

that the Republican numbers have an opportunity, by the end of this week, to be signatories on the discharge petition, totaling perhaps all but maybe four who have a little difficulty getting there. I'm expecting that we'll have a chance to get to that point, and maybe, just maybe, on the best day, every Republican will have signed the discharge petition. I hope we get there because here is what it is about, Mr. Speaker.

Thirty-four Democrats voted "no" on ObamaCare. Every single Republican voted "no" on ObamaCare. It was universal. Every Republican opposed it and 34 Democrats opposed it. Why did they vote "no"? That question is out there. The American people are wondering this, Mr. Speaker. Why? Did they oppose ObamaCare? Did they do so on a philosophical basis? Was it a policy question?

Every one of them would like to tell you it's a policy question. Well, is it ever a policy question in some of their cases? I think we're going to find out. Were they voting "no" on ObamaCare because the Speaker of the House said, "I don't have to have your vote. Go ahead and vote 'no,' and then you can posture yourself back in your district as someone who is against ObamaCare and as someone who is not necessarily doing the bidding of the Speaker of the House from San Francisco"?

Well, this San Francisco agenda has been driven through this House because every single Democrat voted for NANCY PELOSI as Speaker—every one. All 34 of those Democrats who voted "no" on ObamaCare voted for NANCY PELOSI.

So, when you think about how this fits together, if they voted for NANCY PELOSI for Speaker, they enabled the San Francisco agenda to be driven through this House of Representatives. That includes cap-and-tax. It includes ObamaCare. It includes Barney Frank's financial reform legislation that sets the Federal Government up to be in a position to take over our lending institutions, or at least the larger ones if they decide to do so. All of that agenda and more has been driven by the Speaker of the House—NANCY PELOSI from San Francisco, a San Francisco agenda imposed upon America—because every Democrat voted for NANCY PELOSI for Speaker.

Now they'll be going back home at the end of this week, and they're going to say, I voted "no" on ObamaCare. It was a tough vote on cap-and-tax. I was doing something because I had a little nuance here.

I know one Member of Congress, who is part of the Iowa delegation, who said, Well, I think the bill has gotten better here in the House, and I'm going to vote for cap-and-tax because I think they're going to fix it down the hall in the Senate.

You'd sell out your franchise like that? If you had any leverage to fix anything, you just lost it when you voted for it and sent the bill down to the Senate. You stand here, and you hold your vote "no." You don't hold

your nose and vote "yes" and say you've done something responsible.

Where we are, Mr. Speaker, is this: ObamaCare has got to be repealed. There are 34 Democrats who said they were opposed to it who will have an opportunity to prove it right here at the well by signing discharge petition No. 11. Thirty-four Democrats voted "no" on ObamaCare. If they are sincere, they will sign the discharge petition. They will be added to the Republicans who have signed it and to those who will. There will be more tomorrow, and there will be more the next day. I can guarantee that, Mr. Speaker. When we get to this point, we will find out the separation between the women and the girls and the men and the boys.

Were they for the repeal of ObamaCare? If they opposed it in their votes, they shouldn't be for it in policy today. If they are going to duck and cover and try to have it both ways, a discharge petition will help separate that. In fact, it will separate it, and the American people will know the difference. We will gavel out of here perhaps on Thursday night, and most every Republican will have signed the discharge petition. I am hopeful there will be a handful of Democrats who will step up to it, who will take a stand and say, I really meant it when I voted "no" on ObamaCare, and I'm going to put my signature down here on this discharge petition, which commits them to voting for the repeal of ObamaCare if we get 218 signatures and it comes to the floor.

That is being honest with America. That is sending a message out across America. It is giving the constituents in each of these congressional districts an opportunity to take a look at the real record, an opportunity to evaluate the real positions of the Members of Congress—not the smoke and mirrors version, not the duplicity, not the straddle-the-fence version, but the real version, which is, if you voted "no" on ObamaCare, you'd better be for the repeal of ObamaCare. If you voted "yes" on ObamaCare, you might want to reconsider and sign the discharge petition anyway because it is bad policy. It is lousy policy. It can't be afforded. In no way can it be calculated to fit within anything that we might be able to sustain. It is unsustainable.

It is unforgivable to do this to the American people and to take away our freedom to manage our health care—to go out in the market and buy the health insurance policy that we want.

There are many things we can do for reform. There are many things we have tried to do for reform. We sent some of them over to the Senate when the Republicans were in charge here in the majority, and they got locked up with the trial lawyers in the Senate. We are going to have to roll the trial lawyers. That has to happen in this next Congress and in the Congress after that, Mr. Speaker, but we cannot tolerate a Congress that drives up the spending in America, one that runs in a \$1.4 trillion

or \$1.5 trillion deficit. That is 10 times the average deficit under George Bush.

□ 2050

And still they stand up and say, Bush's fault, Bush's fault. Bush's fault?

\$140 billion deficit under Bush. Now, I'd like to have balanced the budget, and I voted for a number of balanced budgets and I'll keep doing that. And I'm an original cosponsor of the balanced budget amendment.

But, Mr. Speaker, to equate a \$1.4 trillion deficit and \$1.8 trillion deficit coming the year behind that, and to equate that to a \$140 billion deficit, it defies any rational thought, Mr. Speaker.

And I hope that I have conveyed some rational thought for you tonight, and I'm glad that you paid attention.

CORRECTING THE RECORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAFFEI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to rise this evening with some of my colleagues to repudiate some of the comments that have been made here tonight, to correct some of the record, and to provide, I think, the real story, Mr. Speaker, of what is going on in America and compare that—and my friend from Iowa, who was up here prior to me stated that it's about the record. And I would 100 percent agree: it is about the record.

And if you look at the past few years prior to the Democrats taking over, our friends on the other side had complete control of the entire Federal Government. And in States like Ohio, they had control of the whole Ohio Government.

And with President Bush, Republican House, Republican Senate, they had an opportunity to implement their economic policy. They had an opportunity to implement their foreign policy. They had an opportunity to implement their energy policy. They had an opportunity to implement their health care policy.

All across the board, our friends on the other side had an opportunity to govern this great country. And the end result, we saw just a few short years ago with deregulation of Wall Street, turning a blind eye to what was going on, hoping that the health care problem would go away, hoping that the energy policy, the energy problems we had in this country would go away.

And the end result was what happened just a couple of years ago with the complete collapse of the American economy, with trillions and trillions and trillions of dollars lost by American families and American businesses, with millions of people losing their homes due to foreclosure, with the Federal Government down here saying that government never works, it has no

role, no place in our society, let the free market work, let Wall Street run the show, let the multinational corporations run the show.

And we will do everything in our power, while President Bush was in office, to completely denigrate the responsibilities of having a referee on the field to monitor Wall Street shenanigans, Mr. Speaker, to make sure, learning from history, that if you let Wall Street go without any regulation, that they will run free and, for a short time, monitor themselves. But then after a while, they will get greedy and they will cheat, and it will become inherent in the system. And at some point, as we saw many economists predict the collapse that they said maybe would happen in '08, maybe '09, or maybe '06, they thought it would come a little bit earlier. But there were economists out there that could see what was going to happen. And it did. The unregulated free market Wall Street collapsed and took Main Street with it.

For example, our friends on the other side, just in the last week or so, when this Congress and this President passed a complete overhaul of the regulations of Wall Street to make sure that this doesn't happen again, our friends on the other side voted against it, Mr. Speaker, voted against regulating Wall Street after we all just watched, as a country, and as the world watched, this system collapse because people just started moving money around.

You want to talk about family values and taking responsibility?

We are now holding Wall Street's feet to the fire, and our friends on the other side said, nope, we're going to side with the big banks. We're going to side with Wall Street. We're going to side with the status quo. And to me, Mr. Speaker, that's unacceptable. That's unacceptable.

And we have a bogey man America now. Oh, we've got to hold up. A San Francisco agenda's coming. Or here comes socialism. It's coming at you.

This time in our country's history requires very sober, mature analysis of the facts and an attempt to build a consensus around solutions. And our friends on the other side have consistently said no, no, no, no to everything that we've done.

Now, you can't disagree with everything. My goodness gracious. Everything?

Regulating Wall Street, saying we need a referee on the field to keep an eye on the big banks and the big-time money firms on Wall Street, to say they need regulated and you say, no?

To say that we wanted to pass unemployment insurance at this very difficult time, and the Republicans put up procedural block after procedural block saying no?

They come out and readily admit we've got to pay for \$30 billion in unemployment insurance, but we don't have to pay for \$650 billion worth of tax cuts that go primarily to the top 1 percent of the people in the United States

of America, millionaires? That doesn't need to be paid for?

So what we're here tonight to do, Mr. Speaker, is to provide for this Chamber and for the American people, and to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the choice, the difference between the party that is now governing the country, and the party of George W. Bush, who left us this mess.

Now, no one's saying that we can fix this overnight; but, basically, what happened is that we were in a football game, and President Bush was the quarterback. And when they took President Bush out as quarterback, we were down 50-0. And now President Obama is in as the quarterback; Democrats are now in on the team. And we may not have won the game yet, but we're still in the second quarter, and the score is now 50-21. But we're moving in the right direction.

And when you look at where the Bush economic policies that everyone on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, rubber stamped, those policies cost our country millions and millions of jobs; 8 million jobs were lost because of the economic collapse on Wall Street, which was the final result of the Bush economic policies.

Millions of people and their homes went into foreclosure because of the Bush economic policies. Trillions of dollars in wealth were lost because of the Bush economic policies.

We were bleeding jobs. The January that President Obama came into office, we were losing almost 800,000 jobs in that month alone, in that month alone.

And so this President and this Congress took a series of bold measures that weren't necessarily the most popular measures to take, but definitely needed, mature measures to help stabilize our economy and turn it around.

□ 2100

And that, Mr. Speaker, beyond all facts to be presented, worked. Now, as I said, we are not anywhere near where we need to be, but it worked. The stimulus package worked. Did it work well enough? Probably not.

But I can only imagine what would have happened if our friends on the other side were in charge and there wasn't any stimulus package at all. How many thousands and thousands of teachers would have been laid off? How many thousands and thousands of State workers would have been laid off? Police and fire would have been laid off because our friends on the other side said, No, we're going to implement a political strategy that means we have to repudiate everything that President Obama does. We have to hope that he does poorly. We have to root against the President. We have to root for the President to fail. We have to root for the country to fail so that we could maybe benefit politically in the next election.

And that's what's happened.

"No" to the stimulus. "No" to unemployment compensation. "No" on re-

ducing dependency on foreign oil. "No" to taking on the insurance companies. "No" to Wall Street reform. "No" to the banks. "No" to providing more credit for small businesses. "No" to tax credits. This is the one I really like. Our friends on the other side voted against getting rid of the tax credits that incentivized moving jobs offshore.

Now, can you imagine saying that, you know, there are some things I'm for and some things I'm against. Our friends on the other side voted against a closing of a loophole to disincentivize jobs moving offshore where Democrats are closing that loophole and incentivizing American manufacturing. Things made in the United States again, making things in the United States again, those times where our parents and grandparents grew up where we made things as a country, where we built things.

And that's what the energy revolution is all about. We send a billion dollars a day offshore. A billion a day, Mr. Speaker, offshore to oil-producing countries that don't like us all that much, and in many instances take our money and fund terroristic acts, try to in the United States and across the world. And then we have to spend money in our military to combat the global terrorist acts.

So if we come up with the idea of can't we produce our own energy here with nuclear, natural gas, wind, solar and put people back to work in the United States making the 8,000 component parts that go into a windmill, making the 400 tons of steel that go into a windmill, making the component parts that go into a solar panel, this is the idea of putting America back to work. And our friends on the other side, Mr. Speaker, are saying, No. Let's keep giving tax cuts to the oil companies so that they can keep drilling when we only have 2 percent of the world's oil in the United States of America.

There's a real choice here. There's a real difference here. And it's important for all of us to recognize the choices that have been made down here and the differences between the two parties.

So we stabilized things. We went from losing 750,000 jobs in that first month in January, and now we have an average monthly job growth of 170,000 jobs a month here in the United States. Not nearly enough. We need more. And we're working on more by helping small businesses, eight-plus small business tax credits to help create jobs, including a tax credit to create jobs here in the United States—as opposed to a tax credit that our friends on the other side support to move jobs overseas—so that we can put Americans back to work making things, manufacturing things, and taking on China. That's what these policies are all about. A green revolution in the United States is about resuscitating manufacturing in the United States.

And let me say that if you had a 401(k) or if you have a retirement plan,

it looks a heck of a lot better today than it did when our friends threw us the keys. Most families have gained about 60 percent of their wealth back because of the increase in the stock market because of the policies of this administration, the bold policies of this administration.

We have seen 98 percent of families in the United States in this past year see a reduced level of taxation.

Again, it's in vogue today in America, especially if you're a part of the neoconservative radical right wing that has taken control of the Republican Party, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, to put up another bogeyman to say, They're raising your taxes. Well, we haven't. Ninety-eight percent of Americans have seen a reduction in taxes.

And so we are doing what we need to do to get us out of this economic catastrophe that President Bush and his Republican Party left this country. De-regulated Wall Street, looked the other way; let the insurance companies run crazy over the health insurance industry. And we've seen skyrocketing costs, incentivized "drill baby drill," continue down that road while oil-producing countries take our money and fund terrorism when we could be investing that money in the United States and manufacturing renewable energy products here.

So we have seen, Mr. Speaker, a dramatic change over the course of the last 2 years.

So the choice is quite clear. Do we return back to the failed tried and tested policies, the worn-out, trite policies of the Bush administration? Do we trot those back out after we saw where they took us?

You know, here's the thing that I love.

Our friends on the other side say, Well, if we just cut taxes for the people that make all the money, it will trickle down and it will benefit everybody else. We tried that, Mr. Speaker. Those were the policies of the first 6 years of this decade. Bush came in, passed his tax cuts, and we didn't see extreme economic growth. We didn't see the middle class rise. We didn't see wages go up. We saw more offshoring of jobs to China and foreign countries. We saw the tax burden pushed off on the middle class. We saw health care costs skyrocket and go through the roof, continuing to take money out of the pockets of middle class families. We saw tuition costs go up all across the country, 9 percent a year.

And Pell Grant, because our friends said, Well, you're on your own; we don't even want to invest in education. You know, Pell Grants did not keep pace with where they needed to be. And our friend who was here earlier was talking about the student loans, how the Department of Education took over the student loan program and the free market. Yeah. Because the banks were charging our kids 8, 9 percent.

You want to keep that system going where you've got to take out a student

loan and you get out of college and you owe \$20,000 or \$30,000 to get a college education? Or heaven forbid you get a master's degree or go to medical school and you come out with hundreds of thousands of dollars in debt so that banks could make a profit off of trying to educate our kids so we could be globally competitive? That's what the other side wants to do, Mr. Speaker. They want to keep that system in place.

□ 2110

They like it just the way it was. Everybody was happy. The insurance companies were happy. The multinationals were happy. The banks were happy. Wall Street was happy, but we weren't happy as a country. And not only did the banks charge 8 or 9 percent for a student loan, check this out. The government said, if a student defaults on that loan, we'll pick up the tab. Jesus, I mean, wouldn't it be nice to be a bank under George Bush. You mean I get to loan this student and this family a student loan at 8 percent and if they default on it, the government will come in and pick up the tab? Hey, we should all go into banking and be that lucky.

They set up a system, Wall Street did, that if there were lots of profits and lots of economic activity, they reaped all the benefits and the wealth was not spread throughout society. They would benefit. And that if it failed and collapsed, they would bring the whole country down with them, Main Street included. And then President Obama gets in and we pass the most sweeping Wall Street reforms since the Great Depression and our friends on the other side voted against it, just to keep the status quo.

So let's recap a little bit. Bush comes in, Republicans rubberstamp his agenda, they cut taxes for the top 1 percent. They try to privatize Social Security and Medicare. Their policies are implemented across the board, economic, energy, foreign policy, right down the line. After they're all implemented, the economy completely collapses and shuts down.

And then the Democrats come in. We get the keys to the car. The wheels are spinning, wobbling. There's cracks in the windshield. There's steam coming out of the engine. The tailpipe's dragging on the ground. There's no back window. It's like the car from "The Big Lebowski" that the Dude used to drive. So this thing's just wobbling down the aisle, wobbling down the street. We get the keys to the car. We take some bold needed actions, and our friends on the other side don't even try to solve the problem, don't even try to solve the problem.

But what has happened is we went from losing 700,000 jobs a month to creating on average 170,000 jobs a month. We saw the stock market go from a little over 6,000 up to 11,000, and 60 percent of the wealth returned to American families. We have seen a reduction

in student loans, an increase in Pell grants, an increase in the minimum wage, making sure everybody in the country has health care. We tried to provide, and we have provided, tax incentives for businesses who create jobs here in the United States of America as opposed to our friends on the other side who voted against closing the loophole to bring jobs to the U.S. They wanted to keep the status quo which incentivized people and businesses moving their companies offshore. And our friends on the other side don't want us to reduce our dependency on foreign oil and have consistently voted against initiatives to resuscitate manufacturing here in the United States and invest in green technologies and green energy here in the United States. So on and on and on.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, which I think really highlights the difference between the two parties is, if you look at the alternative budget provided by the Republican Party here in the House of Representatives, it privatizes Social Security and it attempts to turn Medicare into a voucher system for our senior citizens. Again, a leap back to the Bush-era policies. Do we really want to go back there?

I'm the first to say, Mr. Speaker, we haven't done everything right. I could talk about my disagreements I have with some of what the President has done, or everything we're not all in agreement here. But clearly, there's a difference between what we have done and what our friends on the other side handed us after full implementation of their agenda.

I'd like to yield to the gentlelady from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you so much.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Who has her Florida orange on tonight.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I do, that's because I bleed orange and blue, and Mr. RYAN knows that, and I appreciate the recognition.

And we're also joined by our good friend who has been a weekly staple of these important message hours where we're trying to communicate to our constituents and to people across the country and to our colleagues about the progress that we've been able to make that has been so significant and evident.

One of the things that I wanted to highlight—Mr. RYAN, I'm not sure if you have gone over any of this—but I think an important chart that we usually begin with when we talk about the private sector that has been made, the private-sector employment increases over the past year and a half.

And if you look December of 2007 all the way through to June of 2010, you can see the dramatic job losses that occurred during the Bush administration. The Bush administration ended right about here in January of 2009, and when President Obama took over, we at this point in the year passed the Recovery Act, the stimulus package that

injected \$787 billion into our economy, both in terms of an infusion of spending as well as tax cuts, 98 percent of Americans received a tax cut, mostly focused on tax cuts for small businesses and working families. And then at that point, that's when you see the job growth curve start to shift from almost 800,000 job losses a month in the month before President Bush left office and President Obama was inaugurated, then you begin starting to gain jobs to today where you look in June of 2010 where we have added jobs for six straight months, an average of 100,000 jobs per month, almost 600,000 jobs created this year alone. And if we keep on this pace, by the end of this year we will have created under President Obama's leadership and the Democratic leadership in this Congress more private-sector jobs in this year than the entire Bush presidency. I mean, that's just the facts, and it's an unbelievable fact.

We have turned the economy around, and we've begun to go in the right direction. We have a long way to go but look at the other indicators. Look at the stock market. Look at the three straight quarters of growth in the GDP. Look at the 11 straight months of growth in the manufacturing sector. America has always been about making things. Mr. TONKO and Mr. RYAN are from communities where your constituents, the people that sent you here to represent them, they're used to rolling up their sleeves, doing a hard day's work for a hard day's pay and making stuff, and we want to make sure that we can get America back to work making things again. And that's why we have our Making it in America agenda that we're going to be talking about over the next few weeks as we enter the August recess period.

And we're so pleased to be joined by our good friend Mr. TONKO, a new Member who has been doing a fantastic job.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It's a pleasure to join with you and Representative RYAN on the floor here to talk about what's happening.

You talked about Representative RYAN's district and mine being about making things. I thought tonight I would share some numbers that personalize it to the 21st Congressional District in New York, the greater capital region. Let's look at some of the numbers.

Beechnut, which produces baby foods, a tremendously powerful economic engine in our Mohawk Valley. Their total jobs right now, new positions, are at 106; 52 in the management position and some 54 in new factory positions. These are workers that will be producing on the line. It is a strength to our region.

X-ray Optical. The X-ray Optical system says that they need to share with the world that throughout this recession they have maintained their workforce. In their order of business, they believe this is a monumental feat.

□ 2120

So we are thrilled that they are able to survive throughout this economic climate without any layoffs, any firings. Certainly the jobs in the capital region are plentiful, or becoming more plentiful. The Albany Medical Center has more than 400 openings, including nurses, technicians and other specializations. General Electric company needs some 200 engineers, researchers and financial analysts. Certainly GlobalFoundries is hiring some 69 people, mostly engineers and technicians. Comfortex has hired 40 people since May and is looking for 15 additional workers.

This time last year the State Labor Department in New York reported that there were some 3,800 registered job openings in our area. Now it's reporting that there are some 6,000 job openings.

The unemployment in the Albany area is down to some 6.6 percent, and just recently 2,900 jobs were added to the regional private job sector this past June. So these are numbers personalized to one congressional district in one State.

As we continue to see this sort of increase in jobs across the country, we begin to understand that the dynamics of the Recovery Act are indeed important. There are those who might bemoan that investment. We stop the bleeding of the recession; and for slightly less than a trillion dollars of investment, we see factors now like \$18.5 trillion lost in the last 18 months of the Bush administration in household income that was just lost in that 18-month period. We have recovered some \$6 trillion of that household income as a result of the Recovery Act. So when we talk about that, a down payment of under a trillion dollars has recovered some \$6 trillion household wealth.

I think that's an amazing return for the dollar. That's an amazing recovery, and so the Recovery Act is not only producing that private sector job growth, as my two colleagues indicated this evening with the chart that they have presented; it's also recovered some \$6 trillion in household income and for a down payment, again, of under a trillion dollars. That's a great return.

So I think America is poised for greatness. This cleansing process has been painful; but it allows us to go forward with the sense of commitment to innovation, to a clean energy economy, to the sort of emerging technologies and the innovative genius that is uniquely American.

If we can move forward and take a number of these success stories, success stories in our R&D centers, in our basic research and allow them to be deployed into manufacturing sectors and into the workforce by taking those passions and making the investment that we need to make, we cannot only respond with a jobs agenda but respond to some socioeconomic ills out there.

Our energy crises in this country, several crises under the umbrella of energy, can be addressed by investment in technology, investment in R&D and, certainly, job growth that comes into a new dimension that allows jobs to be created from the trades on up to the PhDs. It covers the full gamut, and I think that's the sort of investment we are talking about here.

We are talking about advanced battery manufacturing. We are talking about smart meters, smart grids, smart thermostats. These are the investments that could be made, people that will install energy efficiency improvements in homes and make businesses more productive, maintaining homes at a cheaper cost by using less electricity and creating jobs in the process.

I am thrilled to join you both as colleagues here this evening because we have a message, we have a great message to share and people need to know. The public needs to know that this investment was made in a very deliberative, laser-sharp focus-type manner that allows us now to begin to see the improvements that are taking hold. Had nothing been done, had the previous administration been allowed its way, we would have seen that straight-line decline continue until we hit the Great Depression.

So I think we are on the right course; we are now bearing northward with that V formation and we are going to continue to grow north to make certain that we continue to grow the private sector economy.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think it's important for us to say we have tried the old way, and this is what we have been trying and attempting to fix. Here you will see, again—or even a rise in manufacturing. What the Democrats are saying here, and you see 2, 4, 6 months of job growth in the manufacturing sector, and what Democrats are saying is that is part of the economic stimulus package, that is part of moving towards a green economy where our people in our country have always made things, have always gone to the factory and made things.

Not everybody can be in an ivory tower; not everyone can do the research. If we are going to succeed as a country, we need the middle class of our country to make things.

You can see that our policies are beginning to work, beginning to take hold; and the idea of taking a billion dollars a day that leaves our country and goes to oil-producing countries that don't like us all that much, that fund terrorism, and then we have got to fund the military to chase them all around the world, is an ignorant policy. It's a frivolous policy that doesn't work.

So what we have done is made investments in wind and solar and the batteries and things that the gentleman stated earlier so that we can do the cutting-edge research, but then we can make it here.

We could manufacture those products here; 8,000 component parts go into a

windmill, 400 tons of steel. Solar panels are filled with different components. In Toledo, for example, they are doing a lot of different solar panels, in Toledo, Ohio.

Let's make this stuff in the United States of America again so we can get back to a time when our parents and grandparents throughout the country could go to work and make something and watch it ride down the road or look at the steel in a building, in the concrete and the windows and the framing and everything that goes into it.

That's what we are moving back to. We have broken with the past, we have broken with the Bush economic policies that our friends on the other side have rubber stamped. We are now moving in a new direction, not nearly as quickly or with the celerity that we all want, but we are going in that direction.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. RYAN, a couple of years ago, when we would be out here each night with the 30-something Working Group, our symbol was the Republican rubber stamp that was emblematic of the philosophy of our friends on the other side of the aisle.

I think we should take a walk down memory lane. Maybe we want to bring the rubber stamp back because it does appear that they have not shed those tendencies, and that's evidenced in the choice that Americans are going to have over the next few months.

Let's go through some of those choices. You are talking about how important it is that we go back to making things in America, that we revitalize the economies that had manufacturing as the backbone of cities and towns throughout this country, throughout the Northeast and the Rust Belt and even—I don't even like the term "Rust Belt" because it implies something that's irretrievable. You know, once something is rusted out, your perception is it's not able to be regained.

I know we don't believe that, and we believe in investing in the concept of making America and that it's more than just a concept, that we are going to put resources into making sure that when we have a choice that we choose to make sure that it's Americans that are doing the manufacturing for the things that we need here, and we are doing that by backing that up with action when it comes to our policy decisions as well.

So are the Republicans. Their actions are vastly different than ours. We propose to close tax loopholes that allow outsourcing U.S. jobs overseas and use the savings to pay for hometown tax credits for small businesses to expand manufacturing jobs. And what do they do? They vote, "they" being the Republicans, vote 170-1, 170 Republicans voted "no," to 1 that votes "yes" to protecting tax breaks for companies that shipped jobs overseas; 170-1 they voted to keep that tax loophole intact so that we could continue to allow

companies to get tax breaks when they ship jobs overseas.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Could I make a point real quickly. That vote is such an example that the other side seems to just be playing politics. They want Obama to fail, and they want to be able to say—

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. They have said it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Yes, they have said it. And they want to be able to say, see, we had nothing to do with any of that. So being so ideological that they vote against getting rid of tax cuts that incentivize off-shoring business. I mean, that says it all. It's one thing to say you are against some of this stuff, but that too?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Let's take it one step further. It's not just bad enough, okay, to say they voted to protect the tax break. On top of that, 95 percent of House Republicans have signed a pledge to protect those tax breaks, signed a pledge, put their name on the line and said, I am going to protect tax breaks for companies that ship jobs overseas.

□ 2130

It's absolutely mind-boggling. We want to make sure that we protect companies and give tax breaks and incentivize companies that make decisions to create jobs here in the United States, in your district in New York, in your district in Ohio, in districts across this country. And they would rather have those jobs created in China and in other countries and boost up their economy.

Mr. TONKO. If the gentlelady would yield, you talk about telling statements on the floor or the behavior in and around Washington that proves very telling, actions sometimes speaking louder than words. The activity that has taken place on this floor as it dealt with America COMPETES, here was a major bill invested in by the Science and Tech Committee, a number of groups overseeing this legislation, monumental to the future of America's workforce, to manufacturing, to investment in basic research, in R&D. And there were all sorts of efforts made to hear everyone, to be totally inclusive about that final package that was developed and then presented on this floor, approved in committees and travels to the floor, and then the game of "gotcha" politics takes hold.

We use all kinds of stall tactics, all sorts of gimmicks to embarrass, to trap people, to really circumvent the real issue of how do you strengthen manufacturing, how do you put together a package that invests in the research monies that are required. How do you invest in the training of the future workforce, beginning in the educational networks, so that STEM—the science, technology, engineering, and math—concepts can all be learned in a way that will enable us to have the workforce of the future? That effort

was so very important. It almost went to defeat. It was pulled as a bill on the floor, and a few weeks later we figured out how to get around the politics spirit that existed.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. TONKO. Yes, I will.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And your point is very well taken. We had to use a procedural motion just to be able to get around there being an obstacle to the America COMPETES Act coming to the floor and being able to get a straight-up vote. And when it came right down to it, we were for it and most of them were against it.

Mr. TONKO. And I think the actions taken by the majority in this House—Speaker PELOSI and members of the Democratic majority—have been about job creation, private sector growth. What I don't think the other side realizes is that what we have out there is middle-class anxiety and uncertainty that's at an all-time high. They're concerned about paying their mortgage. They're concerned about paying for education, for credit card bills that they have, for medical bills. And they are impacted. They are losing jobs through no fault of their own, and now finally they will see hope growing as we grow that private sector situation. That is the dynamic that has really been avoided and not addressed by the minority in this House.

When they asked to have control back—I think what we need to look at is the contrast, and we've mentioned this, Representative WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, several times over in our frequent visits to the floor. But what we need to do is take the big picture, the big frame here and allow people to see the contrast.

We're looking at a group that drove the car out of the ditch. We towed that car out of the ditch. When the minority in this House was in the majority working with the previous administration, they drove this car right into the ditch and couldn't get it out. And then up comes the new team, and what we have done, working with the President and with the leadership in this House, is towed that car out of the ditch, and now they want the keys back to drive. And we say "no" because we need to go forward, not backward. We need to continue to pursue a progressive agenda.

I think when we look at those big picture issues, Social Security—and where they are with that issue? They want to privatize. They want to put it at risk. Imagine the trillions of dollars that would have been lost had we enabled them in 2005 to have their way. I wasn't yet in Congress, but fortunately the Republicans did not get their way and they did not privatize Social Security. We are now here attempting to keep that out of their wish list of privatization.

They also wanted to voucher out the Medicare program, a very successful program for our seniors. They want to put a voucher system in. We're trying

to keep it and maintain it, develop the security of that system into the future.

They liken our work on Wall Street reform akin to attacking an ant with an atom bomb. Well, nothing could be further from the truth. It's a deception that they're proud of. And a number of other things.

They asked our President to apologize for coming down hard on BP for not responding effectively and efficiently and in rapid pace to make certain that we save our environment in the Gulf States area.

So there are all these snapshots that we need to look at. And there is a contrast. There is a team that wants to go back to the failed policies of the past. There is a team that wants to promote an agenda for the future. I firmly believe that what we need to remind them is that there is this anxiety level, this uncertainty with our middle-income Americans, with middle-class America that is at an all-time high. And they are now beginning to see that there is a difference between the former majority and now this Democratic majority. I think we have a track record of history that will show that when we're in control, we deliver for America's working families. I think that's a record for which we can be very proud and which really speaks to the strengthening of America, her families, and her economy.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Absolutely. Thank you very much, Mr. TONKO.

Just to veer a little bit in a different direction towards, again, the choice that Americans are going to be facing, because your facts are stubborn things. You can run away from a lot of different things. Facts are just persistent in chasing you. They've been chasing the Republicans, those stubborn facts, for a long time. One of the facts is that Republicans are consistently on the record of voting against statutory pay-as-you-go legislation.

Now, back in the Clinton administration when PAYGO was first established—and that was a tough, tough vote that Democrats led the way on, made sure happened under President Clinton's leadership—the country finished his Presidency with a record surplus, which was handed to President Bush and he promptly squandered in just a few short years.

If you look at this chart, we will start back in the Reagan administration. And I want to start back in the Reagan administration because—walk with me down memory lane, shall we?

Mr. TONKO. Do we have to?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I know it's painful, but I think it's instructive.

As you walk with me down memory lane, let's look at under which Presidents we operated on a deficit and under which Presidents we operated at a surplus. President Reagan, \$1.4 trillion deficit. President Bush, didn't get any better, got worse, \$3.3 trillion deficit. Go to President Clinton, we went from a record deficit at the time to a

record surplus of \$5.6 trillion. And then when President Bush finished office after being handed a record surplus, he finished office with an \$11.5 trillion deficit, handing that record to President Obama. And, as you said, after having driven our economy off a cliff, now the Republicans are asking for the keys once again.

Facts being stubborn things, as I mentioned, the Republicans consistently voted against statutory PAYGO. In fact, under the Bush administration, they allowed statutory PAYGO to lapse, which is, in large part, why we ended up in a deficit situation. They deficit-spent like drunken sailors—two wars not paid for, the Medicare prescription drug part D program. As good and as pleased as we are that seniors have their prescription drugs paid for, we know that program was deeply flawed, could have been a thousand times better. Ultimately, we were able to fix it in the Affordable Care Act.

But they blindly spent, through tax cuts and spending, and now suddenly seem to have found religion when it comes to spending and deficits.

Mr. TONKO. Representative WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, if you will allow me to just make a comment here.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Sure.

Mr. TONKO. When you talk about the \$11.5 trillion deficit, when the Bush administration ended is when I arrived in Washington as a freshman, several months ago now, in my first term. I distinctly recall that economists of all stripes, from far right thinking to far left, found unanimity in that they thought we needed to invest in solving this deficit situation because the time had long but passed since something like that needed to be done.

□ 2140

The denial under the deficit growth, which became a record proportion, could have been resolved if they had changed their policies, if they had looked at the failure and tried to turn it around. So, by the time the new administration took hold in January of 2009, the requirement was there. It was basic. Every economist was suggesting and was strongly urging that it took investing. So we really had to take additional moneys that drove the deficit a little larger, but it was to stop the bleeding of the recession because the likelihood of disaster was tremendous, so there was no choice but to further invest.

That deficit really drove additional investment requirements, but because of the track record we are showing this evening, it did have its corresponding results. There were lucrative dividends that came from those investments, but they were the smart investments that, yes, grew the deficit slightly, but they finally stopped the bleeding and now show the growth.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. One of the things that is important to note, Mr. RYAN, is that, when we became the majority once again in 2006 and over

the last several years, we reestablished statutory PAYGO. First, we established it in rule. Then we passed it in statute. One hundred percent of the Republicans in this body voted "no." They voted against making sure that we made a commitment in the law to not spend more than we take in, to pay for the legislation other than in emergency spending, and obviously, we've been in an emergency. We've been, you know, pretty careful about what we declare as an emergency, making sure that we have covered the legislation with pay-fors. They haven't believed in pay-fors in years and years, if ever.

Let's keep in mind the tax-cutting policy that they had, which was exclusively focused on the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans, which also wasn't paid for. I mean tax cuts are spending, and there is nothing wrong with tax cuts. We have to balance tax cuts with our spending policy, but when you don't collect revenue, that is less revenue that we have in the Treasury, which affects the deficit as well. So I mean their total disregard for balancing the books is not something that they're going to be able to run away from, and we are not going to let them run away from it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I'm just standing here, listening to you both.

When you piece this all together, their philosophy, which obviously didn't work because we saw how it ended, is to cut taxes for primarily the top 1 percent of the people—millionaires and multi-, multimillionaires—and expect that money to get reinvested. We all saw that the money was reinvested, for the most part, abroad in China and in other countries, so that was part of the offshoring.

Then their philosophy was to completely look the other way. It was to take the referee off the field on Wall Street, and let those people who are making all this money continue to find out all these other schemes to make more money—that's how that ran—even to the tune of the student loans where they let banks give student loans and charge 8, 9 percent. Then the government would back the loan if somebody defaulted. So the system was set up to allow just the wealthiest people in the country to keep making money any way they saw fit.

Mr. TONKO. If I might add to that, I think also—and history will show—that it was a partnership with big interests. It was with Big Oil, with big banks and with the big insurance industry. In the beginning stages of the Bush Presidency, we saw some of the attempts there for trade contracts, for contracts with China. When we look at the investment, when we look at the job market, it can be broken down into three elements—agriculture, manufacturing, and financial services.

Well, it appeared as though the manufacturing was kind of pushed aside. We didn't see the kind of execution of these trade contracts to favor manufacturing. Instead, somehow, they were

gripped by the special interests of big banks, and they ruled in these contracts that were developed.

So I think that, you know, history will show that manufacturing didn't have a high priority with these groups. When you see the emerging technologies, when you see the innovation, the American innovation, there were many small businesses that were continuing to grow, which could have prospered with the appropriate treatment from Washington—policies, programs, resources—and that just didn't happen. Then we saw the further relaxation of regulation with the financial services sector.

So tools were being developed to intentionally circumvent regulation, to relax regulation—perhaps avoiding an aggressive approach with drilling deeper in the Gulf States. All of this created a failure that brought America's economy to its knees, and it was all about partnerships with special interests—big companies, big industries—that really had a grip on what was happening here, and it has caused a lot of failure.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. TONKO, I want to bring us back to the choice, to the choice of going in the direction that we have been taking the country, which is a new direction to reinvest in America, to make sure that we can create jobs here and not give tax breaks to companies that send jobs overseas, to reestablish statutory pay-as-you-go rules so that we can make sure we pay for the legislation we pass and so that we don't spend more money than we take in.

Let's walk through some of the other bills that we have passed here to make sure we can focus on our own economy and can compare the record because, again, this is going to be about a choice that Americans are making.

How about the Small Business Jobs and Credit Act? That was legislation that provided loans to small businesses and access to capital for small business start-ups to help support the economic recovery and to create jobs. Ninety-eight percent of Republicans voted against that legislation.

How about the Small Business Jobs Tax Relief Act? That was a bill that provided tax incentives to spur investment in small businesses and that granted small businesses some tax penalty relief. Ninety-seven percent of Republicans voted against that legislation.

How about the American Jobs and Closing Tax Loopholes Act? It is legislation that would help create or save more than 1 million American jobs and prevent corporations from shipping jobs overseas and sticking American taxpayers with the bill. Eighty-three percent of Republicans voted against that legislation.

There is the HIRE Act. That bill would give small businesses tax incentives to hire jobless Americans. Between February and May of 2010, an estimated 4.5 million new workers were

hired, making American businesses eligible for up to \$8.5 billion in tax exemptions and credits under the HIRE Act. Ninety-seven percent of Republicans voted against that legislation.

I could keep going. I mean, really, this is an unbelievably long list of job-creating legislation that we have passed, that we have put out here on the floor of this House.

Mr. TONKO. Oh, absolutely.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Over 95 percent of Republicans voted against it.

So we could continue to move in the direction in which we have been going—job creation, spurring the economy, investing in America—or we could backslide toward the Bush era and go back to the exact same agenda as they have committed to focusing on, but I'm not sure that I've met anybody who wants to go back to that agenda.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Right. I think what we are proposing and have been investing in is a pro-growth agenda for our country, and that is not as simple as cutting taxes for rich people and hoping and praying that they somehow will invest in the manufacturing in the U.S., you know, and in other investments in the U.S.

We need to rebuild our infrastructure in this country—roads, bridges, waterlines, sewer lines, and combined sewer in all of our big cities. We've got to invest. That's going to put people to work, and that's going to rebuild our country. Our highways and our bridges, we're going to invest in those. We're going to rebuild our country, and that's going to lead to economic development and to economic growth. We're going to invest in technology—green technology—and in National Institutes of Health biotechnology, which is ultimately going to make us healthier and create more jobs.

Those investments aren't made by the private sector, and we need to make those investments which will directly put people back to work. So we want to go back to the philosophy we had in this country in the 1950s, in the 1960s and a little bit in the 1970s, when we had balanced growth, a rising middle class, strong wage growth, and increases in productivity. This is as opposed to what started in the 1980s, except for the blip during the Clinton administration, which was deregulation and letting the big dogs, as you said earlier—big insurance, Big Oil, big banks, and multinational corporations—come into Washington, D.C., and run this show, too. That doesn't work for Main Street.

Ultimately, I think, as difficult as these last couple of years have been, we have gotten to see the supply side economic policy and what really happens once it is fully implemented. We saw the end result of that.

□ 2150

Mr. TONKO. To my colleague from Florida and my colleague from Ohio, I would say this: I believe, the sense I

get is that there's a very thoughtful process now to provide the strong incentives to grow small business, to grow private sector jobs, done in a way that really shows respect, respect for the taxpayers' dollar, and wanting to pull us out of this recession that was so deep and so long. And I think it's happening.

I know that the innovative genius will be inspired by the legislative route we're taking, by the priorities we're establishing, with the budget priorities that we have put into play.

And it's about growing jobs. It's about giving people the chance again to feel the greatness of America, the greatness of America that allows us to know that we have it within our potential, we have it within our grasp.

And I firmly believe that we will do our manufacturing, and our jobs will grow in the manufacturing sector because we do it smarter. We do it smarter.

And, Representative WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, thank you for the opportunity to share with you and Representative RYAN thoughts that I have and that we all share on how we're going down the right course.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you. And I look forward, as we go into the August recess, talking with our constituents about how we've begun to turn this economy around.

I want to close out the last couple of seconds with the focus on tax cuts, remind people that tax bills in 2009 were at their lowest level since 1950, and we look forward to continuing to work on that, striking that balance.

And Mr. RYAN, we'll turn it over to you to close us out.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We're going to continue to go down the road. We're not going to turn back. We've had too much success. We've got a long way to go.

STUDENT LOANS

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it's always an honor to be on this floor. But at times it gets very difficult hearing positions put as being mine which were not mine.

I would like to point out, for example, about student loans. I have student loans. We gave up—well, I won't even get into that. The only asset my wife and I have left is our home so that we could have the honor of being public servants.

We've got a lot of student loans, and I cannot imagine a worse scenario than having to come begging to an administration that we already see punishes Republican States, Republican communities, and beg the administration for a student loan, because there is no one else that makes student loans besides the government.