

stay-at-home mom and earns nothing. The total Smith income per month is \$3,000. When it comes time for retirement, Mr. Smith's monthly benefit is \$1,300 a month. Mrs. Smith's monthly benefit is \$650. The Smith's total benefit is \$1,950.

The dual-earner couple, Mr. Green, Mr. Green earns \$2,000 a month, Mrs. Green earns \$1,000 a month, so they have the same combined income as the Smiths. Their combined monthly income is \$3,000. The retirement benefit, however, Mr. Green's monthly benefit is \$1,000; Mrs. Green's monthly benefit is \$650. The Greens' total monthly retirement benefits are \$1,650.

But take these same couples, the Smiths and the Greens, to make matters worse, under our current system when one spouse dies, the remaining spouse receives 100 percent of the larger earner's benefit. So the survivor benefit is in the Smiths' case, her monthly benefit is \$1,300. In Mrs. Green's case, the monthly benefit is \$1,000. Because Mrs. Green worked outside the home, she is penalized by Social Security upon the death of her husband. Mrs. Green will receive \$300 less per month than Mrs. Smith just for working.

It all began, actually, during World War II and Rosie the Riveter. You saw women out in the workplace and women continued to work over time. As you can imagine for a woman whose family relied on two Social Security checks before her husband's death, this can be a harsh financial burden. More importantly, though, if the husband dies and she chooses to receive her husband's Social Security benefits instead of her own, that means she will never receive the benefits of her own taxes paid over her lifetime of work.

While women certainly have made great strides toward pay parity in the past 30 years, there is still a gap in earnings between men and women in equivalent professions. Naturally, this pay inequity will mean that millions of women are forfeiting their benefits that they have paid for and deserve. More and more women are also entering the workplace. In 1950, just about 30 percent of women over the age of 20 worked either full-time or part-time. Today, that number is 60 percent. The more full-time women in the American workforce, the harsher the treatment when it comes to their retirement years.

Despite dramatic and positive changes in the workplace, women on average still receive less income, have less non-Social Security pension coverage, and are more likely to miss productive working time while raising and caring for a family. These statistics highlight the need for equitable treatment of women in the Social Security system.

Times certainly have changed since our Social Security system began, and family life has, also. Marriage in America today faces many challenges. We have seen a dramatic rise in the num-

ber of marriages that fail, and today millions of Americans divorce each year. As you can imagine, there are many divorced women who did not work outside of the home and instead chose to raise a family, which, as every woman knows, is a full-time job in and of itself. The Social Security system of the 1930s and 1940s, however, does not recognize the new world in which American women live.

Let me give you a hypothetical example. Phyllis Smith was married in October of 1995 to Jim Franklin. Jim, a successful real estate agent in the suburbs, was able to bring home enough money so that Phyllis did not have to work outside the home. After some time, Phyllis and Jim had two children and a happy life-style. Unfortunately, as the years passed, the couple grew apart until they divorced in September 2005. In this case, Phyllis is entitled to absolutely none of Jim's Social Security benefits. However, had Phyllis and Jim waited to divorce until October, a mere 1-month difference, she would have been entitled to half of his Social Security benefit. Women should ask, how is this fair to Phyllis? She has a fair claim to half of every other marital asset, half of the house, half of his 401(k), but because Social Security has not addressed this problem since its inception, her retirement is anything but secure.

Mr. Speaker, this is a clear example of why Social Security is a bad investment for women. Each year, thousands of single women who have never married between the ages of 25 and 64 pass away. We all know that heart disease is a major contributing factor along with cancer for early death among women. In 2001, according to the Census Bureau, 77,851 women in this age category died. That was in 1 year alone.

Assuming that at least three-quarters of them earned income and paid into the Social Security system, the hundreds of millions of dollars paid to Social Security by more than 55,000 women are gone. These hardworking women paid millions of dollars in taxes and their heirs will never receive a single dime for all of their years at work. Unlike income taxes, which go to general revenue and are used for building roads, maintaining an army and educating our children, today's Social Security taxes go to today's retirees. Your Social Security taxes do not get earmarked for you. As the gentle-woman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) said, she thought that they were in a box somewhere with her name on it, all the money that she put into the Social Security system. It is not that way. You pay in today to pay the benefits of today's seniors.

□ 2015

The women who pass away before they receive Social Security, for them this is nothing but a tax from which they or their family will never receive a benefit. On the other end of the spectrum, these women who do live long

enough to collect Social Security face the challenge of being disproportionately dependent on the Social Security system for retirement income. Remember I cited facts of the percentage of women in our country who rely only on Social Security, and that number is much higher particularly in many areas in Florida. Women live an average of 5.5 years longer than men. Non-married women over 65 rely on Social Security for an average of 50 percent of their retirement income. Thirty-eight percent of unmarried women rely on Social Security for 90 percent or more of their retirement income.

These numbers make it clear that if a woman lives long enough to receive their benefits from Social Security that they are very likely to rely on that benefit as a major part of their monthly income. These facts are proof of the urgent need for this Congress to show some leadership necessary in a bipartisan manner to enact reforms that guarantee Social Security will be there for our future seniors and our current seniors when they need it the most.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this Congress must recognize that the issue of Social Security reform is an important issue, and they must also realize how it affects women and that it is vitally important to the retirement of millions of American families.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3010, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mrs. CAPITO (during Special Order of Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-148) on the resolution (H. Res. 337) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3010) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CAFTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REICHERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

Before doing that, I would just like to make a couple of comments about what was said by my friend from Florida, who was joined by other members of the Republican Party to talk about their privatization plan, their plan to privatize Social Security. I applaud them for coming up with a plan. President Bush has for the last 4 months

gone around at town hall meetings, invitation only, where there is never any disagreement in these meetings, preaching Social Security change, never specifically saying what that change will be. The President, other than saying it is privatization, has not offered a specific Social Security plan. But what concerns me both about President Bush's comments and about the comments from my friends on the other side of the aisle is they really are engaging in what we used to call, when they privatized Medicare, "Medicare" tactics. They are doing the same kind of Social Security scare tactics by saying people are paying taxes into Social Security but may never see this money that they have put in.

And I cannot imagine a more secure system than Social Security. It is a system that has been around for 70 years. It has never missed a payment month after month after month for 70 years. It is reliable. It is predictable. It is always going to be there.

And when people who are Members of Congress stand up and say that we cannot count on this money being there, the Supreme Court made a decision here and Congress could make a decision there that Social Security might not be available, it simply scares people. And I do not think there is any room for that in our political system to scare people of any age, whether they are retirees or whether they are soon to be retirees or whether they are my age or younger than I and simply are not so sure about Social Security, to scare them and say that it will not be there, when it has been there every month for 70 years. It is reprehensible, frankly.

In terms of solutions, the first thing we should do with the Social Security, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) said earlier tonight, is quit stealing from it. Quit using money from the Social Security fund and spending \$1 billion a week on the Iraq war. Quit spending money from the Social Security fund and giving tax cuts to the wealthiest 1 percent of people in this country. That is how we start to change, to reform, to make even stronger the Social Security system.

Mr. Speaker, I turn my attention to the Central American Free Trade Agreement. In a White House news conference in May, President Bush called on Congress to pass the Central American Free Trade Agreement this summer. Last year the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), majority leader, the most powerful Republican in the House, promised that we would vote on CAFTA during the year 2004. Then the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) promised a vote on CAFTA prior to Memorial Day. Now the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is promising a vote again, and this time I think he means it, that we are going to vote on this by July 4.

Mr. Speaker, many of us, the dozen of us, Republicans and Democrats alike, who have opposed the Central Amer-

ican Free Trade Agreement have one message about CAFTA: Defeat CAFTA and renegotiate a better Central American Free Trade Agreement, one that business and labor, manufacturers, small business, ranchers, farmers, environmentalists, religious people, religious figures, leaders in the six CAFTA, Central American, Latin American countries and the United States, one we can agree on. But as it is, religious leaders in each of our seven countries, the U.S. and the Dominican Republic and the five countries in Central America, labor union members, workers, small business people, farmers, ranchers in all seven countries think this CAFTA is wrong and we should renegotiate a better CAFTA.

The President commented that workers can excel anytime, anywhere, if the rules are fair. I agree with President Bush that workers in our country can always compete if the rules are fair. That is why it is too bad this administration negotiated a Central American Free Trade Agreement that fails so miserably to do that.

Today the President grossly generalized the opposition to CAFTA, lobbying the tired accusation of economic isolationism. Name-calling does not have a place in this debate. For the President to say we are backward looking, economic isolationists, protectionists, none of those terms means anything, and all of those terms lower the debate to the lowest common denominator.

Just to clarify for the President, those he calls economic isolationists, the fact is a majority of Members of this Congress oppose the Central American Free Trade Agreement. At least 23 business organizations represented at a rally just yesterday in Washington oppose the Central American Free Trade Agreement. Farmers and ranchers and small business people and workers all over these seven countries oppose this agreement and call for a renegotiation of the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

We want a trade agreement with CAFTA countries, but we want one that benefits the many, not the select few. CAFTA was a negotiated agreement, negotiated by the select few, including the drug industry, including the largest corporations in America, an agreement negotiated by the select few, for the select few, for the drug industry, for the largest corporations of America. That is what the White House is trying to force through this Congress, a failed trade agreement that was dead on arrival.

Just look at its history. Thirteen months ago President Bush signed the Central American Free Trade Agreement. Every other free trade agreement President Bush has signed, one with Morocco, one with Australia, one with Chile, one with Singapore, four agreements, each of these four agreements that the President signed was voted within 60 days by this Congress. The President signed it; within 2

months Congress voted on it and passed it.

This trade agreement is very different. He signed it 13 months ago, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), majority leader, the most powerful Republican House Member, has not brought it before this body or the Senate simply because it does not have the votes, because it has languished in Congress for more than a year, because this wrong-headed trade agreement is a continuation of failed trade policy in this country and Republicans and Democrats alike understand it.

Just look at what has happened with our trade policy in the last dozen years, Mr. Speaker. If we look at this chart, we will see that in 1992, the year I happened to be elected to Congress, the United States had a \$38 billion trade deficit. That means we imported \$38 billion more worth of goods than we exported; \$38 billion. That number grew and grew and grew until last year, in 2004, our trade deficit was \$618 billion.

In a dozen years, our trade deficit went from \$38 billion to \$618 billion. What does that mean? That is just a bunch of numbers. Well, it is not just a bunch of numbers. When we have a trade deficit grow like that, what it means is a lot of lost jobs. President Bush the first said that every \$1 billion in trade deficit, every billion dollars, and we had \$618 billion last year, over \$500 billion the year before, over \$400 billion the year before, and over \$300 billion the year before that, that every \$1 billion of trade deficit translates into, according to President Bush the first, 12,000 lost jobs. So if our trade deficit is \$1 billion, it is a net loss of 12,000 jobs. If we multiply that times 618, we have a lot of jobs lost in this country as a result of our failed trade policy.

Mr. Speaker, if we look at this next chart, we will see what those numbers mean. The States in red are States that have lost 20 percent of their manufacturing in the last 5 years: Ohio, 216,000, where I live; Michigan, 210,000 jobs lost; Illinois, 224,000; Pennsylvania, 200,000; Virginia and West Virginia, 95,000; North and South Carolina, 315,000; Alabama and Mississippi combined, 130,000.

The States in blue have lost 15 to 20 percent of their manufacturing: Texas, 201,000; Florida, 72,000; Georgia, 107,000; Tennessee, 93,000; California, 353,000.

Those are manufacturing jobs lost in the last 5 years in large part because of our trade policy. Yet President Bush wants us to pass another trade agreement called CAFTA, a dysfunctional cousin of NAFTA, an agreement that will cause the same downward spiral in our manufacturing situation in this country.

It is the same old story. Every time there is a trade agreement, the President promises three things: He says it will mean more jobs for Americans; it will mean more manufacturing done in the U.S.; it will mean better wages for

workers in developing countries. Yet with every trade agreement, their promises fall by the wayside. We lose jobs. The standard of living in the developing world continues to stagnate. Our own wages stagnate.

Mr. Speaker, Benjamin Franklin once said that the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and over and expecting a different result. Mr. Speaker, we are doing the same thing on our trade policy over and over and over again, and for some reason, although not a majority of Congress buys this, but for some reason the President and the largest corporations in the country and some Members of Congress, Republican leadership, believe that the outcome will be better, will be different this time, will actually produce much better results.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at this job loss, again, these are just numbers, but think what 216,000 jobs lost in Ohio or in Akron or in Columbus or in Dayton or in Toledo or in Cleveland or in Lorain or in Youngstown, when a factory closes down and moves to Mexico, which happened to a plant in Elyria just in the last couple of years in my district, when a plant closes down, 800 jobs were lost. The schools suffer because there are fewer tax dollars for the schools. Police and fire are often laid off because there are not enough tax dollars. But it is what it does to those families, those 800 families, who generally cannot find jobs. The bread winners in those families simply cannot find jobs that pay nearly at the rate of those manufacturing jobs. So these families suffer. The kids suffer. The school district is hurt. All kinds of people lose when these trade agreements pass this Congress and we see this kind of manufacturing job loss.

The administration and Republican leadership have tried every trick in the book to pass this Central American Free Trade Agreement. This year the administration is linking CAFTA to helping democracy in the developing world. Defense Secretary Rumsfeld and Deputy Secretary of State Zoellick have said CAFTA will help us in the war on terror, but 10 years of NAFTA has done nothing to improve border security between Mexico and the U.S.; so that argument does not sell.

Then in May, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce flew the six Presidents from Central America and the Dominican Republic around the Nation, hoping they might be able to sell CAFTA to the Nation's newspapers, to the public, to the Congress.

□ 2030

They flew to Albuquerque and Los Angeles, to New York and Miami, to Cincinnati in my home State. Again, they failed. In fact, the Costa Rican President announced, after the junket paid for by the Chamber of Commerce, that his country would not ratify CAFTA unless an independent commission could determine it would not hurt working families in his country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the administration, finding that nothing else works to convince enough Members of Congress to vote for CAFTA, now the administration has opened the bank. Desperate after failing to gain support for the agreement, CAFTA supporters now are attempting to buy votes with fantastic promises.

I would hold this up, Mr. Speaker. This is called "Trade Wars, Revenge of the Myth, Deals For Trade Votes Gone Bad." It refers to a study of 92 documented promises made during trade agreements and how many of those promises by the administration to Members of Congress were actually honored. Fewer than 20 percent; 16 of these 90-some promises were actually honored by the administration.

Members are not going to fall for this kind of disingenuous, these kinds of disingenuous actions from the administration. Again, the President can open the bank, the President can promise bridges and highways, the President can promise campaign fund-raisers in districts, the President can make all kinds of promises, sugar deals and textile deals to Members of Congress; but this year, they are not buying it, Mr. Speaker.

Instead of wasting time with toothless side deals, our U.S. trade ambassador should renegotiate a CAFTA that will pass Congress. Republicans and Democrats, business and labor groups, farmers, ranchers, faith-based groups, religious leaders, environmental, human rights organizations in all seven countries, the Latin American Consulate of Churches, for instance, have opposed CAFTA. All kinds of labor organizations and small businesses, manufacturers in this country have opposed CAFTA. They all say they want a trade agreement, but they want to renegotiate this CAFTA so that we will have one which actually works for American businesses, for American small businesses, for American workers, and for workers in these developing countries.

This CAFTA will not enable Central American workers to buy cars made in Ohio or software developed in Seattle or prime beef in Nebraska. They make these promises. The CAFTA supporters have said, Mr. Speaker, they said that if the United States passes CAFTA, we will increase our exports to these six Latin American countries, they will buy our things. But if we look at this, Mr. Speaker, the United States average wage is \$38,000; Guatemala is \$4,000; Honduras, \$2,600; and Nicaragua, \$2,300. A Nicaraguan worker cannot buy a car made in Ohio, cannot buy produce from Mr. FARR's district in California. A Guatemalan worker cannot afford to buy software from Seattle. An El Salvadoran worker cannot buy prime beef from Nebraska or textiles or apparel from North Carolina. This is about CAFTA companies moving jobs to Honduras, exploiting cheap labor in Guatemala.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, our goal should be to lift up workers in those

countries so that they can buy American goods. When the world's poorest people, Mr. Speaker, can buy American products and not just make them, then we will know that our trade policies are working.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we must renegotiate CAFTA.

I am joined this evening by the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), a friend of mine, a Member of Congress, who came the same year I did, in 1993, from Northern California; and I would like to yield some time to him.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and it is a pleasure to be here on the floor with the gentleman. I wanted to be here for the discussion of CAFTA, and I wanted to say that as a former Peace Corps volunteer in South America, this issue of development of these countries is very, very important. I just think that we are putting the cart before the horse with this trade agreement.

We are dealing with the Central American countries of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua; and of those countries, Nicaragua and Honduras are two of the poorest countries in all of Latin America, Bolivia being the third poorest. These countries do not have, as the gentleman just pointed out, right now a level of living, a wage income to be able to afford imports of American products, which would probably have less of a tariff because of the agreement.

What is missing in this is that in order to really help these countries, we need to invest in education, we need to invest in clean water systems, we need to invest in very basic things. Frankly, they are agrarian countries, meaning they grow agricultural products. Do we think they can compete with any of the agriculture products that we grow in the United States? Absolutely not. There is no way in the world, as we saw with the corn going into Mexico after NAFTA, that even the smallest of those farms can continue to compete.

So I am very concerned and very opposed to CAFTA; and I think, as the gentleman pointed out, it needs to be renegotiated. These countries need investment in infrastructure. That is why the Peace Corps is involved in these countries. If you talk to the Peace Corps volunteers in these countries, I am sure that the discussions they have had with most of the people have nothing to do with CAFTA, because they are like most parents in the United States.

If anybody is listening to this and watching this debate, they will know that as parents, what you are interested in is education for your kids. There are no schools. There is nothing in CAFTA that promises new schools or new teachers or new water systems. There is just a hope that perhaps, with additional investment in these countries, that foreign firms will come in and invest. Why would they invest in these countries? Why? Because there is

cheap labor, cheap labor because people are not educated, because they do not have an infrastructure, tax structure that allows for the development of infrastructure.

So I think that to just jump in and talk about taking the most powerful economic Nation in the world and essentially entering into an agreement which allows us to bully up on the poorest countries in our hemisphere is the wrong way to go. I appreciate the gentleman bringing these issues forward, because I think there is not enough discussion.

Remember, part of CAFTA is also DR CAFTA, which is the Dominican Republic. And that has been bandied about; and of the six legislatures, El Salvador, Honduras and Guatemala, those three legislatures have ratified it. The others have not because they say that an agreement with the Dominican Republic, which is next to Haiti, the other poorest country in the region and in the Caribbean, that they do not have transparency about negotiation and the ratification process.

So we have political infrastructure problems, we have accountability problems, and I think we are missing the point. If we really care about bringing up the level of living, frankly, the way you do that is you invest in the simple things. You invest in rural roads and in rural schools and in rural water systems and definitely health care systems.

So I appreciate the gentleman bringing this forward. The other country here is Costa Rica, and they have an upper-middle-income country. It has one of the best tourism programs in all of Latin America. It did it without having to enter into a trade agreement with the United States. It did it with other kinds of U.S. aid. I would just point out that Nicaragua and Honduras have qualified as countries eligible for Millennium Fund accounts. It is a good program. It is a bottoms-up, sort of let the countries build what they think are important. The program is very good, and these countries qualify because they are the poorest countries there are.

But when it comes down to finding out what the Millennium Account is doing, I think it is being driven essentially by the people interested in CAFTA, because they are building not water systems, not schools, not infrastructure for the rural areas, but building highways from port to port, thinking that CAFTA is going to come along and have this superability for the farmers to compete with the American farmers, for people to be on a level to buy consumer goods that are sent to them from the United States.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out the gentleman from California was a Peace Corps volunteer himself in Latin America and is a fluent Spanish speaker; and I think the perspective he brings shows that even though the wages are so much higher in these countries, it is not a question

of we just want to shut them off and keep them away and not let them compete and all of that in the world economy. It is a question of development and bringing up their standard of living. These trade agreements in the past have not done that.

Talk to us, if the gentleman will, about from your perspective what development means. The gentleman talked about water systems and all of that. Instead of a CAFTA that does not lift standards up, what kinds of things work the most and, in particular, the poorest of these countries in Nicaragua and Honduras and Guatemala whose income is about, in some cases, less than one-tenth of ours, one-fifteenth of ours, if the gentleman would.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, perhaps people do not like to hear this, but a country that has been able to put their priorities in perspective has been Cuba, and the reason Cuba did it is they invested in the infrastructure to keep the rural people in the rural areas so that they could have rural economic development. The countries that we are talking about, people are fleeing the rural areas to move into the cities. That is why there are all these poor barrios that are constructed without water.

I lived in a house that did not have water or sewer or lights. It is a pretty miserable situation because all you are doing is, in our case, we had kids haul water for us; they cannot go to school because they have to haul water. So you really begin to understand that if you are going to try to build up sort of an economic base, you have to stay with the basics; and the basics are, you have to have running water in the house. If you have to go and get it, that means that usually the children have to go get the water and bring it to the house.

And if you do not have any electricity, that means you have to build a fire or buy very expensive petroleum, now kerosene, to start a fire. Most people go out and try to get charcoal and get wood. So you are gathering the basics to make the meal so people can eat. You have to go out, and you certainly cannot afford to go to the supermarket, so you go at it piece by piece. It takes the whole day just to put together food on the table.

So if we want to really help these countries, let us make sure that there are some guarantees that this is going to happen. There is nothing in CAFTA that says that. This is about the rich getting richer.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No labor standards.

Mr. FARR. And the poor staying poor. Now, Latin America, I was in Honduras and Nicaragua, and I have to say from the government officials that you talk to, they are all excited about CAFTA. There are some that are worried about losing their identity, some politicians in Costa Rica, the most successful of these countries, that are very concerned that the CAFTA

agreement is going to have this dominant United States, just sort of the big, huge 800-pound gorilla move into these countries and wipe out their local identity, wipe out their local culture and customs and essentially homogenize the whole thing with American fast-food chains and American businesses.

So where I am concerned about this is that I think if we want to have a win-win, I mean, frankly, the Central American markets, these are small countries. These are poor countries. There is not a huge market down there. This is not going to put a big blip on America's foreign trade. This is not like trading with China or trading with Europe. These are some of the smallest countries in the entire; well, they are the smallest countries in the entire hemisphere. And the importance of these countries in a trade agreement for us as sellers is not that big. For us, as a country that is looking to stabilize the hemisphere, it is about infrastructure development. If you want to generate drug trade, keep a country poor. If you want to generate people that would be interested in terrorism because life is not getting better for them, so you go to extremes and start listening to that, keep them uneducated, keep them poor.

So if we really want to fight for our priorities and emphasize our priorities in this country, we ought to be ensuring, first of all, that these countries have an infrastructure development that has 100 percent access to education, 100 percent access to health care, 100 percent access to a safe place to sleep. And then, when you begin developing an educated middle class, you can begin these more sophisticated trade agreements.

Frankly, I do not see that the trade agreements, there is no responsibility for the outsiders in this agreement, for the countries outside, to do anything to improve the level of living. They are just going to assume that the free market enterprise is going to take care of us; it will trickle down.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and I know that it does not even work in the United States, the trickle down theory here. We had a tax cut for the most wealthy people in America with the idea that the wealthiest would take all of that tax cut and they would give it to the poor and they would start funding the necessary affordable housing, they would fund the educational stream in America, where the public sector does not meet it. They would fund, essentially, the charity of America. It has not happened. It does not work that way. And CAFTA is not going to solve the Central American problem, and it certainly is not going to solve America's trade balance, which is caused by primarily our trade with China, trade imbalance.

Now, my farmers, it is interesting, in California we grow \$3 billion of agriculture in my district. None of it is subsidized by the Federal Government.

These associations, they have all come out and said, we support trade agreements, they support all of these trade agreements; but as individuals, that is not the market we are interested in. We do not expect; in fact, if anything, they are going to be growing these products and trying to send them into us, because they are going to try to grow strawberries, which is a value-added project.

We grow the most strawberries in the world in my district, we grow the lettuce, we grow the things that you find that are fresh fruits and vegetables, and those countries have climates that they can grow those. So what are they going to do? They are going to compete with our farmers, if they can at all; and frankly I do not think the worry is that they can compete much, at least not on a large scale.

□ 2045

So this issue of the kind of the social conscience of CAFTA is missing the point. We need to invest in America's best, which is our social responsibility as the leading economic engine, the leading power of the world, to make sure that the level of living for the rest of the world is being improved by our business ventures, not being taken advantage of.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think there were a couple of things that you said tonight that were very good. There is nothing in this agreement that will raise living standards when you look at the six countries here, and their incomes, especially Nicaragua, Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador, all make no more than about one-tenth of what Americans make.

There is nothing in this agreement to bring worker standards up, to bring environmental or food safety standards up. In fact, this agreement protects prescription drugs and the prescription drug companies; the agreement does that, but does not protect workers standards.

It protects Hollywood films, but does not protect the environment and food safety. And when you talk about the size of these economies not buying very much from the United States, the size of these five Central American countries, the economic output is about the equivalent of Columbus, Ohio or Memphis, Tennessee or Orlando, Florida. It is simply not a place that is going to buy from the United States.

But what we should be doing is a trade agreement, a renegotiation of CAFTA, in a trade agreement that will lift worker standards up so that these incomes begin to rise, so that over time they can in fact buy American products, they can send their kids to school.

You talk about children, particularly girls, not having any chance to go to school and get out of this situation. In this agreement, we found this in other places, this agreement just locks in that sort of exploitative sort of economic situation where people simply do not

have the opportunity that they should have.

Mr. FARR. It is very interesting. Before coming here I was in the State legislature and before that in local government, and before that in the Peace Corps. And what I learned in local government, and we are dealing with economic development all of the time, trying to encourage business development.

But, you know, in that process, you extract a lot from business. Because it is essentially sort of that corporate responsibility to be a citizen of your community. In California, we tax them a lot. If you are going to build hotels, we tax the hotels for tourism occupancy tax. That stays with the city.

We tax sales tax, high sales tax. And communities can raise it higher. We tax on gasoline. We have a huge tax. And people will say, yeah, California is a big high-tax State. But guess what? It is also the biggest economic engine, the fifth largest economy in the world. The most start-up businesses, the most everything.

California is not suffering by the fact that it is proud to have businesses that share in their prosperity through the taxation process and through being good corporate neighborhoods. Silicon Valley is out raising their own money to support local transit, their own money, private money, to build housing for people on the street, for the homeless and for people who cannot afford the rental rates, to have subsidized housing, and leverage that with public money.

That is the kind of agreement you ought to be making. It ought to be this quid pro quo. It is not just about trade. It is not just about going in and taking advantage of people, but, really, what is the social benefit that you get from allowing businesses to come into your community, or allowing businesses to come into your country. And I do not see that in this legislation. That is the problem. We are missing the leadership role that the United States has.

And these things could be negotiated out. Yes. The agreements are all about trade agreements under the GATT agreements, which are commodity by commodity. So it is not so broken that those things do not already exist. So you can deal in bananas, and you can deal in sugar. You do not need CAFTA to do that.

But you do need these side bar agreements. And here we have created the Millennium Fund. I compliment the President for creating it. But I think at the same time, the Millennium Fund has gone to these countries and said, What do you want? It is really ironic. I do not think they have talked to the poor people. I do not think they have talked to the people they need to talk to, even though it is supposed to be very good transparency, because they come back and say, We want big superhighways.

Well, that is not going to benefit the education of poor kids. We want bigger ports so bigger ships can come in here,

because when we do have the ability to trade with America, we are going to be needing places for a lot of these American goods for land and for our goods to go out. We are forgetting the basics.

We are losing the war on drugs in Colombia because we are fighting the war by eradicating crops. We are investing very little in alternative development and alternative crops. You cannot win on the war on poverty by just making businesses be more successful. I mean, the lesson in this country is that if you want to win the war on poverty, it has got to be a social collective responsibility to assure that there is investment in institutions that help the poor, and that the poor can help themselves through programs like Head Start, through programs like the welfare social services that we have.

And, you know, I just think that the debate here about our hemisphere, we ought to be prouder of this hemisphere. We ought to be more involved in this hemisphere. We ought to be looking at the responsibility, and we have seen that with all of the immigration issues. We debate immigration all of the time. It is sort of like if we build a higher fence and make the border secure, 10 million undocumented people will sort of disappear. It is not going to disappear as long as you have a border between the United States and Mexico, the changes between the richest and poorest border in the world, and the heaviest trafficked border.

We have not learned. The only way you are going to improve that is by investment in Mexico. We have NAFTA. NAFTA has not risen Mexico up to the level where people can stop coming across the border. So what makes you think that CAFTA is going to raise the level of El Salvador and Nicaragua so that they do not migrate up through Guatemala and up through Mexico, and are part of the illegal immigrants?

This is what I am saying, that we cannot deal with this on a piecemeal fashion. We have got to have a bolder, wiser, more inclusive commitment to raising, as you said, raising the ships, raising, you know, the tides for all ships, not just winners and losers.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. You said something very perceptive about California, and whether it is the Silicon Valley or whether it is the Central Valley or whether it is Cleveland, Ohio, what our country has been successful in doing is workers in our country share in the wealth they create.

If you work for someone and you help that employer make a decent living and make a good profit, you as an employee share in the wealth you create. That company also pays taxes in that community, so that the community has safe drinking water and the community has decent road structure and other kinds of infrastructure.

But, as you know, whether you go to Nicaragua or whether you go to the Mexican border or any number of countries in the developing world, workers do not share in the wealth they create.

I have been to an auto plant in Mexico 3 miles from the United States. The workers work just as hard as workers in our country. It is a clean, productive plant, with the latest technology.

The difference between a Ford plant in my district and the city I live in, and a Ford plant in Mexico, is the Ford plant in Mexico does not have a parking lot, because the workers are not sharing in the wealth they create.

You can go around the world to Vietnam, and go to a Nike plant, and the workers cannot afford to buy the shoes they make. Or go to Costa Rica, the workers at a Disney plant, the workers cannot afford to buy the toys for their kids often.

So the workers are not sharing the wealth they create, and the companies are generally taxed very little, if at all, so they are not putting any money into those communities.

So if we would renegotiate CAFTA and put a program together like you talk about, with safe drinking water and infrastructure and schools so that boys and girls could go to school, and the workers were making enough that they could begin to buy some things, you would see their standard of living going up, and everybody would be better off, instead of just the largest corporations in the world.

And the interesting thing about all of that is even though the leaders of those countries, as you have said, most of them except Costa Rica like the idea of CAFTA, the workers in those countries, the citizens of those countries simply do not.

I would like to show you this here. Several months ago there was a demonstration in one of the Central American countries, I believe this is Guatemala. There have been 45 demonstrations against CAFTA in each of the six countries, and our country too, but 45 demonstrations where literally tens of thousands of citizens have shown up at the Parliament asking these countries not to ratify the agreement.

This is a case where the police attacked workers who were protesting peacefully. Two workers were killed. In place after place, it is clear that, like you understand, of course, they understand better than we possibly could why this agreement does not work. They know it will not raise their standard of living. They know they will not share in the wealth they create in a factory for their employer.

They know that these companies that come in will not pay taxes in their local communities so they can have safe drinking water and a better environment and better food safety standards and all that comes with an industry coming to town.

I know when an industry comes to Ohio, it means a lot for the community. It is good jobs. They pay property taxes for the schools. They build good roads because of their tax dollars. All that comes when these factories come, they mean continued misery.

Mr. FARR. Remember, when these companies come in, they are coming in

according to the zoning that has been adopted by the local community. They are coming because the community wants them there, and they know that they are going to be sharing in the responsibility.

I mean, I do not think we are trying to knock down responsible corporate entities, and companies that do a lot for their employees. But I think you cannot just do this on the fact that some of the companies do much better jobs than others.

Some of my companies in the Salinas Valley provide for all of their farm workers health care insurance, 401(k) plans, scholarships for every one of the farm workers' children that go to college. And I represent more farm workers than any other ag district in the United States.

And so I know that there are very responsible corporate entities that will do the responsible social thing. But you cannot just sort of, when you are dealing with a whole country like this, and dealing with major trade agreements, you cannot just sort of pick out that there will be some winners and losers.

The country cannot afford to have any losers. The country and the people in these countries, the poorest countries in Latin America cannot afford not to have a total commitment. And CAFTA does very little to ensure that the infrastructure is going to be improved. It only hopes that the trickle-down effect will make it better, thinking that there will be more capital in the country by investment and by productivity. At the expense of what?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. History has taught us otherwise; that it does not.

We have been joined by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) from Los Angeles who has been a real leader on all kinds of economic justice issues, especially trade issues.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for the time, and I applaud him for his efforts to expose what is wrong with CAFTA, the U.S. Central American Free Trade Agreement.

I must say he has put many hours into helping to organize us around this issue and to present the real facts about what CAFTA is and what it is not.

CAFTA is yet another unfair trade deal that will hurt working families in both Central America and the United States. CAFTA is not only the latest unfair trade deal in a decade of failed trade policies. Over the last 12 years, the U.S. trade deficit has exploded from \$39 billion in 1992, to over \$617 billion in 2004.

As a matter of fact, I think the most interesting thing about what is happening in the Congress of the United States is this tremendous trade deficit under what is supposed to be a conservative President.

And aside from the trade deficit, the United States deficit that we have here in America under this administration.

I think people should take note of that. In my home State of California, over 353,000 manufacturing jobs have been lost since 1998.

Nationwide, almost 2.8 million manufacturing jobs have been lost since President Bush took office in 2001. CAFTA is modeled on NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement. And let me say I did not support NAFTA, as I do not support CAFTA.

The North American Free Trade Agreement had a devastating impact on many American workers. When NAFTA was passed in 1994, the United States had a \$2 billion trade surplus with Mexico. In 2004, we had a \$45 billion trade deficit with Mexico.

NAFTA caused almost 1 million American manufacturing jobs to be exported to Mexico. CAFTA will cause even more manufacturing jobs to be lost to American workers. I do not care whether it is a Democrat President or a Republican President, I do not support these unfair trade agreements that cause us to have such huge trade deficits and who displace American workers.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for the press conference he organized where he had several business people who came to Washington, to explain how small- and medium-sized businesses will be unable to compete with cheap labor in Central America.

□ 2100

What I loved about that press conference was the fact that we had these representatives from small and medium-sized businesses coming to Washington, D.C. to tell the truth about how they have not been represented here in Washington. Many people think when the Chamber of Commerce speaks, they are speaking for all businesses. They made sure that everybody knew that this was not true.

They also made sure that everybody understands that the National Manufacturers Association was not speaking for everybody. These are small and medium-sized businesses that represent the heart and soul of America: Mr. Alan Tonelson with the U.S. Business and Industry Council, Mr. Jim Schollaert with the American Manufacturing Trade Action Coalition, Mr. Fred Tedesco with the PA-Ted Spring Company of Connecticut, Mr. Jock Nash with Milliken & Company of South Carolina and the National Textile Association, Mr. Mike Retzer with the W.W. Strohwig Tool & Die of Wisconsin, and Mr. Dave Frenzel with Pen United Technologies of Pennsylvania and Manufacturers for Fair Trade.

These business persons are the kind of business people that we talk about all the time. Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle talk about how we support small and middle-sized businesses, how they are the heart and soul of America. And how they really are responsible for creating more jobs than even the big conglomerates and the

international corporate businesses. We talk about how we want to give support to them. Well, this is how we can support them. Enough of the rhetoric. Let us get down to business.

If we want to support our small and medium-sized businesses in this country, we will not support CAFTA. We will not support what they have come to Washington to tell us undermines their ability to stay in business.

I think we could not have had a more clear representation of what is wrong with CAFTA than to watch these American business persons talk about what is wrong with CAFTA. When American workers lose good jobs in manufacturing, they often have no choice but to take jobs with low wages and no benefits.

The countries of Central America that are included in this agreement are some of the world's poorest countries. The average Nicaraguan worker earns only \$2,300 per year, or \$191 per month. Forty percent of Central American workers earn less than \$2 per day. Central American governments do not enforce fair labor standards, and thousands of Central American workers work in sweatshops with dreadful working conditions.

CAFTA will do nothing to improve wages and working conditions in these impoverished countries. Opposition to CAFTA is wide spread, not only in the United States but in Central America as well. CAFTA will increase agricultural imports into Central America by large corporate agri-businesses. These imports will put an estimated 1.2 million farmers out of work, displacing families and causing an increase in world poverty. When poor Central American farmers lose their jobs, they will be forced to move into over-crowded cities and seek work in sweatshops producing manufactured goods that are currently made in America.

CAFTA will cause American workers to lose good manufacturing jobs and again seek jobs with lower wages and no benefits. At the same time, CAFTA will cause Central American workers to lose their farms and seek jobs in sweatshop with meager wages and no benefits.

CAFTA is not a free trade agreement at all. It is an outsourcing agreement. I say it again: this is not free trade; this is about outsourcing American jobs to third world countries for cheap labor. That is what it is. Let us call it what it is.

It allows profit-hungry corporations to ship American jobs to impoverished countries where workers can be forced to work long hours for little pay and no benefits. It is a bad deal for Central American workers, and it is an equally bad deal for workers here in the United States.

So I would urge this President, Mr. Conservative President, Mr. President who claims to have concern about American businesses, Mr. President who should not be the President, presiding over a big trade deficit, a huge

deficit in the United States, I would urge him to withdraw this CAFTA agreement and negotiate a trade agreement that will create good jobs and provide real benefits to the impoverished people of Central America as well as the working people of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is awfully ironic that I am, who is considered a progressive and a liberal, even more conservative than the President of the United States when it comes to preserving American jobs and getting rid of a trade deficit that we do not deserve to have.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentlewoman is exactly right when she talked about small businesses, those manufacturers that we all have in our districts. The gentlewoman from Toledo, Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has joined us. We all have seen these companies of 50 and 100 workers, often nonunion, usually family owned, usually Republican business, mostly men, some women. We had 23 business groups represented yesterday in this news conference; but more importantly, these small manufacturers understand when a big company outsources their jobs, these small companies simply have to close. This may be 50 jobs in Lorraine, Ohio or Akron, Ohio. There may be no article in the newspaper that this plant has closed, and nobody knows much about it except these 50 families whom it is just devastating to.

I thank both of our friends from California for joining us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the stalwart in fighting for economic justice and fair trade, not these free trade deals that do not work, my good friend, the gentlewoman from Lucas County, Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR). We share the same county, Lorraine County, in our districts.

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the author of a book on fair trade, and my colleagues, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), for joining us this evening.

I want to focus for a few minutes on the important issue of agriculture. And the new trade ambassador who happens to be from Ohio claims that our agricultural exports to Central America are going to increase by \$1.5 billion, or almost double our exports, to the region as a result of CAFTA. But you know what, that is what they told us when we debated NAFTA. They said that we were going to increase agricultural exports.

Let us look at the record. The record shows with Mexico we are dead even. It did not make any difference. And with Canada we have fallen over \$4.3 billion into the hole. We were promised by the former trade ambassadors we would get more food-processing jobs, and that sounded like a good thing back in the early 1990s.

They told us we would get 54,000 new food-processing jobs. Guess what? We did not get a single one. In fact, we lost 16,000 food-processing jobs in this coun-

try. Even Brachs Candy is locking up their doors in Chicago and moving south. Same thing in my district, Spangler's Candy.

NAFTA boosters said to us, oh, farm cash receipts are going to go up by 3 percent a year. Guess what? They have gone down by that amount. And net farm income during the NAFTA period has gone down by nearly 10 percent from \$52.7 billion to \$47 billion. So NAFTA's legacy for farmers in America is declining prices, and they know it: shrinking revenues, shrinking markets, and rising debt burdens. And now the same people who gave us NAFTA want to give us CAFTA, the same group.

And what did the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) say, if you keep making the same mistake over and over again, it is a sign of insanity.

I agree with the gentleman 100 percent on that. In fact, the food consumption power of consumer markets in CAFTA countries is exaggerated. We already hold an \$812 billion deficit in agricultural products with the CAFTA countries. Already we are in the hole. With NAFTA and Mexico, we were almost even. We were in debt a little bit with Canada, and it has gone completely south.

We know CAFTA will mean more sugar imports into our country. We also know in one of the most important areas which hardly anybody has talked about, in ethanol production which is a brand-new market for our country. We have got about 54 ethanol plants in this country right now. A Corn Belt State like Ohio would benefit enormously from some of the new energy legislation we are working on in the Congress.

But what CAFTA would do is, guess what, it would open up exports from Argentina and from Central American countries of ethanol-based products, including ethanol made from sugar into our market. So in the same ways we are becoming and have become totally addicted to imported petroleum, now we will get addicted to ethanol by imports through agreements like CAFTA, rather than finding a way to help our farmers bring those markets up in this country.

Minnesota is really leading the way. I love the people of Minnesota, the farmers of Minnesota. I just wish I could do for America what they have done for Minnesota in the area of ethanol production.

So when we look at this CAFTA agreement, and I know time is limited this evening, I just wanted to come down here and say if we had a decent renewable fuel standard that would require an 8 billion gallon reserve, what we could do for real farm income, not subsidy income, but real farm income in the entire Corn Belt region, in the sugar beet region of this country, in the cane sugar region, all these areas of our country where we could really make a difference. Wow, what we could do here at home.

I just think CAFTA is a bad deal. I think we should learn from the past. And agricultural America knows it is a bad deal. The only people who are supporting this are some of the brokering companies. Whether they get their product in China or whether they get it in Argentina or in the United States, these transnationals, they really do not care. They just want to trade on the backs of those who are actually doing the work.

We should care about the American people. We should care about the farmers in our fields. We should care about those people who are working in our processing companies and keep that production here.

Mr. FARR. The gentlewoman and I are both on the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations, and I cannot think of two people that fight more for small farms and the ability of rural America to have a successful economic development.

I am wondering if the gentlewoman is finding in Ohio, in the people the gentlewoman has run across, most of the agricultural trade associations are supporting CAFTA. As I run into the members of those associations, they are not so keen on it. They are very concerned. They think that these are agrarian countries, and so what is going to happen is the products that they grow and can get into the school lunch program, can get into the organic program, can get into essentially the multi-billion dollars that America spends on food for the military and food for food stamps and things like that, that these products will be produced not at the local farmers market and additional farmers markets; but these products will come from Central America, at the expense of small farmers in our country, particularly of specialty crops.

Ms. KAPTUR. I think the gentleman has raised an excellent point. I think the Washington trade groups are totally out of touch with their members at the local level.

I have had farmers say to me when we were debating the NAFTA agreement, why should we let bell peppers come in from countries that do not have environmental regulations like we do? Bell peppers coming in with DDT, when DDT was being banned in Ohio. They were not competing on a level playing field. They were on a different field. They would go down to these towns. You cannot even call them towns. Little dusty villages in Mexico where these bell peppers were grown. And the farmers would say, I have been going down there for 20, 30 years. They do not even have an asphalt road yet.

So the whole system of life was different, and they were being asked to compete with a country that really did not allow its farmers to earn more by virtue of the hard work that they did. They respect the people of Mexico, but they knew the system was rigged against them. They said, just give us a level playing field.

Mr. FARR. I think the difficult is, and we all agree on this, that you cannot just have these trade agreements which are private business contracts and expect the social responsibility of both sides of the agreement are going to raise those opportunities for people who are less educated, for people who are below living standards.

It has got to be a totality. If we are going to trade ideas and products, we have also got to trade in education. We have got to trade in social responsibility and minimum standards, minimum wages, minimum protection for labor, minimum protection for environment. The whole quality of life has to improve.

This is the most giant business deal that the United States will ever make. And it is tragic that in this giant business deal we are not dealing with all of these other issues that we came here to Congress to try and solve.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for his comments on that. I think the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) is exactly right and he understands how one has to have integrated policies.

I wanted to say as I am looking at the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) who has fought so hard for people to build a real middle class in this country and to help other nations help their people create a middle class, what is really sad about these trade agreements is it pits the poor against the more poor. It draws our living standards down. But one farmer that I met in Mexico said to me, what is really upsetting is that we feel like crabs in a bucket.

□ 2115

Every time we try to get up a little bit, somebody else pulls us down, and they were fighting this rush to the bottom, which is the expression that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) uses so well. One poor person pulling another person down, rather than having the standards that the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) is talking about, where we all agree to a minimum standard. We bring people up, not pull them down.

Ms. WATERS. I think you are so right, and I thank you so very much for the leadership you have provided on these issues. I thank you for opening up opportunities for women to go down to Mexico and take a look at what is going on there. It is because of you that a lot of people in this Congress have become interested in this issue, and I appreciate the work you have done.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for saying that. Also, 60 percent of those people who are employed in these Central American countries are women. They are working in banana companies trying to pack these crates, 40, 50, 60 crates an hour. They are being forced to make men's trousers, 400 to 600 pairs an hour, and they have to work 2 weeks to afford 2 pairs of slacks down there, which costs \$39.40, and yet, they are making 400 to 600 pairs of trousers an hour.

What kind of a continent, what kind of a world are we creating when we pay so little heed to those who work so hard for so little and then we put our workers out, largely women workers in the textile industry in this country, where we farmed out those jobs in places like North Carolina, South Carolina, are hollowing out of this production? At least they were in the middle class. They had finally made it to the middle class. What are we doing in this country?

Ms. WATERS. It could not have been better stated.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank all of my colleagues. Our time is about up. Thank you very much for your passionate remarks in closing.

I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

This Congress will likely vote on this agreement soon. It is pretty clear that the most powerful people in all seven countries, the Dominican Republic, the Central American countries and the United States, support this agreement but overwhelming opposition among the public, small business owners and family farmers and ranchers and workers and people who care about the environment.

If this Congress does its job, it is clear we will defeat this CAFTA and then renegotiate one that lifts up workers in all seven countries. I thank all of my colleagues for joining us this evening.

30 SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ING-LIS of South Carolina). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again, it is an honor to address the House for another week. The 30 Something Working Group has come to the floor to talk about issues that are not only facing young people but also facing Americans in general, and I think one of the greatest values we have in this country is caring about future generations and caring about those that cannot represent themselves.

It is important that we come to this House and in this great democracy that we celebrate every day and recognize the contributions of those individuals that go to work every day. Those individuals know what it means to punch in and punch out every day. Those individuals know what it means to not have health care; those individuals that are going to have to pay down this \$7.8 trillion deficit; those individuals that are running small businesses that would like to have assistance from this Federal Government to be able to carry