

with most of the dealers whose franchise agreements are not being assumed, which should have the additional benefit of easing the hardships attendant to the dealership closings.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Madam Speaker, could you tell us how much time we have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland). The gentleman from Ohio has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the Chair very much.

In this affidavit, Mr. Henderson indicates that the idea of shutting all these dealerships—in their case, 2,600—wasn't his idea. The purchaser rejected their plan. Does the gentleman know who the purchaser of General Motors is? It's the United States Government.

Mr. NUNES. It's us. It's the people.

Mr. LATOURETTE. It's the task force. So they rejected Chrysler's plan. They rejected General Motors' plan. They said, Go back to the drawing board. Mr. Rattner, who was the head of the task force, said, You have got to come up with a new plan; and Mr. Bloom testified in front of the Senate that they rejected the plans because they didn't find the car companies' plans to be aggressive enough when it came to shutting down plants, throwing people out of work, and closing car dealerships. So again, just like when people were shocked about the AIG bonuses, people running around town here saying, I'm shocked. Well, you shouldn't be shocked. You told them what to do. You didn't say that you have to close 10. You didn't say that you have to close one in Cleveland and one in California; but you did say you have to close a bunch; and you can't walk away from that responsibility.

And now there's legislation. I thought that the gentleman from New York was still in the Chair. The gentleman from New York (Mr. MAFFEI) is the lead Democratic sponsor of a piece of legislation that says, You've got to deal with these people fairly, these 200,000 people that you've tossed out of work. So he has proposed legislation. I have proposed legislation. But Mr. Rattner, before he left, in response to the legislation, the administration opposes the legislation to force the reopening of Chrysler dealers and prevent General Motors from closing dealers. So I don't know how much more they could be involved.

That brings us to Clue, the Travel Edition. The task force has said that they're not responsible for 20 auto plants closing and about 50,000 auto workers being thrown out of work. They're not responsible for the 50,000 Delphi workers who don't have health insurance today. They're not responsible for the 200,000 people that work at the dealerships across the country that are now going to be out of business. So who is? Around this chart we have Mr. Bloom. This is the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Geithner; former President George W. Bush; the President of the United States; Larry Summers, the

President's economic adviser; and down there is Robert Nardelli, the former head of Chrysler I was talking about.

Again, the same scenario. This is a pretty simple question: who decided to take the ax to those 20 plants, those almost 300,000 people and shut 'er down? I mean it's no longer get 'er done. It's shut 'er down. I think we should find out, but nobody will fess up. Nobody will say who did it.

Mr. NUNES. So nobody knows who did the AIG bonuses; no one knows who put that legislation in; and now no one knows who shut down the automotive plants, the auto dealers. We're sitting here with 300,000 people out of work in the largest democracy in the world, which is supposed to be a deliberative body where the Congress is supposed to make the decisions, and we have no answers.

Mr. LATOURETTE. The gentleman is correct. I just want to conclude, unless the gentleman has another thought.

Mr. NUNES. I just want to thank the gentleman for bringing this to the people's attention. This is really the only avenue that you now have is to come before the people, to come before the whole world, and you have laid out a very compelling case that, quite frankly, we're not getting anything done. In fact, we don't know who's doing what around here. I am troubled by this, what you've brought to the floor of the House; and I hope that you will continue your effort to figure out and get to the bottom of who did this.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Well, I will. And I thank the gentleman for participating in this. I want to thank Larry the Cable Guy for making a cameo appearance during the course of this. We want to be bipartisan. We want to get things here. But get 'er done by a date certain, no matter what the details are, when you drop 300 pages at 3 o'clock in the morning, when you drop 1,100 pages at midnight, when you work in private and in secret to draft legislation to do things like cap-and-trade and health care legislation, it really is not the way that the government is supposed to work.

We know, on our side of the aisle, as Republicans, that we did such a lousy job that the voters replaced us in 2006. We understand that. But by the same token, there are a lot of bright people on our side, a lot of bright people on that side; and I would believe that we could come together on all of these important issues and give the American people some legislation that they can have confidence in because Members of both parties participated. People are very suspicious of Washington. They say, It's so partisan. They're always fighting with each other. A giant step toward solving that would be to work these things out in a bipartisan way.

I thank the gentleman, I thank the Chair, and I yield back the balance of my time.

ISSUES FACING AMERICA

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I always enjoy listening to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, with whom I have worked on a number of projects. I have the greatest respect for him. But I don't always agree with his analysis. It's interesting to listen to people who are claiming that they're concerned that they've been shut out of the process or that they are irrelevant. I do think there is some real question about the relevance of some of my friends on the other side of the aisle, but that is a decision that they and their leadership have made consciously.

Now I don't think that my good friend from Ohio falls into the description of what his fellow Ohioan has declared that Republican legislators should be. Minority Leader BOEHNER has said, They shouldn't be legislators, they should just be communicators, because their job is more of a political one, not being involved with the process. That is why their budget plan was not a budget plan, but it was a press release. In fact, I was kind of embarrassed for them when they announced it with great fanfare and the press asked, Well, where are the details? You're giving us a press release. Sadly, sitting on the Budget Committee, we found that our Republican friends were not involved with a serious alternative that would deal with our Nation's problems.

We have enacted, for the first time in history, a significant, comprehensive piece of legislation that's passed the House to deal with carbon pollution, climate change, global warming, and the fact that the United States simply can no longer continue to waste more energy than any other country in the world. The Republican response, the tone has sort of in part been set by the Senator from Oklahoma who has declared that global warming is a hoax. We have not seen a Republican response that puts forth a comprehensive effort. In fact, the previous 8 years of the Bush administration, Republican control, were characterized by global warming denial, interference with States that were trying to do something. Remember the State of California and nine other States who wanted to put in place more effective energy protections for automobiles, higher standards? California has this right under the law. It requires a waiver for the Federal Government, waivers that Republican and Democratic administrations alike have always granted, except for the Bush administration and the Republicans in the latest round over the last 8 years. They denied that right for the people in California to move forward and deal with it. Denied

the opportunity to save energy, to create new jobs. It's I think, frankly, embarrassing.

Most recently we've had a chance to watch up close and personal the debates that are taking place dealing with health care. Frankly, I have got some personal experience with this because I tried to do exactly what my previous two friends were talking about, and that was to have serious efforts for bipartisan legislation to improve America's health care. You know, you wouldn't know it, listening to some of the rhetoric that comes from leadership; but there are actually areas of broad bipartisan agreement. One deals with the notion that our senior citizens and people and their families who are facing extraordinarily difficult circumstances, dealing with end-of-life situations, that these citizens and their families ought to be able to have their doctor help them understand what they're facing, what their choices are; and most importantly, have them be able to tell their family and their doctor what they want done. Sadly today, Medicare, although it will pay for all sorts of tests and procedures, 7,000 different categories, I think is the count, it won't pay for a senior's doctor or nurse or some other trusted health professional to sit down and have that conversation with them. Madam Speaker, when we worked on the Ways and Means Committee, we found that Republicans and Democrats alike agreed that that was wrong, agreed that this was an area, when we were talking about health care reform, that we should change. We should have Medicare and any reform effort that we brought forward help seniors and their families prepare for the most difficult decision any of us will face.

We had bipartisan legislation. I am proud to say that we discussed it extensively in committee. In fact, some of the most heartrending stories for the need for this legislation did not come from our witnesses. They came from members of the committee, including Republican members, who talked about why this legislation was important. Well, that is why I was proud that this legislation we've been working on, that I cosponsored, that I have had Republicans join me in cosponsoring, was incorporated into the House reform legislation, House bill 3200.

□ 1600

But, you know, people who've watched C-SPAN and the news over the course of the last week, people who've read news accounts, would see that this bipartisan, humane, important legislation giving more choice to seniors and their families for being able to make sure that their needs are met the way they wanted, that was hijacked.

We saw, sadly, on the Web page of the Republican minority leader that they're claiming that this is somehow leading us down the path of euthanasia. We heard a Republican on the

floor this week claim that their approach is better because it would protect senior citizens from the government taking their life. Absolutely outrageous and shameful, inaccurate statements designed to inflame, confuse and, frankly, gum up the works.

I find no small amount of irony, because what my Republican friends were claiming they wanted to be involved, they were involved. They agreed with it. And yet we're finding people, for political purposes, trying to mislead and scare families across America.

It's ironic, because the only provision that I know that would have been mandatory was actually offered up by a Republican Senator, who's a friend of mine, from Georgia, who had offered the proposal. It wasn't accepted. It was later withdrawn, but the proposal was that before somebody enroll in Medicare, that they have to fill out a form telling people what they want rather than having people guess about it. Not a bad idea to consider.

But in this climate where people are trying to poison the discussion, stifle the debate, and prevent us moving towards health care reform, it would have, sadly, been toxic. It's ironic that I had one of my Republican doctor colleagues tell me that he has conversations like this often, but he said that he wishes that it wasn't in the last hours before a major operation or before it was too late; that people ought to think about it, and we ought to do it in reasonable fashion, like we proposed under our bipartisan legislation.

Madam Speaker, this is an example of where I think our Republican friends really need to take a deep breath and decide whether they are going to be communicators or they're going to legislate, whether they're going to join us in trying to solve these problems. There are amazing opportunities.

One of the things that has been interesting, even the most hardened C-SPAN junkies of late have probably been a little embarrassed when they hear Republicans coming to the floor braying like donkeys asking, "where are the jobs?" interrupting otherwise semicoherent speeches with a refrain over and over again, "where are the jobs?" like somehow the Democrats and President Obama have taken them and hidden them. But I give them credit for finally asking an important question; although, without any context and without any answer, looking as though they had no clue.

Next, to national security and the health of our communities, the record of job creation, how many, what kind, and for whom is one of the most fundamental issues that government will face in tough times of high unemployment and job insecurity. It can, in fact, sometimes feel like it crowds everything else out, and no wonder. Americans want economic security for themselves, their family, and ultimately for the country. If we're not economically secure, we can't deal with cleaning up the environment, with education and health care.

Unfortunately, my Republican colleagues are losing an opportunity, not just to ask themselves a question, but to deal with these critical, long-term economic questions because, in a dynamic, free market economy like the United States, the job creation process is a continuous one.

Every day in America jobs are being created and jobs are being lost. The real question is what is the balance between job growth and job loss. What's the nature of the jobs, and how do we improve it for the future. I understand my Republican friends starting to pay more attention to this because, candidly, the Republican record, since 1940, is not exactly stellar in this regard.

Since 1940, Republicans have been in charge of the United States more years than Democrats, 36-33. But, despite that fact, in terms of actual job creation, you can go back and look at the Department of Labor's statistics, for those 33 years, Democrats created 64.2 percent of the jobs in this country. Republicans were responsible for 35.8 percent of the jobs.

Now, I'm not saying this was all President Kennedy or President Johnson or President Truman, and I'm not saying that there weren't things that President Eisenhower and President Reagan did that were important and useful. It isn't always the partisan makeup that is determinative. But there is a very interesting pattern that should count for something.

When my Republican friends come to the floor braying, "where are the jobs?" they ought to look at the record, and the record is that Democrats have a better history of job creation. And you don't have to go back to Truman and Eisenhower to look at that. It has, in fact, been a rather dramatic difference just in the period of time that I've been in Congress. We've had 16 years, 8 years of the Clinton administration, 8 years of Bush, where there's a pretty stark difference.

The Clinton administration produced 22 million jobs in the period of time. They averaged 237,000 jobs per month, despite the predictions of some of my Republican friends, many of whom actually are still in Congress, that the policies, the economic policies, the tax policies of the Clinton administration were going to destroy the economy. 237,000 jobs per month created. And that's more than the 150,000 jobs that a dynamic American economy needs to sort of keep in balance.

What was the record under the Bush administration where the Republicans were actually in control, almost absolute control of Congress, and they were in control of the White House? The Bush, the second Bush administration, created only 58,000 jobs per month. It's the lowest average monthly job creation rate since the Eisenhower administration when the country was almost half as small. It was the lowest average yearly job creation since Herbert Hoover. And it got worse as it went along.

The economy lost half a million net jobs in 2008. Now, remember, this is an administration, 5 million jobs in the Bush administration, 22 million jobs in the Clinton administration, and those are just private sector jobs.

In the Bush administration, 2½ million people were added to unemployment, and there were a smaller proportion of Americans who were working when Bush left office than when Clinton left office. But that trend was actually quite disturbing because, for 10 consecutive months as the Bush administration was wrapping up, we were seeing job loss. And they continued early in the new year.

Now, I think even my most partisan Republican friends would agree that you don't take a massive economy like the United States and turn it on a dime. The fact that Barack Obama became President January 20 didn't turn around. The jobs that were being shed and lost were a result of the previous 8 years of activity. And so, much of the last 10 months of job loss, plus what has happened earlier in this year is certainly not the fault of the Obama administration.

The Obama administration has inherited the worst financial collapse in American history since the Great Depression, with the effects that are still being felt on the State and local level and will continue to ripple throughout the economy even after it's turned around. It would be premature, at best, to render a verdict on the Obama administration, although I am actually pleased that my Republican friends who remained silent in the midst of the anemic job performance of the Republican administration under George Bush and actually went into negative areas, I'm glad that they've found their voice and are starting to speak out. Now it's time to engage their brains in these important long-term questions.

The fundamental nature of the job market is, in fact, changing in this country. Employers are slower to replace jobs. Assumptions about guaranteed employment and benefits are being challenged as economic models have been turned upside down. We ought to be working on two different levels.

One is to stop an economy in free fall, to strengthen opportunities to avoid future job reductions and strengthen underlying economic activity. The second is to deal with the nature of future jobs. It's even more important than the short-term strategy, because in a large and growing country, we need to be able to provide for the needs of workers, young and old, with a variety of interests and skills all across the country. This suggests that it is time for my friends on the other side of the aisle to reconsider their opposition to infrastructure investment and unyielding support for more and more tax cuts, especially for those who need them the least. That's the same formula that the Republicans were offering which, essentially, helped create the problem.

For 8 years, they had unprecedented control, not just of the executive but the legislative branch. They resisted robust infrastructure investment. Even when it appeared a year ago that the economy was teetering, when we were starting to see actual job loss, President Bush and his Republican allies would only agree to a tax cut-only solution.

We implored, we begged, put unemployment insurance into the equation, put food stamps into the equation. This is money that all the economists agree will have more stimulative effect. This is something that will help people most in need, and they'll spend it right away. These are people who are living on the edge. And for heaven's sake, work with us to spend a little money rebuilding and renewing America, because these not only create construction jobs, engineering jobs across America, but it also improves our long-term productivity by protecting the environment, by stopping congestion and pollution. They refused. The only thing they would agree to was a package of tax cuts, including tax cuts for many people who, frankly, didn't need them.

Well, that changed with the election of President Obama and strengthened Democratic leadership in Congress. We produced an economic recovery package, and it was passed in a few days in the new Congress, that met broad needs across the country. As a gesture to Republicans, as an effort to get Republican support, the largest single portion of that recovery package was tax cuts. Now, we're not hearing, as the Republicans come to the floor asking in a confused way, "where are the jobs?" they ignore the fact that an important part of this recovery package is their favorite solution, tax cuts, \$288 billion.

□ 1615

Now, we limited the tax cuts to the bottom 95 percent. We're not giving it to the wealthiest Americans but to the Americans who need it the most. By the way, it fulfills a campaign pledge of President Obama's. Every working family in America who is in the bottom 95 percent has enjoyed a reduction in their tax rates and a reduction in their withholdings, which is having some effect on the economy. It was a gesture to the Republicans. Ironically, as for the Republicans who come to the floor who say they want to be involved, we put this in to address their concerns and to engage them.

How many Republicans in the House voted for the package? Zero. Even though almost half of the package was their favorite prescription and it was going to 95 percent of the American public, there was not a single Republican vote, and there were only three in the United States Senate.

We went beyond that. We added \$144 billion to State and local fiscal relief. I don't know what it's like in your community, but I'll tell you that, if our

State legislature hadn't received several billion dollars for Health and Human Services, a half billion dollars for education, over a third of a billion dollars for transportation infrastructure, the unemployment rate in my State would be even higher, and our legislature would tie itself in knots trying to figure out what to do.

You know, it's interesting. Some of the Republican Governors made a big show that they weren't going to accept this money for unemployment insurance. Hello. They had to be forced in States like Texas and in South Carolina by Republican legislators to stop grandstanding and accept money to help the poor and unemployed in their States.

Mr. Speaker, it's interesting all of those people who voted against the economic recovery and who voted against the infrastructure. It's interesting looking at a list of them who are showing up to be on the platform when the ribbon is cut when the projects are announced. I find it ironic that the Republican leaders who voted against it are claiming credit in their press releases for important projects that are being funded in their States. They're communicating, but it's a curious communication—claiming credit, blaming Democrats because it doesn't happen instantaneously, not being part of formulating the solution.

It is, I think, frankly, embarrassing watching the spectacle. The most embarrassing thing about what's going on in South Carolina is not whether some politician was hiking the Appalachian Trail or not but the fact that it took their legislature to take a State that has one of the highest unemployment rates in the Nation and accept money to help impoverished people. That's what's embarrassing.

Well, I am pleased that we actually did enact this. I'm sorry that Republicans decided not to support it. I'm sorry that they are attacking and distorting. I'm sorry that they, in the past, haven't been concerned about job creation. It has not been an issue until recently when they've thought they could make political mileage out of it.

Mr. Speaker, this is serious business, and the American public deserves a Congress that will treat it seriously, not one that comes to the floor, braying "Where are the jobs?" or one that ignores legislation that they have before them that talks about what investments have been made in health care, in education and in infrastructure.

In fact, just this week, we had over 60 Republican legislators vote against filling a hole in the Highway Trust Fund. If they'd had their way, it would have meant that we would have stopped issuing important transportation projects this summer, which make a difference all over America.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by just making some reference to job intensity. We've had a program that speaks to job creation and to trying to keep

the jobs that we've got. It speaks to trying to help State and local governments and the private sector move forward. Our energy legislation that passed the House, if it were to pass in the Senate and be enacted into law, would make a huge difference for jobs in the future within the energy business—everything from wind and solar to more energy-efficient construction. It is time for us to use the tools to develop more and better jobs and to think about how we spend dollars that will create the most jobs: job intensity.

Many of the smaller-scale projects in transportation, in community livability and in rehabilitation carry multiple benefits. Last Sunday's New York Times was filled with stories of decayed roads in the metropolitan New York area, in Connecticut, in New York, and in New Jersey. Yet these articles could have been written about places all across the country—from Detroit, to Decatur, to Davenport, to Denver—where investment, if it happens at all, really hasn't been invested in the ways that will create the most jobs.

Going out to some suburban area and building a new road in a newly developed area rather than fixing decayed existing infrastructure does not create as many jobs as fixing it first. Fixing it first is a winner because it will help to restore damaged communities. It will not add an inventory of more and more roads that will have to be maintained when we can't even maintain our roads, bridges and transit systems right now. Fixing it first is much more labor-intensive. There are more jobs to be created in fixing existing infrastructure that is falling apart than in making new infrastructure that will have to be maintained in the future.

It also strengthens mature cities. Many in America are concerned about the vitality of their inner cities. It's not just older industrial cities that one thinks of, like Detroit or Buffalo, but cities around the country, from Cincinnati to my hometown of Portland, Oregon. People are concerned about what's happening in the inner cities. You know, it's not just the inner city. It's that first and second tier of suburbs around them. We need to be thinking about these metropolitan areas, about making strategic investments that are going to strengthen local economies and are going to create more jobs, which will enable us to revitalize the neighborhoods that Americans live in.

There is also a question about what we're going to do with jobs for the future. Even if we're able to get the auto industry back on its feet—and some of my friends have heard our colleagues recently talking about their concerns about whether or not the auto bailout was effectively targeted. Well, I think we don't want a collapse of the American automobile industry in the United States. It would not just affect the upper Midwest. It would send a ripple effect across the country, affecting all

of those dealerships and the many auto suppliers. Even if it works, it's very unlikely that we're going to have the high level of automotive activity that we've had in the past. We've got a lot of inventory. Things are being scaled down.

What will be the source of new job growth in the future if we're able to hold onto the auto industry that we have?

Another area that we've had has been the homebuilding and development industry that, since World War II, has been a source of dramatic growth and activity, especially in the last 20 years. Its construction, finance and home sales have employed all sorts of people all along the food chain, which has propped up the economies in southern California, Florida, Las Vegas, and Phoenix. Now these same boom areas are in a collective swoon, and look to have significant development over supply for years to come.

We're going to see a rebalance in the future in the type of housing. Smaller families are going to be the norm. By 2040, there will be more single-person households than families with children. With another 100 million Americans, who will be here by the mid-century, we are going to be changing dramatically—where we live, how we live, how we move. We're going to move forward in restructuring communities.

We also need to think differently about job creation. We need, as I say, to be looking at the job density for the rehabilitation and for the location of infrastructure. There's going to be an explosion of needs to upgrade our infrastructure for sewer, for water, for the smart grid.

Future jobs will focus on enhanced efficiency, on new energy supplies, on being able to clean up after ourselves. Tens of millions of acres that the United States owns have been polluted by unexploded ordnance and by military toxins because of years—actually, centuries—of military training and activity in the United States. Maybe we should start cleaning that up and putting people to work repairing the environmental damage and then recycling that land for park and open space, for housing and industrial development.

We've got lots of opportunities, Mr. Speaker, to be able to redirect the economy—to deal from health to energy. That is what the administration and the leadership in Congress are attempting to do.

The bottom line is that we are going through a major restructuring. It's hard. The administration has inherited the most damaged economy since the Depression. It's not going to turn on a dime. It's going to be a struggle for the next year or two, but it's going to be redirected faster. We're going to recover faster, and it's going to be sustainable if we are able to move in the right direction for the future.

I've talked about energy, about renewable resources, about using Federal resources more wisely, about being

able to invest in critical infrastructure. I'm hoping that this is one area in which our Republican friends will join us to reverse the policies of the Bush administration, which have, frankly, prevented us from passing the transportation reauthorization for 2 years. We had 12 short-term extensions, and we were forced to accept a funding level that even the Bush Transportation Department said was almost \$100 billion lower than what we needed.

We have got an opportunity to rebuild and to renew America. We have got an opportunity to work together. I am hopeful that the American public will weigh in on these issues. Nothing is more critical, and nothing will bring about, I think, a little more grown-up behavior here on the floor of the House than if the American public indicates that they're watching and if they ask the hard questions.

As Members of Congress return to their districts this next month for meetings and for townhalls with business, with media, with students, with churches, and with civic organizations, having Americans asking these pointed and direct questions will help us get on track.

I am convinced that, ultimately, with the help of the American public, a new administration and a Congress that is focusing on what is most important, we will be able to deliver on this promise: That we will have a better Federal partnership, that we will strengthen the livability of our neighborhoods and that we will make our families safer, healthier and more economically secure.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1640

THE PEOPLE'S WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) is recognized for 22 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I thank my good friend from Oregon for giving such a detailed presentation of the enormity of the work that we have generated in collaboration with this administration and what "change" actually means.

Sometimes the television news bites and other activities that, by the very nature of our Nation, which is so diverse, may draw upon our thinking, we don't get to the bottom line of the kinds of opportunities that we've seen over the past 8 months, 7 months, of hard work from the time that President Barack Obama was sworn in as President of the United States and Congress was sworn in for the 111th Congress. Our work is not yet finished. And we want to continue that work in dialogue with our constituents.

So I wanted to speak today some with a little lightheartedness and some