

And I was thinking about this coming over here tonight. I will make a slight presumption, but it's not much of a presumption, that possession of cocaine in Arizona is against the law—especially large amounts. I would make the presumption that possession of marijuana in Arizona is against the law. I think there's a good presumption by an old judge from Texas that possession of heroin in that State of Arizona is against the law. I do think under those circumstances, if those are written into the code, which I presume they are, they are probably felony cases of a serious nature. I think that carrying automatic weapons, fully automatic weapons, is both against the Federal and the State law in Arizona. I'm pretty sure. I know they are in Texas.

Now, if people are coming across our border armed with AK-47 weapons, backpacks full of drugs, marching in caravans, in many cases dressed in uniforms—paramilitary uniforms—marching into the public lands of Arizona and I guess turning over to some motorized operation they want to that takes it and spreads that filth all over the country, the State of Arizona has the right to enforce, if nothing else, the drug laws of Arizona. And I would argue if they don't have the resources to stop this epidemic of violence and drugs and prostitution and smuggling of individuals from every part of the world into our country, if there's not enough law enforcement personnel to put on the ground to enforce those laws, which they have absolutely the right to enforce, they ought to be able to call out the Guard to do it, as long as they abide by the posse comitatus laws.

So this is just after you have caught the drug dealer with a pack full of heroin and an AK-47 on his shoulder. How bad is it to ask, Oh, by the way, are you an American citizen? I don't know. First off, you don't have to call the Border Patrol. Throw them in jail and prosecute them for violation of State law. So this thing is kind of out of whack a little bit, by my way of thinking. But the real shame to me is suing Arizona.

Finally, we spent almost a year and a half talking about, dealing with, and behind closed doors, writing of the majority party's bill for health care reform. And in that bill we basically mandate that the government will tell people what product they will buy and who they can buy it from. As a result, the individual mandate extends the commerce clause power beyond the economic activity to economic inactivity. That is unprecedented. In other words, what they're saying is, if you don't buy this product for your employees, you're going to be punished with a \$2,000 fine. And the question becomes: Is this commerce as the commerce clause of the United States is written?

Basically, we have expanded the Federal Government probably farther

under the commerce clause than any other single clause in the Constitution. And now, using the commerce clause as an argument, the argument in here is that you can make an employer buy a product sold by a company or your choice of companies, or if they don't buy it, they get fined. And the question is, Where does that stop? If that's the law, why can't we make everybody buy a Chevrolet? I don't know. Why can't we? If we can make them buy Blue Cross or some other company's policy or be fined \$2,000, why can't we say everybody that buys a car in America next year has to buy a Chevrolet or a Buick or a Ford? Let's not get in trouble with the auto manufacturers. Or, I don't care what. You have to buy one or they pay a \$2,000 fine. If they can do it on health care, they ought to be able to do it on automobiles, shouldn't they? Where does it stop? That's the kind of issue we've got to ask ourselves as we look at this.

Never before has the Congress used its commerce power to mandate that an individual person engage in an economic transaction with a private company. Regulating the auto industry or paying cash for clunkers is one thing; making everyone buy a Chevy is quite another. This is in *The Washington Post*.

But the real question we have to ask ourselves is: How are we marching over human rights in this country, individual rights—the real thing that sets us apart from the rest of the world? How are we stepping all over people as a government. And shouldn't we be concerned about stepping all over people? And I've lost count, but I know it's in the teens of people who have filed lawsuits against the Federal Government in at least two jurisdictions, and maybe three, saying this is unconstitutional; you can't do this.

Shouldn't we be thinking about all this? Shouldn't we wonder if the rule of law prevailed in other parts of that 2,500-page document we call the ObamaCare or health care bill? Because when we wrote that bill, we created some of those laws that are the rule of law. And the rule of law has to comply with and be supported by the United States Constitution, because that's the rock we build our laws upon.

So as we finish up talking today about the rule of law, I bring these issues up so that this House and others can ponder them and say, As we continue to march down a corridor which steps all over the rule of law, where does it stop? And where do we stand up and say, Wait a minute, that's not right. Wait a minute. When a court tells you something and orders you to do something and then you appeal it and the appeals court tells you the same thing, then what is it about "no" that you don't understand? When Governors are trying to save their environment, why are you getting in the middle of their business and not letting them build a berm. Why aren't you helping them?

We've got issues we've got to talk about as far as the overreaching of this Federal Government, and I think we will. I think we will be discussing them this fall in a pretty serious manner.

Madam Speaker, my time is almost done. I thank you for the time you've yielded me tonight.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2020

THE COUNTRY'S ECONOMIC FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, it's a privilege to join my colleagues on the floor this evening to talk about the future of our economy and the new direction that we, the Democrats, are moving this country since taking over the Congress. We will plan to spend the next 45 minutes to an hour talking about where we've been and where we are at this point and the opportunities that we have to continue to go. My colleagues and I will talk about the progress that we've made and the efforts that we've employed to try to create jobs and turn the economy around.

We feel really excited about the accomplishments that we've made thus far. We have only to look back to the month before President Obama took office in January of 2009 to see at that point the economy having bled 700,000-plus jobs. Fast-forward to June, now July of 2010, and we are now adding, on average, between 125,000 and 200,000 jobs per month. And those are private sector jobs. We also have the addition of public-sector jobs through the census. But consistently month after month, particularly starting at the beginning of this year, the economy has consistently added private sector jobs, and that is incredibly important. We know that the way we're going to continue to turn our economy around, the key to our economic revival, is through job creation.

We can attribute much of the success and much of the turnaround that has occurred thus far to our passage of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act last February. We know that the \$787 billion stimulus package that we passed injected badly needed resources into the economy. But, Madam Speaker, it also injected badly needed capital in the form of tax cuts for the middle class and for working families, and that's something that doesn't get talked about enough.

We do talk a whole lot about job creation, but one of the keys to job creation, we know, is stimulating the economy through tax cuts targeted towards the middle class, working families, and small businesses. We have really endeavored to make sure that

we've struck a careful balance and the right balance between stimulating the economy by injecting the badly needed resources and also generating the tax cuts that we know are the lifeblood of so many small businesses, for them to have the capital available to be able to make the investments that they need in the infrastructure of their businesses so that they can have the wherewithal to add new hires and create more jobs.

And that's something that, if you compare and contrast the priorities of the previous administration to the priorities of the Obama administration and our leadership under Speaker PELOSI and the Democratic leadership here in the House of Representatives, the priorities back in the Bush era were, again, a return to the trickle-down theory of economics; that if you focus tax cuts and if you focus all of your attention on the wealthiest Americans, on the largest corporations, then somehow that largess will flow downward through the economy and, you know, "rising tides lift all boats." Except in this case, we know that that policy sunk the boats and, instead, we capsized a whole lot of small businesses in the water; and now we have been engaged in a really significant effort to try to right those ships and get the economy back on track. We're excited about the progress that we've made, but we also recognize that we have a long way to go.

There are a number of things that we are going to want to focus on tonight. Let's just look at the weekly economic update just in the last week and in the last month. If you look at employment, the private sector in the month of June created an additional 83,000 jobs, and the unemployment rate continues to fall. It fell to 9.5 percent. That's the sixth straight month of job growth in the private sector, and the fall in total unemployment reflected a decrease in our temporary census jobs. We added 9,000 manufacturing jobs in June, and that is the 11th month in a row that we have added manufacturing jobs.

So the progress that we're making is evident. We need to be able to continue that progress and not get too timid or gun-shy while we balance our priorities and make sure that we can focus on getting the jobs done.

The June jobs report was another reminder of just how far we've come since last year and how much work remains to be done to stop the free fall. The President and Congress took strong and immediate steps in the Recovery Act and put those people back to work after 22 straight months of job loss before President Obama took office. We now have seen our economy create private sector jobs for the last 6 months in a row, and we need to make sure that we can continue that recovery.

We're moving in the right direction. We know it's not fast enough, but that's why President Obama is fighting for additional steps to speed up the re-

covery and keep the economy growing. And he and we have made clear that creating jobs is our top priority.

Another priority, for example, in a State like mine, in my home State of Florida, particularly in south Florida, is making sure that we can get lending kick-started again and make sure that folks who are struggling to be able to make their mortgage payments and remain in their homes still have the ability to do that. We have been very focused, and the administration has been very focused on creating programs that will help keep people in their homes, that will give banks and banking institutions the opportunity to work with homeowners so that we don't see masses of individuals out on the street and continue the flood of housing that has become available on the market as a result. So we have a lot of things to think about.

I am joined tonight by several of my colleagues, the first of which is my colleague from Houston, Texas, who has been a long-time Member, focuses on the needs of her district like a laser beam, and has talked quite a bit about the need for job growth. She is struggling in her community, as a fellow Gulf Coast Stater, dealing with the aftermath of the BP oil spill, my good friend, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I am very glad to join multiple friends from a number of our great States in America. But more importantly, I am glad to be part of the team, working with the Congresswoman, our leadership, of course, and the President that focuses on creating jobs for Americans. That's an exciting message for all of us.

And I am very delighted to sort of dash the misstatements that have been going on about what we have accomplished here, and if I might just be redundant and cite the fact that the private sector has created 83,000 jobs in June.

But I would like to add something else, Congresswoman. I think you have seen this number as well, that this has been one of the best quarters for corporations in terms of profits. It is well known, and of course many of us encourage individuals to save money and to invest. But I think it's particularly important for the American public to know that our corporations have money. We've created the right economic atmosphere for them to grow, but they've decided to not create all of the jobs they could. And I would just like this evening to congratulate them for the profits that they've made, but I want them to be inspired to create jobs for the American people because the government has worked very hard to create a banking system for them to feel comfortable with as we pass the Wall Street reform so that they can create jobs, hire people.

There were 9,000 manufacturing jobs created in June, and I think that is extremely important, but 136,000 jobs since December. We have good news for

the American public. We have heard you, and we believe in buying America and making it in America. Therefore, we're going to be looking, over the next couple of months, to craft an agenda where you will see jobs being created by the message of this Democratic leadership.

We can tell you that we mean business because we can show you the facts. For the 11th consecutive month, the manufacturing sector has expanded. They have heard our call. They have heard our creed.

The Purchasing Managers Index registered at 56.2 in June. Of the 18 industries surveyed, 13 reported growth.

Look at, if you will, the gigantic change that we have seen in the automobile manufacturing sector where our companies are coming back. Many people complain about the approach we utilize, but we can look at the bottom line. Ford never took the money. GM has paid the money back. But what we want them to do is to manufacture smartly, hire people and create jobs. We have created—this Democratic leadership, this President has created the atmosphere for these companies to grow, and we want them to grow more.

Let me just add these one or two points. Consumers who have been feeling the pinch—we know there's unemployment, and right now, today, we're fighting to extend unemployment for those hardworking Americans who have seen their jobs go but need to support their families.

□ 2030

And let me make it very clear. Unemployment insurance is not a hand-out. It is a gift coming back, or it is an acknowledgment of your hard work, and we want to keep you over a bridge. We want to give you a bridge until you get another job.

But disposable personal income grew by 0.5 percent in May. It grew by .6 percent in April, and it grew by .4 percent in May. So you can see that it's steadily going up. It's steadily going up, and this is making a difference.

As I cite these last points, Congresswoman, to emphasize how we, on this side of the aisle, the Democrats, have a positive attitude about knowing that America's going to make it as we make products and as manufacturing grows, I'm disappointed that some of my friends who are on the other side of the aisle are thinking differently.

One of the things that they don't like to say is that when President Obama first came into office he inherited an economy that was losing an average of 750,000 jobs in 1 month. Now, I'm not the kind of personality that wants to look back and blame the last administration. But we know for a fact that there were no jobs created in the last 8 years.

And so let me conclude on remarks that have been made by a good friend. The minority whip asked the question, stimulus dollars have not produced jobs. This is what the minority whip

said while hosting a job fair in Virginia. And I would only like to say that to help the American people, it would be grand for us to work and march in step, in a bipartisan step, and that is the only thing we're concerned about, no matter what region we come from, is creating jobs.

Many of you know that we are being hit in the Gulf in many different ways by the BP oil spill. My good friend is being hit for tourism. I just had one of her mayors before my committee, and they said they're not being listened to about tourism.

I'm being hit because of fishermen and shrimpers and oysters, but also I'm being hit by the hardworking people who work in the energy industry who are innocent who may be losing jobs who cannot work offshore.

But our good friend, Mr. CANTOR, rather than working together to produce jobs, has said this: He hasn't seen any evidence of jobs being created.

Well, according to the Council of Economic Advisers, the Recovery Act created or saved more than 48,000 jobs in Virginia in 2009. In May, the Congressional Budget Office reported that in the first quarter of 2010 the Recovery Act was responsible for an increase in the number of people employed by 1.2 million, and 2.8 million. This is stunning.

And the job fair that Mr. CANTOR had, and I congratulate him for having a job fair. I congratulate the companies for coming, and I'm very glad that the companies that were in the room had gotten \$52 million in Recovery Act funds to create jobs.

Can you imagine?

This is not a partisan commitment to America. Wherever you are and you need a job, our stimulus dollars have been there.

And so I hope that we can end our criticism of the Recovery Act, because we know we can point out infrastructure projects and jobs created in all of our home districts, and we can point to the Democratic leadership where their message is jobs, jobs, jobs.

We have nothing to be ashamed of, but we must stay steady. We must stay consistent. We must make sure that the unemployment insurance goes out to our constituents. We're going to fight to the end to make sure that that goes where it needs to go, and that is to the people who need it.

And finally, I'm excited about the manufacturing spurt, surge that we're going to continue when we take the message of buy America and make it in America, we are creating jobs. And this Democratic leadership believes that America is standing tall, and we will be a country that recovers in a very, very special way.

And I'm delighted to be able to join with my friends who understand that there is an American economic recovery. We know it, we see it, and we're working on it.

I yield back.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you so much. Thank you, Ms. JACKSON LEE. Thank you for joining us and for your leadership. You have really been a stalwart fighter for the middle class and working families that Democrats have always stood for and stood by, and it's just absolutely critical that you've come down here tonight to help us get that message out. So thank you so much.

And it's a really wonderful transition, the item that Ms. JACKSON LEE closed on, making sure that we can make things again. And focusing on manufacturing and the resurgence of manufacturing in this country is a perfect segue to the priorities and the message that I know my good friend from Michigan, whose district I was just in this morning and had the privilege of joining him in his district in Ann Arbor and had an opportunity to meet with his constituents who are very supportive of his efforts to create jobs here and to focus the needs on Michigan's economy right here in Washington. So my good friend, MARK SCHAUER from the great State of Michigan.

Mr. SCHAUER. Thank you, Congresswoman. I'm proud to be here tonight to talk about our recovery, our economic recovery, about jobs, about a manufacturing agenda, and a "made it in America" agenda.

The people that I represent in Michigan understand that we have a fundamental problem with our economic recovery, and that is unfair trade policies that have cost us in Michigan hundreds of thousands of jobs.

I've cosponsored a bill to repeal NAFTA. I know there are different views on that. My views are very clear, that we need to support trade policies that put American jobs and American workers first.

The people at home that I represent have heard me say it, and I'm proud to say it on the floor of the House of Representatives here today. The time is now to fight for American jobs. The time is now to fight for American jobs.

There's an issue that I'm working on that I think I've gotten some attention of certainly Democratic leadership that wants to fight for American jobs and manufacturing and American workers, and I think this is an issue where my friends on the other side of the aisle will embrace as well. I've already got one Republican cosponsor on H.R. 5312. And it's a very simple issue. It's about fairness. It's about fair trade rather than trade policies that, again, have cost us millions of jobs in this country.

What I learned as I've been fighting for fair trade and giving our businesses, small businesses and large, an opportunity to make things again in my State and in this country, is that we have been using our tax dollars to support and create jobs in China rather than jobs here in the United States of America. As I dug into this issue, quite innocently, I was looking through

some census promotional materials, and I was shocked to find that some of those materials to promote something that I support 110 percent, the United States Census, each of our communities needs to get its fair share of dollars to support education and housing and public safety, and so forth, but some of these promotional materials, you guessed it, were made in China.

This is a key ring that—I carry this everywhere I go. And I show small businesses, tool and die shops, small manufacturers, they tell me that they could tool this little key chain, and it says, United States Census 2010. They could have the tooling done, they could have their manufacturing process ready in 1 week to make this little metal key chain.

Now, what you may not be able to see at home, you may not be able to read where it says United States Census. And again, I want to remind you that your tax dollars are paying for this. There's a little sticker, and you guessed it, it says "made in China."

Now, we can and we should make this with our tax dollars here. Now, China, when they joined the World Trade Organization in 2001, did not sign the government—

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Would the gentleman yield for a question on the key chain?

Mr. SCHAUER. I will yield.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Have you had an opportunity to talk with the Census Bureau about why it is that they are getting promotional material that they're using to get Americans to complete the census form from China?

Mr. SCHAUER. I have. Thank you for asking me that. I've heard a couple of interesting answers.

□ 2040

And I also have a hat. The people that I represent at home see me with this hat. It's white, a very poor quality hat that says "United States Census 2010," you guessed it, made in China. And the United States Census says, well, if products are substantially altered, substantially altered—this sounds like bureaucratic speak—can qualify as made in America.

So I guess what they consider substantially altered is this little metal key chain that was made in China, apparently had the "United States Census 2010" printing done in the U.S., and that's substantially altered. The hat that I usually have with me—I don't have it tonight—same thing: the hat is made in China.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. If the gentleman would yield for another question. So essentially the screen printing that was done onto the item, they define that as substantially altering the actual piece.

Mr. SCHAUER. Correct.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. So it's exempted?

Mr. SCHAUER. It satisfies the Buy American provision. I actually met with Commerce Secretary Gary Locke

about this—and by the way, I have been appointed to the President's Export Council, and I plan to work on these American jobs issues—is if there are certain orders that have to be done quickly, that there is a loophole.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Okay, but can I ask you another question?

Mr. SCHAUER. Yes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Because it's not like we don't know that we do the census every 10 years and that we are going to need promotional materials to promote the census.

Mr. SCHAUER. Exactly.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. So what would be the urgent nature or last-minute ordering that would be done for key chains or hats? We know in 2020 we are going to need that. We know in 2030 we are going to need that.

Mr. SCHAUER. Exactly right. Exactly right.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Stock up.

Mr. SCHAUER. The point is there is no good answer. And so we as Democrats have to look at—we have to scour the law, all of our laws, and look at Buy American provisions and make sure there are no loopholes like these that allow our tax dollars to create jobs in other countries. It's not just China. There are T-shirts, I think it was, made in Honduras and so forth.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Would the gentleman yield just for a quick comment? That very product, T-shirts, hats, and there may be many others, just fits right in with small- and medium-sized businesses, the very businesses that make jobs. I would yield to the gentleman for a response on that. Isn't this the kind of products that fit right into that?

Mr. SCHAUER. I was in Reading, Michigan, at a small business appreciation dinner. And I took the hat, took the key chain, and I said, Can anyone here make these? Hands went up. I mean, we can make these things. We do. And, in fact, when I testified before the House Ways and Means Committee on this issue, Congressman SANDY LEVIN held a hearing on our trading relationship with China. And the other thing that the Census Bureau says is, well, we don't make these things here, or we don't put them out—you know, we can't find folks here in the United States that make these.

I took seven or eight hats from my office representing different groups in my district. One was from Grand Ledge High School, their baseball team cap. They were all made in America. And of course those items were of a much better quality than the hat that was made in China.

My ultimate point is that China has been playing us for fools. China has been playing us for fools. They are eating our lunch. We are letting them do it. And so it's time for us collectively as Democrats, and I hope our Republican colleagues join us in this fight, it's time to fight for our jobs. This is a simple matter of fairness.

I will sum up this issue that what my bill does, it's a straight issue of reciprocity, a true fair trade issue. And the way it works is that we will allow Chinese companies the same access to our government contracts as China's government is allowing our companies to have access to their government contracts. So if that number in China is zero, then you guessed it, no Chinese company will have access to our government contracts. If the number is a million, then there will be straight reciprocity. So it's time for us to decide which jobs we are going to use our tax dollars to support. And I think the answer for us as Democrats is those jobs are American jobs.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Absolutely. And thank you so much for your leadership on this, Congressman SCHAUER. Really, this is something that you have been spearheading for a long time. And it's finally cracking through. I know that it's a priority that we're going to be taking up in the very near future. And I have a hunch that legislation is going to definitely be sent over to the Senate. And they would be hard pressed not to take it up.

With that, I want to turn it over to the very eloquent and hardworking stalwart for creating jobs and helping us turn the economy around in his home State of New York, Mr. PAUL TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and thank you for bringing us together to discuss an important aspect of the work we do, creating jobs, providing the dignity of work for individuals and families across this great country. And it's great to join with you and Representative JACKSON LEE, Representative SCHAUER. I know we are going to be hearing from Representative MURPHY.

But to be with everyone here and put our thoughts into a context that allows people to understand where we are headed with this recovery program, I think this chart expresses it in a very straightforward, simplistic way, a simple straightforward decline for many months, where we lost \$17.5 trillion of household income, where 8.2 million jobs were lost. We were headed for a deep, deep depression. And then this sharp straight line upward, which now expresses a recovery.

And I should point out that many of us believe, all of us here on this floor tonight believe, that we're not only recovering the economy, but we're restructuring the economy. That's an important aspect of the work we're doing. To create those jobs that will bring strength to the American worker, provide economic vitality for the American family. And so we see this clustering here of 6 months of recovery in the private sector area of job creation and job retention.

This is an important aspect to the investment that has been made, the policy reforms that have been initiated and responded to by this administra-

tion and the leadership of this House. But there is more to come. We're not satisfied with this.

But when we hear the critics from the other side of the aisle say where's that great number of jobs, where are those new jobs, well, we can point to these new jobs. They're there. They're a statistic. They're historic now. Where were you to decry the loss of those jobs? There was silence about the jobs being lost. There's huge contrast in their approach to the jobs. We heard nothing with job loss. Now we're hearing complaints, diminishing, of the efforts to create jobs, especially in the private sector, which is happening.

I think rather than dwell on statistics, and all of my colleagues have done this very well tonight about statistically showing that we're making progress and that we've turned the corner and that there's been a sharp U-turn in the response as a Nation for job creation, but I think we need to put it in the big-picture framework of trust, of competence.

This party, the Democrats, have come forward with a plan of action, one that has saved a lot of effort of further loss, economic consequences for American families. And we know who brought us that steep red line of decline: it was a party that continues to espouse privatization of Social Security, vouchering of Medicare, supporting tax breaks to ship jobs offshore, to call the response to Wall Street reform akin to attacking an ant with an atom bomb.

What a gross misrepresentation. What a gross unawareness of the issues that brought this country's economy to its knees. And so I bring forth that sort of contrast because I think it's what's governing the response today. The positives, the optimism that we share, the reforms we're promoting are swinging us upward. The contrast is that continued effort to further push hard on the middle class, to not allow for Medicare—a system that has worked well for our Nation's seniors—to raise the age limit, the threshold for Social Security. All of these efforts coming, all of this denouncement of Social Security, of Medicare, that has stabilized people in their retirement years, are what they advance and what they promote.

□ 2050

Are you going to trust that thinking, that party, to continually pull us into the red, or are you going to look at Democratic action where we've resisted this sort of behavior, where we are believing we can grow the economy, where we are embracing the theme that we are going to make it in America again? Let American workers know that we're standing for that turnaround.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TONKO. I most certainly will.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you. Because I wanted to ask you, the

way you're characterizing our colleagues' view—and I want to bring our good friend, Mr. MURPHY, into this discussion because he and I, in the 2006 to 2008, in the 110th Congress, we spent quite a bit of time on the House floor talking about the Republicans' efforts to privatize Social Security. And I'm wondering if your characterization of their agenda is one that you—is this something that you think is—is it your opinion?

From what I understand, we have a number of different third party validators that can document that they have consistently supported privatization of Social Security and vouching of the Medicare system as we know it.

Mr. TONKO. Oh, absolutely. As stated on the floor, we know what people want. We know where they want to take us. And I just think the contrast needs to be shared, because that same thinking is prevalent in terms of economic recovery, of economic development policies, of the sort of stopping of the bleeding that we promoted here in the House by inserting a new order of thinking.

You know, even with the energy crisis, with the devastation—Representative JACKSON LEE, you see it from where you sit, and Representative WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, you see it from the Florida perspective, Texas perspective—the gulf has been impacted. And for people from the cheap energy voice in this House, coming from the Energy and Commerce Committee, required an apology, demanded an apology from the President for coming down hard on BP. And all of the devastation to the economy, to the people, 11 lives lost, the ecosystem being devastated. That's another sign of difference where there isn't trust, in my opinion, or confidence.

So people, I think, are going to take a look at this and say, Let's continue this. The path out of the damaged zone may not be as quick as we would have liked, but it is happening. It is happening in a positive measurement and its growth in the private sector of job creation for 6 continuous months.

So I just think that contrast is important in the discussion that we have here tonight on the floor of the House.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you, Mr. TONKO. Really, you have hammered home, you're here night after night, week after week, to make sure that we can talk to the American people, illuminate not just our efforts on turning the economy around and creating jobs but our successes.

And someone who has been really focused on creating jobs, making sure, as a member of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, making sure that we do that through our innovation agenda, through our passage of the global warming and climate change legislation and also through health care reform, is the leader from the great State of Connecticut, Congressman CHRIS MURPHY.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Thank you very much, Representative WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Representative TONKO, Representative JACKSON LEE.

Listen, everybody should take a look at that chart that was next to Representative TONKO. It's not a coincidence that from month to month to month in the last year of the Bush administration we lost more and more and more jobs, and then immediately upon the new President, President Obama, taking office, we started to lose less and less and less jobs to the point now where we are adding jobs to the economy. It's because the stimulus has worked. It is because it is infusing new money into the economy. It is because tax rates are the lowest in this country since 1950. People have more money to spend than ever before. It's because we put money in the hands of teachers and firefighters and police officers and renewable energy companies and solar companies and advanced battery technology companies. The leading edge of our economy is creating jobs. It's because manufacturing is coming back.

To Mr. SCHAUER's point in June, 9,000 new manufacturing jobs in this economy. Since December, 136,000 new manufacturing jobs. The economy is heading in the right direction because we're putting new policies into place that are investing in small manufacturers, in small businesses, in Main Street.

And that's the dichotomy here. I mean, that's why I ran for Congress 4 years ago, because I watched Washington, I watched the Bush administration put all of its focus on the haves, on the big multinational companies, on the big oil companies, the big pharmaceutical companies, the big defense contractors, and very little emphasis on the small manufacturer with 10 employees around the corner from me; very little emphasis on the small mom-and-pop business that was struggling to get by paying for the energy costs and the health care costs that were padding the pockets of the big guys. That's the fundamental shift that's happened here, and you see it on issue after issue.

You see it in our approach to energy as, Mr. TONKO, you said we're investing in small renewable energy companies while the Republican leadership, on issues of energy, are asking for apologies to BP. You see it on health care reform, where we're putting power in the hands of consumers; whereas, the Republicans, when they tried their stab at health care reform with the Medicare Prescription Drug Act, put all the power in the hands of insurance companies and drug companies. And you see it with respect to manufacturing.

What we're talking about as Democrats is reinvigorating American manufacturing, to stop this defeatist notion that we can't make things here in America anymore. That's what sort of drove the House of Representatives when the Republicans were in charge was manufacturing is dead. They can't

do it here any longer; we're just going to sign free trade agreements with any country that comes to us without any regard to fair trade, that we're going to allow jobs to flow out to China, to India, to Mexico.

Democrats and the Obama administration refuse to give in to that notion. And I think you are going to see, over the course of the next several weeks and several months on this House floor, Democrats in the House of Representatives standing up for American manufacturing and saying we can make it here in the United States.

Mr. SCHAUER's initiative is right on, right on. If we can start standing up to countries like China and say, Listen, if you're going to—if you want free trade with the United States, then you have to allow us to sell to you just like you sell to us. I think it starts with the way that we buy things for the American Government.

A number of us are working on legislation that we hope will come before the floor very shortly that will say simply this: When the American Government buys things, whether it be for the census or whether it be for the Defense Department, let's buy it here in the United States.

Sure, you might be able to find that part for the jet engine 10 percent cheaper in China, but that job being created in China rather than in a machine shop in New York or Connecticut is costing our government, is costing our economy way more than the 10 percent you saved in lost wages, in lost taxes, and in increased social safety net costs like unemployment compensation.

So I'm looking forward to this summer and this fall as we build on the work that we've done here, when Democrats do what we're good at doing, which is standing up for small guys, for little guys, for American manufacturing, and that we put an end to what has been a decade-long defeatist attitude in this country and in this government to just allow for manufacturing to go to the folks that can do it for the cheapest and who can do it with the lowest and the worst environmental and labor regulations around.

I think we're going to stand up for American manufacturing. I think we're going to continue this trend of growing manufacturing jobs. I think it's going to be part, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, of the story of the recovery and the resurgence of the American economy.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you very much for helping us share that story with the American people and with our constituents, because it's absolutely critical, as we turn the corner and go through the summer, that we make sure that we talk about our efforts to continue to focus on job creation, and particularly on tax cuts for working families and the middle class because it's such a dramatic shift from where we were. And as we get closer and closer to the choice that Americans will be making in November, it's

going to be critical that people understand the choice that they're going to be making. They can backslide toward the Bush era, where the focus was exclusively on the wealthiest few in America, exclusively on the largest corporations and the trickle-down theory of economics that was disproven time and again, or we can continue to go in the direction, the new direction that we have been pursuing, which is focusing on job creation, focusing on making sure that the middle class can thrive.

And there is no one that knows that effort better than my good friend TOM PERRIELLO from the great State of Virginia.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Thank you so much for bringing this group together to talk about jobs.

As the gentleman from Connecticut mentioned, we can build things, make things, and grow things better than anyone else in the world if we give the American people a chance. For too many years, the other side has had a strategy of saying if we just nickel-and-dime the middle class enough, maybe we can win a race to the bottom with China. If we just cut into our environment enough, maybe we can win a race to the bottom with China. That's been the Republican strategy. We will not win a race to the bottom with China.

Our side wants to win a race to the top with China. We can outcompete China and India as well as Europe and Japan if we unleash the innovation, entrepreneurship of the American people that comes from our small businesses, if we understand that instead of bailing out the biggest companies for their failures we start to give just a little bit of support to our small business owners, our entrepreneurs, our scientists, our innovators.

□ 2100

We made a down payment last year on rebuilding America's competitive advantage. We made a down payment to unleash the research and development, the technology and the innovation in our small businesses. And we also understand that to win that race to the top against China, we have to have a 21st century workforce, so we have made college a little more affordable.

But it is not just kids headed to college. We also want to invest in those who want to learn a trade or career in technical training. That can be the difference between making minimum wage and 20 bucks an hour. Sometimes in this city or on Wall Street the difference between minimum wage and 20 bucks an hour doesn't seem like a whole lot, but to people back home it is the difference between being able to support your family or not, being able to pay those bills or not.

And we have tried to go after those who are nickle and diming the working class and the middle class in this country, the utilities, the credit card com-

panies, the health insurance companies and others that have been bankrupting our small business owners and our working class and middle-class folks.

We can still build it here. We are already seeing this in the energy sector. As many of the people here tonight have talked about, our farmers can be on the front line of that struggle for America's energy independence. Our manufacturing in our district is actually exporting to Asia on high quality efficiency technologies.

But it is not going to happen by pulling in our shell. It is not going to happen by thinking small. It is not going to happen by doubting the resolve of the American spirit, the American individual, the American entrepreneur. It is going to be doing it by giving that support.

Right now we can be doing more to rebuild this Nation's infrastructure; the infrastructure of yesterday, our sewage, our water, our roads; and of tomorrow, our broadband technology, our electric grid technology, so that we have the most efficient system. That is how we outcompete the world. We can still do this better than anyone else. We must call all of us to that best self right now to outcompete, and we are not going to do it by taking our foot off the pedal right now.

We are in tough economic times. Our American families feel it. Just this last week I did a tour of over a dozen Main Streets in my district in central and southern Virginia, talking to small business owners who spent a lifetime building up their business, their clientele, their reputation, to one day sell that business in order to be able to retire securely.

Times are tough. That is not where we live right now in terms of Main Street. But we have to start putting Main Street ahead of Wall Street, and I mean the kind of values we have on Main Street, of basic decency and accountability. That is what we need in terms of real Wall Street reform. That is what we mean in terms of transparency, like the DISCLOSE Act.

Where I come from, if you want to say something, you stand by it. You put your name by it. That is the simple rule of the DISCLOSE Act. To Wall Street, we are just saying if you don't have the money, you shouldn't be able to lend out the money. I think we need to do more to put a hard cap on these leverage restrictions. And I mean Main Street jobs, and thinking we still need those jobs for people that they can support a family with.

The people here tonight are dedicated to that working and middle-class American who has been struggling in these tough economic times, to make it a little easier to get that business started, a little easier to get through the tough times, a little easier to get that child off to college or to trade school, and a little easier to make sure that you are going to have a secure retirement.

I look forward to this month, because we are in an urgent time. This is not a

time for political games by either side. This is a time where we shouldn't leave until we have launched a manufacturing strategy and an agricultural strategy for the 21st century, where we have helped to put our construction crews back to work making this country more efficient.

We can do these things, I have no doubt that we can, and I believe that we will continue to fight the people here to make sure that that happens and that we will see that economic growth and recovery back on Main Street.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you so much, Mr. PERRIELLO, and thank you for your leadership in your district and the optimism and hope that you fight for every single day.

You know, it really always boggles my mind how the Republicans wake up every morning, come to work and decide, I am going to be an obstructionist today. I think today I am going to figure out yet another way to say no. And rather than come to the table and work with us, because they need jobs in their districts too, instead, they vote no here, and then they do like the minority whip did just in the last week when he was home in his district. After voting no on the Recovery Act and being critical of the Recovery Act, he didn't have any problem showing up and taking credit for one of the projects funded by the Recovery Act in his district. I think Americans really see through that transparent attempt at hypocrisy.

We are a party of genuine articles. We are Members who work hard every day to make sure that we can get it done for the American people and get this economy turned around.

There is no one that works harder at that in rural America than my good friend LINCOLN DAVIS from the great State of Tennessee.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Debbie, it is certainly good to be here. And as I have listened to the debate, the discussions that we have had about creating jobs in America, I think personally to go back and check a little bit of history, I represent a unique congressional district, but so do 434 other Members of the U.S. House. The district I represent is the fourth most rural residential congressional district in this country. It has the third highest number of blue collar workers.

We are hurting in the Fourth Congressional District, as we are throughout America. And what we have been seeing in the last several years is an administration and those who truly do not understand, not only rural America, but those who live in urban and inner-city as well.

As an example, starting on January 1st, 2008, through October 31st, 2009, we lost eight million jobs in this country, eight million moms and dads, eight million working sons and daughters who lost their jobs starting in January. I am not talking about 2007, I am talking about just in that 22-month period alone, eight million jobs. During the

Bush administration, around one million jobs were created, new jobs in the time January 1st of 2001 through the time that George Bush left office on January 20th of 2009.

If you take that growth number during that period of 8 years and look how long it would take us to find the jobs to replace the eight million that were lost, it would take 64 years at the same growth rate during the Bush administration.

So for the folks on the other side of the aisle, start using math. When you use the math, be sure it adds up to what you are saying.

When we look at eight million jobs that we have lost starting in January, the last 13 months of the Bush administration, through October 31st of 2009, if we were to create 200,000 jobs a month—during the Clinton administration that is what happened, about 250,000 on the average jobs per month during the 8 years that Clinton was President. But if we take those numbers, it will take over 3 years to just replace the eight million jobs we lost as a result of the trade policies and the policies of the Bush administration.

So if we want to start analyzing and blaming folks, let's get the facts straight. Let's get the figures right. People in my district don't care who it is, whether it is Bush or whether it is the Obama administration, whether it is the Clinton administration. They want jobs.

How will we create those? Through the eighties, in the area I represent, the apparel industry and the textile industry was a great part of the low wages, quite frankly, and some of the low-skilled jobs that we had.

My brother worked at a garment factory that worked almost 1,500 people in 1983. As a result of the trade deals that we cut with the Caribbean steel initiative and the Andean region, as the result of the tax policy that we had, we reduced taxes on the richest people in America from 70 percent, as it was on January 1, 1981, to 28 percent was the max.

I am not complaining because we had a tax cut, but here is what I do disagree with. We also during that period of time told small business folks, I am sorry, the depreciation schedules you had, 10 to 15 years, are no longer in place. It is going to take you 30-plus years now. So in essence what we told small business folks, you no longer have the tax breaks that you had at one time. You no longer have the tax incentives to create jobs for folks who live in rural America and inner-city or urban areas, because what we are doing is giving the tax breaks to the wealthiest individual wage earners, not small business folks.

When the other side talks about helping small business engage, let's really get serious about a tax policy through depreciation schedules that will encourage small business folks, the creator of 70 percent of the jobs in our country, an opportunity to start revitalizing America again.

In 1970, one out of four people worked in manufacturing in this country. Today it is one in 10. Let me repeat that. One out of four people worked in manufacturing. One in 10 does today. Where are those jobs?

In 1998, we signed an agreement, this country did, and I have to blame the Clinton administration and perhaps Mr. Rubin, who was the Treasurer at that time, we signed trade deals called GATT, General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, and we brought two large countries, India and China, which has a third of the world's population, into the WTO.

□ 2110

In 1998, you could not find an American label in China. It's hard to find an American label in America today. They're all over there. And when you purchase an item today that has always had an American label on it, whether it's toys, whether it's clothing, or whatever it may be, that American label is still stamped on it to look where it's made. It was made here at one time in this country. So from my standpoint, we've got to revisit many things that have caused us to lose 8 million jobs in 22 months. And if we don't do something about it, we'll never be able to regain those. We'll continue to see our economy and America slide backward when it comes to industrial development and economic growth.

I propose—and I hope that we can possibly take a serious look at a bipartisan effort to revisit the trade deals—the free trade deals—and make them reciprocal trade deals. Reciprocity means each of us shares equally. Unfortunately, that has not been the case. From this standpoint, when we also gave fast track to the former President to actually make the deals and send them to Congress, where we can't change those deals, it hamstrung the advocates for America, the direct representatives for America. The U.S. House of Representatives was denied an opportunity to amend any trade agreement.

So as we engage in trade in the future—and my time is running short—we need to realize 8 million jobs, 200,000 jobs created a month more than what we had starting the first of the month. It will take us almost 3 years to recover the jobs we lost in the last budget year with the Bush administration. I don't really like to be partisan, but I hear so much rhetoric from the other side. No one is pointing out the facts. It's time for the facts, and it's time the American people start listening to the facts rather than listening to bumper sticker slogans.

It's America, folks. It's our country, folks. It's not about Democratic or Republican politics. It's not about ideologues. An ideologue looks for the future. It's reality today. And the future will be reality when it appears. The ideologues will never have it where they want it—on the left or the right.

It's time we start worrying about America again and creating jobs for all of us in this Nation.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you so much, Mr. DAVIS. Really, I think it's so incredible. We had nine Members join us tonight for this hour. And we had the full philosophical spectrum—from the most conservative member of our caucus to the moderates to progressive members of our caucus. And that shows not only the big tent that we are in the Democratic Caucus but that we really are a reflection of America and American values, whether it's making sure that we can create jobs in rural America or the most urban core. It's absolutely critical.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Would you yield?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I notice there's a chart up showing the huge deficits. When Barack Obama was elected President, the first 30 days of his term he had to renew a trillion dollars and pay the interest on it. If JOHN MCCAIN had been elected, he would have had to renew a trillion dollars that he didn't bring to the table. Whoever was elected President and sworn in on January 20 in 2009, the next 30 days we had \$12 trillion in total national debt. You look at that on a monthly basis, that's a trillion a month we have to renew and pay the interest on it. It didn't matter who it was. So as we look at the national debt, please, America, yeah, we need to reduce the deficit. And we're working on that. We call that pay-as-you-go. We need performance-based programming in our budget.

And so I would just want to remind you: 8 million jobs lost, starting on January 1, 2008, America, and the current President, regardless of who it is—Barack Obama or if it had been JOHN MCCAIN—had \$1 trillion every month since they'd been President to renew and pay the interest on.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. You're absolutely right. Thank you so much for your leadership and for joining us this evening.

To close us out in the hour, we have a duo from the great State of Pennsylvania. Both of them are freshmen. The gentlelady from Pennsylvania was particularly pleased, I know, when her colleague from Pennsylvania was elected recently in a special election because that made her not one of the most junior Members in the Chamber. Now he holds that title. But the gentlelady from Pennsylvania, Mrs. KATHY DAHLKEMPER.

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Thank you so much. I appreciate the gentlewoman from Florida's leadership here. I want to reiterate my good friend from Tennessee brought up some of the important numbers that need be brought up. I'm from western Pennsylvania, as is my fellow colleague who has now made me not the junior Member. We have a manufacturing-based economy. And the numbers that my friend from Tennessee talked about are the numbers

that I have seen not in the past 2 years but over the last 12 or 15 years in terms of good manufacturing jobs lost in our region.

And what I find most exciting about this recovery that we are in is that we are making things again. And it's already been talked about tonight. But we are making things in America again. For the 11th consecutive month, the manufacturing sector has expanded in this country. We have got to depend on making things for our economic growth, not on the paper industry of Wall Street. And we have seen the problems with that, starting in 2007 and beyond.

I want to bring up a few highlights from an article from the Erie Daily Times today, an article that talked about Erie County, where my home is from: manufacturing employment rose in May for the third month in a row. Viking Plastic in Erie County had increased employment from a low of 65 workers to nearly 100. GE Transportation, which reduced payroll by 1,500 workers in 2009, has called back 200 permanent and temporary workers.

Economic growth is being seen throughout my district in the manufacturing sector. I visited a small electronics manufacturer, AMS Electronics, in Butler, Pennsylvania. They're performing well, despite the downturn, having increased their client base with the help of their local manufacturing extension partnership, a program that we fund through an act called the America COMPETES Act, which has recently been passed through the House.

So there is good news coming out of western Pennsylvania. Just even yesterday, I was at Donjon Shipping, a new manufacturer. We're building currently a tug boat; working on a barge next. Making things, permanent products that are going to be helping to improve the wealth of our Nation and bring great jobs here.

So I want to just reiterate what so many of my colleagues have said tonight, that there is good news. America is recovering. Not as fast as those out there need us to. Obviously, too many people still unemployed. But when you've lost 8 million jobs, 8 million jobs. We're on track this year to create more jobs than were created under 8 years of the Bush administration. I think that's important to remember.

So we are moving forward. We are creating jobs in this country. I just wanted to tell a little bit about the good news from western Pennsylvania. I want to thank everyone for their help tonight here with bringing this message to the American people—the message that we are continuing to recover. This summer we're going to see what we call the "summer of stimulus," where we're going to see, I think, great numbers with highway projects that will increase by more than 600 percent from July of 2009 to this July.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Will the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Yes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Given that you're from a State that is in the heart of the Manufacturing Belt, can you talk a little bit about what is going on in your district and the efforts that we're making here to create jobs and what kind of progress the recent surge in manufacturing has brought to communities in Pennsylvania?

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. One of the great things about my part of Pennsylvania, and I really think Pennsylvania in general—I have to be a bit biased here—but we have a great ethic and we have people with great skills. We have been a manufacturing-based economy for a long time. So when businesses come there and they see the work ethic of the people, they want to stay, expand, and grow. And what we're doing is trying to provide that climate that will allow our businesses to grow and to provide those opportunities maybe for those new entrepreneurs that they have an opportunity to actually take that product that really could do great things in our country and do great things actually throughout the world. Because I see more and more of our businesses actually exporting also, and work that was going to Mexico and to China actually coming back, because we can make anything as well, if not better, than anybody else in the world. And we know that.

So we're working hard. As I mentioned, great numbers coming out of our district because there's new products, there's new clientele, there's expansion and creation going on throughout many different sectors of our manufacturing-based economy. And so whether we're talking about some of the tax credits and incentives we've been trying to do either through the recovery package or with other pieces of legislation, we are working hard to get back to that manufacturing base. At least from my part of the world, my part of the country, it's important. I know not so much in Florida, but in Pennsylvania it certainly is the backbone of our economy, along with agriculture.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, it's okay. You're right. In Florida, we don't have a strong manufacturing base, but we want to make sure that folks in Pennsylvania are able to thrive economically so they can come down and vacation and they can afford to take a vacation and come down to south Florida and across my beautiful home State and spend their hard-earned dollars that they have been able to use and invest in their small business and come down and make sure that they can help our economy thrive.

Thank you, Madam Speaker. We yield back the balance of our time and thank the Speaker for the opportunity and look forward to hearing from our colleagues.

□ 2120

SOCIAL SECURITY AND THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. KOSMAS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, that's one of the great things about our system, we have a chance to speak from both sides. As I listened, I was surprised to hear I had taken so many positions that I had never taken. But let me just say that with regard to Republicans being for privatizing Social Security, that bill did not pass. It didn't even get around here to get passed because so many Republicans were not in favor of it. And, in fact, you can go back and find this Republican saying repeatedly then and still saying that what we should do is what was not done when Social Security came into existence, and that is take Social Security tax dollars and put them in a Social Security account.

Now, until I got here 5½ years ago, I was under the impression that it was some kind of modern creation that Social Security tax dollars were taken away, they never even get to the Social Security Trust Fund but went to general revenue with IOUs being placed in file cabinets for the Social Security Trust Fund. But lo and behold, come to find out, Social Security tax dollars have never, ever gone into the Social Security Trust Fund, not since its inception.

Now, in Texas, we have the Texas Employee Retirement System. Teachers have an employee retirement system. And those systems have done many times better than Social Security for one reason: They put dollars into the retirement fund so the fund was able to grow. And because it was able to grow, people can get several times more in the way of retirement payments from those retirement systems than you can from Social Security. In fact, when I first got here in 2005, I had my staff run a check to find out—and I gave them a hypothetical to submit to Social Security as well as to the Texas Employee Retirement System and another retirement system to find out what kind of monthly income you would receive under that hypothetical.

It turned out, the best Social Security could tell us was that under the hypothetical we gave them, that the monthly income from Social Security to a deserving senior would be somewhere between \$600 and \$900 a month. Well, if anybody is familiar with seniors and the costs that they end up being out of pocket, you will know that \$600 to \$900 does not go far enough, but that's what Social Security payments would be. And as I recall the hypothetical, it was \$30,000 average for 30 years before retirement, and that was the best we could get, \$600 to \$900.