

(Mr. LIPINSKI 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 gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

PROBLEMS THAT OHIO FACES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker for his recognition, and I am happy to be joined this evening by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), and later we will be joined by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN). We are going to be talking this evening about the Nation, but especially about some of the problems that are faced by those of us who live in the State of Ohio.

□ 2000

Mr. Speaker, Ohio's theme has been "Ohio, The Heart of It All." It is true that Ohio is the heartland of our Nation. Ohio probably more than any other State is a microcosm of this great Nation. We have the Great Lakes to the north, the majestic Ohio River along the eastern and southern boundaries. We have some of the richest, most productive farmland in the world. We have great cities: Akron, Toledo, Youngstown, Cincinnati, Columbus. They are wonderful metropolitan areas. We have small towns. And many of those small towns are in my district. Certainly Youngstown and Steubenville, Marietta, Portsmouth, Lisbon, Ohio, all wonderful towns. And we have a great diversity of population. We have great ethnic and racial diversity. We have religious diversity. We have high tech and some of the greatest universities that exist in this country.

Although the American people are hurting tonight economically and otherwise, the people of Ohio are especially hurting. In the month of June, Ohio lost 14,100 jobs, bringing the total number of jobs lost since President Bush came to office, the number of jobs lost in Ohio, to 231,500 jobs. In June, Ohio lost 3,400 manufacturing jobs, bringing the total number of manufacturing jobs lost under President Bush to 173,300 jobs. That is only 200 jobs behind those jobs lost in Texas, and third in the entire Nation.

The number of unemployed persons in Ohio grew by 111,121 since President Bush took office in 2001, rising to a total number of 3,338,831 persons unemployed last month. That is in Ohio. Nationwide, job creation is still anemic

with only about 110,000 jobs created nationally in the last month.

The middle class in America is being squeezed. Senator JOHN KERRY has been talking about this middle-class squeeze. Over 90 percent of the new jobs created since August 2003 are service-sector jobs that pay an hourly wage of less than the national wage average. About 1.4 million of the jobs created are service-sector jobs with an average wage of \$15.24 an hour, which is 41 cents less than the national average. And 203,000 of these jobs are temporary in nature, providing no stability to the people and the families who depend upon them. Approximately 370,000 of these jobs were in low-paying domestic industries such as wait staff in restaurants and bars and retail workers.

In addition to this, and most Americans know this, wages are at a record low. Over the last year, the average hourly wage has fallen. When adjusted for inflation, wages are now at the lowest point in 2 years, and the typical American family is making \$1,500 less per year under President Bush.

The portion of the national economy going to wages is lower than it has been since 1966. In contrast, after-tax corporate profits are the highest since the government began keeping track in 1947. So the wages of America's workers are declining and the income of the corporate giants are increasing.

Now as we approach a month-long recess, instead of this Congress taking steps to help the American working family, Congress is spending its last remaining days debating what is likely to be an unconstitutional effort to block gay marriage and a bill to further extend tax cuts to those who are already wealthy. No wonder that this Congress has come to be known as the "do-nothing Congress." Instead of taking up bills which focus on issues which are really important to the average American, congressional leaders are focusing on issues which are important to their very narrow political constituency. The priorities of this Congress do not reflect the priorities of the American people.

Tonight, my colleagues, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), and I will be talking about some of these issues to inform the American people and to try to alert our colleagues to what is really happening in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. The gentleman talks about an area in his district which is near and dear to my heart. My grandfather lived in Portsmouth, Ohio, and raised nine children in Portsmouth, and I still have cousins and relatives there.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, every time I mention a town in Ohio, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) has relatives there. I do know

the gentlewoman's relatives in Portsmouth, Ohio, and they are delightful folk, and I am so pleased the gentlewoman is joining us today, and it is wonderful to have her as a colleague because I do feel like we come from the same part of the country.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I also recognize the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) from the Youngstown area. He has come to Congress, and he has not missed a beat; and I am so proud and pleased he is doing such a wonderful job.

Tonight I am going to focus on gas prices because gas prices have significantly affected Ohioans. I rise to express my disdain that gasoline prices have increased dramatically, exceeding \$2 per gallon, and reached record levels in May 2004. Although recent decisions by OPEC are expected to have some impact on gas prices, the Energy Information Administration has indicated that gasoline price levels are still expected to remain high by historical standards.

These high gasoline prices have significant impacts on family budgets and on the economy as a whole. We were talking about the middle-class squeeze; I am going to talk about middle-class and lower-class squeeze. Who can expect that they are going to have to pay \$2 a gallon for gas? Last night in Cleveland at a gas station right around the corner from my house, a guy walked up to the window and said \$40 worth of gas.

Increased expenditures for gasoline reduce families' discretionary income and can result in inflation in the price of consumer goods. On May 17, 2004, the Federal Reserve Chairman, Alan Greenspan, indicated that the dramatic increase in oil and gas prices is "an economic event that can significantly affect the long-term path of the U.S. economy."

A recent report by the staff of the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives found that increased cost of gasoline prices can force motorists in Ohio to pay \$483 million more for gasoline in the summer driving season than they did last summer. The increased cost will be approximately \$62 million in the Cleveland area alone. For the average family in Ohio, the increasing gasoline prices can increase fuel costs by \$125 between Memorial Day and Labor Day.

In recent months, gasoline prices have increased rapidly in Ohio and in the Columbus area. On July 6, 2004, the average price for a gallon of gasoline in Ohio was \$1.81. Compared to 1 year ago, that represents a 35-cent-per-gallon increase.

Prices have increased by a similar amount in metro areas throughout the State. On July 6, 2004, average gasoline prices were \$1.82 in the Cleveland area, an increase of 32 cents a gallon compared to prices 1 year ago. In 2004, drivers in Ohio will purchase approximately 5.5 billion gallons of gasoline, an estimated 460 million gallons per month. Assuming that the prices remain at the statewide average of 35

cent per gallon average higher this summer than in 2003, increased gasoline prices could cost Ohio drivers an additional \$161 million monthly. Over the 3-month summer driving season from Memorial Day through Labor Day, the total increased cost for drivers in Ohio would be \$483 million. An estimated 12 percent of all gasoline used in Ohio is used in the Cleveland area. That means that Cleveland drivers purchase approximately 57 million gallons of gasoline monthly. Assuming gasoline prices in the region remain 36 cents per gallon higher this summer than last year, increased gasoline prices will cost Cleveland drivers almost \$21 million monthly. For the 3-month summer driving season from Memorial Day through Labor Day, the increased cost for Cleveland drivers would be approximately \$62 million.

There are 7.7 million registered drivers in Ohio. On a per-driver basis, the increased gasoline prices will cost the average driver in Ohio \$60 over the summer months. An average two-car family in Ohio will spend an additional \$125 for gasoline during the summer driving season, and the list goes on.

I am here to say that under this administration, we have not seen any efforts to decrease the cost of gasoline, which continues to put a pinch on our families.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, in the last Presidential election, then-candidate, now President, Bush said, I am an oil man. He said, I am not a big oil man, but I am an oil man, and I know how to jawbone, and I will jawbone OPEC and I will tell them to turn on the spigots.

The Saudi regime, I believe, only remains in power because of the support they receive from this country. In my judgment, if we were to withdraw our support from Saudi Arabia and that regime governing that country, they would be gone in a split second. And yet at a time when we really needed their help, when our economy was struggling to recover, they participated in a decision to cut oil production which sent the cost of gasoline in this country skyrocketing. To my knowledge, President Bush has said nothing to OPEC, nothing to the Saudi regime. He has not jawboned. We have gone through this spring and summer with all of these high prices. The gentlewoman talked about the price of gasoline in Ohio, and that situation exists across this country.

Now, are we going to have lower prices soon? I suspect we may because I think there is reason to believe that an arrangement has been made with OPEC and especially the Saudi government as the election comes nearer and nearer, that they will take steps to increase production and thereby decrease the price pressure, and the result may be lower gasoline prices. But I hope the American people remember what they have gone through over the last 5 or 6 months. I hope they remember the hundreds and hundreds of dollars that

have come out of their family budgets as a result of these high gasoline prices.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) for sharing her thoughts.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I heard on the news that a Saudi person, a representative said in fact they do this every time a Presidential year comes up, nearer to the Presidential election, they reduce the cost of gasoline in an effort to support the President.

I want to remind Members of one more thing. I heard candidate Bush, then-candidate, now President Bush, say if Bill Clinton wanted to reduce the cost of gasoline in the United States, all he would have to do was pick up the phone, call the OPEC leaders and say, turn on the spigot.

My statement to President Bush is practice what you preach. Pick up the phone, call the OPEC leaders, and tell them to turn on the spigots. It is a much more complicated process than that. He knows it, but now he is not willing to step up and do what he said back when he was a candidate.

□ 2015

I want to again thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) for his leadership. I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) for the opportunity to be a colleague of his.

Mr. STRICKLAND. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), our newest representative from the Youngstown/Trumbull County area.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for the opportunity here tonight and for taking the leadership to put this together for us for the Ohio delegation.

We have suffered unlike any other State, I think in the country, as far as job loss goes. The one statistic that former Secretary Reich shared with us last week was that one in five of the jobs in the United States of America that were lost have been lost in the State of Ohio. One out of every five. And so if there is any constituency, if there is any State that has something at stake in the upcoming election, I think it is the great State of Ohio.

I would like to shift gears a little bit, not too much, but to talk a little bit within the same context of job loss and talk a little bit about China.

Ohio has had over the years an extremely strong manufacturing base in a variety of sectors, an opportunity to really grow our economy over the last 30 or 40 years and to provide a great opportunity for immigrants who have moved into the State of Ohio an opportunity to have a good wage and a pension and health care benefits and be able to send their kids on to school. We are now competing with, really, the great country as far as manufacturing goes that is China. We cannot deny it any longer. In many ways we have let

this happen, but we have to deal with the facts as they present themselves today.

I was going through Wired Magazine last week, and I want to share with the American people and the citizens of the State of Ohio some statistics and some pie charts here. I do not know if they can read them at home so I will share them with them, but they can get this at Wired Magazine. I do not know if it is on their Web site or not, but their last publication had these, or maybe it was two publications ago, had these statistics in there. I want to share them with the American people because I think they are very indicative of the situation we are facing, the critical situation that we are facing in the United States of America.

Let me just say, first, that this is not an issue that we can deal with 10, 20, 30 years down the line. This is not an issue where we can say, "We're just going to wait. We're the United States. We're the superpower, the only superpower. We're going to wait and we'll deal with that later. We've got to deal with Iraq, and we've got the budget deficits."

Mr. STRICKLAND. The fact is if we do not wake up and smell the coffee in a few years, and I am talking about a handful of years, we are going to find that China is going to eat our lunch economically. They have billions of people. They do not have the same kind of requirements that we have here in terms of environmental requirements, labor standards. Their wages are pathetic. We are talking about pennies a day. And they use slave labor; they use child labor.

They are an authoritarian government. I have been told that when a Chinese worker is injured on the job, they are just shuttled aside and they bring on someone else. So there are all kinds of reasons why the playing field is not level when it comes to China and dealing with China and this trade issue.

We made a mistake, in my judgment; this Congress, this administration made a mistake in granting to China most-favored-nation trading status. We gave them the advantages that come with that designation.

We supported their entry into the World Trade Organization, although they are authoritarian, although they are oppressive, although they routinely abuse their own citizens in terms of human rights and civil rights; and yet now we are allowing them to engage in a trade relationship with us which is out of balance, unfair, unequal.

I think my friend is right, and I believe he has some charts there showing what is happening in terms of certain sectors of our economy.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And staggering, staggering in the sense, and the gentleman has been here a lot longer than I have, but he will remember, every trade agreement that we have signed, from NAFTA on, the great phrase, the permanent normal trade status that we have granted to China, at one point it

was most-favored-nation, and Singapore and Chile and then Australia and now Morocco later this week.

In each instance, when we were talking about this, we were told that the high-wage jobs were going to stay here and that we were going to give the lower-paying jobs, the jobs that Americans did not want, we would let them go to China. We were told that all this new high technology, all these new high-tech jobs that we were going to be creating here in the United States of America would stay here, so our people would benefit with the jobs and health care and everything else.

I want to just share with the American people these pie charts. This is the top five exporters of electronics in the billions of dollars in 2002. Top five exporters of electronics, one of the industries that we thought when everyone was talking about these trade agreements, we could keep here.

Who is actually exporting these electronics? The United States of America in 2002, \$2.5 billion; China exporting electronics, \$3.8 billion worth. The United States, \$2.5 billion; China, \$3.8 billion. That was in 2002, top five exporters. Then it goes on, it has Italy is at \$5.9 and Germany and the Republic of Korea.

Then we get to the top five exporters of telecom equipment in the billions of dollars in 2002. United States of America, \$21.6 billion; China, \$36.4 billion. In electronics, in telecommunications equipment, we are getting our clock cleaned. Wake up and smell the Starbucks.

Next pie chart. I will start over here. The top five exporters of assembled computers. When we were hearing NAFTA and GATT and permanent normal trade, these were the jobs. We are going to start making computers in the United States of America. You are going to go from making steel to computers. It is going to be great. You are going to make good wages. You are going to be able to move your community forward and increase your tax base.

Top five exporters of assembled computers, United States, \$2.4 billion; China, \$3.8 billion. They are cleaning our clock in the computer industry as well. Ireland, \$4.6, Mexico, Malaysia.

So the point is well taken. Electronics, telecommunications equipment, assembled computers, we are getting our clock cleaned by China.

And so the point I want to make is, it is easy to sit up here and say, what do we do? We are getting beat up. We look like Rocky Balboa at the end of Rocky I. We have the bloody eye and we cannot see. We have the Band-Aid and our nose is broke. That is how the United States looks as we are competing with China.

And so what do we do? It is easy to make that analysis. The only thing that we can do is invest in education in the United States of America, and we have not done it.

This is a staggering statistic that I want to share with the American peo-

ple that will explain and illustrate why we are having the problems that we are having today with China and why, if we do not fix this problem, we are going to continue to have these kinds of troubles.

Top five sources of engineering graduates: United States of America, 59,000 in 2001; China, 219,563 engineering graduates.

If we want to create the new economy, if we want to compete in electronics and computers and telecommunications equipment, if we want to start exporting, we need to have engineers graduating from universities in the United States of America who are going to go out into our economy, who are going to create jobs, start businesses, work for American companies. There are not many Americans that want to move to China. There just are not that many. That is not a jingoistic statement. That is not slamming the Chinese. The Chinese have a proud culture, as they should, as every country does in some capacity.

But quite frankly, I was not elected in China. I was elected in the United States of America. And when you see a problem like this, a problem that can be fixed, 219,000 engineers in China graduating every year compared to 59,000 in the United States of America, that is something that the United States of America can fix. We can make it a national priority. We can fund Pell grants. We can lower tuition costs around the country. We can provide incentives for people to graduate in math and science and engineering and the different kind of technological industries that we need them to graduate in.

We need to fund No Child Left Behind. We need to start at the beginning and we are not doing the job here in the United States of America.

There are a lot of problems here that we cannot fix. There are some problems that you hope, you say your prayers at night that the problems get fixed. This is not one of them. This is a problem we can fix. The unfortunate thing is, as I go through these educational statistics here, title I, underfunded by \$7.2 billion. The No Child Left Behind Act that was passed by this administration and the Congress, the last Congress, just in Ohio, the No Child Left Behind Act with all the Federal mandates in Ohio, Ohio local school districts are underfunded by \$1.5 billion this year, \$1.5 billion.

Pell grants, in the 1970s when they started, they accounted for 80 percent of a person's college tuition. Now they account for 40 percent. Student loans being run by the banks. The banks are in on the deal now. We have to worry about making sure the banks make their cut instead of making sure students have the opportunity to go to school. There are 250,000 people that are college eligible that do not go to college because they cannot afford it, 250,000.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Speaking about China, job loss, the needs that we have,

I have a chart here that shows that since President Bush has been in office, I am talking about the period from January 2001 through April of 2004, 48 of our 50 States have lost manufacturing jobs. These are jobs that traditionally pay decent wages, have benefits, enable a person to support their families, pay their taxes, support their communities. If we can just look at the heartland of our country here, and I am talking about our great State of Ohio, Ohio has lost 163,500 manufacturing jobs.

That job loss is continuing. We now know from the recent statistics that just last month, Ohio lost more than 3,000 manufacturing jobs.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thought the economy was doing great. Did I miss something?

Mr. STRICKLAND. There are people who live in Never-Never Land. People in this administration must live in Michael Jackson's Never-Never Land because they seem totally out of touch. The President comes to Ohio and he talks about how the economy is doing better than it has done in decades. Where is he talking about? What is he talking about?

The job loss continues. You look at our surrounding States. Pennsylvania lost 157,400 jobs. West Virginia, a fairly small State, 9,500 manufacturing jobs. The great State of Kentucky where I got my education, my higher education, lost 38,600 jobs. Indiana lost 66,500 jobs. Michigan, 133,200 jobs. The job loss is horrendous, and it is continuing. Even the jobs that are coming back do not pay nearly as much as the jobs that have been lost.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) who is kind enough to join us tonight.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I appreciate this discussion tonight and just wanted to make a few points. The gentleman said that there has been talk from the Bush administration, from the President himself, on how there has been this great recovery. I wanted to point out what was in the Wall Street Journal today that talks about that, yes, for some sectors of the economy, there has been a recovery.

□ 2030

They talk about a two-tier recovery that is going on where wealthier households are the big beneficiaries of a stronger stock market and higher corporate profits and bigger dividend payments and boom in housing, but ordinary people are not seeing that same kind of recovery.

And they show some very telling statistics here. For example, hotel revenue was up 11 percent in the first 5 months of 2004 at luxury and upscale chains, but just up 3 percent at economy chains. At the five-star Broadmoor Hotel in Colorado Springs, Colorado, \$600-a-night lakeside suites are sold out every day through mid-October.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think this may indicate something that I think we intuitively feel, that under this administration the wealthy have done very well. There are people in this country who have got significant tax breaks, who are capable of paying \$600 a night for a hotel room. Most of my constituents certainly could not do that, and I think this is just one example of how the rich are being well cared for by the Bush administration. The working middle class is being squeezed, as Senator JOHN KERRY and Senator EDWARDS have been talking about as they have traveled around this country. There is a middle-class squeeze. The wealthy are doing very well.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, let me give the gentleman a couple of other examples that will kind of surprise him, I think. At least I do not know people who spend this kind of money. At high-end Bulgari stores, and I may not be pronouncing it right because I am not sure what they are, but "at high-end Bulgari stores, meanwhile, consumers are gobbling up \$5,000 Astrale gold and diamond 'cocktail' rings made for the right hand, a spokeswoman says. The Italian company's U.S. revenue was up 22 percent in the first quarter. Neiman Marcus Group, Inc., flourishing on sales of pricey items like \$500 Manolo Blahnik shoes, had a 13.5 year-over-year sales rise at stores open at least a year. By contrast some 'same stores' sales at Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., retailer for the masses, were up just 2.2 percent in June. Wal-Mart believes higher gasoline costs are pinching its customers. At Payless ShoeSource, Inc.," and I know about Payless Shoes, "which sells items like \$10.99 pumps, June same-store sales were 1 percent below a year earlier.

"A similar pattern shows up in cars. Luxury brands like BMW, Cadillac, and Lexus saw double-digit U.S. sales increases in June from a year earlier. Sales of lower-tier brands such as Dodge, Pontiac, and Mercury either declined or grew in the low single digits."

So it is not just the gentleman that thinks that maybe there is a difference, but this economist from J.P. Morgan, Dean Maki, says: "To date the recovery's primary beneficiaries have been upper-income households." He said, "Two of the main factors supporting spending over the past year, tax cuts and increases in stock wealth, have sharply benefited upper-income households relative to others."

So we have the good times for upper-income Americans and pretty hard times or certainly not better times for most other Americans.

If I could just go on for another minute, there was an article also in the New York Times on July 18. The headline was: "Hourly Pay in U.S. not Keeping Pace with Price Rises," and the lead is: "The amount of money workers receive in their paychecks is failing to keep up with inflation." So

this is really the relevant number. Even though we may be seeing some increase in jobs, what we are finding is that wages are going down, that American workers are having a hard time keeping up with inflation.

Last Friday, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that hourly earnings of production workers, non-management workers ranging from nurses and teachers to hamburger flippers and assembly-line workers fell, wages fell, 1.1 percent in June after accounting for inflation. The June drop, the steepest decline since the depths of the recession in mid-1991, came after a 0.8 percent fall in real hourly earnings in May.

And one other article I wanted to quote from the New York Times on Sunday, if I could, and that will end my comments: "If President Bush was correct when he asserted recently that the economy was strong and getting stronger, why are so many people not only out of work but also looking for jobs?"

"Mr. Bush noted with evident relief that the Nation had added 1.5 million jobs since last August. Senator Kerry and his supporters complain that the country still has about a million fewer jobs than when Mr. Bush took office.

"But," the New York Times says, "neither statement captures properly the shortfall of jobs that has built up over the last 3 years. An accurate estimate is not 1 million but 4 million, and possibly higher."

So the real job numbers, the real numbers of the shortfall of jobs, is about 4 million jobs. This tells us average workers are not even keeping up with inflation, and this Wall Street Journal article tells us today for some people they can go out and buy \$5,000 cocktail rings made for the right hand, that there is a boom business in that. We have a two-tier recovery. Ordinary people are not feeling it.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Illinois for sharing with those of us from Ohio tonight.

As I said earlier, and this reinforces what she has said, wages are now at the lowest point in terms of the purchasing power that they have been in 2 years, and the typical American family is making nearly \$1,500 less per year than they were when George Bush was elected President.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), and I noticed the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) has joined us.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I welcome our good friend from Lorain, who is here.

A couple of points. We are, talking about how the wealthy are doing very well, and I think most Americans would say George Bush is an all right guy, and this is not a personal debate that we are having here. These are statistics that we have. These are facts that we are presenting to the American

people and let them make the decision that they need to make in the fall.

But I really think that this administration, very similar to the first President Bush's administration, has really gotten out of touch with average American families.

The gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) was just saying \$600 for a hotel room. For people in my district, that is 2 months' rent. They are spending it for one night in a hotel room. I mean, that is out there. But I think this President has really become out of touch, and a couple of examples, one in particular, that I want to use.

Last year, last Labor Day, the President came to Ohio, and all the problems that we have talked about tonight, all of the issues that we have talked about with all the different cities in our communities and Youngstown, this President on Labor Day, the most job loss since Herbert Hoover, goes to Richfield, Ohio, which is one of the wealthiest suburbs in the State. He does not go to Toledo or Youngstown or Lorain or Akron or Cleveland or Steubenville. He goes to Richfield. I mean, if one really wants to empathize with the people who are suffering in our country, one does not go to the suburb. Go to where the people are hurting.

And two times ago when he came to Ohio, he was in a very small little county that had the best unemployment rate in Ohio. In the city of Youngstown, the unemployment rate is almost 17 percent. In the city of Warren, it is 14 percent. He goes to an area that is doing okay and says the economy is really turning around.

So I think that this administration is clearly out of touch. They are not understanding that we have lost 14,000 jobs in the State of Ohio just in June. This was not over the last year. Just in June we lost 14,000 jobs. Tuition has gone up by 10 percent. We are getting our clock cleaned by China. So I think all of these issues tell me, as a new Member of Congress, that this administration is not really getting the point.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think what my friend is describing is the middle-class squeeze. The fact that in America today the people who play by the rules, who work, who want to work, who want to pay their taxes, support their churches, invest in their communities, educate their kids, these are the people who are being squeezed. And those at the very upper limits of the income ladder are being richly rewarded by this administration.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), my long-time friend.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) for yielding to me, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) and earlier the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for joining us.

I got here late, but I heard the comments of each of my three colleagues about job loss, and Ohio has suffered

probably more than any other State. Maybe the gentleman from Michigan's (Mr. HOEKSTRA) State has been hit just about as hard. But we have lost one sixth of our manufacturing jobs in my State, the State of Ohio. We have lost over 200,000 jobs. In fact, if I look at it, we have literally lost 180 jobs every single day of the Bush administration.

They are saying that we are seeing job growth now, and we have seen a few jobs created; but there are a couple of issues there. One is we have not nearly come back to where we were. In fact, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) pointed out, George Bush will be the first President since Herbert Hoover to have lost a net loss of jobs. We have had a net loss of 215,000 jobs, and now we have just had a net loss this past month, heavily manufacturing jobs, 160, 165,000 manufacturing job loss.

And it is not just the people that lose their jobs. It is what it does to these communities. Cleveland laid off 800 school teachers because of job loss, and that means that the average schoolroom in Cleveland will have 30 students per teacher in an average schoolroom. The city of Lorain, my hometown, has been forced to cut its number of teachers to lay teachers off. It means worse police and fire protection for those people who live in these communities. So job loss does not just hit the families who lose their jobs, as bad as this is. It also can really devastate a community.

That is the first part of it. And even though we are now seeing some job growth, and that is a good thing, as we said, those jobs do not pay as much as the jobs, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) said, that were lost. We lose a steel job, an auto job, and we create a job maybe, not as many as we lost, but we create a few jobs that pay \$5 an hour less. Better than nothing, but certainly not what we need to build the kind of middle-class economy and middle-class communities that we would like.

But the other part of it, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) said, is those who have jobs, and most people, of course, have not lost their jobs. Most people still have jobs. But those who have jobs are feeling that squeeze. Gas prices are up almost \$2 a gallon. I guess I should not be surprised because the President and the Vice President both were oil company executives. Vice President CHENEY is still receiving \$3,000 a week from the Halliburton Company, the oil company that he used to work for that is now doing so much business in Iraq. Oil prices are up. Health care costs are way up. The cost of prescription drugs is through the roof.

Yet this Congress and the President have done absolutely nothing to bring drug prices down. The drug industry has given President Bush and the Republican Congress for their campaigns literally, literally, tens of millions of dollars. And it has been a good investment for the drug companies because their profits continue to be the best,

the highest profits by a factor of three or four of any industry in America.

So gas prices are up. Health insurance prices are up. College tuition, if people want to send their kids to college, Ohio State is going up 13 percent next month, I believe, or in September, whenever school starts. Tuition at Akron University a year ago, in the gentleman from Ohio's (Mr. RYAN) and my district, for freshmen went up about 16 percent. So they are getting gas prices increasing, health care costs increasing, college tuition increasing. At the same time, wages are stagnant. There has been no wage increase.

And I think the best example of sort of the Bush economy, we can see it at the Timken Company.

□ 2045

Timken, for those who are not from Ohio that are listening and for those perhaps unfamiliar, Timken is one of the major success stories of American manufacturing, a fourth generation family running a steel company, ball bearings and steel supply company, in Canton, Ohio.

The Timken Company, the fourth generation owners of the company and managers of the company are very good friends of President Bush. The Bush family and the Timken family have gone back for years together.

The Timken Company a year ago was the site of a visit by President Bush celebrating the productivity of the workers and the success of the company. President Bush said, and we all applaud this, that Timken workers' productivity has increased 10 percent from 2 years ago to last year. A 10 percent productivity increase, almost unprecedented.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would ask the gentleman, what was the result of that increased productivity? What did the workers get out of that?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that is the rest of the story. That is exactly right. A 10 percent productivity increase a year ago. Then earlier this year, in April, Timken announced record sales, the highest sales of any quarter in its history, in its almost 100-year history, and Timken announced a 63 percent increase in earnings per share over the first quarter of 2003. So immensely more productive workers, 10 percent more. A year later, record sales, a year later highest earnings, a great increase in earnings per share.

Do you know what happened a week later? You know, obviously. Timken announced it was going to shut down its three remaining Canton, Ohio, plants; 1,300 workers would lose their jobs, good-paying jobs, industrial workers, and Timken was going to build another plant in China.

This is sort of the Bush economy. It is more productive workers, more corporate profits, higher pay for executives; squeeze the workers, squeeze their health care, make them pay

more, squeeze wages; shut the plant down, more production in China. Then a whole other cycle: more profits, more sales, bigger executive pay, more squeeze on the workers.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I make a prediction to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN). My prediction is this: President Bush will not return to Canton, Ohio, to the Timken plant during this election year, because the people there are hurting. They know that although they worked hard, although they increased productivity, although the company continued to make money, it wanted to move to where it could earn more money, and that was China.

I just want to share with my friend something that is in the President's economic report to the Congress that was presented to us in February of this year. On page 25 of that report, is this statement: "Whenever a good or a service can be produced at lower cost in another country, it makes sense to import it, rather than to produce it domestically."

That is the philosophy that drove Timken to China: more money, greed, higher profits. But that is the philosophy of the Bush administration. "Whenever a good or a service can be produced at lower cost in another country, it makes sense to import it, rather than to produce it domestically."

I say to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), nearly every product can be produced at lower cost in another country if you are going to pay slave wages, if you are not going to have environmental standards, if you are not going to have safety requirements for the workplace.

That is what we face with the George W. Bush economic philosophy, and we are going to lose jobs until we change our course.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, it is interesting what the gentleman says about these companies moving to China, because I have heard executives say to me, some from my district, some from Ohio, some from around the country, "The global economy forces us to have to move to China."

But it is those same executives, and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) has been part of these debates in the past, a Republican friend from California opposed to these trade agreements, but these same executives come to this Congress and ask for trade agreements, ask for PNTR for China, as for the North American Free Trade Agreement.

President Bush is wanting to double the size of NAFTA in population with the Central American Free Trade Agreement and the Free Trade Area of the Americas and quadruple the number of low-income workers. So the companies push for the trade agreements which serve to bring in more low-income workers, weak environmental

laws, no labor standards. Then the companies throw their hands up and say, "We have to move because our competitors do."

It is all part of the Bush economic plan, to do these trade agreements that lower wages, that force down wages, that weaken food safety standards, that weaken environmental laws; that really do pave the way, invite those companies, really invite those companies to go overseas, at forced slave labor wages for totalitarian governments.

These are not democratic governments. They are countries that suppress labor, that keep laborers from organizing, that keep workers docile. Then we are surprised they are "outcompeting" us. Of course they are.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I am sometimes amazed and sometimes appalled at what I perceive to be the hypocrisy of this administration. Recently, with the approval of the Bush administration and this Congress, a decision was made that Cubans living in this country could only visit their relatives on the island once every 3 years. Why? Because Cuba is a Communist country. Fidel Castro is an authoritarian dictator. Yet, at the very same time, we continue to expand our efforts to accommodate China, to encourage Americans to invest in China, to encourage trade with China.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield further, to encourage China to take our jobs, the best example, when the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) and I came to this Congress in 1992, our trade deficit with China, meaning the number of dollars we bought from them more than we sold to them, was about \$1 billion. In those days, 1992, we bought from China about \$1 billion more than we sold to China. We had a trade deficit of about \$1 billion.

A year-and-a-half ago, that trade deficit passed \$100 billion. This year it will exceed \$120 billion. So we are buying from China every day about \$300 million more than we are selling to China. We have a daily trade deficit with China of between \$300 and \$400 million.

What does that translate to? According to the first President Bush, who really lost his job because he was out of touch with the workaday problems of American workers, but what President Bush I said is, \$1 billion in trade deficit translates into 18,000 jobs.

If we have a trade deficit every day of \$300 million, we are losing hundreds of thousands of jobs as a result of that trade deficit.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for pointing out those really outrageous facts. But can you imagine the American citizen is being told, you cannot voluntarily travel to Cuba. You cannot go down there and enjoy a few days vacation or interact with your friends or families except once every 3 years, because they are a bad Com-

munist country and Fidel Castro is a authoritarian dictator, and they persecute people of religious faith.

Does anyone in this Chamber or who serves in this Chamber or in this administration, are they unaware that China routinely persecutes people of religious faith, puts them in jail, in prison; uses slave labor; is an authoritarian country? And yet we encourage this free trade with China.

I think it is hypocritical. I do not think it is consistent. I think the American people should be asking, what kind of rationale or reason is behind such duplicitous policy and behavior?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was talking about Timken and all the issues with China and how it really has tilted the playing field to benefit really the top 1 or 2 percent of the people who can benefit from the increase in stock prices and the increase in their own personal wages because they have to pay someone 50 cents an hour, as opposed to \$50 an hour with health care benefits and all that, I think what we are trying to say here, beginning to wrap up, is all we are trying to do here is to create a system where everybody gets to play along.

It is like there are only certain kids that can get into the sandbox, and if you are not born to the right gene pool or you are not born in the right hospital or in the right neighborhood or belong to the right church, somehow you do not get to play.

All we are saying is, there are ways that the government throughout the history of this country has played a role in moving these people along.

We mentioned earlier with the Title I funding, which deals with at-risk youths who need help, Title I funding, the 2005 President's budget underfunded it by \$7.2 billion. \$7.2 billion.

So we could talk about China, and we are getting our clock cleaned, and the top 1 percent is really benefiting. The question the American people are asking and the people in my district are asking is, how do we help those people who are not able to play along? And the answer that we always have come up with in this country is to make sure everybody is educated, that everybody has health care, that everybody has a shot. You may not finish the same, but you should start the same at the beginning.

All I am saying is, we are trying to argue that if the system does not help everybody, the system is not working; and this system is not working. The threat when people do not move along with everyone else is, the whole system collapses.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I want to thank my friend.

Earlier this evening I had the privilege of meeting with a group of Ohioans who are involved with projects and

agencies that try to help the homeless. They were from Cincinnati and Cleveland and Portsmouth and all of the areas throughout Ohio.

I said to them, "You are the people who are really doing God's work, because you believe in community. You understand that none of us really gets through this life as individuals. All of us need help and receive help. It may be from our parents, our relatives, our neighbors, our church, our schools."

But I think what the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is trying to describe is the fact that we are a large national family, and we have differences. We have ethnic and religious and racial, philosophical differences. We have different skills and abilities, different educational levels. The fact is, we are not all the same, but we are all a part of the same great Nation.

What we have been describing tonight is a nation that is out of balance, that has great unfairness, has inconsistencies, and quite frankly, I believe, a nation that is lacking in leadership.

What we need is a Congress that will come together and work for the real benefit of the American people, and we need a President who is aware of the real problems. I think what we have described tonight is a government administration that is out of touch.

I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), earlier our colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), and our colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for participating in this discussion tonight.

NEUTRALIZING THE IRAQI THREAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HENSARLING). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow my good colleagues who just talked about what they consider to be the free trade debacle of the 1990s with a gentle reminder that that debacle commenced with the 1994 NAFTA vote under the Clinton administration, strongly supported by President Clinton, and I think, strongly supported by then Senator KERRY. At the time when we started that, I think we had a \$3 billion trade surplus with Mexico. Shortly thereafter, we had a \$15 billion annual trade loss.

I am reminded with respect to China that one of Mr. Clinton's strongest contributors, who happened to be the chief executive officer of the Loral Corporation, found that he had, after he had seriously violated the rules of transferring technology, had transferred technology to the Chinese with respect to their launch capability, because in their satellite launches they use these Long March rockets to do their satellite launches, and they use that same