

HONORING CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY OF CLEARFIELD, JOHNSONBURG BOROUGH, AND TIOGA IN FIFTH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to mark a number of very important anniversaries and celebrations within my congressional district.

First, today I rise to honor the compassionate work that goes on in the nearly 100-year-old Children's Aid Society house in Clearfield, Pennsylvania. On this coming August 6, the society will be celebrating its 120th anniversary, marking over a century of dedication and service.

Originally founded as a child welfare agency, which served to place orphan children into suitable homes, the Society eventually grew into a successful children's home. Several auxiliaries were established, from DuBois to Winburne, and they proved instrumental in fundraising, investigating homes, maintaining contact with the children placed in homes.

As the years passed, the Society also expanded within Clearfield and became involved in many programs, such as Big Brothers Big Sisters and the Health and Human Services Council.

This organization has received consistent praise and monetary support from the public and has battled through many financial and procedural issues. Their endurance through time and their far-reaching services attest to the authenticity of their work.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Children's Aid Society on their success and wish them the best in the future. Here's to another 120 years of successful service.

Mr. Speaker, this also, this August, marks the 200th anniversary of the Johnsonburg borough in Elk County, and we will be celebrating this milestone in August.

Founded in 1810, its major industry was paper, with a mill still operating in the area. Originally owned by Curtis Publishing Company, which published the Saturday Evening Post, it was thought to be the largest coated paper mill in the world.

Once called Quay, Johnsonburg is the oldest settlement in Elk County. Considered a booming town along the Clarion River, former President Ulysses S. Grant used to come there to fish and visit the other retired Civil War generals.

As befits a 200th anniversary, the community will hold a grand celebration, including a parade and ceremonies at the Johnsonburg Fire Department, which is celebrating its own 100th anniversary.

There will be a social, fireworks display, a pancake breakfast, and a Fire Department Anniversary Dance. From carnival games to an Elvis imperson-

ation, the 3 days of activities August 27 through 29 promises to hold something for everyone.

I am proud of this community in my district and wish it continued success and prosperity for the next 200 years.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the tiny community of Tioga celebrates its 150th anniversary this year. It's located in Tioga County, Pennsylvania, near the border of New York State.

When it was founded, the community was a dense and overpowering wilderness of towering pines and hemlocks with deep undergrowth and teeming wildlife. The early inhabitants were tribes of Seneca Indians, who viewed it as prime hunting and fishing grounds.

□ 2120

It took a brave family, Jesse Losey and his wife, to travel from New Jersey and become the first settlers in the area. Later, Benajah Ives acquired the Losey land and built a house and inn at the southern part of Tioga Borough, now located beneath the Tioga Dam. There is even a story that Thomas Berry won Ives' Inn in a poker game, and it was at Berry's Inn that the first local elections were held in Tioga County in 1804.

It was 1860 when Tioga Borough was separated from Tioga Township and recognized as a separate political division. It is that date that is celebrated this year. The residents are proud of their town and their history, and I wish them sincere congratulations on this historic occasion.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes. (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

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

(Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

#### MAKE IT IN AMERICA

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, before I start, I would like to ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of Manufacturing in America. This is the subject of my Special Order tonight.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, if I might just review with you and others what's happened since 2007 here in the United States. As this diagram indicates, beginning in 2007, the Great Recession during the George W. Bush administration, reaching its lowest point

in December of 2008 and January of 2009 where 750,000 jobs were lost. The Barack Obama administration came in in January of 2009 and within 2 months passed the first stimulus bill which leveled off the decline and slowly began the recovery of the American economy. And most every month since January of 2009 we've seen an improvement, so that in this year, in 2010, we are now seeing small, but important, gains in the employment in America. Some 600,000 jobs have been created over the last several months. This is the result of policies that were enacted by the Democratic Congress, the Senate, and signed by the President.

Those policies we need to understand. They began with the stimulus bill and carried on through several other pieces of legislation. In each and every one of those pieces of legislation, there was no help from our Republican colleagues. They were absent. They voted "no" on the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act; they voted "no" on the Workers, Homeownership, and Business Assistance Act—93 percent of them voted "no." One hundred percent voted "no" on the stimulus even though, as you can see from the charts here, it stabilized the economy and then led to 2.8 million people keeping their jobs and getting a job here in the United States.

The Student Aid and Financial Responsibility Act, 100 percent of Republicans voted "no," denying students larger loans, greater Pell Grants, and it goes on and on. The Cash for Clunkers—and we will hear from Ohio in a few moments—a majority of the Republicans voted "no." The Democrats had to carry the day. The hiring incentives to restore employment, the HIRE Act, creating 300,000 jobs, again, it was the Democrats; the Republicans voted "no."

So after this 18 months of concerted effort to create jobs in America through the various stimulus programs, such as the Cash for Clunkers, the homeowners assistance programs, all of those, we're seeing an improvement. But this was the first 18 months. We are now moving on to the second half of the Democratic agenda. If I might just reach over here, this is the second half of the Democratic agenda, Make It in America; Make It in America so that America can make it.

Manufacturing matters, and that's the subject of our discussion. The first 18 months, get people back to work, stimulate the economy, set a solid foundation. We are now on the road to permanent improvement in the American economy through manufacturing.

Joining me here tonight are my colleagues from Wisconsin and from the great State of Ohio to talk about manufacturing in the Heartland—some of it a little cool, or cold, depending on the time of the year, and some of it, the central part of America's manufacturing sector.

I would like to ask the gentlewoman from Ohio, BETTY SUTTON, to join us

and share with us her experiences about the great State of Ohio and "making it in America."

Ms. SUTTON. Thank you very much, Representative GARAMENDI, for your leadership as we move forward to activate our manufacturing base to revitalize our economy. By enacting policies that will work with our U.S. manufacturers and our workers, we are going to "make it in America."

Manufacturing is the backbone of our economy; it's the backbone of our national security and, frankly, the promise of the middle class. When I grew up, it was a time when people could count on a good manufacturing job to put food on the table and take care of their families and have a pension that they could count on that would be there when they retired, and security. But we've watched our Nation witness the loss of millions of good manufacturing jobs due to policies that put our companies and our workers at an unfair disadvantage. Over the last decade, we've certainly seen those effects across the country, but we've seen them in a big way in Ohio.

The U.S. has lost roughly 6 million manufacturing jobs, with Ohio losing more than one in three manufacturing jobs in the last decade. We've seen factory after factory close as jobs are shipped overseas. We've seen our workers and our jobs undercut by foreign countries and foreign companies and competitors that engage in unfair trade tactics, ranging from Chinese currency manipulation, which is the same thing as cheating, to illegally subsidized steel; and for too long we haven't had a comprehensive plan to reverse this trend. But with our Make It in America initiative, we are saying very loudly, very clearly, and very persistently that we have had enough, that we are going to pass policies that work with and for our U.S. manufacturers and our workers and our country.

Today we passed three bills that are going to bolster U.S. manufacturing and provide for families in northeast Ohio and across this country opportunities for good jobs for today and for tomorrow, because though we may make different things or improved things, we still need to make things; and we're going to do it today, and we're going to do it tomorrow.

Manufacturing jobs have a multiplier effect like no other job out there. Each manufacturing job can generate at least four other jobs in the private sector. Our workers can compete—we know it—as long as they have a level playing field, and our Make It in America agenda is going to help level that playing field.

So I'm very happy to be with you. I know we're going to talk about the bills that were passed today. And I want to just also, before I turn it over, talk about something that we're going to do tomorrow. Tomorrow we are going to, under the Make It in America agenda, we are going to take up the As-

sistance, Quality, and Affordability Act, known as AQUA. It includes an amendment of mine that will ensure that U.S. taxpayer dollars, number one, are going to be used to build our cities' drinking water and sewer systems, and that when we do that, American-made steel and iron and manufactured goods are going to be used to build them.

□ 2130

It is just another example of the things that we can do to make it in America and to make it possible for our workers and for our economy to make it in America.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Would the gentlelady yield for a moment?

Ms. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Do I understand you to say that, presently, our tax dollars that are used for water projects and sanitation projects purchase steel, pumps and other material which are manufactured overseas?

Ms. SUTTON. We have seen our "buy America" provisions in a number of our bills be whittled away over time so that we aren't ensured the way that we should be. When taxpayer dollars are used, I think the American taxpayers expect that we use goods made in America and that we put Americans to work. That is what this amendment is now going to ensure so that the predicament that you've described can't happen, because we now have an amendment to stop it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. So we will use our tax dollars to create manufacturing jobs in America.

Ms. SUTTON. Exactly.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We will make it in America.

If the gentlelady would yield, I would like to turn to our colleague, Dr. KAGEN from Wisconsin. He and I were chatting earlier, and he was in a rage about what happens on the international scene.

Would you like to share that with us, Dr. KAGEN?

Mr. KAGEN. I certainly would.

I want to thank you for convening this special hour to have this conversation about manufacturing things here in America and about making it in America.

Ms. SUTTON from Ohio described what we need. We need a level playing field because, with a level playing field, we can compete and win against anybody in the world as long as we have a level playing field, but that level playing field hasn't existed for quite some time. I'm not going to point fingers at which party started it, because we all had something to do with it—Democrats and Republicans alike.

How did it happen? How did our manufacturing base escape and bleed away? Who opened the door? Who put the hole in the ship? Who bled away our American manufacturing base?

I think it was corporate America. I think, today, we are really back to 1910 where our real competition is on Wall Street.

So people who are back home, listening tonight, have to ask themselves a question: Well, whose side are we on? Do we have our heads in the boardroom of a Wall Street bank or of a Wall Street corporation that is benefiting by shipping our jobs overseas?

No, not at all. We have our feet on the factory floor, and our voting record shows it.

You mentioned earlier in your opening remarks about tax cuts. The Democrats have delivered over \$300 billion in tax cuts to the middle class—to people like Elaine from Peshtigo, who wrote me this note. It's people like Elaine who have rung the bell:

I am soon an 80-year-old woman and a widow. My husband and I farmed, and we certainly had hard times the first years, but the years now are harder for old people. Oil companies take a huge profit. The CEOs make a salary no man on earth is worth. Pill companies are taking huge profits with no consideration for old people. The people of my generation lived through the Depression, World War II and two more wars, and now, in our old age, we face other obstacles.

Well, Elaine, from Peshtigo, Wisconsin, has nailed it. We are on her side. We voted to prevent the Republicans from privatizing Social Security. We voted to prevent the Republicans from sending her money to Wall Street. We voted to strengthen Medicare and to make sure that there are services available for prevention—and at no cost to her and to her husband, should he still be around. We have strengthened Medicare, but the Republicans are trying to destroy it.

Let me come back to the essential point of being here. We know things are tough for everybody in California, Ohio, Wisconsin, and everywhere else in America. How did it get this way? Well, we have been through some tough times. We are going to make it, but we have a lot of work to do.

What happened to our middle class? Middle class destruction. Here is where it is today:

Today, the banks own more homes than people do.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Excuse me.

Are you telling us that banks own more homes than individual families do?

Mr. KAGEN. The banks own more homes today than individual people do.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Those would be Wall Street banks?

Mr. KAGEN. Those would be banks which derivatized and created these derivatives to somehow gin up the mortgage market to \$63 trillion when it was down to \$13 trillion. The banks own more homes than people do, but people need to be in their own homes at prices they can afford to pay.

Secondly, executives on Wall Street earn incomes that are 300 times that of a worker on the factory floor—300-1. Well, 25, 30 years ago, it was 20- to 25-1. Now it's 300-1. So things have been tilted in Wall Street's favor.

Again, whose side are you on—Wall Street's or Main Street's?

Third, these numbers are pretty frightening.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If the gentleman would yield, the Wall Street Reform Act goes to the heart of both of those issues.

Mr. KAGEN. Exactly.

Mr. GARAMENDI. There was significant reform of the mortgage industry with the Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, and there was also a provision—well, it wasn't in the Wall Street Reform Act, but there is a debate going on now here in Congress and in the Senate about what to do with this executive pay, with this 300-1 ratio. That is the question of:

Do we continue the middle class tax cuts, and do we let the tax cuts expire that the Bush administration put in for the high and the mighty and the wealthy?

Mr. KAGEN. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Please.

Mr. KAGEN. The wealthy in America have had a 10-year free ride. For the past 10 years, they haven't paid their fair share. As a direct result, 63 percent of the people in America who used to be middle class are now living paycheck to paycheck and week to week, and 43 percent of Americans have less than \$10,000 in their retirement funds. That is going up towards half of the people in this country who will never be able to retire.

Things have tilted towards the top. This trickle-up philosophy that Republicans launched on us for the past 8 years really hasn't worked for the middle class. That is why I call it "middle class destruction," and the numbers prove it. We have to keep people in their own homes, but they can only afford homes if they have the higher wage jobs, jobs where they're making things in America.

Let me show you this one. If you thought that was bad, here is our competition.

How does the middle class become destroyed? How do you compete with garment workers in China who are being paid 82 cents per hour? Well, I guess you go to Cambodia, because they get paid 22 cents per hour.

Now, America is watching tonight. Do you think Elaine's children and grandchildren are looking forward to working for 22 cents an hour? Maybe the banks should own all of the homes. As for the middle class in America, I'm not sure why we even talk about it. It's an endangered species.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Before you go to the next issue, I recall a piece of legislation that we had on the floor more than a month ago. That piece of legislation dealt with corporate tax breaks. It ended corporate tax breaks for corporations that ship jobs offshore. When a corporation under the present Tax Code sends a job offshore, it gets a tax break. It amounts to \$14.5 billion a year.

Would you put that previous one back up?

Mr. KAGEN. I sure will. Do you want the 22 cents an hour?

Mr. GARAMENDI. The 82 or the 22 cents an hour. Either way.

So, if a corporation were to be making shirts, ties, or suits here in America, it could ship those jobs to China or to Cambodia and get a tax break. Now, this House voted to end that tax break. We voted to end that tax break.

Mr. KAGEN. But it was Democrats.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Again, whose side are you on?

Mr. KAGEN. Right.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Every Republican voted to continue that corporate tax break, giving those corporations tax advantages, literally giving them our tax money so that they could offshore that garment worker's job.

Ms. SUTTON. Excuse me. Will both gentlemen yield for just a moment?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Of course.

Ms. SUTTON. You bring up such an important point.

We had this policy that encouraged jobs to be moved offshore, and we had other policies that, frankly, allowed, for many years, unfair practices to undercut our workers and our businesses.

Now, I know we're all pretty new here. You know, I'm in my second term, and you're in your first term, and the gentleman from Wisconsin—you know, we just came here, so we're fresh in the fight. Yet the reality is that it is important to notice what was happening before the big recession hit.

□ 2140

So in Ohio, those wages have taken our jobs overseas, with the help of tax policies that we have finally been able, with the majority on this side of the aisle, to pass by ourselves to try and change.

And it does beg the question, and I listened to your comments earlier about how we went through this litany of measures to try and stabilize the economy, and we did. And now, of course, this is so important because this goes beyond stabilizing the economy, and it goes towards creating real value by making real things, not pretend values that the banks made and people moving money around made.

Mr. KAGEN. Would the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SUTTON. I will yield.

Mr. KAGEN. We want a middle class to have higher wage jobs, to earn the money they need, to not just educate themselves as workers, but also their family, to begin to save for a retirement that so far they haven't had, and that can only happen with manufacturing jobs. But how can any corporation on Wall Street or Main Street compete with a government?

What's really going on in the world today is the idea, the free market capitalism idea that grew up our middle class, the greatest middle class in human history. Free market capitalism has bumped into a brick wall in

China because the Chinese and Asian model of capitalism is the government is the business, because over in China, the case against China, they have no environmental protection laws. We do. The cost of everything we make went up. Theirs went down.

They have absolutely no social safety net. If a worker in a factory gets injured, he or she is a widget and is gone. No social safety net.

And finally, they really, until recently, haven't had a middle class. They're beginning to move up and develop a middle class. But, you know, where I come from, why should we have to have our middle class begin to disappear just so they can develop their own? I think that's wrong.

And my final slide here, the chase against China. Everybody on the Democratic side of the aisle is fervently interested in promoting making things in America. But how can we compete against China when they continue to manipulate their currency? It gives them a 20 percent to 40 percent price advantage right out of the chute. When China provides subsidies to investors from foreign nations to come in and not pay taxes for several years, well, we can't afford to do that. We actually care about people in America.

And what about the value-added tax, giving them 17 percent benefit? They have import barriers you can't believe.

And then they have something else we're going to begin to talk about, like "Buy American." They've had, for a number of years, "Buy Chinese." They have taken advantage of the United States of America. And this Congress, both the House and the Senate, until this point in time, has been had because we fell into this trap of chasing things at the lowest price of production. But these days must come to an end, and I believe it's time for the American people to understand whose side are we on.

The Democrats have a policy and a way forward to work our way back into prosperity, and it begins with addressing our trade imbalance with Asia and, specifically, with China. It begins with this administration changing their mind about allowing China to manipulate its currency. It begins with people like Ms. SUTTON, Mr. GARAMENDI, myself, standing up to big corporations on Wall Street and calling them out.

It's time to change their ways, begin to make things in America, do that through our trade deals as well.

And I yield.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Ms. SUTTON, would you like to pick it up from there?

Ms. SUTTON. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and I would—because sometimes we come down here and we make the case, but it's important to also let people know that it's not just us saying this. The Economic Policy Institute, on this point about China, the Economic Policy Institute reported that unfair trade with China has cost our Nation 2.4 million jobs between 2001 and 2008.

Ohio, where I am so honored to serve, has lost nearly 92,000 jobs because of China alone. In my congressional district, the 13th District of Ohio, made up of hardworking citizens who want nothing but a fair shake, in my congressional district, 5,700 jobs have been lost as a result of China's currency manipulation, pointed out by the gentleman from Wisconsin, and other illegal subsidies and unfair trade barriers. And these, of course, are good paying jobs that pay family sustaining wages.

And if I could just indulge the gentleman for one moment about a case study, something that has played out in the past year or so. You know, during this recession, when market forces would indicate that you cut back on steel production, do you know what China did? They ramped up production. They dumped that steel into the United States, and my steel companies, our manufacturing companies in Lorain, Ohio, at U.S. Steel—and I like the name, U.S. Steel—were undercut, and so our workers were laid off.

So what did we do? What is our mechanism? Right? Our mechanism is we go to the International Trade Commission. So they had a preliminary hearing, and I went to the preliminary hearing, which was, evidently, an unusual move. But I think I've got to do everything I can to stand up for the people that I represent, so I went to the preliminary hearing.

We got them to move the process forward to a final hearing. We took a letter, I took a letter signed by 40-some colleagues in this House, and we went—I went and others got others to go, and we all went to the final hearing of the ITC. This was about oil country tubular goods, which is what we make in the 13th Congressional District, and how China was unfairly subsidizing their steel.

And what happened? A unanimous decision that it was, indeed, happening. And you know what? That's good, right. That's good news. But the only problem is our people have been out of a job for over a year before we get the tariff gone.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Let me, if I might, just bring that to the West Coast. The San Francisco Bay Bridge, from Oakland to San Francisco, major artery, had a problem with the Loma Prieta earthquake and had to be rebuilt. It's been a long process to rebuild. It's going to be a magnificent new bridge.

The CalTrans, California Transportation Authority went out to bid. An American contractor proposed two bids. One bid was the steel would be manufactured and fabricated here in the United States; the other bid was the steel would be manufactured and fabricated in China. There was a 10 percent difference. The State of California chose to save 10 percent, and all of the steel winds up being imported from China.

We lost jobs. This is an example of where our tax money, and that's exactly what it is, was not used to sup-

port American jobs but, rather, used to support jobs in China. For what, 10 percent?

It turns out it actually turned out to be more expensive because the Chinese welds in the fabrication were not satisfactory, were purposely hidden, and it was only because an inspector finally arrived from California, looked at it and said, Oh, my. This will not work. So they had to go back and do the whole thing over.

One example. I'll give you more examples as we go down here, but I'm telling you this: We can make it in America.

Wind turbines. We led in the development of wind turbines. We're spending billions of dollars a year to subsidize the wind turbine industry.

China said, Oh, we've got wind in China. Let's build wind turbines. They have excluded every international company except a Chinese company in the manufacturing of turbines, and now they are exporting those turbines to America.

The same way with solar panels, photovoltaic panels. And I'll come to buses a little later. But this is something that I find extraordinarily wrong, and we're going to change it. And before this conversation is over, we're going to talk about how it can change.

Mr. KAGEN—excuse me. Dr. KAGEN.

Mr. KAGEN. Yes, yes, the doctor in the House. Thank you.

I was very moved by the idea of steel being targeted for extinction by Communist China. I was very moved. But I represent Paper Valley, you know, Kimberly-Clark, Procter & Gamble. We have 22 different paper companies in my district or just outside of it. We invented the tissue business and femcare products. We have some tremendous paper products.

□ 2150

But we have some problems. The problem is that China has targeted not just steel for extinction here in America, but also automobiles, and a number of other things. And the list goes on: armaments, power generation, oil and petrochemicals, telecommunications, civil aviation, shipping, machinery, automobiles, information technology, iron, steel. They have some very strategic plans underway to target everything we manufacture for extinction to take the jobs away.

And let me detail how they did it in paper. The government would purchase raw materials in Brazil, at government expense ship it over to China, ship it from the port on trucks up to the paper mill, make the paper. And then again at government expense, after the government allows slave-like wages to be paid, the government then pays for the paper to be shipped back to the port, shipped over off of Oakland, and then dumped into the United States of America below our cost of production.

Well, as Ms. SUTTON pointed out, the International Trade Commission can at times be effective, but it takes so long.

You know, justice delayed is justice denied. In health care, treatment delayed is malpractice. And what happened in the paper industry, we lost two paper companies in my district because of unfair trade and unbalanced trade with Communist China. Only recently did the Appleton company that makes coated paper have a successful case before the ITC.

I had the opportunity to testify, much as BETTY did, and I was proud to hold up a picture of the family and to let these judges know that we're not talking about dollars and cents and the worth of a piece of paper like a stock. We're talking about people that live in their home and can't chase their job to China. You can't swim to China, get the job. You can't survive there. So the bottom line is we have to ship our values overseas, not our jobs.

Ms. SUTTON. You are so right. I just want to put a highlight on this fact. When we went to that hearing, the standard for judgment is material harm. So we showed that these actions were undertaken and resulted in material harm; and that material harm, those are people, people with families that they're trying to raise right here in this country right in Lorain, Ohio, and in Wisconsin, and all over this great country. And because of the length of time that this went on, these folks didn't have the income coming in. And guess what? Then our communities didn't have the tax base to support what? Police and fire and city services. And we end up what? Paying unemployment. And people suffer the loss of the dignity of work, which is so important to the people that I represent. They just want an opportunity.

Mr. KAGEN. Everybody that we represent understands the United States of America can't pay its bills, can't pay its debts on unemployment checks. We need real checks, checks that come from manufacturing. And that we can do with balanced trade, but we are running out of time. The American people understand that. That's part of their anger. That's part of their great frustration.

And I know that we have been listening to them on the Democratic side of the aisle, and we are moving as hard and pressing as hard as we can against any administration, against anyone in the United States Senate to begin to identify how we can begin to make things in America again, put people back to work so they can stay in their own home.

Mr. GARAMENDI. At the beginning of this discussion, the gentlewoman from Ohio talked about the wise use of our tax money, in this case in the water systems and the sanitation systems, to use that tax money for materials and products and machines that are built in America. That's but one example. It's a very good example, because we desperately need that infrastructure. It's the foundation for quality life, for healthy life, as well as for building our economy.

There's another one that came to me in this process. Actually, today I had a telephone town hall, and a fellow said, you know, in Vallejo, California, the old shipyard at Vallejo, Mare Island Shipyard, has this huge building, and one of the European train companies is setting up a shop there. They don't know what they are going to do with it, but is there some way that you could help that company bring to Vallejo, California, and Mare Island jobs to refurbish trains? And my answer was, yes, absolutely.

We have had a buy American provision in your tax money for years and years. There has also been in the law four waivers that Secretaries of Transportation have used repeatedly for more than 20 years now to waive off, forget about, ignore the buy America clause. So about \$5 billion a year of our gasoline tax money is used not to buy buses and trains and light rail cars made in America, but rather made overseas.

So my answer to this gentleman was a piece of legislation that I have introduced, a lot of support among my Democratic colleagues to simply tell the Secretary of Transportation you don't have four waivers; we're eliminating three of those discretionary waivers. If the cost is more than 25 percent, then maybe you can have a waiver. But the other three waivers, they're gone. We're bringing those manufacturing jobs, those manufacturing jobs that build the buses, that build the trains, that build the BART cars, the MARTA cars, the transit cars here in Washington, DC, we are going to make those in America because, by golly, that's our tax money, and we're going to use it in America just as we're going to use our tax dollars to make those sanitation systems and water systems from American-made goods. That's our promise, and we can do it.

I talked to Secretary LaHood, the Secretary of the Department of Transportation, yesterday. I said, Mr. Secretary, I know that you have been working hard not to give waivers, but I want to give you—in fact, I want to take away three of the tools that your predecessors have used to ship jobs overseas. And he said, I'm not giving waivers. And I said, if my bill passes, you won't be able to. We're going to spend that money in America. One more example of what we can do not just for jobs today, but for tomorrow and for generations in the future using our tax money to make it in America.

Manufacturing matters. It's the heart and soul of the middle class. It is the strength of the economy. And we're going to reestablish in America the manufacturing industries of yesterday and today, whether it's buses or trains or light rail.

Mr. KAGEN, you were kind of getting agitated there. Maybe you want to add to this.

Mr. KAGEN. Yeah, I was going to actually ask you a question. Isn't it true that we have really begun to close

those tax loopholes that allowed these Wall Street corporations, with the Republican support, to take our jobs overseas? Is that really true?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, the answer is halfway home. This House passed legislation more than a month ago, and tomorrow I believe we will have that same legislation back for another vote. Our Republican colleagues universally voted "no" on ending the tax loophole that gives corporations \$14.5 billion of our tax money to offshore American jobs. We're going to end it. We're going to put the issue back on the floor tomorrow.

The problem is the United States Senate and the Republican Party, where in the Senate one Republican Senator stands up and objects and says I'm going to filibuster, and everything stops. They got to round up 60 votes. The Republican Party controls that 60 votes, and they have repeatedly, time after time said "no" to jobs for American workers in the first 18 months of this Congress, where we have put 2.8 million people back to work. The Republicans in this House and in the Senate say "no."

I have got a solution for it. The next Senator that says, I object and I'm going to filibuster ought to be paraded down to the well of the Senate, the microphones turned on, and start talking, Mr. Senator. Let's see how long you are going to talk with the C-SPAN cameras on you. My guess is within an hour you'll make a fool of yourself. The filibuster will be over. The votes will be there to put Americans back to work.

I yield.

Ms. SUTTON. I thank the gentleman, and I could not agree more. Call the bluff. Let them get up, make the case to the American people about why they're standing between people who need jobs and the jobs that can be there. I mean, I don't think the American people will stand with them. I think they will stand with these policies that we are offering now in this agenda and this moment forward on making it in America.

And I just have to ask the question, because it is really startling if you think about, you laid out all of the things that we did to try and stabilize the economy, and all of the actions we are undertaking and have been undertaking as we build towards the future, where we can make products in America and we can also enable our communities and our workers and our businesses to make it in America.

□ 2200

Every once in a while people must turn on the TV, I know that they do, and they hear our counterparts on the other side, and they say over and over again, as if the American people won't notice that they're voting against everything, they say: Where are the jobs? Where are the jobs?

Well, the reality of it is we're putting the bills on the floor and you're voting

against the jobs. So there's this idea that they must insult the American people by suggesting that somehow the jobs are missing. You're voting against the jobs, and now you have a chance to join us in the Make It in America.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Yesterday, Dr. KAGEN and I were in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee hearing, and Dr. KAGEN was in the chair, and we heard from a panel of contractors and bus manufacturers that the stimulus bill actually created jobs.

Dr. KAGEN, I know you have personal experience in this. You had told me about it earlier. Why don't you share that experience where Republicans say no jobs are created, yet the contractors, the voters are saying thank goodness for the stimulus bill because it kept me in business, it kept my employees employed. Dr. KAGEN.

Mr. KAGEN. The real question would be where would America be today, where would our economy be today, had we not in February of 2009 passed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act? We'd be in the tank.

Mr. GARAMENDI. That was the stimulus bill.

Mr. KAGEN. That was the stimulus bill. More and more people would be out of work. We stabilized State governments. We stabilized private corporations like road builders, like asphalt people, like bridge builders. We stabilized State and local governments to make sure that the police would be there when you dial 911. We stabilized fire departments to make sure if you're on fire at home, help will be on the way. But no, somebody over there has got people confused and angry that somehow it just didn't work.

Look, many economists have said that the economic stimulus bill that we passed last year simply wasn't big enough to get us all the way out of the economic ditch that we're in, but make no mistake about it. The Democratic Party and all of us here in Congress who are voting "yes" for progress, we are cleaning up after the biggest elephant parade in American history. There is so much mess to clean up.

Now, I always told my patients that it would take you about as long to get better as it took you to get sick and to come into my office, and it's going to take us a while to work our way back into prosperity. We will succeed but people in America have an election coming up, and not to be electioneering, but you have to ask yourself the question: What would your life be like without the stimulus bill and having the police and firemen there when you need them? What would your children's life be like at school not to have a qualified educator and teacher in the room to help your children get that world-class education they're going to need to compete against unfair trade deals, as we have with Asia?

So the bill clearly worked and the testimony yesterday in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee

was a resounding "yes." I asked each of the gentlemen there to testify, a hypothetical question: If you had been in Congress, knowing what you know now about how it benefited your company, would you have voted for the stimulus bill. Yes, yes, yes, yes, universally it has helped.

Now, where do we need to invest? Here in America. And when I ask my constituents I say, look, I'm your hired hand. I've got your tax dollars right here. Where should we build the next bridge, the next school, in the sands of Iraq, maybe in northern or south-eastern Afghanistan? No, Doc, we need that invested here at home.

Our Nation's infrastructure is about \$2.1 trillion behind. We need to build our bridges once again, our schools, our water treatment plants. Our hard-earned tax dollars are better invested here at home to grow the economy, to grow the jobs that we need, not on Wall Street but on Main Street, and the real contest here is who are we listening to.

Now, if the C-SPAN camera pans around, they will see a whole lot of empty chairs, but there are three Members standing up having a conversation about in which direction we're going to be moving. But you have to ask the question: who are these other gentlemen and ladies listening to? I'm listening to Elaine from Peshtigo. You're listening to people back home from California, from Ohio, and this is a painful job. This is a painful job because progress is so slow.

But be confident, America. We're beginning to make progress. We're moving our economy forward and up. We need to move up, not down.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Let me give another example of where we can set the stage for future manufacturing jobs in America. It was America that really created the photovoltaic cells. We've lost this industry in America. This is in China. Some of it is in Europe. But it's no longer really much of a manufacturing industry in America.

We talked earlier about the wind turbines and the way in which that industry has gone offshore. We talked about the buses. It turns out that many, many economists, and certainly I would join with them, say that the future industries are green technology industries. We have to shift away from coal and oil. We needed to be energy independent. The green technologies of solar, wind, all of those biofuels and algae fuels, all of those are the industries of the future.

Yet, our tax money is not used to support those industries. All too often here's what happens: Just as in buses, our tax money is used to buy wind turbines from China or Korea. I will give you another example on the wind turbine. Let me get that wind turbine back up here so I can get excited about this.

I represent some of the biggest wind resource areas in the Nation: the Altamont Pass and the Solano wind resource area. I was out there touring it

one day with one of the three companies that operate in the area. I looked at this thing. It's 400 feet tall. The blades are wider than the length of a football field. It's going round and round and generating electricity, and I said, where is it made? And the executive looks at me and said, well—I said, no, no, where is it made? He said, well, the tower is made in Korea. Oh, how about the blades? Well, the blades are coming from Europe. And I said what about the generator and all of the electronics? Well, it's not made here. It's either made in China or it's made in Europe. And I told him, I said, what's wrong with that story? And he said, well, that's where it's made. And I said you're receiving serious taxpayer subsidies to build those, to put those towers in place, and you are subsidizing China. Do you think that's right?

He goes, well—and I said, I'm going to promise you this. I'm going to go back to Washington and I'm going to introduce legislation that says in the green technology, all of those subsidies, all of those tax subsidies for putting the photovoltaic system on top of your roof, for building a huge, giant solar thermal system or biofuels of all kinds, and of course the wind turbines, if you want that tax subsidy, it's going to be made in America or else you will get no tax subsidy. Those are our tax dollars. Those tax dollars are going to be spent on American-made equipment. And he said, Well, I don't think we can do it. I said, Your choice; you don't want the subsidy, then you can buy it from China, but by golly, if you want a subsidy, you're going to buy American-made equipment.

That bill is introduced. It is going to move because Democrats understand American taxpayer money, whether it's building a sanitation system or a water system or paying for a wind turbine or a photovoltaic system on top of your house, those are going to be made in America.

Ms. SUTTON. Or a bridge or a highway. We want this to all be made in America. These are taxpayer dollars. The taxpayers expect it to happen. We need to do this work when it needs to be done, but we need to do it with the American workers and American businesses having the chance to make it in America.

I just want to say to my friend from Wisconsin, I know what he's trying to convey in his remarks, but you know, the American people, they are facing great challenges, and that's what you're reflecting in your comments.

And I have to tell you that I still think that this job, this honor that I have to serve here, I don't think it's painful. I think it's a privilege and I think it's an honor, and I know that the gentleman thinks the same thing about his service in this House.

□ 2210

Because when people are facing the unfair competition that they are facing, the policies that are working

against them instead of with them, the cheating that goes on with currency manipulation and unfair practices, all of those things that are happening, we are here in this moment and we have a chance to change it for them and it matters the most.

So I am very excited about being here, fighting forward, not fighting back, but fighting forward to make sure that we make it in America by strengthening U.S. manufacturing at every turn in ways that make sense for our country, our people. We know we need to manufacture here also because our national security requires us to make things in America.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Dr. KAGEN.

Mr. KAGEN. I certainly appreciate my colleague's comments and I couldn't agree with her more that what we are talking about is our national security. If you don't make anything, you won't have anything. If we don't have a viable economy, we cannot defend ourselves with our military. So we need to manufacture things here in America if, for nothing else, for our own national security.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, we have about 10 minutes left, and I would like to bring us back really to where we started, or where I started this discussion, and that is, for the first 18 months, the strategy of the Democratic Party in this House, in the Senate, and with President Obama has been to stabilize the American economy. Let me go back to this. Let's review what was happening.

Beginning in December of 2007, the last 2 years of the George W. Bush administration, the American economy slid into a recession. It became the greatest recession in America's recent history, since the Great Depression of the 1930s.

By December of 2008, in January of 2009, the last months of the Bush administration, we were losing over 700,000 jobs, 750,000 jobs a month. President Obama came in and my two colleagues here—I was not yet in Congress, having just joined last November—you put through the stimulus bill, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. It stabilized. It stopped the slide, and people began to go back to work, with the largest, middle class tax cut in America's history, the largest middle class tax cut ever in American history. There were major investments in infrastructure. The result, after 18 months, was 2.8 million Americans working that otherwise would have been out of work or had gone back to work; 2.8 million Americans.

We see that here. We see the improvement, the monthly reduction in the number of people losing jobs. So that by this year, 2010, after 1 year of the stimulus program and other programs that were all voted on by Democrats with virtually no Republican support, we began to see job growth; not enough, not nearly enough.

We are now shifting gears. We are into the second half. We have stabilized

the first half. We have reached some improvement, and now, now it is the second half.

In the second half, manufacturing matters. This is the heart, the soul, the strength of the American economy, and it is where the middle class makes it. It happens to be, as you so eloquently pointed out, Dr. KAGEN, it is where the middle class lost. When those manufacturing jobs were shipped overseas, middle class lost. We will make it in America when we manufacture once again in America.

Both of my colleagues here have laid out some very important elements. One is the international competition, and I would like, Dr. KAGEN, if you could review with us the international competition and the disadvantage of one—both hands tied behind the American manufacturer's back.

Dr. KAGEN.

Mr. KAGEN. We are beginning to build a better Nation. We are beginning to put people back to work. There is a great deal of work to do, but our trade deals have to be balanced. Where I come from, people don't want fair trade or free trade; they want it to be balanced.

And if China is sending us a ship with \$50 million worth of goods that they produced and unloading it for sale here in the United States, then they should purchase from our manufacturers, from our workers, \$50 million worth of goods, again, to take back to their country. We have to balance our trade deals.

But it is hard to balance a trade deal when the country manipulates its currency and begins with a 20 to 40 percent price advantage just because they are cheating on the price of their money. It is hard to balance a trade deal when China is subsidizing foreign investors to come in and gives them taxes for free, a free ride for several years. It is hard to have a balanced trade deal when you have got value-added taxes that benefit the Chinese Government's corporations.

When you understand that there is no difference between the government and a corporation, I don't know of a single company that can defeat a government, especially one that is manipulating its currency. You know they have got a "buy China" policy.

We need to balance this deal, have a level playing field, and it begins by manufacturing, giving our manufacturers the tax advantages they need to create American jobs for American workers. For too long, for too long the Republican tax policy has been to reward the wealthy, not those who are working.

If you reward work instead of wealth, we can begin to not just balance our trade deals, but keep people in their own homes to solve our housing crisis and make certain that people have a positive future once again.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Before I turn to the gentlewoman from Ohio, I want to pick up that tax policy. American tax

policy, probably set by both Democrats and Republicans in the past decades, gave an advantage to United States corporations that would offshore American jobs with a tax credit, \$14.5 billion a year.

The end of those credits came to the floor a month ago on a piece of legislation that would end those tax breaks that American corporations have for offshoring jobs. The Democrats voted to move that to the Senate. Not one Republican voted for ending those despicable tax breaks that the corporations have.

There is a difference here. Where do you stand? For whom do you fight?

Now, the gentlewoman from Ohio started us off talking about how we might use our tax money more wisely. Would you please bring us back to the reality of what's going on in your district and how this would benefit your district.

Ms. SUTTON. Well, certainly.

The taxpayers in my district and the businesses, the workers there and across this country, I believe, expect that, when we use those tax dollars, that we use them to buy things and build things in America.

This is about their money and making sure we put it to work for them by putting them to work and not about shipping the money to foreign countries so that they can produce the products there and then ship them back over here.

So today, something very important happened and was passed. It is called the End the Trade Deficit Act, sort of to put a punctuation mark on this. You know, our trade deficit has continued to grow for all of the reasons that we talked about, and our trade deficit increased to \$42.3 billion for May of this year, up from the previous month. The deficit with China, alone, in May was \$22.3 billion, up from \$19.3 billion in April.

So this Make It in America program—and it is not a flash in the pan. This is an ongoing mission that we are on because we are going to revitalize U.S. manufacturing, and we are going to stand up for U.S. manufacturing against unfair competition.

You know, the issue of currency manipulation—we have to, when we come back, I urge everyone, and I know you guys are on board, to bring the bill that is part of Make It in America called the currency manipulation—end currency manipulation, End Chinese Currency Manipulation bill to the House floor for a vote so we can see who wants to stand with U.S. manufacturing. And I am fairly certain that those on this side of the aisle are prepared to do it.

I think we do have some even on the other side of the aisle who are prepared to do it. But it is so critically important that we do take all of these steps on this multifaceted mission that we are on to make sure that our businesses and workers get a fair shake, because we know when they do, it

strengthens our economy. It strengthens our national security, and our folks will be able to make it in America.

□ 2220

Mr. GARAMENDI. How correct you are. And we would reach out to our Republican colleagues and ask them to join us on Making It in America.

We've had enough of our tax dollars shipped overseas to buy buses that are manufactured overseas, to buy trains and ferries. Our tax dollars need to be spent at home. If it's a water system, a sanitation system, a bus, if it's our tax dollars, make it in America. If it's our tax dollars, then let's use it to make our future energy supplies—wind turbines, solar systems—make it in America. It's our mission, in the second half of this session, to make it in America.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, we in West Virginia understand well the need for this "Make it in America" initiative. Even as we diversify, from broadband infrastructure to tourism marketing, we all know what the manufacturing center means for good paying jobs. The leap from a hard days work, producing the best products in the world, to a service-based industry is a far stretch—one that leaves our national security at risk. The House Democrats understand the need for a plan and action to increase American manufacturing and create new American jobs.

When we "Make It in America," we create jobs to lead the world economy. First and foremost, we must ensure that every nook and cranny of the federal government is geared towards American products, American companies and American workers. In 2007, the Defense Department alone allowed over 14,000 contracts for goods and services to go to foreign companies. That's \$5.7 billion American tax dollars we waved goodbye to. We've got to shut the floodgates on the tidal wave of taxpayer's dollars flowing overseas, and shore up our contracts for goods and services bought by the federal government and provided by American workers. I'm a long time advocate for "Buy American" provisions in law, but a concentrated effort will sharpen the focus on a fair deal for our workers and small business and industries.

A global economy doesn't mean a one way trade route for American capital. There's no question we can compete here at home, under fair rules applied to all competitors. Federal agencies should be partners, not competitors, with our workers. The first step towards this realignment is the National Manufacturing Strategy. We passed Congressman LIPINSKI's bill that calls for a National Manufacturing Strategy and will create the high-skill, high-wage jobs of the future—promoting American competitiveness, innovation, and exports.

The manufacturing sector generates two-thirds of our exports, and employs millions of Americans. This manufacturing strategy goes hand-in-hand with the newly formed Buy American Caucus, of which I am a member, by working to promote American jobs; reclaim American leadership in manufacturing; support small businesses; and close loopholes in current law to ensure that the federal government is purchasing American-made products.

Our efforts have the potential to assist manufacturing businesses throughout southern West Virginia. We are proud of those manu-

facturers who continue to support the economy and workers, and are particularly proud of those in the Third District of West Virginia. We have to create a continued demand for American products and create a rebirth of our state and nation as the manufacturing world leader. That effort must start with buying American products here at home.

#### POSITIVE SOLUTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PERRIELLO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I guess I rise at an appropriate time to follow the dialogue that we just heard.

It amazes me, as I'm here now on my 44th day in the House of Representatives, and it seems like on each and every day I've heard the other side of the aisle do nothing but blame a previous administration for the failings of today. It is my hope that at some point they will begin taking responsibility for some of the policy actions.

But what we're here to talk about tonight are positive solutions. We've heard a lot of blaming and name calling here over the past several weeks, and we're here tonight to talk about positive solutions to some of the difficult challenges.

So to the colleagues that were just speaking, we're here to call your bluff. You said come call your bluff, well, here we are, and I've got some good gentlemen that are going to join me. But what I want to start out with today is we're going to talk about the kitchen table solutions.

As you may have heard, we have had a program here where we've been actually going out and seeking solutions from the American people, not from our leadership, not from a political party, but from the American people; and it's called America Speaking Out. And there have been more than 12,000 specific ideas generated from the American people, more than 600,000 votes cast on these ideas as to what is most important.

And so the top concerns from the kitchen table all across America: number one, jobs—and I think we've been saying, where are the jobs? Number two, spending. Why isn't the Federal Government balancing their checkbook? And then health care, ObamaCare itself. So that's what we are going to talk about tonight.

As we move through this, I know we have some colleagues that are going to join me. My good colleague from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is going to be with us and also Mr. THOMPSON from Pennsylvania. But first we're going to talk about the number one issue facing America: jobs, jobs creation.

We have a few quotes here. One—this is, I guess, just from last year, it says: "Our stimulus plan will likely save"—"likely," key word—"save or create 3

to 4 million jobs. Ninety percent of these jobs will be created in the private sector and the remaining 10 percent in the public sector." But now the public sector has lost nearly 8 million jobs in the last 2 years; government has gained 656,000 jobs. So when our colleagues from the other side of the aisle stood here a minute ago and said jobs have been created, they were in fact true; but they were created in the public sector, not the private sector.

And then it also says estimated unemployment without the stimulus would be 8.8 percent this year. Well, with all of the stimulus bailouts, buyouts, Cash for Clunkers, you ring it all up, unemployment in May was 9.7; far exceeded their expectations. So obviously the plans are not working.

So what have been the job killers? Excessive taxation, insufficient liquidity, economic uncertainty, and red tape and government mandates. So over the last year we've seen nearly double-digit unemployment, the debt is continuing to grow, we've got a job-killing agenda, and according to the National Federation of Independent Businesses, one in six small businesses are concerned about the uncertainty of the future. Fifteen million people out of jobs, out of work right now, unemployment at its highest rate in 25 years, and the private sector, again, has lost 8 million jobs.

So we heard a minute ago, stimulus: that was creating all the jobs, that was going to take care of America. Well, I think about stimulus and health care and all that we saw last year, and it brought Americans to the National Capital last year. If you will remember, on September 12, Americans from all over this Nation rode on buses here, flew on airplanes to celebrate—was it to celebrate or to speak out against what has been done? And we all know the American people are not happy right now.

So what is coming up next? 2011, 5 months away, under the leadership here in Congress, we will see taxes go up on each and every American. We heard "middle class tax cuts" just a few minutes ago. There aren't going to be any middle class tax cuts; in fact, every tax rate goes up for every American all across the country in so many different ways. Every individual tax bracket goes up. We have a marriage penalty, the Child Tax Credit will be cut in half. It doesn't sound like a tax cut to me; it's actually a tax increase. And then farmers, small business owners will see their tax rate go up to 55 percent in the States. And then of course capital gains and dividend taxes will rise as a result of the leadership here in Washington.

So much to do, so much to do. The good thing is that we have positive solutions. That's what we are here to talk about tonight. I know my good friend, Mr. THOMPSON from Pennsylvania, is a good leader on job creation and is working hard in that area. I would love to have you join us, if you