

this company may be making a profit on the war, it is just incredible to me.

All we are asking is that our Republican colleagues in control of the House have some sort of hearings and bring this up. That is all that you mentioned in the letter from our colleagues on our committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), want. That is all they are asking be done, and still the Republicans refuse to do it.

We are just going to come down here and continue to come down here until some effort is made by the majority party to have hearings and to have some accountability. We just cannot keep bleeding with all this money that is going into this company. It just does not make any sense.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). The Chair would remind Members that it is not in order in debate to directly accuse the President or the Vice President of lacking integrity or of "speaking out of both sides of their mouth."

#### GREAT WORK BEING DONE BY 10TH MOUNTAIN DIVISION, FORT DRUM, NEW YORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, we have certainly heard a lot of information here this evening. Of course, both sides in this House have not only the right, they have the obligation to speak out when they believe that things are not right. It is an election season, and we are hearing a lot of political discourse and rhetoric. We hear a lot of it from the Presidential campaign trail. While it is their right and while it is their obligation, we all know, we should know, that words have consequences, and the words spoken here in this House do resonate across the country.

I would never question anyone's motives or patriotism, but, at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I just cannot help but point out, last week I traveled to the countries of Iraq and Afghanistan, it was my second trip to Iraq, my first trip ever to the country of Afghanistan, and had a chance to see what was happening there on the ground.

Mr. Speaker, we hear about Afghanistan and Iraq and the capture of Saddam Hussein in December. In an effort, I guess, to minimize the importance of that, and let me say that was important and we are safer because that man is in custody, but in an effort to minimize the importance of that significant event, we heard rhetoric that, well, it does not really matter, because we should not have been in Iraq in the first place, we had not finished the job in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a minute tonight and talk about what I saw

going on in the country of Afghanistan, and I wanted to talk about the great work that is being done by the 10th Mountain Division out of Fort Drum, New York.

Mr. Speaker, General Austin in Afghanistan with the 10th Mountain Division spoke to us, and as part of his briefing he shared with us a picture, and the picture was so dramatic that I wanted to share it with this House, and, in fact, I wanted to share it with the country.

Mr. Speaker, this is a picture of what our guys in Afghanistan are doing to end the war on terror in that country, to reclaim that country for its people, and, in the end, to make us safer here at home.

Here you see some of our young soldiers. Here is a man, and I do not remember whether he was Taliban or al Qaeda, but he lived in a house on a steep mountainside. He thought he was relatively immune from prosecution in that perch because he could see anyone coming up the hillside to apprehend him. So he was sitting by his campfire one morning taking his morning meal, and this very large helicopter, half of it landed on his roof, and he was apprehended by our forces. You see him being loaded in the back of the helicopter to come and face whatever charges were brought against him.

Mr. Speaker, this is a dramatic, dramatic photo showing what lengths our fighting men and women will go to in order to end the conflict in Afghanistan, and I believe they are well on the way to ending that. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would go so far as to say as soon as the snow melts out of the passes in those mountains on the border area between Afghanistan and Pakistan, we are very likely to see the very beginning of the end for those groups who mean to harm our troops and innocent Afghani citizens and those individuals who want to prevent the return of civil society to Afghanistan.

So, Mr. Speaker, I know it is a little bit off the point of what we have just been hearing, but, in fact, there are some good things going on in the world. Our troops are doing a masterful job on the ground, both in Iraq and Afghanistan. I am proud of them. I am proud of our country.

Just for the record, Mr. Speaker, I was over there, but I did not consume any meals, so we will not have to reimburse the people for those.

But, once again, I wanted to point out just the dramatic aspect of that photo. Think of the risk that pilot is taking in order to apprehend that individual and bring him to justice, the loadmaster in the back of that craft that essentially landed the helicopter on that man's roof. You can imagine the surprise of that individual as he was brought into United States custody.

#### IMPORTANCE OF SERVICE ECONOMY IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I do not normally use this forum of Special Orders to address our colleagues, but tonight I want to spend some time talking about a very important issue. I want to talk about hamburger-flipping jobs. Actually, I want to talk about the claim made by some politicians and pundits that the American economy is turning into an economy of hamburger-flipping jobs.

Now, we all know that hamburger-flipping jobs is a buzzword. It is a phrase intended to sum up a lot of complex changes that are going on in the American economy. Obviously those changes are impacting jobs. They are impacting businesses, they are impacting families, and they are impacting communities. Talking about hamburger-flipping jobs is a way to say that our economy is in decline. It says we are losing, quote/unquote, good jobs, and in their place we are creating bad jobs, second-rate jobs, no-future jobs.

Sometimes the same people talk about dishwashing jobs, or janitor jobs, or retail jobs, especially at Wal-Mart or Target or K-Mart. People use buzzwords because they reduce complicated ideas to a simple digestible package, and in this case we are talking about a whole host of very complex economic trends.

It is no surprise that people turn to buzzwords. We no longer have to worry about viewers nodding off to sleep during long-winded speeches. They have 200 cable channels from which to choose, and obviously the unlimited Internet, so they can clearly move on for seconds.

But, Mr. Speaker, I hope that our colleagues will bear with me as I go through this, because I think it is absolutely critical to dispel the utterly ridiculous, factually inaccurate, completely fictitious assertion that the American economy is heading downhill and that we are replacing good jobs with hamburger-flipping jobs.

Exposing the charade of the hamburger-flipping jobs argument is absolutely critical, because these buzzwords are at the heart of a concerted attack on the fundamental basis, Mr. Speaker, of our economic strength, an attack on the fundamental basis of America's economic strength.

There are serious people who want to turn back the clock on our economy, threatening very real gains that have been made by millions and millions of American families.

Now, it is buzzword time again, Mr. Speaker. Talking about hamburger-flipping jobs is a way to demean our, quote/unquote, service economy. What do we mean by service economy? We do have an economy that is increasingly

based on services, that is true. That means jobs that serve people, serving people well, customers, clients, taxpayers, patients and students. This new service economy is, I believe, a good thing. But as I have said, this is a very complicated subject. It is big.

When we talk about the U.S. economy today, we are talking about an \$11 trillion economy, and that is just in 1 year, Mr. Speaker. The forces, changes, trends and technologies that are in play here are global, so the impact is even greater than our Nation's \$11 trillion economy, and the changes run deep. We need to look at changes that have impacted our country and our economy over the last century, and particularly over the last two decades, the last 20 years. These changes over the last two decades are key to this story.

The hamburger-flipping jobs argument is basically a way of saying that the changes in our economy mean things are getting worse or will get worse for most Americans. But in fact, Mr. Speaker, things are getting much better, and they promise to get even better for America in the future.

□ 1900

This is an economy that is increasingly based on skilled workers. We do have a more global economy with complex business, trade, transportation, communications, and cultural links. We have new technologies making their way into so many aspects of our lives, and mostly in ways that are very, very good. By and large, these forces are working together in ways that are making the American economy work better in 2004 than it did 2 decades ago back in 1984.

Now, I am using the term "economy" in the broadest sense, because each of these factors, services, skilled workers, globalization, trade, transportation, communications, and technology, is dramatically changing the way Americans do the things that make up our lives: work, shop, go to school, go to the doctor, be entertained, and have fun. In short, the people who claim that we are creating a hamburger-flipping jobs economy are asking us to turn back the clock on the past 20 years of change.

Now, every change has not been good, obviously, and even the good changes that we have undergone on an overall basis have not been good for everyone. But I think we are clearly on the path to a better future, and dramatic course changes at this point could be very, very bad; would, in fact, I believe, be very bad for Americans.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have been talking about 20 years of change. I have not been talking about it just by accident. In fact, one of the reasons why I am here is that I believe we are now 20 years into a profound and dramatic period of economic change in America. One of the most striking things about the hamburger-flipping jobs buzzword is all the concepts it embodies. Those

concepts have been around for a long time. It is basically a political and economic urban myth listening to that term: hamburger-flipping jobs.

When I listen to different politicians talk about hamburger-flipping jobs and what they see as a declining economy, I swear that I have had a flashback to 1984. The spirit of the rhetoric, the basis of the ideas, the sense of foreboding, and being on the wrong economic track reminds me of Walter Mondale's run for President in 1984. Now, I have recently gotten my hands on his nomination speech before the Democratic Convention in that year.

It is a remarkable read, Mr. Speaker, and not because it stirs the soul. It is remarkable to see in such explicit detail the platform on which Mr. Mondale ran for President back in 1984. He said that taxes were too low, the deficit was going to destroy our economy, we needed to adopt a nuclear freeze and negotiate annually with the Soviet Union. These were the big issues of his campaign back in 1984; and as we all know, he was, thank God, trounced by Ronald Reagan. Walter Mondale did not actually use the term "hamburger-flipping jobs," but he said a few things that show that in 1984, the Democratic Party standard was firmly entrenched, deeply tied to that intellectual camp believing that hamburger-flipping jobs as a pejorative were the wave of the future.

Speaking of the Reagan administration, the candidate Walter Mondale said, "They crimped our future. They let us be routed in international competition, and now the help wanted ads are full of listings for executives and for dish washers, but not much in between." He did not quite say hamburger-flipping jobs, Mr. Speaker, but there it is, the claim that most of the jobs that were being created were for dish washers.

He went on to say, "When the American economy leads the world, jobs are here, the prosperity is here for our children. But that is not what is happening today. This is the worst trade year in American history. Three million of our best jobs have gone overseas."

Again, that is Walter Mondale talking in 1984 about where we stood. He said, "It has been devastating, the worst trade year in American history. Three million of our best jobs have gone overseas."

And as if Walter Mondale had a vision of 2004 and the fact that leading American companies are investing in facilities in places like China, India, Europe, and Mexico, creating new jobs in those new countries, Mondale said, "To big companies that send our jobs overseas, my message is, we need those jobs here at home, and our country won't help your business unless your business helps our country." That was Walter Mondale in 1984. Now, this certainly sounds a lot like the political rhetoric regarding Benedict Arnold CEOs that we hear today.

We also did some research, Mr. Speaker, to find the earliest reference that we could come up with to the term hamburger-flipping jobs, and lo and behold it was in 1984. We found an article in the New York Times that was basically about this very same issue: the concern that good American manufacturing jobs were disappearing, often moving overseas and being replaced by low-paying service jobs, the dreaded hamburger-flipping jobs. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would include in the RECORD an article in the New York Times which I am going to talk about.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 4, 1984]

"HIGH TECH," NARRATED BY WALTER CRONKITE

(By Steven Greenhouse)

It is late afternoon at the Fanuc Limited factory at the foot of Mount Fuji in Japan, and not a worker is in sight—not a human one at least. The huge metallic arm of a robot swivels around and places a small mechanical part into the machine it is building. In this way, Fanuc's robot-filled, computer-controlled factory can run eight-hour shifts without anyone working inside.

That's the haunting opening scene from the probing hour-long CBS documentary, "High Tech: Dream or Nightmare?" which is to be aired tonight at 8. In narrating this timely documentary, Walter Cronkite makes clear that these 21st-century manufacturing techniques are a boon to productivity. With robots replacing people, there's little need to worry about absenteeism, alcoholism, strikes, shoddy workmanship or overtime pay.

However, Mr. Cronkite questions just how good this brave new manufacturing world is for the nation's workers. By forcing dozens of aging factories to be closed and thousands of workers to be thrown out of their jobs, robots and other high-tech production techniques have created what Mr. Cronkite called "the blue-collar blues." Indeed, one expert interviewed predicts that technological change alone will cause a shortfall of six million jobs for American workers by 1990.

The show addresses several of the key issues facing the United States as it embarks upon another industrial revolution: What is going to happen to the hundreds of thousands of workers whose jobs are taken away by machines? By destroying many high-paying factory jobs, are high-tech production techniques going to turn the United States into a nation of \$50,000-a-year systems managers and \$3.50-an-hour janitors and hamburger flippers? In other words, is high tech going to polarize the United States and cause its great middle class to disappear?

Mr. Cronkite also examines an important corollary economic question: How healthy is the nation's shift from a manufacturing economy to a service one? He asks whether this shift is going on faster than it naturally would—or should—as a result of imports from countries that heavily subsidize their industries or pay one-tenth the wages of what American companies pay. The cameras also look at the unevenness of the nation's recovery. Thriving Silicon Valley is contrasted with ailing Rust Bowl cities like Cleveland and Youngstown, Ohio, which one expert described as "Manufacturing Appalachias."

Mr. Cronkite interviews Lee A. Iacocca, Chrysler's dynamic chairman, who says the nation should be doing more to preserve its ailing manufacturing base. "You can't just have video arcades and drive-in banks and hamburger joints," Mr. Iacocca says.

None of the workers or economists interviewed takes a Luddite view suggesting that high tech be scrapped because it throws workers out of jobs. But they caution that unions may vigorously oppose the introduction of robots—Mr. Cronkite calls them “steel-collar workers”—if blue-collar workers are merely victims of high-tech, if they do not share in the benefits resulting from high-tech’s more efficient production techniques.

“I think the real issue is the social cost of the change—who pays for it, how it’s paid,” said Harley Shaiken, a technology expert at Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Mr. Iacocca suggests that government, labor and management should undertake a massive retraining program to salvage the lives of 45-year-old workers laid off at Youngstown’s steel mills and Detroit’s assembly plants. Mr. Shaiken proposes government assistance to help the jobless move to areas where jobs are abundant. And Thomas R. Donahue, the secretary-treasurer of the A.F.L.-C.I.O., suggests a shorter work week to help spread the jobs that remain.

The documentary is more cerebral, more theoretical than most. It is long on interviews—most of them excellent—with experts such as economists, corporate executives and robotics pioneers. At the same time, the show is short on interviews with workers whose lives have been turned topsy-turvy by technology. One or two detailed interviews with these victims of technology would have made the show more compelling.

The documentary is at its most interesting when it shows how the antiseptic new high-tech factories operate. An enjoyable and informative takeoff on Chaplin’s “Modern Times” was a speeded-up sequence showing the construction of a jumbo jet in Boeing’s highly automated factory.

The camera work in that sequence and many others is superb. By zooming in on computer screens, for example, the photographer helps make some of these difficult new technologies comprehensible. In addition, the camera conveys the eerie, often alienating qualities of these technologies.

At the program’s conclusion, Mr. Cronkite asks what is going to happen to the workers of the 1990’s—that is to say, to children now in school. He wonders whether high tech will provide enough jobs to match what will presumably be their impressive skills and education. That, however, may be the stuff of another documentary.

Mr. Speaker, the article that I talk about is a news analysis of the probing hour-long PBS documentary that was entitled “High-Tech: Dream or Nightmare?” Again, this is back in 1984. It was an article about a television documentary by then the Nation’s leading TV personality, Walter Cronkite. Remember, this was 20 years ago, 1984, the very early days of cable, before satellite television. The networks were really king and spoke to a majority of the American people.

The New York Times describes the haunting opening scene of the documentary: a robot-filled, computer-controlled Japanese factory. No human workers in sight. The article reads, “Walter Cronkite makes clear that these 21st century manufacturing techniques are a boon to productivity.

“However, Mr. Cronkite questions just how good this brave new manufacturing world is for our Nation’s workers. By forcing dozens of aging factories to be closed and thousands of

workers to be thrown out of their jobs, robots and other high-tech production techniques have created what Mr. Cronkite called ‘the blue-collar blues.’ Indeed, one expert interviewed predicts that technological change alone will cause a shortfall of 6 million jobs for American workers by 1990.”

Again, this was a New York Times piece in 1984 giving an account of the Walter Cronkite documentary.

It goes on to ask, “What is going to happen to the hundreds of thousands of workers whose jobs are taken away by machines? By destroying many high-paying factory jobs, are high-tech production techniques going to turn the United States into a Nation of \$50,000-a-year systems managers and \$3.50 an hour janitors” and, yes, Mr. Speaker, “hamburger-flippers?” As I have said, hamburger-flippers is the buzzword for the very, very negative service economy, and we see it used that way back there in 1984.

I quote again, Mr. Speaker: “Mr. Cronkite also examines an important corollary economic question: How healthy is the Nation’s shift from a manufacturing economy to a service one?” Again, that is 1984, the New York Times reporting on the Walter Cronkite documentary.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Lee Iacocca, referred to in this article as Chrysler’s dynamic chairman, was always better at turning a phrase than most. He argued in the piece that the country needed to protect its manufacturing base saying, “You can’t just have video arcades and drive-in banks and hamburger joints.”

That kind of argument, Mr. Speaker, has a timeless feel to it. We heard a lot of it in 2003, and we will continue to hear a lot of it in 2004. It is just so amazing that we go back and hear the exact same thing having been said 20 years ago.

I believe that stepping back and looking at this issue over a longer time frame like this 20 years is actually very important for us to understand just how mistaken and how really dangerous the hamburger-flipping analysis that was offered in 1984 and is being offered in 2004 is, and that Cronkite documentary and the New York Times were right when they said massive changes were under way in America. The U.S. was entering a period of profound economic and technological change. To say it was the dawn of a new industrial revolution probably is not the best choice of words, because the fundamental change in the economy was the shift from the heavy industry-based economy of the middle 20th century to the more technologically and skill-based new economy of these past 20 years, from 1984 to 2004.

It is not easy to describe the new economy, Mr. Speaker; but some aspects are very clear. It used more communication technologies to connect people from all corners of the world. Information technology, digital technology, and the Internet exploded dur-

ing that 20-year period. It was faster. Business adopted just-in-time production schedules that relied on very precise planning and transportation models, and there was a lot of change. That was true for business, and it was true for people as well.

I want to focus on this last concept first, namely, change. The new economy, some call it the service economy, but I think a better name for it is the 21st century economy. It meant a lot of change, and change that has happened very quickly. To give an example, the pace of economic change in the past 20 years compared to the preceding era of economic stability, which I would say ended up in a period of stagnation; I looked at the list of companies in the Dow Jones industrial average. The Dow Jones has compiled an average of the stock prices of a select handful of the Nation’s leading businesses since 1884, and it is intended to reflect the market generally, the Dow 30. Now, from 1963 to 1983, the Dow Jones average included 30 companies. Over those 20 years, 26 of the 30 companies were the exact same. Only four dropped off and were replaced by new companies. Now, that is obviously stability that we saw from 1963 to 1983; and for the most part, during that period of time it was good, it was comfortable, and it was stable.

The 26 companies, Mr. Speaker, that stayed the same through the entire 20-year period are Allied Chemical, Aluminum Company of America, American Can, AT&T, American Tobacco, Bethlehem Steel, DuPont, Eastman Kodak, Exxon, General Electric, General Foods, General Motors, Goodyear, Inco, International Harvester, International Paper Company, Proctor and Gamble, Owens-Illinois Glass, Sears Roebuck, Standard Oil of California, Texaco, Union Carbide, United Technologies, U.S. Steel, Westinghouse, and Woolworth. Those were 26 of the 30 companies that remained constant during that 2-decade period from 1963 to 1983. Of course, by the mid 1970s, the economy was not performing well, to say the least. I will discuss that more later. But as I said, the line between comfortable stability and very uncomfortable stagnation can be quite thin.

Looking at the Dow Jones Industrial Average over the period of transition into this 21st century economy, that is, the past 20 years, shows a very, very different picture. From 1984 to 2004, there was a remarkable turnover of 16 new corporate faces among the 30 included in the Dow Jones Industrial Average, those 30 businesses. Today, the Dow Jones Industrial Average’s 30 includes the following companies: 3M, Alcoa, Altria Group, American Express, AT&T, Boeing, Caterpillar, Citigroup, CocaCola, DuPont, Eastman Kodak, Exxon, Mobile, General Electric, General Motors, Hewlett-Packard, Home Depot, Honeywell, Intel, IBM, International Paper, Johnson & Johnson, J.P. Morgan Chase, McDonald’s, Merck, Microsoft, Proctor and Gamble, SBC Communications, United Technologies, Wal-Mart, and Disney.

□ 1915

The new companies read like a Who's Who of the economy of today, including Boeing, Citigroup, Hewlett-Packard, Home Depot, Intel, Johnson and Johnson, JP Morgan, Microsoft, SBC, Wal-Mart and Disney.

This list may be the most succinct way to respond to the hamburger flipping jobs argument, Mr. Speaker. The new economy, the service economy, the 21st century economy, the changes in the American economy over the past 20 years have seen the rise of these new corporate giants and the industries and technologies they represent. They represent the revolution in computer software and hardware, the revolution in telecommunications, the revolution in global finance, the global entertainment business, the revolution in retail, distribution and supply management. They are now key faces in the American economy.

Those companies that survived, those that were there throughout the last 20 years, like AT&T, General Electric, General Motors, Eastman Kodak, Exxon, IBM and Procter & Gamble, all adopted those same technologies and techniques to make themselves 21st century economy leaders. In other words, change swept through those companies even when the names stay the same.

Change is scary. I will acknowledge that, Mr. Speaker. It is scary for businesses, and businesses are not actually alive. Businesses are really just organizations of people, and we all know that change is scary for people. Change often leads to uncertainty and confusion, at least temporarily, and even when it is not affecting some directly, it does create anxiety. No doubt about it, the 21st century economy has brought change and anxiety.

Tracking the early history of the hamburger flipping job political urban myth, I came across another absolutely striking article from the New York Times. This article was just 2 years after the previous one that I mentioned. This one was written in 1986. In terms of our 20-year time frame, this was still basically the start of this process of moving towards the 21st century economy.

The article is entitled *The Average Guy Takes It on the Chin*. It is by Steven Greenhouse. He authored the article that I quoted from earlier about Walter Cronkite's documentary, and it is a rhetorical precursor to the message of the two Americas that we are hearing about today in this Presidential campaign.

This article from 1986 begins: "For millions of breadwinners, the American dream is becoming the impossible dream. Even the most basic tenet of the dream, that a young family will be more prosperous in its middle age, has grown more elusive. The statistics tell the harsh story of Americans struggling just to stay in place economically."

Obviously this was not a good news piece written back in 1986. It tells the

story, which was very real in that year, of the economic stagnation that struck this country in the 1970s, which culminated with the wrenching economic downturn that we saw in the early 1980s. Well, the economy began to grow in 1983. It was entering the period of profound change that I have talked about, and the eventual outcomes were not clear obviously at that point.

Frank S. Levy, a professor of public policy at the University of Maryland, is quoted as saying, "From the end of World War II to 1973, everybody was getting better off, but from 1973 through now," that was 1986, "that has stopped," he said.

The article goes on to say, "Economists generally agree that the only way workers can manage to make substantial strides in real earnings during the years ahead is through steady and strong productivity growth, which very few economists are predicting now."

And it says, "Many economists point out that other countries such as Japan and West Germany have achieved higher growth in productivity. Some even suggest that the United States may be starting to undergo the same wrenching economic decline that the British have experienced in recent decades."

Now, remember again, this was written in 1986, Mr. Speaker.

I mention that quote because at the beginning of this past 20 years, there was a very real concern, fear some would say, that foreign countries like Japan and West Germany were more productive and were more successful. They would dominate the 21st century economy. In fact, many here in this Congress at that time, I remember very vividly standing here listening to those who would argue that we had to model the U.S. economy after the economies of Japan and Germany, their industrial planning models.

Now, Mr. Speaker, of course, jobs are key, and the prospect that they will be scarce does breed anxiety. Again, this 1986 New York Times article goes on to say, "As young workers enter the job market, many can find only low-paid jobs in the service sector." It goes on to quote Sandra Shaber of Chase Econometrics who said, "For every 25-year-old I read about making \$300,000 on Wall Street, there are hundreds of 25-year-olds working as fast-food people or hospital orderlies earning \$3.50 an hour."

Now, there it is, Mr. Speaker, the vision of the service economy, meaning one well-paid Wall Street success story and hundreds of 25-year-olds working in fast-food chains and cleaning bedpans.

In my view, the New York Times article obviously failed in predicting the future, but it actually did an excellent job in summarizing the recent economic history up to that point back in 1986. The problem was slow productivity. They were right on target.

The article highlights, "When asked the reason for lagging income growth, economists speak with rare unanimity:

Slow productivity is Public Enemy No. 1," these economists said back in 1986. It goes on to quote Audrey Freeman, executive director of the Conference Board. She said, "In the long term, the only way to get wages to increase without inflation is to increase productivity, but we haven't been doing very well in that department." Again, that was said in 1986, portending the future.

The fundamental problem was productivity. They got that right, Mr. Speaker, but the economists in this article got just about everything else dead wrong. Here is what they had to say about the ongoing transition to more services in the economy. They said, "As the Nation's economy moves from manufacturing to services, the productivity problem compounds. It is generally easier to turn out more widgets per hour than to squeeze more hourly output from lawyers, travel agents or hamburger flippers."

Not to belabor the point, but I would quote again from the article, "The experts are not optimistic about the outlook for productivity growth. 'I really don't see productivity growth coming back to the 3 percent levels that we had in the 1950s,' said Douglas P. Handler, a productivity specialist with Wharton Econometrics.' And, 'There is very little on the horizon that would cause us to be optimistic about productivity improvements over the remainder of this decade.'" Again, this was written in 1986, 18 years ago at the beginning of this move that started 20 years ago towards this 21st century economy.

Finally, I cannot pass on the fact that the author goes out of his way to point out that the one group of people that is not able to see how bad things were in the American economy in 1986 were the American people.

In the face of all the economists in the article, the author notes, "Nevertheless, households are stubbornly refusing to change their spending habits. And spirits, despite the grim income statistics, remain high. According to the University of Michigan Survey Research Center, consumer confidence is far higher than it was during the recent times of double-digit inflation, interest rates and unemployment."

Well, Mr. Speaker, this article is a great example of the kind of anxiety about technology replacing jobs and service jobs being bad, foreign countries like Japan being better prepared for the economy of the future than America, and productivity being dead in the water with no hope in sight.

As I said, this article was from 1986, nearly 20 years ago, but if you listen to the political debate today in 2004, you hear many of the exact same themes: Technology threatens jobs, losing jobs to lower-cost foreign competitors. You can almost take every reference to Japan and simply change the country name to China, and you get a tangible sense that the future is not good.

I am not going to go chapter and verse through all the doom and gloom

predictions and warnings of those who think that America and its people are actually threatened by the 21st century economy. We do not have the time to do that, and it is obvious to those who have been listening to this national debate over the years, whether the issue was trade with Mexico, the creation of the global trade rules of the WTO, trade with China, or the recent bursting of the Internet bubble.

Instead, let us remember that 20 years is a pretty long time. Yes, we hear many of the same concerns in 2004 that were voiced in the late 1980s, but we can now judge how accurate, how sensible, how thoughtful those concerns were 20 years ago. In fact, I believe that we can look at how things played out over the past 20 years, the dire predictions and the reality, and learn a thing or two about how the similar line of thinking would impact our future going forward.

So did America turn into a Nation of a few \$50,000-a-year systems managers and an army of \$3.50-an-hour janitors and hamburger flippers, a handful of Wall Street wizards lording it over a middle America of fast-food servers and hospital orderlies? Did the American dream become the impossible dream? Remember, we are no longer in the world of economic or academic theory when we answer these questions. For a moment, we do not need projections from the Conference Board, Chase Econometrics or Wharton Econometrics. We have just lived these 20 years from 1984 to 2004.

Did the American dream die over the last 20 years? For nearly all Americans, nearly all Americans, the answer is a resounding no. Did Japan take over the global economy as was predicted? The answer, an obvious no. Did U.S. jobs decrease? Another obvious no.

Over those 20 years, over those 20 years the U.S. economy put 40 million people to work, and pay was up. Did incomes fall? No. Pay and real incomes increased. As I said earlier, the forces that ended up shaping our economy over those 20 years actually impacted just about every aspect of our lives, your lives, Mr. Speaker. A focus on better services, more skilled workers, more global integration, more international trade, better transportation, revolutions in communications and technology, they impacted every corner of life here in America.

So let us take a moment to take a broader look, step back and think about the big activities in our economy and in your life. Are you consuming more or less? For most people the answer is a lot more, and, remarkably, much of the stuff we buy is relatively less expensive and usually more technologically advanced than it was 20 years ago. Is your television set bigger? Almost certainly. Do you have more choice in what you watch? I am from Los Angeles, so I am biased about the quality, but say what you will about the products of the American entertainment industry, there are many,

many more choices available to viewers in 2004 than there were in 1984.

Do you have a computer in your home today, and did you back in 1984? Do you use the Internet? Do you communicate with friends and family over e-mail? Do you go on line to check the weather forecast or movie times, or shop for something that is hard to find, or hear about sales at your favorite stores? You did not do any of those things 20 years ago, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1930

Did you have a cell phone 20 years ago? Again, this is an easy one. You probably do today, and almost certainly did not 20 years ago. Many millions of Americans feel better because they have their cell phones with them and can contact family and friends in a pinch.

Do you travel more? Fly more? Are you driving a better car than you did in 1984? The answer to all of those questions is almost certainly yes, as automakers have stretched themselves to the brink putting new technologies into cars that get better mileage, break down less, are safer, are environmentally cleaner and are packed with technology. Think about the times you had to take your automobile back to the shop 20 years ago juxtaposed to today. The kind of technology that is packed into the cheapest car in 2004 was considered to be cutting-edge technology in 1984.

Has health care improved? Now, people are concerned about health care costs, obviously. And now is not the time to go into that debate. We talk about it regularly around here. But, clearly, since 1984, the number of new treatments and improvements in new technologies have been staggering. We can and will debate about how to pay for it all, but there is no denying that health care in America has taken a huge leap forward, and I am convinced that we are now on the brink of a new biotechnology revolution.

Is education improving? Again, education is never good enough, but we have made great strides in education since the middle 1980s.

We could go on all day thinking about how things have changed over the last 20 years, but it is clear they have changed a lot. The U.S. economy is turning out bigger, better, and more advanced products and services. There is no question that the doom and gloom predictions of 20 years ago proved to be way off the mark. Contrary to the Mondale prediction of 1984, the U.S. economy did not crash and burn.

So did the service sector slow U.S. productivity growth, as was outlined in that Steven Greenhouse article in the New York Times in 1986? The answer: a resounding no. Did most twenty-somethings end up working in fast food and other low-skilled jobs while a few made it big? The answer is no. Did computers and robots replace millions of workers and leave them unemployed or flipping

hamburgers? The answer is no. But that is actually a complicated issue that we need to get into in greater detail.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we want to know the why behind the fact that 20 years ago there were predictions of doom and gloom and then those 20 years ended up resulting in such great strides, we need to look at the core economic question. That question is: Did American productivity go up? The answer is, yes, it went up dramatically.

In fact, productivity has been going up so rapidly, and we have all heard this recently, some people now think that the problem is not productivity; they think it is now a jobs problem. Remember that scary New York Times piece in 1986? "The Average Guy Takes It on the Chin," was the title of the article. Greenhouse and his gaggle of economists and productivity experts pointed out that increasing productivity was key to the future. They were right in 1986 when they said that productivity was key to the future. The thing they got wrong was their prediction of doom and gloom. They missed the productivity revolution that was emerging then and there right before their eyes.

They predicted the hamburger-flipping jobs future. In 1986, that was excusable, because predicting the future is tough. I know, because I am sorry to say I did not buy Microsoft, Intel, and Cisco stock back in the mid-1980s. But some people still serve up the same ideas that we heard in 1984. It is like they were locked in a time capsule for the past 2 decades and missed the massive economic changes that have occurred.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, something happened to American businesses on the way to the hamburger-flipping future, or, more accurately, a number of things happened. As I mentioned earlier, American business underwent a revolution in computer software and hardware, a revolution in telecommunications, a revolution in banking and finance, a revolution in transportation and delivery, and a revolution in retail distribution and supply management.

We saw companies like Citigroup, Hewlett-Packard, Home Depot, Intel, Johnson & Johnson, JP Morgan Chase, Microsoft, SBC, Wal-Mart, and Disney become part of the corporate elite. Overnight and express delivery services exploded. The Internet became a place of business with eBay, Yahoo!, Amazon and Google getting started back then.

Just as important as those success stories is the fact that the revolutionary business practices and technologies infiltrated just about every level of American economic life. The corporate dynasties that survived the past 20 years, AT&T, GE, General Motors, Eastman Kodak, Exxon, IBM, and Procter and Gamble, remade themselves into 21st century economic leaders. American small business remade itself as well. Computers, cell phones,

paggers, credit cards and scanners are part of nearly every business in America today, even very small businesses.

Does your dry cleaner take credit cards? Does your auto mechanic have a diagnostic computer to check your car? The buzzwords for business and the economy of the last 20 years are concepts and strategies like supply chain management, just-in-time delivery, distribution centers, information management, customer relations, forecasting and planning. It is about adding value to the raw materials and basic goods.

To businesses, the result was a massive jump in their ability to serve their customers better. And I do not just mean customers like you and me, but business customers too. The ability to harness technologies that improved planning, customer service, and communications created jumps in productivity and efficiency. To customers, whether the customer is General Motors being served by a parts supplier or a family being served by Wal-Mart, the result has been greater choices and lower prices.

I am going to repeat something here: the ability to harness the new technologies, use technologies, those technologies created the increased productivity and efficiency. That is the key here, because machines do not harness technology, Mr. Speaker, people do. And that is why people, millions and millions of smart, skilled, hardworking Americans have been at the heart of the revolution of the 21st century economy.

Again, in our search for a suitable buzzword, the "services economy" really does not do it. It is a "business serving customers economy." Still not catchy, but business serving customers is really more accurate.

We do have a service economy. Providing a service of some kind to someone represents 65 percent of everything produced in America, and those services account for over 80 percent of U.S. jobs. The 20-year-old predictions that the service economy would be based on hamburger-flipping jobs or dish washers, lawn workers, and retail salespeople clearly missed the mark. We have lived through the 20 years creating this 21st century economy. We are in the Internet Age, the 500-channel, 50-inch-TV age, the prices-are-falling-at-Wal-Mart age. This is not the hamburger-flipping economy.

Mr. Speaker, jobs concern people. Mom and pop always want their kids to be able to get a decent job, if for no other reason so that they do not have to keep supporting them. That was at the heart of family anxiety in 1984 and 1986, and that will remain the biggest economic question in 2004 and 2006. And we lived through the Internet bubble in the late 1990s. We know that every boy and girl in America is not going to be a Silicon Valley multimillion dollar entrepreneur or biotechnology engineer. Mom and pop are practical enough to understand that. But that is

not the problem. The important question is what are the 21st century economy jobs going to be? What will Jimmy and Nicole be doing in 6 years? The fact is that they, like most American workers, will be in the business of serving someone tomorrow, next year, and in 2010.

Of course there will still be fast-food jobs, retail jobs, lawn care, janitorial, and house-cleaning jobs. There will be construction jobs. There always will be. And as the number of people in America grows, and we are approaching 300 million Americans in this great land of ours, the number of those jobs will grow. But our economy created 40 million new jobs over the past 20 years. Forty million jobs since the birth of the argument that the service economy meant nothing more than hamburger-flipping jobs.

So let us get down to brass tacks. What kinds of jobs are the American people doing in the 21st century economy? And I am going to go through this litany here, Mr. Speaker.

Network and communications administration, business administration and management, computer engineering technology, electronics engineering technology for all the machines that are not computers, health information technology, legal support, accounting, marketing, advertising, customer relations, news and information reporting, tax preparation and planning, highly specialized transportation and delivery, human resources support, pension and benefits management, purchasing and global sourcing, demand forecasting, inventory control, warehousing, and distribution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are not CEO jobs. They are not get-rich-quick jobs. But they are good jobs using very valuable skills. They are service jobs that are a part of just about every kind of business in America today. They are not Bill Gates, and they are not hamburger-flipping jobs.

Think about the big and growing sectors of our economy. Think about what you spend your money on, Mr. Speaker: health care; biotechnology and pharmaceuticals; elderly care; education; movies, entertainment and digital gaming; recreation; telecommunications, cable, satellite TV and radio, phones, cellular and wireless networks; fashion; insurance; real estate; autos, maintenance and repair; mass transit; investments, whether you call it the stock market, pensions, or securities. We all know that more than half the American people are members of the investment class, as many as six in 10. Government services, which is, as we all know, almost unimaginably big. Leisure, hospitality, and tourism.

Then there are the businesses that serve other businesses: engineering, environmental protection services and technologies, risk management, export and import financing, express delivery, high-tech manufacturing, and biomedical informatics.

Mr. Speaker, the 21st century economy, the business serving customers

economy, is based on all of these things. Not robots, robot technicians, and a bunch of fast-food workers and lawn workers. As we have made the transition of the past 20 years, more than half of all service jobs and a large majority of new service jobs paid above the average wage. And as I said earlier, low-paying hamburger-flipping, retail and janitorial jobs continue to grow as our population grows, but executive and professional jobs are growing much, much faster.

If the American economy of the past 20 years, this new 21st century economy that has revolutionized the way businesses serve their customers, is so great a success, why is any of this an issue? How can somebody in 2004 say that we are becoming an economy of hamburger-flipping jobs and not be ridiculed and laughed off the national stage?

A big part of the answer is that our economy has been undergoing a big long transition, which is the 20-year story, but we live day to day and year to year in an economy where things get better or worse. In economic terms, we have trends, which are the long-term big picture, and cycles, which are shorter term. The trends can last a couple of decades, even the better part of a century. The cycles are business cycles that last a couple of years or maybe one decade.

Most economists, or at least economic historians, would agree that our Nation's economic history has been dominated by the Industrial Revolution and the creation of the global industrial economy. We had a largely agrarian economy when our country was born. America then underwent a long transition, a transformation, really, to being the world's leading heavy industrial economy. That long economic transition took up the bulk of our Nation's history. It was well under way by the 1840s and probably climaxed in the 1960s.

Big historical trends rarely have bright-line starting and stopping points. Politics and history can work that way with elections, assassinations, wars and treaties providing clear historical dates to look back on. Economic change is different, Mr. Speaker. Even big dates, 1929 and the stock market crash or 1930 and the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, are really not that significant when looking at big trends. The big economic trends in the first part of our Nation's history was the transition from the agrarian economy to the industrial economy.

□ 1945

That was a transition that probably took 100 years. There was no single point where 1 day, or 1 year, America had an agrarian economy, and the next year it was industrialized. And single events were not that important. Instead, the spread of increasingly heavy machines, in early factories, railroads, and on farms, were key. And technologies always take time to go from



invention to standardization and widespread use.

Mr. Speaker, we are now clearly in the second transition. Heavy industry is no longer the king of the American economy. Instead, businesses, large and small, are harnessing technologies and skilled workers to create an economy based more on providing better service to customers than on the specific product itself. This has been going on for 20 years now. Twenty years happens to coincide with the birth of that political urban myth where everyone ends up with a hamburger flipping job. Over those 20 years, jobs are way up, incomes are way up, and technological improvements are spreading throughout our lives. Very few Americans would take the 1984 life-style outlook that they had over the 2004 life-style, but we have had business cycles over those 20 years as well.

We have had years of booming growth, we have had years of slow growth. We have had two actual recessions when the economy shrank. We have had lean times that did not fit the academic test of a recession, but certainly felt like a weak economy.

In the midst of any one of those lean times, the fact that the economic trend over the previous decade was very good really did not matter much. Things were worse than the year before or the year before that. In addition, during the first part of the current 20-year economic growth trend, time had not passed enough to tell the difference between a trend and a cycle. The start of a trend can look a lot like the upside of a cycle.

The economic slowdown that began in 2000, the final year of the Clinton administration, was clearly the downside of the cycle that began in 1992, the final year of the Presidency of George H.W. Bush. In the past 20 years, we had at least two cycles, one ending in a recession in 1991, and the other in a recession in 2001. We are almost certainly into a third cycle with growth again picking up.

The U.S. economy has been growing strongly for the past 2 years. It grew at a staggering 8.2 percent annual rate in the third quarter of last year, surpassing even the most optimistic projections and marking the strongest pace in nearly two decades, 20 years. Unemployment claims are dropping, and workers' wages and benefits have climbed in recent months. Family incomes are up. Consumer spending is up. Inflation is low. The housing sector has been very strong, and business productivity, as we all know, has been incredibly strong.

At this point in the business cycle, the big economic issue has been jobs. Remember, in the short term, we are coming off of some years like 1999 and 2000 where unemployment reached such low levels that most economists could not imagine numbers so low. In that context when the recession and slowdown in 2001 resulted in 6 percent unemployment, it created real concern,

especially among the recently unemployed, and that is understandable.

Politics reacts far more to the short-term cycle than the long-term trend, so it is easy to see why everyone is talking about the struggles of recent years rather than the incredibly good news of the last 20 years. But as we deal with the political realities of the short term, we must not lose sight of the big picture.

The hamburger flipping job argument is not just false, it is actually a dangerous thing. Twenty years ago this kind of rhetoric did not get the chance to hurt our economy because hard-working and innovative Americans kept right on forging new technologies, revolutionizing what businesses do and how they do it, and improving the way Americans go about living their lives.

But today, thanks to the short-term business cycle we are coming out of, the hamburger flipping argument resonates with a lot of people, and it is resulting in some very misguided and dangerous proposals. It is generating calls for protectionism, calls for policies that stifle the very environment that has allowed skilled American workers to harness new technologies and bring about our booming 21st century economy.

Mr. Speaker, attempts to undermine the principles that are the foundation of this economy threaten the progress and prosperity that has come about over these two decades. That is why debunking the hamburger flipping argument once and for all is not just critical to understanding the good news of the last 20 years, it is essential to ensuring that our future remains bright as well.

#### HAITI NEEDS OUR HELP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS)?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, Haiti today is facing an economic, political and humanitarian crisis so severe that the United States Government and the United States Congress have no choice but to immediately act. Daily, Haitians are dying as a result of the violence. These deaths are intolerable, and the United States simply cannot sit back and watch a country in our own hemisphere spiral into chaos.

Our government has voiced concern that Haitians, desperate to escape the escalating violence and poverty, will

flood American shores. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, just this evening there are reports that boats are coming towards the United States from Haiti filled with people fleeing literally for their lives.

We should be more concerned about the drastic conditions that led to the desperation and hopelessness of these Haitians refugees. The Congressional Black Caucus calls upon the President and the international community to work with the elected leadership in Haiti to bring about an end to the political turbulence and stop the attempted coup d'etat that is mounting in that country.

Mr. Speaker, let me be absolutely clear. It is imperative that the United States involve itself with an international force to create stability in Haiti before more lives are lost. We cannot afford to lose another day or another life due to our inaction. Because of the urgency of the Haitian crisis, my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus and I went to the White House and laid out our concerns today before President Bush. I must say, it was a good meeting with the President.

We explained to the President that we were tired of turning on our televisions every day and hearing about the slaughter of Haitian people. We explained to him that we believed with all the sincerity in our hearts that this was an urgent situation, and that the President of the United States was facing a very critical moment in his Presidency, and that he could do so much to turn this situation around.

We explained to him that there are so many people throughout the world who for various reasons had gotten or created within their minds a very negative view about the United States of America, but this was a time when he could act and turn some of those views around and show that not only was he a concerned President, but he was indeed a compassionate President.

So we had an opportunity, a rare opportunity I must admit, to meet with the President of the United States today, the Congressional Black Caucus did. Twenty Members were there, and we were very pleased to also have an opportunity at the same time to meet with Condoleezza Rice and Colin Powell.

Let me just pause here to say that we expressed to Colin Powell, the Secretary of State, our gratitude for all of the hard work he had been doing over the past several weeks. It was Colin Powell that stayed in contact with many Caucus members. It was Colin Powell that tried to find ways to diplomatically resolve this matter, and at the same time we felt that things had not moved to the degree that we wanted them to; and so, therefore, we had asked to meet with the President.

Now, when we met with the President today, when the Congressional Black Caucus met with the President, there were several things that we wanted him to do, and to his credit he gave the