

a small fraction of that funding, that modest investment produced impressive results. MEP helped more than 2,700 Ohio businesses to create or retain more than 1,100 jobs, increase sales by \$20 million, cut costs by \$47 million, increase investments by \$58 million. That is exactly the sort of helping hand Ohio and the Nation's small manufacturers need.

Then the President proposed an MEP funding cut of 88 percent, ended up signing a law a couple of years ago that cut it almost that much. Not surprisingly, services to Ohio businesses dropped significantly. This year, the President's budget request asked for a funding cut of another 50 percent. Less than \$1 million per State will be left for MEP. We should be supporting a funding level five times that amount because it would mean more tax revenue, more jobs, more success for U.S. manufacturers.

Ohio's Republican governors urge the President to change his position on MEP. Working men and women from my State and across the Nation understand that our economic future is at stake. We should pass a bill this week ensuring increased MEP funds over the President's request, but this body probably will not do it.

To support our Nation's manufacturing, we should pass a bill to stop China from manipulating its currency by artificially pegging it below the dollar. China starts outs with a 40 percent advantage over American manufacturers by this illegal act, not to mention having no minimum wage and forced labor camps and child labor and all the other advantages, artificial advantages if you will, in a free marketplace that China has. But I do not think that legislation to deal with currency manipulating will be on the House floor this week.

To support our Nation's manufacturers, we should pass such a bill making sure China plays fair and meets its World Trade Organization obligations, but I do not see a bill on the floor this week to do that.

To support our Nation's manufacturing, we should pass the bill of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Foreign Debt Ceiling Act of 2005, that would create an emergency trade review group at the U.S. Trade Representative's Office to develop a plan of action if the trade deficit is above 5 percent of U.S. GDP or if foreign debt climbs above 25 percent of GDP. But that is not being considered this week either.

The manufacturing industry is the backbone of our country. This industry, these workers, these communities built America. And when these industries suffer, our communities suffer, our families suffer, our schools suffer, our Nation is hurt. Yet many in Congress continue to support measures that move these jobs overseas. Let us be clear about whom we should support.

Congratulate manufacturers, is what the resolution on the floor will do and

nothing else this week, who have remained in the U.S. and refrained from sending manufacturing jobs overseas. But it is not just about keeping our middle class strong; we should be concerned about national security. Without a strong manufacturing base, there can be no strong reliable national security in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we, finally, in this Congress adopt a manufacturing policy.

□ 1945

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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, the American people are hearing a lot of information about our Social Security system, and I am sure they have got legitimate questions: Is there a crisis or not? If there is a crisis, then is there a trust fund or not? If there is not a trust fund, where did it go, who took it and when?

There are, of course, those who say that there is no crisis, that we have a system that is awash in cash and can fund all future benefits but it needs minor tweaking to ensure solvency.

Perhaps crisis is the wrong word. Captive may be a better selection because certainly we are held captive by our demographics. If our current system is to work and work well, we need large numbers of young people to pay into the system, and we need retirees to live relatively short intervals after their retirement; but in fact, neither of these situations reflects reality.

Birth rates are down in this country, although not to the degree as seen in some Western European countries, still resulting in a smaller pool of younger workers to support retirees. Life expectancy is up, largely because of the unbelievable advances in medical care that have occurred in the last 70 years since 1935. Both situations are arguably good news, but they do portend a serious situation for our Social Security system.

For example, in the country of Japan there are now four retirees to be supported by every new job that is created. It becomes extremely difficult to remain competitive in such an environment. Raising taxes to deal with the Social Security shortfall arguably has been done several times in the past 70 years; but, unfortunately, that makes the problem even worse. The old axiom states that you tax what you do not

want, but surely we want jobs for tomorrow's Americans, but increasing the payroll tax may mean ultimately there are fewer such jobs.

In 1937, the Supreme Court ruled that excess Social Security funds were to be placed in the general revenue fund. Mr. Speaker, that is what happened to the trust fund. In fact, nonnegotiable government instruments housed in a metal filing cabinet in West Virginia represent the surplus in Social Security, and that surplus has been spent over the last several decades by Congress. Congress spent the money, Congress wrote out an IOU for the money, and we continue to write IOUs for the interest.

Mr. Speaker, where is the fairness in a system that holds captive 12 percent of the country's payroll and pays no interest on the money? This, I think, is the heart of the problem. What Albert Einstein described as the miracle of compound interest is denied to American workers.

What are the solutions that might be there for us to help with Social Security? We could cut benefits. I did not come to Congress to do that. We could raise taxes. Not this guy.

There are, of course, those who feel that growth in the economy will help those two workers that are going to have to support every retiree into the future; and I will tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I will bet on the American economy every time, but I am not sure if we can improve productivity to that degree.

Mr. Speaker, what we can do is take those excess funds being paid into Social Security and place them into individual accounts that would not be accessible to government spenders and not be accessible to congressional appropriators. Allow these accounts to earn interest by following a conservative investment strategy, and now perhaps we begin to see the opportunity to preserve Social Security and ensure its solvency well into the future.

The question is always asked how to pay for this transition. I have already excluded a tax increase or benefit cut as a viable mechanism. The money to finance the transition would have to be borrowed; and in fact, this does not represent new debt because the obligation has already been incurred. The borrowing is only to refinance an obligation that already exists, a situation analogous to refinancing a mortgage.

Mr. Speaker, we should always be for good government. The principle of good government would suggest that the current obligation is present, but we are not acknowledging its presence. By financing the transition, we can convert an unknown obligation into bonded indebtedness. It becomes a marketable instrument; and that, in fact, would be a commitment to good government.

Financial markets are not known for their courage. They do not like uncertainty; and, clearly, the uncertainty of

monetizing the Social Security debt in the future is one that they will deal with fairly severely. But by making that a known obligation, we are giving the markets more comfort into what our intentions are with regard to the unfunded Social Security liability.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close with a quotation that was delivered in this House some years ago: "Voluntary contributory annuities by which individual initiative can increase the annual amounts received in old age. It is proposed that the Federal Government assume one-half of the cost of the old-age pension plan, which ought ultimately to be supplanted by self-supporting annuity plans."

These words were spoken in this Chamber 70 years ago by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the father of Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, it is our obligation to deal with this problem this year. I applaud the President for pushing it on the national agenda, and I look forward to the debate.

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

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

THE DREAM LIVES ON

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago yesterday on March 7, 1965, events in Selma, Alabama, became a seminal moment for the advancement of civil rights in our country. Last weekend, I had the privilege to join one of my heroes, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), who was also one of the leaders of the nonviolent civil rights movement, to retrace his steps across the Edmund Pettus Bridge where America's long march to freedom met a roadblock of violent resistance. The day became known as Bloody Sunday.

By 1965, the cause of equality and human dignity had already seen much progress and setbacks: the Supreme Court decision of *Brown v. Board of Education*, Rosa Parks's defiance on a bus in Montgomery, the breaking of a color barrier at Ole Miss, the historic March on Washington, the assassinations of Medgar Evers and President Kennedy, the bombing deaths of four little girls at the 16th Street Baptist

Church in Birmingham, Alabama, the Mississippi freedom summer, the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

But on this Bloody Sunday, about 600 people, young and old, put their lives on the line and met the unbridled force of racism for the most basic American right, the right to vote and be full participants in our democracy. The Alabama State Patrol was waiting for them at the other side of the Pettus Bridge and attacked them with clubs, tear gas, and dogs.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) was beaten so badly he believed he was going to die. The images were captured on TV. When the movie "Judgment at Nuremberg" was interrupted with the news, many people watching the movie first thought that it was a continuation of the movie depicting brutal Nazi oppression, until they realized that this was happening in America, right now. People's shock moved the political world.

One week after Bloody Sunday, President Johnson spoke to the Nation. In inspiring words, he said: "At times, history and fate meet in a single time and a single place to shape a turning point in man's unending search for freedom. So it was at Lexington and Concord. So it was a century ago at Appomattox. So it was last week in Selma. Their cause must be our cause."

Two weeks after Bloody Sunday, Dr. Martin Luther King and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) led 4,000 people across the Pettus Bridge on their 54-mile march to Montgomery. Six months later, President Johnson signed the Voting Rights Act, proclaiming that the right to vote is the most powerful instrument ever devised for breaking down injustice and destroying the terrible walls which imprison all people merely because they are different from each other.

Soon the Voting Rights Act will be up again before Congress for reauthorization. We should do it sooner rather than later. We should make it permanent, rather than for short periods, so we do not have to revisit the issue and debate its provisions. Surely there is enough common interest and bipartisan support to accomplish this.

Their cause 40 years ago this week still must be our cause to overcome today. For as long as the power of America's diversity is diminished by acts of discrimination and violence against people just because they are black, Hispanic, Asian, Jewish, Muslim or gay, we still must overcome.

As long as the gap between rich and poor continues to spread in our Nation, with some and not all having access to health care, we still must overcome.

As long as children of color are more likely to live in poverty, die sooner, and less likely to graduate high school and go on to college, we still must overcome.

As President Bush stated during his recent trip to Europe: "We cannot carry the message of freedom and the baggage of bigotry at the same time.

All our nations must work to integrate minorities into the mainstream of society, and to teach the value of tolerance to each new generation."

President Clinton pointed out 5 years ago at the Pettus Bridge that these challenges already have existing bridges waiting to be crossed. He said: "These bridges stand on the strong foundations of our Constitution. They were built by our forebears through silent tears and weary years. They are waiting to take us to higher ground."

But there is still much work to be done. In the words of Martin Luther King, Jr.: "Human progress never rolls on the wheels of inevitability. It comes through the tireless efforts of people willing to be co-workers with God."

We remember the event of 40 years ago this week not only to honor the courage, sacrifice and accomplishments by those like the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) and so many more, but also to rededicate ourselves to their unfinished work: the pursuit of justice, love, tolerance and human rights, in our country and throughout the world.

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

(Mr. WELDON of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. MICA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, today is International Women's Day, a day we honor women and their contributions to the American way of life. American women, from the frontier era to the