

and I were here, some others on the floor were here. We adopted an economic program that the leader, your present leader said, and others said, Mr. DeLay said and other members of your leadership said, and the President of the United States said, would build an extraordinarily robust economy, would take our country to new heights of economic well-being.

The gentleman I am sure probably knows these figures, but during the last year of the Bush administration, after having passed, without the Democrats stopping it or changing it or modifying it, after adopting the economic program and pursuing it for 7 years, from 2001 to December of 2008, in the last year from January to December, we lost 3.189 million jobs. 3,189,000 jobs were lost, the worst economic performance of any administration over 8 years in the last 75 years. In other words, since Herbert Hoover. The worst performance.

Now, in the last year of the Clinton administration, I tell my friend, we gained. In the last year, when, as you recall, there was a slight slowdown, we gained 1.9 million jobs. So the turnaround from the last year of the Clinton administration and the last year of the Bush administration was 5 million jobs. That was the economic status that was left, the legacy of the Bush administration and of the policies adopted by the Republican Congress from 2001 to 2006 which was not changed, as you recall, because President Bush had, of course, the veto.

The fact of the matter is that the Clinton administration created an average of 216,000 jobs per month on average over 96 months. The Bush administration, under the economic policy that you promoted then and are promoting now, I don't mean you personally, but your party is promoting. And let me say this again, under the Clinton administration, 96 months, an average of 216,000 jobs a month were created, plus. Under the Bush administration, the average job performance over 96 months was 4,240 jobs per month. You need 100,000-plus to stay even in America.

Now let me give you an additional figure. In the last 3 months of the Bush administration, you lost an average of 650,000 per month. Over the last three months, we have lost far too many, but an average of 450,000 per month. In other words, while we are not in the plus place, which is why I expressed on Fox News my disappointment, I can't imagine there is anybody in this Chamber, the President is disappointed, the Vice President is disappointed, the American people are disappointed that we are not creating those 216,000 jobs per month that we did under the Clinton administration, and we are still losing jobs because of the disastrous economy that was inherited.

I tell my friend that it was not just the facts that argue that, but Secretary Paulson, Ben Bernanke and President Bush said we had a disas-

trous economic crisis that confronted us at the end of the Bush administration's economic policy conclusion and asked us to respond very vigorously to that.

As you know, during the course of the Bush administration, we did that. Unfortunately, it has not been enough. We did that again with the Recovery and Reinvestment Act which we think is succeeding. But my friend would, I think, fairly observe that his 2001 tax cut after 130 days had not turned America around; in fact, in my view, never turned America around.

Now your leader talked about on that same show, well, we created 5 million jobs. There was a spike up, and a disastrous spike down, which is why, as I said, 3.18 million jobs were lost during the last year of the Bush administration.

We believe that the Recovery Act can work. We think it will work. We hope this economy comes back from where it was left us on January 20, 2009. America is experiencing pain. Too many of our people are experiencing pain. We regret that. It is disappointing. We need to take such efforts as we can to correct that.

I will tell my friend in addition to that, at this point in time there is no intent to have an additional bill on the floor. The administration is not talking about it. We are not talking about it. I was asked a question in the press and I said rightfully, we certainly wouldn't put that off the table. We will consider steps that need to be taken in order to address the economic crisis that confronts our Nation, but there is no plan at this point in time to offer an additional bill of that type.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and just say historical facts can be applied and used at will, and that there were plenty of opportunities to point and cast blame and claim credit as there were Republican Congresses and Democratic Presidential administrations and the like. So we could go on for a long time about the past.

My point, Mr. Speaker, in posing the question to the gentleman is as a result of the mere fact that promises were made by this administration, goals were set. We were told this stimulus bill, if we were to act in haste, the way this Congress acted, and in fact no one in this body read that bill of 1,100 pages, we were told if we were to pass that bill and it were to be signed into law that unemployment in this country would not exceed 8.5 percent. As we know, as the gentleman knows, in many parts of the country it is well in excess of 10 percent. Nationally, we are on the way to 10 percent.

We must and should, Mr. Speaker, in this House do all we can to try and get this economy back on track. It is not that we should repeat the mistakes of the past in that stimulus bill, and we await the administration, the gentleman's prescription as to how to address, as he says, the very real pain

that America's families are experiencing.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman would yield, let me say that looking in the past is not fruitful unless you learn from the past.

The point of my recitation was that the policies proposed in 2001 and 2003 demonstrably did not work, and I read the results of those policies which were the policies of the Bush administration. What I pointed out is that it is the same formula that is being recommended once again from your side of the aisle. So it is instructive to learn from what didn't work in the past.

I reject your assertion that the Recovery and Reinvestment Act hasn't worked. I have pointed out to you that we have lost a third less jobs over the last 3 months than we lost during the last 3 months of the Bush administration.

Is losing one job one too many? It is. Is it a disappointment? It is. But after a quarter and a little more of effectiveness, 95 percent of Americans got a tax cut, got money in their pocket, as you know, as a result of the Recovery and Reinvestment Act. There is \$65 billion of construction jobs being affected. Has it gone out fast enough? It hasn't. Is it starting to pick up? It is. Was the thought 10 to 15 percent would be spent within the time frame we are now talking about? Yes, that was the projection. Has that happened? Yes, it has. So that projection was correct. Is unemployment higher than we anticipated? Yes, it is, because the recession and almost depression, according to Bernanke, that we inherited from the last administration was so deep and so endemic that we are having real trouble getting out of it.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman, and in closing, I would leave the gentleman with two points: one, the plan that the House Republicans put on the table and presented to this President was focused on small businesses. If he looks at that plan as the President did, and the President clearly said there is nothing crazy in this plan, which meant that these are things that could work.

The President also, to my second point, claimed that we may have philosophical differences on tax policy and the rest, but he said to me, "I won." So it is, Mr. Speaker, this President's and this Congress's economy. We stand ready and willing to proffer up yet again our plan to address the economic woes of the American families. We have a plan that would be at half the cost of that stimulus bill and produce twice the jobs.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 13, 2009

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate, and further,

when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, July 14, 2009, for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KISSELL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? There was no objection.

REPORT ON H.R. 3170, FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. SERRANO, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-202) on the bill (H.R. 3170) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

UNINFORMED OR MISINFORMED

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mark Twain once said, "If you don't read the newspaper, you are uninformed; if you do read the newspaper, you are misinformed."

Both might be true for those who rely on the national media for all the facts. For example, you might not know that the unemployment rate jumped to 9.5 percent last month, the highest rate in almost 30 years.

Or that the Vice President this week admitted the Obama administration misread the economy.

Or that President Obama has given more than a dozen ambassadorships to individuals who raised a total of over \$4 million for his campaign.

Or that while the media report that 46 million people lack health insurance, there really are only 10 million people who can't afford or can't get health insurance.

The national media should report all the facts so Americans are not uninformed or misinformed about major issues.

□ 1430

HONORING HAZEL HAINESWORTH YOUNG

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise with great pride and a deep sense of sadness. Pride because I'm honoring Hazel Hainesworth Young, 103 years old, who passed just a week ago in my own hometown of Houston, Texas.

I am honored to say that she was an educator all of her life, a school teach-

er. She, in essence, set the standard for our famous Jack Yates High School and Phillis Wheatley High School. Phillis Wheatley High School was the school that Congressman Mickey Leland graduated from and Congresswoman Barbara Jordan.

Hazel Hainesworth Young was a magnificent soul, someone who nurtured the leaders of today, who was the dean of girls at Wheatley High School, whose daughter, Maryann Young, followed in her footsteps as a teacher. She was a Soror. She was a wonderful icon of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority. But she was a public citizen.

Her brother, of course, part of the, if you will, the intelligentsia and the excellence of legal prominence in the civil rights movement, but she brought about the civil rights movement by teaching to young Negro children—yes, Negro children—the opportunity to go forth and to shoot for the stars. There were no barriers to her teaching.

She was honored in her lifetime because so many were guided and inspired by this wonderful, beautiful woman. I had the chance to be mentored by her, and I will go home to honor her, but she is honored today on the floor of the House. What a wonderful woman. Hazel Hainesworth Young, 103. She passed, but she will live on forever.

HEALTH CARE

(Mr. REICHERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, Americans all agree, and even Members of this body, Members of Congress, agree on the broad major concepts of health care reform. We all agree that health care should be cost effective, easily accessed, high quality with choices, focused on the patient, and it should be for everyone.

A government takeover, though, wouldn't be affordable. It will cost \$1.6 trillion. Easy access? Ain't gonna happen. High quality? I don't think so. Customer service? You've got to be kidding. Doctors might say you need an x ray; but under the government-run plan, you may just get told you've been X'd.

NEW HEALTH CARE WILL COST AN ARM, A LEG, AND A WHOLE LOT OF TAXES

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country want to know how we're going to pay for this health care plan that the Democrat majority is going to put forth.

Last week, on "Fox News Sunday," Mr. Wallace asked this question of Congressman HOYER, the majority leader, he said, How are you going to pay for it

specifically? What taxes are you willing to raise, and are you going to tax health care benefits? And Mr. HOYER said, "Well, I'm not going to go into—that's a proposal on the table in the Senate, not in the House, as you know. The pay-fors are going to be tough. Nobody wants to pay for what we're buying. And very frankly, our financial status in America has gone down." In other words, he didn't want to tell how the American people were going to have to pay for that program.

And then the President of the United States, at his town meeting last week, said, Now, one-third of it we're going to pay for by increased revenues—that's increased taxes—and the cost will be between \$1 trillion and \$3 trillion, probably closer to \$3 trillion. So he's saying they're going to have to raise at least \$1 trillion in new taxes.

And then he went on to say about two-thirds of it would come from reallocating money that's currently in the system. Now, where in the world are they going to get \$2 trillion out of other programs to pay for the extra two-thirds?

The people of this country are being hoodwinked. This health care program they're talking about, this socialized medicine, is going to cost an arm, a leg, a lot of taxes, and inflation because they're going to spend money we do not have.

HEALTH CARE: MEND IT, DON'T END IT

(Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, soon we will be debating health care reform on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. The goal is to pass legislation before the upcoming August recess. No doubt one of the most significant features of the debate on health care reform will involve what is now known as the "public option."

The public option is a government-run health care program. The President has said that anyone who has private health care insurance will be allowed to either keep it or join the government plan. Mr. Speaker, the public option is the first step to a complete government takeover of our private health insurance system. The public option will have advantages by virtue of being a government entity. It will destroy the private health care insurance market, turning the entire system over to a Federal bureaucracy.

The Federal Government's record of managing Medicare, Medicaid, and the care of our veterans is one of allowing massive fraud, inefficiencies, and the abuse of patients.

Mr. Speaker, our private health insurance is in need of reform, but I would urge my fellow Members of Congress to mend it and not end it.