. This is the Big Five. It's not all the small ones. It would be much higher if you added the small ones. We are in the midst of an energy boom right now—oil, natural gas. We are producing more energy of natural gas and oil than we have in the last two or three decades. Also, the oil companies are doing pretty well, yet they continue to receive billions of dollars a year—perhaps as much as \$5 billion, \$4 billion for the Big Five in the oil industry—of your tax money to support them as their profits have added up to over \$1 trillion. This is just the Big Five in the last decade.

Why would we do that? Why would we continue to use our tax money to support the oil industry? They get enough at the pump from us. They don't need a tax break. Let's take that tax break, turn it around and put it into tomorrow's energy systems, into supporting the green technologies—the

solar, the wind, the conservation programs, the electric car systems, the batteries that will power those systems in the future—as we transition our economy from where we were to where we must be in the future. That's just one example of the tax breaks that are not necessary, and there are numerous other ones.

Why would we give Wall Street hedge fund billionaires an additional tax break where their real income—I mean, not capital gains, but their earned income—is taxed at capital gains rates rather than at an income tax rate? Why would we do that? We should end those kinds of tax breaks that are not necessary for economic growth and shift that money into deficit reduction or into assisting those future industries that we need to have or, perhaps, into research or education.

These are all strategies for the future, and they affect my communities that I represent. The infrastructure programs are crucial to my communities. I represent 200 miles of the Sacramento River. The second-most flood prone part of this Nation, the second-most at-risk cities in this Nation are in my district.

One proposal would reduce the infrastructure money needed to upgrade the levees to provide the protection for human life and property. Another proposal is to invest in infrastructure. One proposal is to cause layoffs and to take out those civil servants who are working in the Army Corps of Engineers and to say, For 20 percent of the time, you're going to be furloughed; you're not going to work. So the Army Corps of Engineers' work necessary to design, to oversee and to push forward the projects that I need in my district in order to protect my citizens will be delayed. It will be delayed through the next storm season.

We pray we won't have a flood, but why should we even have to pray when our proposal on the Democratic side would fully fund those civilians in the Army Corps of Engineers who are necessary to push forward the projects to protect Sacramento, to protect Marysville, to protect Yuba City, and to provide the money—the Federal share of the cost—of rebuilding and upgrading those levees? I'm not the only place in this Nation that is faced with that. We saw recently Superstorm Sandy, and we know the horrible impact that that had on New Jersey, New York, and the surrounding areas. We need to rebuild. We need to put that infrastructure in place because we know there will be additional superstorms in the future.

We are looking at a fundamental policy here, a fundamental question of our values as Americans. Are we going to have an investment strategy that grows the American economy and puts people back to work and protects Americans? Whether they are poor or impoverished, whether they are children or seniors, are we going to put in place policies that meet their basic

needs? And for those future seniors, will they have the promise of Medicare? That is a question before the House of Representatives that in the next 3 days will be answered.

I pray and I work with my colleagues to see to it that we have a growth agenda, that we have an agenda of jobs, that we have an agenda to care for those who have little, and that we honor this value:

The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much. It is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back my remaining time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ENGEL (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business traveling with the President to Israel.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and March 18 on account of a death in the family.

Mr. HARPER (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of a home emergency.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 20, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

751. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the amount of purchases from foreign entities in Fiscal Year 2012, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 113 note; to the Committee on Armed Services.

752. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting results of a meeting of the Economic Adjustment Committee to consider additional funding sources for the Defense Access Roads program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

753. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General George J. Flynn, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

754. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Ex Parte Cease and Desist and Summary Seizure Orders-Multiple Employer Welfare Arrangements (RIN: 1210-AB48) received March 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.