our economy. The average manufacturing worker produces four times as much per hour as the average worker did 50 years ago. As a result, manufacturing has been one of the most important parts of the economy and has produced higher living standards for Americans as those products from American manufacturing have become cheaper and better and wages in manufacturing have risen. But now we are losing our manufacturing base as we tend to move towards a service economy.

With manufacturing suffering in recent years, other industries such as the service sector have offered alternative employment. The trouble is that manufacturing cannot be simply replaced by insurance companies or the legal profession or retail trades. There are only four economic sectors that generate material wealth. Only four. And they are agriculture, where they produce things; mining, where they produce things; manufacturing, where they produce things; or construction. And those are the four. Of those, only manufacturing is not limited by natural resources and is capable of export.

We need innovation to produce better products at competitive prices to regain our manufacturing leadership. We cannot pay American-level wages unless we can still be competitive. That means innovation for quality products and increased productivity. Innovation starts with basic research, followed by application and commercialization.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Research under the Committee on Science, I am familiar with the government's efforts to find and promote basic research, mostly through the National Science Foundation. NSF has seen substantial increases in recent years, and we need to ensure that this money is spent in ways that research discoveries can have the greatest impact in terms of promoting innovation and practical application for United States businesses. The development of basic research for industrial use has generally been the province of businesses which undertake these efforts to create new products. Unfortunately, according to witnesses at a recent Committee on Science hearing, application is the hardest part. Companies facing intense competitive pressure find it difficult to set aside sufficient resources, money, to develop new products, especially if the results cannot be anticipated before 5 or 6 years. So we are having a gap. Government is now the substantial payer of basic research; and having that research with tech transfer and to apply that research for better and more products and efficient ways of manufacturing is what we are lacking.

Development also suffers from low prestige. The academic community and Federal grants generally reward those who seek knowledge for knowledge's sake rather than those who do the necessary development work. Some foreign countries spend their research dollars monitoring our government funding basic research and then spend the rest of their government money to apply that research for commercial products ahead of our getting that application in the United States.

Another problem we face is the shortage of math and engineering talent. The United States has long lagged far behind other nations when it comes to producing top-notch engineering and research talent. Let me just give an example of China. China produces 10 times as many engineers as we do in the United States. This cannot continue if we expect to continue a strong economy in the United States. It cannot continue to go on without erosion of our international competitiveness. That is why I have pushed NSF to do a better job of promoting math and science careers to students. We need more capable math and science students for research and business and for our future.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the decline in manufacturing employment is something that we ignore at our peril. Over the long term, we cannot hope to have a healthy and growing economy unless we make lots of tangible goods that people want to buy both in the U.S. and overseas markets. Government needs to support not only basic research but to provide incentives for American business to develop applications to ensure continued economic health.

IN SUPPORT OF THE CHILD TAX CREDIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's New York Times story ran a headline: ''Iraqis Are Out of Jobs, But Pay Day Still Comes.'' With the administration's blessing, 200,000 Iraqis are receiving $20 a day for no-show jobs. They do not work. They do not show up for work. They do not do any work. Twenty bucks a day. I come from Chicago, from Cook County. We like no-show jobs. We think that is a good thing. We built an entire political party on no-show jobs, not at 20 bucks a day; but for everybody's appreciation, in the last 2 months we have given Iraqi families nearly $900. That is equal to the amount that we would pay for the child credit. So we are paying Iraqis and Iraqi families 900 bucks over the last 2 months, which is equal to what we are fighting over here, which I do not believe we need to fight here in the House since the Senate agreed 94 to 6 for the same amount of money. Yet somehow we said in Iraq if they do not work, if they do not show up for work, we will give them 20 bucks a day. It is a no-show job. It looks pretty good to me. But here if they work full time, trying to help their families, trying to raise their kids with the right values, trying to provide them clothes for school, food for the summer, a camp, a program, YMCA, they are not part of the American family.

I want to tell the Members something. Here is an American official, a government official who said nobody is going to quibble about paying a few dollars into this economy.

I am going to quibble. I do not know whom he talks to. I do not know who is paying him except for all Americans, and he says nobody is going to quibble? But what we are quibbling about is whether the children of America, 12 million children, 6.5 million families, are going to get the same sense of value here in America that we are saying in Iraq that for 20 bucks a day they do not have to show up for work and we will pay them. But here if they show up for work, work hard and pay their taxes, they do not deserve a tax cut, that they are unappreciative.

Who are these children? They are America's children, and they have done right. Parents are trying to raise them with good values, trying to teach them right from wrong. And what do we do in Congress? We turn those values on their head. We turn those values upside down and say if they work full time trying to do right by their kids, they do not deserve a tax cut. We are going to treat Iraqis with a different sense of values, a different sense of appreciation.

Let us be clear about what this says about who we are. America's children. Enron in the last 4 out of 5 years had record profits, did not pay taxes 4 out of 5 years. They got breaks. WorldCom, $12.5 billion in profits, 2 out of 3 years did not pay any taxes. They were big recipients of government contracts, yet did not pay taxes. We are paying their taxes. Tyco decided to move their address down to Bermuda, got a new ZIP code, new area code. $600 million dollars in government taxes were not paid; yet they got benefits in government contracts. That is a form of corporate welfare. If they do not pay, if they do not work and they are a corporation, we take care of them. America's children, 12 million of them, we are not going to give them a tax cut.

Recently on a Friday, the unemployment rate hit 6.1 percent. When this President came to office, the unemployment rate was 4 percent. Nearly 3 million Americans have lost their jobs, and we have added $3 trillion to the Nation's debt. What a deal, as we would say back in Chicago. $3 trillion dollars added to the Nation's debt, and Americans are paying with their jobs.

I believe the Senate did right. They did right by our values as Americans; and I know people on the other side of the aisle. They are good people with good values, but those values that left the 12 million children on the floor while corporate interests were circling the conference room are not the values we came here to vote for. We all came not just to be a vote, but we came to be a voice for our values and the values

that say WorldCom is going to get protected; Iraq, 20 bucks, no-show jobs, they are going to get protected; 6.5 million American families work full time, making somewhere around $20,000, and I am talking about a rookie cop, first-year teacher, first-year emergency worker, those types of people, they are not getting a tax cut. They are not worthy of it.

What does that say about who we are? So that tax bill is not just dollars and cents. It is a reflection of our values as Americans. And this person, this body, is going to quibble with an American official who thinks that somehow paying 20 bucks a day not to shows up for work is valuable; but if one shows up every day trying to provide for their children, that is not valuable and it is not worthy of a tax cut. It is worthy of a tax cut. Those children are America's children. That mother and father earning $20,000 are as valuable as if that mother and father were earning $200,000.

So I would say that this House, this body, we did not come here to just be a vote. We came here to give voice to our values and the values that we all represent regardless of what part of the country we come from. Regardless of what party we are from says that those 12 million children, they too deserve to go to school, they too deserve to go to the YMCA, they too deserve to go to the summer camp, and they too deserve for their parents to put funds away for their higher education; and we in this body need to take up the Senate bill, take up the DeLauro bill and vote on it immediately so the President can sign it so that on July 1 their tax cut gets sent too so that when they show up for school like the Iraqis who do not show up for work, they get a tax cut too.

UCF CHAMPIONSHIP CHEERLEADING TEAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a big thrill to rise today to honor a hometown university, the University of Central Florida, and their cheerleading team for their Division I championship and cheerleading and dance team competition this year. UCF President John Hitt and the entire UCF family are simply thrilled with the success and are extraordinarily proud of this accomplishment. In fact, this is no fluke. UCF cheerleaders have finished in the top 10 for 9 out of the last 10 years. Talk about consistency. All champions exhibit quiet determination; but two teammates especially, Jamie Woode and James Kersey, demonstrated exceptional resolve above and beyond the call by competing with serious injuries, a broken fibula for Jamie and a torn rotator cuff for James. That is the UCF Knights spirit.

A student athlete's success is not merely measured by athletic performance, however. This 18-member team holds a cumulative 3.3 grade point average. During her 19-tenure as coach, Linda Gooch has witnessed all but one of her team members earning bachelors degrees, an all-too-rare accomplishment in Division I competitive student athletic programs. Today I will submit a resolution with many colleagues from Florida commending the fabulous success of the University of Central Florida cheerleading team on its championship this year and wish them continued success in the future both on and off the field.

THE CHILD TAX CREDIT, THE REPUBLICAN TAX BILL, AND THE RANGEL PACKAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Houston, Texas, I stood with carpenters and letter carriers, working families who work for the communications industry of the Nation, builders who build in the hot sun and the very cold winters, and those who take our plates away in restaurants and hotels. Some would call them the working class: low-income families, middle-income families. The one thing that they probably are not considered to be in this Nation, though I abhor any sense of class distinctions, but they probably would not be considered elite.

So I stand here today, Mr. Speaker, in arguing on their behalf, particularly in light of the very inequitable tax bill that was passed just a few weeks ago. I think the argument could be made that the elite went free on that day and they marched the working poor and the working Americans into a locked jail and threw the key away because the $550 billion tax cut that the President signed clearly did not represent working families of America, clearly did not represent individuals whose income may fall between $10,000 to $26,000.

Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in having a class between incomes. I certainly appreciate those who have made their way in this Nation and have built their income and capital upon the democracy and the free opportunity for business in this Nation. But, frankly, I think it is appalling and an outrage that we can be in this Congress, take our income every day, take the benefits of this Nation, and refuse to protect the least of those. The Senate has passed a bill. It has fixed its error. The first error came when they refused to take the Lincoln amendment in the last hours, Senator LINCOLN's amendment in the last hours of the tax negotiations. They left the working people off the table. So they enacted a bill that values the elite few over millions of Americans and left out those who make between $10,000 and $26,000.

That is why I am here to support the Rangel-DeLauro bill as an original cosponsor to restore that tax credit. What does that mean? That when the checks are issued in July to all the millions of others who are doing well, a tax credit for children, $400 to make it a total of $1,000, who will be left out? Those who make the 10,000 to $26,000. Are they the deadbeats of America, are they the undeserving, are they the ones that my good friends on the other side continue to hammer over and over again they do not pay taxes? I reject it. I refute it. It is ridiculous. They pay payroll taxes. They pay property taxes. They pay sales taxes. They contribute to America's economy. How dare you provide this elitist response that these working families who get up every day and clean tables, these working families who get up every day and help build America, are you telling me that they do not deserve a tax credit on their children?

The reason, Mr. Speaker, that I add to this is that we have the worst unemployment in America that we have had in America's history amongst any President in the United States. We have gone up to 6.1 percent unemployment with unemployed reaching $3.1 million. That means that the very people we are talking about per child tax credit may have only one bread winner in the family. Not two, but one. And that means that children who need these dollars maybe for the beginning of the school year are now denied because of the elitist attitude of this Congress and the Republican leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I refuse to stand with that kind of Neanderthal thinking. I prefer standing with the hundreds who stood with me, working men and women who are appalled by the lack of a tax credit and equally appalled by the opportunity or the effort by this particular body, this Republican majority, to put a comp time bill on the floor of the House which eliminates any opportunity for individuals who get overtime pay and gives them only, only compensation by giving them comp time off. Not when they need it, Mr. Speaker, but when the employer says they can have it.

So here we go. We have got a tax scenario that penalizes working families. We have a working bill that violates the Fair Labor Standards Act, and we have an overall package that we are trying to help Americans and we cannot seem to get it on the floor of the House. We need to get the Rangel-DeLauro bill, H.R. 2286, on the floor of the House now, this week. We must continue to fight for providing them along with our United States military personnel whose salaries fall within that $10,000 to $26,000 a year. We have got to stand to create jobs when we have seen such an enormous loss of jobs. Mr. Speaker what we have here is a failing of the United States Congress,