

made it very clear that he believes, for the interest of economic security and stability in the country, that the pay-go rules ought to apply on both the spending and the tax side. Because, of course, in either event, you can plunge yourself, as we believe we have, into deep deficits.

So I think that will be a good debate. We will obviously point to Mr. Greenspan's assertions, which we agree in this instance, that it is very difficult to control if you do not have pay-go applying on both sides of the ledger.

Lastly, if I might, as a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means, a senior member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman knows that the Foreign Sales Corporation legislation has been pending for many, many months now. We are concerned, as you know, that the Europeans are now imposing sanctions as a result of the WTO's finding that we are not in compliance.

Can the gentleman tell me whether or not the FSC legislation will be on the floor any time soon; and, if so, whether or not the Rangel-Manzullo alternative will be made in order as an alternative?

I yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Maryland for yielding to me again.

The legislation is very much on our minds. As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means has worked hard on this legislation already. The gentleman mentioned the substitute which the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) may want to offer in committee. The tariff increases are beginning to take effect, increasing by 1 percent every month, so it is something we are working hard on.

We do want to work closely with the other body on this to be sure that we can actually enact legislation, as well as with the President and with his team, the U.S. Trade Representative's Office and the Treasury Department in particular. So we are working closely with them.

I do not know when legislation may come to the floor, but I understand that the Committee on Ways and Means is planning another meeting next week to discuss certain aspects of this, to be sure that as we repeal the FSC/ETI provisions, we are also providing adequate benefits for U.S. companies who are involved in global competition.

So this is a very high priority on our side of the aisle and we continue to work toward that goal.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and while I accept his premise that it is a high priority, very frankly, I will tell my friend from Ohio, there is no doubt we could have passed a bipartisan supported bill here with a very substantial number of votes many, many months ago. That was not the determination, apparently, of the committee to report out such a bill. We think that is unfortunate.

We believe that if the Rangel-Crane or the Rangel-Manzullo bill, or the Manzullo-Rangel bill were reported out, I think we would see well over 225 to 230 votes for that, maybe more. But in any event, I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield a moment.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PORTMAN. I respect the gentleman's vote-counting ability, as he knows, but being on the committee, I can say that I am not certain such a bill could have even been reported out the committee because there are many complexities with responding to this tough issue.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, if I can just briefly, I share the gentleman's view. I do not think such a bill could be reported out of the Committee on Ways and Means either. Our perception is, as the gentleman well knows, it is tough to pass bipartisan bills out of the Committee on Ways and Means because I do not think there is any interest in doing that. I think that is unfortunate because this is a critical problem confronting us.

I think we could have, as we have in the past, and the drug reimportation being a perfect example of a bill that passed very handily in a bipartisan fashion through this House. Unfortunately, it did not make it out of the conference committee. Notwithstanding the fact that both Houses were for it, there were people who were not for it.

But this is a critical problem, and my only suggestion to my good friend, with whom I have worked in a very bipartisan fashion on very successful legislation, and I know the gentleman's inclination is to do that, to legislate, not just to throw bombs at one another. I thank the gentleman for his observation and hope, in fact, that he is correct and we move on this quickly. And if it is not a bipartisan bill as it comes to the floor, I hope that we do provide for the minority an opportunity to offer an alternative which we think will be in the best interest of this country. We will debate that and the majority will prevail.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments and thank him for the information.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair will recognize Members for special order speeches without prejudice to the possible resumption of legislative business.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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 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.)

LOSS OF JOBS IN OHIO

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Bush made a campaign trip to Cleveland to speak to small business people to explain his economic policy and to try to answer why Ohio has lost 300,000 jobs in the last 3 years; to try to explain why Ohio has lost 160,000 manufacturing jobs; that one out of every six manufacturing jobs in Ohio has disappeared, likely permanently for most of them. One out of six jobs in manufacturing has disappeared since President Bush took office.

He also came to Ohio to answer why the head of his council, the chairman of his Council of Economic Advisers, Gregory Mankiw, said that outsourcing of jobs, jobs moving overseas, that Mr. Mankiw said and the President signed a report supporting this, that outsourcing was a good thing because it makes the economy more efficient.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the President needs to explain a little better. Last week, I was in Akron, in my district. Akron, Ohio. I spoke to some company owners who own small machine shops with 50 employees, 30 employees, or 100 employees, but all small manufacturing businesses. One owner of a machine shop came up to me before I spoke. He gave me a stack of these fliers. He actually gave me about four times this many, about six or seven inches of fliers. He told me that he gets about this many fliers every month, and he says these fliers are auction fliers. They basically are notifications from companies all over the United States that are having fire sales; that are having going-out-of-business sales.

□ 1345

Mr. Speaker, here is an auction flyer that says high-tech manufacturing plant closing in Elk Grove, Indiana.