This show is an opportunity to share knowledge and experience. For example, the beekeeping exhibits have drawn a lot of attention since 2007 and the widely publicized plight of the honeybee from colony collapse disorder. This disorder is characterized by sudden colony death, according to the Mid-Atlantic Apiculture Research and Extension Consortium based at Penn State.

It is the honeybee that is responsible for pollinating 100 fruits, vegetables, and nuts that are vital to us. Scientists and researchers are getting closer to finding the cause of the colony collapse disorder but are not there yet. Sharing awareness is key to finding the cure.

Agriculture remains Pennsylvania's number one industry with more than 63,000 farms statewide. Farm products range from dairy production, cattle, mushrooms, corn, and various greenhouse crops. Also, timber harvesting continues to be a major job source throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, particularly in my district because of our unparalleled hardwoods.

Having come from a family of dairy farmers, I am always happy to meet and talk with those who continue to work on the farm and provide our Nation's food supply. This annual event is one of the best opportunities to do just that because of the diverse mix of farmers, State and local government officials, and agriculture associations, all of which have great agricultural expertise.

There are many reasons for celebrating the Pennsylvania Farm Show, and I hope I have piqued your interest enough to have you attend this year or next and experience it for yourself.

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

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

INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT CREATES JOBS

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, this week two so-called reporters from Associated Press, a Matt Apuzzo and a Brett Blackledge, did a supposed analysis of the investment in transportation and infrastructure projects from the so-called stimulus legislation. They came to the conclusion that there was no effect on local unemployment and it barely helped the beleaguered construction industry. That is a pretty interesting conclusion when we can document the jobs created, the hours worked: 250,000 direct jobs were created, and when you look at the secondary employment impact, you are up to about three-quarters of a million jobs. There are 8,587 highway and transit projects under construction, and it had no effect on local unemployment? What they are saying is, because of the hemorrhaging in other parts of industry and business in America, the unemployment rate is going up.

Now, what if we had just not made the investment in transit and infrastructure and had walked away from those 750,000 jobs? Would they have written a story saying that unemployment increased by nearly a million jobs because the Federal Government failed to invest in transportation and infrastructure? This is a totally perverse and bizarre conclusion reached by these two individuals.

If they wanted to write about the tax cuts in the stimulus, I would say they are right. Remember, the total investment, total, in hard jobs, in transportation infrastructure in this bill was about 5 percent of the gargantuan stimulus bill, 5 percent, yet it created 25 percent of the measurable jobs. Now, the tax cuts which totaled 8 times more, 8 times as much money was spent on tax cuts, something which mimicked the failed Bush policy that President Obama wanted to do to have a bipartisan bill and cut a deal with three Republican Senators, we got $300 billion of tax cuts for three Republican votes for that bill which have not created a single job or prevented the loss of a single job.

Ask any American who is still working what they did with their tax cut last week, and they will say, What tax cut? Oh, President Obama's promised tax cut, the one the Republicans in the Senate insisted on.

They would say, I didn't get a tax cut.

Yeah, actually you did. There was a slight reduction in your withholding. And you are not getting sent a check this time. You are paying a tiny bit more.

Now, I have a lot of people in my district who could use that $12 a week. But they will also say to me, Congressman, that is not going to put a single person back to work. It is not going to help my neighbor down the street who doesn't have a job and used to work in the construction industry, and these two turkeys have the temerity to come up with a so-called study which is now being quoted by the likes of the Wall Street Journal and other right-wing institutions as proving that public investment in infrastructure doesn't create jobs. It arguably did create jobs, but I will say it was way too small.

We have 160,000 bridges in our national system that are weight limited or functionally obsolete. What if we had a plan to replace all of those bridges? What about the jobs in the steel industry to produce the steel for those bridges? What about the engineering jobs and the construction equipment jobs and all of those things? This stimulus was too small and too short-term in terms of transportation and infrastructure. It was a one-time thing. It did create a lot of jobs and it kept a lot of people off the unemployment rolls, but it didn't get the maximum effect it would get with a long-term investment in transportation and infrastructure where you get people ordering new rock-crushing machinery. There happens to be some made in my district. Or new streetcars. We are making some of those in Oregon, too. Or buses that are manufactured in the Midwest with components from all around America. Those sorts of things will put a heck of a lot of people back to work, will revive our manufacturing so we actually need not less, which would be the conclusion of these guys, but more investment in our crumbling transportation network in America.

The city of Chicago, I hope they are listening down at the White House, got a grand total of $350 million towards its $6 billion backlog on the Chicago Transit Authority. They are holding up some of the ''L'' with 2-by-4s and other sorts of braces. They spent that money in 30 days. They ordered buses. They ordered steel. They put people to work immediately. They could have spent a billion. They could have spent $2 billion in that time period, but the money wasn't there. It was too small, but it did create a heck of a lot of good jobs and make needed investments in this country.

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

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

AMERICA CANNOT SPEND ITS WAY OUT OF DEBT

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, you know, I really get a big kick in listening to my Democrat colleagues when they talk about spending all this money on infrastructure and how we are not spending enough and how we need to come up with another stimulus bill. The fact of the matter is, since they took control of Congress, the national debt has gone up by almost $4 trillion. You can't spend your way out of debt. You can't create jobs by digging yourselves into a bigger and bigger hole, and that is exactly what they are talking about doing.

Now they say they have created jobs. They said that unemployment would not go above 8 percent, and they say they have created or saved 2 million jobs or thereabouts. The fact of the matter is 7 million jobs have been lost; lost. Seven million jobs have been lost.

Now, even if you said and accepted their premise that they saved or created 2 million jobs, you would still be

5 million jobs in the hole, and the unemployment rate isn't 8 percent. It is 10 percent, and it was up above that, and I believe it probably will get there again.

You know, I just can't understand why they don't get it. John F. Kennedy, a Democrat, he got it. He said time and again when he was President, if you give people more disposable income, they will spend it to buy more products. And if you give more income back to business and industry through tax cuts, as I was just talking about with individuals, that will give them more money for investment and to hire employees. And if people and industry go out and spend that tax cut, then they are going to have to produce more products; more refrigerators, more cars, more vacuum sweepers, whatever it is. And if people buy more because they have more money to spend collectively across the country, 300 million people, then you are going to see employment rise; employment rise, not unemployment.

John F. Kennedy understood that, and that is why early in his administration he put through tax cuts. And then when Ronald Reagan came in after the debacle called the Carter administration where we have unemployment at 12 percent and inflation at 14 percent, worse than we have today even, Reagan came in and said we are going to cut taxes. And I think he even mentioned John F. Kennedy. And so Reagan, Yeah, well, we are going to cut taxes instead of raising taxes. So they cut taxes and we worked our way out of a very severe recession. We created millions of jobs and had an economic expansion that lasted 20 years because we cut taxes and gave people their money back, some of it, and we gave business and industry some of their money back so they could make investment. That's the way you do it.

And yet the Democrats and the Obama administration are talking about the tax cuts that were put into place early in the Bush administration. They want to let them expire this year, which is going to be a drain on the economy, take more money out of people's pockets, more money out of business and industry, and exacerbate the economy, the economic problems we are facing.

And so when I hear my colleagues come down—I love to listen to their rhetoric. Their logic eludes me, though, because you are not going to solve the unemployment problems or the economic problems in this country by loading more debt and more taxes on the backs of the American people. You are going to cause the future generations to look back at us and say, Why did you do that to us, because you are going to have inflation and you are going to have higher taxes and you are going to have a deteriorating economy, and you are going to have the government taking over more and more responsibility, which is what a lot of socialists in this administration would like to see. They believe government can do the job better than the private sector. Obviously, most Americans don't agree with that if you look at the polls lately just on the health care bill alone.

So I would just like to say to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that if we are serious about solving the economic problems, let's take a look at history. Let's look at what they did in the Kennedy administration. Let's look at what they did in the Reagan administration, and let's say we are going to extend the tax cuts. We are going to cut taxes further right now because it will give people more disposable income, give more money for business and industry to invest, and people and industry will buy more; therefore, they will produce more products and more people will go back to work and you will lower the unemployment rate.

The unemployment rate today, it is not 10 percent, incidentally. There are a lot of people who have been getting unemployment checks that aren't included anymore. It is more like 15 to 17 percent, and this administration is responsible for it.

MISTAKES OF BANKS TRANSFERRED TO TAXPAYERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the conventional wisdom flowing through the media to our Nation is that without the Wall Street bailout, America would have gone into economic depression and many banks would have failed. Well, the bailout passed. But think about it, then America fell into depression. Unemployment skyrocketed, and since January of last year, 141 banks have failed and been resolved through the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation with more to come. Yet the biggest banks that did the damage were rescued rather than broken up and held accountable. These big banks gambled wildly, taking huge risks with our money and our mortgages, and now they are transferring their trillions of dollars of mistakes to our taxpayers for generations to come. What's wrong with this picture?

The public's anger is rising, rightly. That can make a difference because that will affect elections. Yet the powerhouses of Wall Street who took TARP money within a year are earning the strongest profits in America compared to every other business, and they are handing themselves exorbitant bonuses, over $150 billion and counting. Clearly what Congress did was incorrect.

□ 1645

America has fallen into a deepening depression, more unemployment, with projections for a jobless recovery, with rising trade deficits, which weren't supposed to happen because of the value of the dollar. Why? Because the financial crisis was resolved in the wrong way. The financiers who created this house of cards are still rewarding themselves and doing a reverse Robin Hood—taking from others to reward the privileged few. That doesn't sound like the America I know.

Credit remains frozen across our country. Credit being frozen means no more jobs. It means jobless recovery, because businesses cannot make payroll. They cannot buy supplies. They cannot maintain their inventories. When five megabanks in our country control nearly half the deposits of the American people, that is too concentrated. It is too unaccountable. And it is too much of a transfer of power from the many to the few. That isn't what America is about.

Alone, or joined together in groups, these big banks successfully lobbied Congress to weaken financial regulatory reform and defeat one of the most powerful and necessary reforms rebuilding the protective walls between regular, prudent commercial banking and speculation. Financial reform should have deconstructed the too big to fail firms that caused this economic crisis, but the bill that whizzed through this Congress a few weeks ago did exactly the opposite. It enshrined them, it grandfathered them.

I introduced H.R. 4377, called the Return to Prudent Banking Act, which would restore the Glass-Steagall protections, which were overturned a decade ago in a bill called Gramm-Leach-Bliley that sailed through this Congress. Our bill would restore the barriers between commercial banking and speculation, not allowing this transfer of power to the abusers.

I look forward to working with my other colleagues, like Congressman MAURICE HINCHEY of New York, such a leader on this issue, to combine our bills, to return our financial system to a prudent banking system, one in which credit is no longer seized up because we fixed what is wrong with the fundamentals.

Our citizens demand a more competitive banking system, one that is less concentrated, and without the systemic risks our current one encourages. The momentum is building for real change, and I am glad there is an election this year. Because despite the work of the megabanks to enshrine themselves, we still have hope because more Americans are paying attention.

There is an article in the Wall Street Journal today by Thomas Frank entitled Bring Back Glass-Steagall. He is right. The so-called financial regulatory reform bill that moved through this House too quickly last year before examining the root causes of this crisis has a bottom line. The House bill basically grandfathered the megabanks, which set the stage for a future meltdown in our economy because the Federal Government becomes the open arms for Wall Street's high risk future behavior. The big banks of course will