

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

with enormous sincerity and seriousness.

I want to acknowledge the passing of the mother of the mayor of Acres Home, Willie Baker in my congressional district. I offer them my deepest sympathy. I rose to the floor yesterday to acknowledge the passing of Vermel Cook. A pioneering surgical nurse who worked with Dr. Michael E. DeBakey and Dr. Michael Cooley. These are issues that members address as Federal Representatives in the people's House.

So to those families, the Cook and Baker families, I offer my deepest sympathy.

It seems then relevant to suggest that in addition to the many issues that we confront, I had the privilege of joining the Senate in having passed today by unanimous consent H.J. Res. 12, which, for many of my colleagues, 61 of them who cosponsored, many of them recognized the cultural richness of America, particularly in music which I happen to be a fan of and I believe it's so much a part of the American character whether it's country western or whether it's jazz, whether it's pop or whether it is gospel.

So H.J. Res. 12 acknowledged today along with the United States Senate that we would designate September 2009 as Gospel Music Heritage Month and it would honor the gospel music for its valuable and longstanding contributions to the culture of the United States. I hope that those who are members of various faiths throughout this Nation will take the time during their religious services to celebrate gospel musicians, gospel singers, gospel producers, gospel writers, and their own church choir or their place of faith's church choir, wherever they are practicing their faith. If there is a choir and it draws the kind of celebratory respect for their faith, I hope they will celebrate it.

So I am very pleased to have done this for a second time and to recognize the importance of the many artists and the many different influences, including country western music on gospel music. To recognize Thomas Dorsey, and Mahalia Jackson, the Stamps Quartet, the Statesmen, The Soul Stirrers, James Cleveland, Ray Hearn, Rex Humbard, the Mighty Clouds of Joy, Kirk Franklin, the late Brenda Waters and Carl Preacher and Shirley Joiner, The Winans, and Kathy Taylor, and so many others.

And then those who went on from gospel like Al Green and Elvis Presley and Aretha Franklin, Alan Jackson, Dolly Parton that had a gospel influence.

So in this place that is the people's House, we likewise attempt to be sensitive to items of joy, and I'm very proud that we will have an event in September, on September 12, at the Kennedy Center honoring gospel music heritage, and I hope my friends will do so.

But as we do that, we recognize that there are painful experiences so many

of our constituents are having. So I rise today to thank my colleagues for joining me in sponsoring H.R. 3450. That is the Automobile Dealers Fair Competition Act of 2009.

We expect that because of the bankruptcies of GM and Chrysler that we are in direct line of losing some 200,000 jobs—I believe some 40,000, some 10,000 in the State of Texas—from the closing of automobile dealerships. Not only that, we realize that automobile dealerships, many of them, were the anchors of our community, the supporters of little leagues. Some of them, of course, gave us the best deals of our life. Maybe some of them didn't give you the best deal or the deal you wanted, but they are your neighbors.

Dealerships in the 18th Congressional District hire people. They're like family. They provide cars for our law enforcement, our city government. They make a difference. And by the closing, we know that they're closing small businesses. According to estimates, all termination actions combined could lead, as I said, to the loss of 200,000 direct jobs and many, many productive small businesses will be destroyed.

We also know that this termination has been in contrast to the contractual relationship called a franchise that the different dealerships had with GM and Chrysler.

So what does H.R. 3450 do? The bill deals with automobile dealers by giving them, if you will, the ability to have antitrust protection. They can now have the right to protect themselves by asking the question, Is the closing of automobile dealerships anti-competitive?

So in this bill, the bill will provide enforcement teeth to this right by giving dealers in an expedited court process to enforce the restraint of trade rights.

The bill is, in essence, giving them the right to protect themselves by going to court. This would deem decisions by auto manufacturers, specifically the Automobile Dealers Fair Competition Act of 2009, would deem decisions by auto manufacturers not to grant franchise extensions to old GM and Chrysler dealers provided they can demonstrate that they are still operating as a viable operation, that they can provide or they can show that that is an illegal restraint of trade.

In addition, the bill will provide enforcement teeth to this ride by giving dealers an expedited court process to enforce the restraint of trade rights. If new GM or Chrysler doesn't grant a replacement franchise to a growing concern within 90 days, the dealer can petition to Federal court, district court and ask the court to refer the case to a special master who will be required to hear the case and make a ruling within 90 days.

We don't want these dealerships to be closed, particularly those that are viable and are working in our community, as many have been, who have provided an economic engine to the community.

It is our belief that there is empirical evidence and quantitative analysis that can be done to determine the impact of GM's mass dealer terminations to GM's market share.

If you close dealerships and you leave open Honda and Toyota and Lexus and other foreign-made car dealerships, are you impacting the competitive nature of our manufacturers and car dealers by giving them a noncompetitive edge because you have shut down competitive dealerships trying to sell American cars and you're leaving the other guys—which we welcome here in the United States; we're open to opportunity—but you let the foreign-made cars have the higher number of dealerships and therefore you deny jobs, you deny the manufacturers a forum for selling their cars. It's just not right.

So I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3450 to provide for the Automobile Dealers Fair Competition Act of 2009. It is H.R. 3450. We're delighted to already have a number of sponsors. It is bipartisan. We believe it can be another legislative initiative, and I am on many, to protect and provide for automobile dealers and say to the car manufacturers, our good friends in GM and Chrysler, we care about the suppliers, the car dealerships, and all of the workers that may now look to unemployment because those dealerships are closing. Those are good, good-paying jobs, and we want them back.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm hoping that my colleagues, as they return from the August break working in their districts, will look at H.R. 3450 so we can likewise move that forward as quickly as possible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize the importance of good health care: health care for all America, health care with a public option. And for some reason, we think that this is something strange, but every single policy that has asked the question, Would you favor or oppose creating a public health insurance option to compete with private health insurance, not closing down private health insurance, you can see the increasing strong numbers: 65 percent, 83 percent, 76 percent and 72 percent.

One of the highest, I believe, indicated that this would not close anyone's private health insurance. In fact, it said: public plan option creating a new public health insurance plan that anyone can purchase. Some of the other polls say: ensuring that you can continue in your own choice.

And so I'm very proud that I support the public health insurance option that allows people to have insurance to stay where they are, but it allows all the small businesses to be able to provide themselves with insurance so they can do their business right.

What about leaving a job, getting fired and wanting to be a sole proprietor? You won't have to worry about being covered with good quality health insurance. Preexisting disease, you

won't have to be worried about being covered by good health insurance. The idea that you're not old enough for Medicare, you won't have to worry about good public insurance.

Let me give you an example—and this is happening in districts around America. In the 18th Congressional District, for example, up to 14,600 small businesses could receive tax credits to provide coverage to their employees; 5,300 seniors would avoid the doughnut hole in Medicare part D, 480 families would escape bankruptcy each year due to unaffordable health care costs; health care providers would receive payment for \$49 million in uncompensated care each year. Ask your hospitals. They do not get reimbursed when they are the Good Samaritans and take people into their emergency rooms or take people who are sick. Once they're in the emergency room, they admit them.

Uncompensated care in my district alone will get \$49 million and 184,000 uninsured individuals would gain access to high-quality health care.

How can we beat this? Help the small business, individuals who have ideas, want to get out and show their entrepreneurship, want to be a sole proprietor. Maybe they have two employees or 10 employees. You will get a public option. Don't let those scare tactics of you lose your insurance or it will accelerate beyond belief, because we have cost control in this bill.

In addition, don't let anyone misdirect their anguish at physician-owned hospitals. They are valuable. Do you realize that doctors come together and save hospitals from closing? They do that in Texas with Saint Joseph's Hospital. They want to do that in my district with ATH Heights Hospital. Some of my colleagues have told me about rural hospitals that are closing but doctors who care about the Hippocratic oath believe that they're there to be caregivers, and they run and they provide the saving grace by putting money into investing in those hospitals and saving them and keeping them from closing.

□ 1645

They, too, should be allowed to take in patients under this health care reform. And I'm fighting to make sure that that happens because they're not double-dipping. We want the quality to be high. We want to regulate it. But anyone that knows a doctor that has interest in a hospital by way of ownership, small amount kept regulated, you know that that hospital, if it's a general acute hospital, can give good care, if it's a specialty hospital, can give good care. And so I am looking forward to the opportunity to again begin this debate because I believe it is important.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to acknowledge the critics that say that the stimulus package has not worked. Well, I will tell you that Houston Metro in Houston, Texas, as a new start trans-

portation system, is going to be eligible for stimulus dollars as we move forward. I only use the 18th Congressional District because it is right at my fingertips.

But there are jobs being created. Just alone in my district, housing and urban development, we've had \$13.6 million in stimulus dollars; education, \$42.5 million in stimulus dollars. And we want to continue to raise a question for our Governor to take out the \$3.2 billion that is in the Rainy Day Fund in the State of Texas and utilize those stimulus dollars to put teachers back to work.

We were able to ensure that every teacher in Texas will get an \$800 salary increase the day they start work when the new school year starts. Those are stimulus dollars that came through the working of the Democratic Congressional delegation of the State of Texas, \$800 increase in their salary. \$22 million in Social Security, and Small Business Administration, \$8.5 million. That means in loans to our small businesses that are receiving monies from this important generating of jobs.

And so we have been able to fix our courthouse with \$807,000. We have been able to fix our Federal building with \$109 billion. We have been able to work, if you will, with the Catholic Charities emergency food and shelter, \$24,000. We have been able to reach the Community of the Streets Outreach with \$25,000. We have been working with new Kid Care emergency food and shelter. They have received dollars. Northwest Assistance Ministries has received dollars.

This is one district, but multiply it for the needs across your community. We have been able to keep nonprofit workers to help those people who have been unemployed. I think that is a far cry. Cleme Manor Apartments, new construction, substantial rehabilitation. Garden City Apartments, new construction, substantial rehabilitation.

Mr. Speaker, we are putting people to work. They are working on the construction and rehab of those apartments where individuals live. They are giving individuals a cleaner, safer, better quality of life by improving their apartments.

What I would ask my colleagues to do and those who may be listening, go to your local city halls. It's public knowledge. Ask them to print out for you a list of the stimulus dollars that have already come. More are going to come. Those will be grant dollars. It means that any of the nonprofits in your States or cities or counties can apply for dollars that will put people to work.

Right now, we have the ability to utilize some \$700 million in what we call "green" jobs. Of course, you can't see it overnight. You couldn't see it in March. You couldn't see it possibly in February. Maybe you didn't see it in April or May because, yes, processing is important, documenting your dol-

lars, where are your tax dollars going, making sure we have the right report is correct.

In Houston, I am very proud to have worked on the stimulus dollar legislation providing language to ensure that minority- and women-owned and small businesses would be recipients of those dollars in the appropriate manner so that we don't leave out small businesses who would have the ability to legitimately be receiving stimulus dollars through a government process and work that they would be doing.

And construction dollars for all of the construction workers out there. Rehabilitation is a right way to work. I'm glad that the Houston Heights Tower received some \$95,000—those are where a lot of my senior citizens live—for new construction and rehabilitation. I remember going to the Heights Tower during Hurricane Ike.

And so it is important to refute some of the negative commentary that the stimulus dollars don't work. They do. Settegast Heights, again, \$877,000 have gone to my city of Houston in the 18th Congressional District alone; new construction, substantial rehabilitation. People will have a better quality of life.

Wesley Square Apartments, \$508,000, new construction, substantial rehabilitation. Some of the homeless persons who have come upon hard times, many of them homeless veterans, will be able to have a better quality of life because stimulus dollars were utilized.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we have come to the end of a portion of the 111th Congress, and I am very proud that we passed an SCHIP bill that enrolled more children in health care, that we increased the minimum wage, that we provided for parity for women in working, that their income or their salary is competitive with men, that, as well, we have begun to stand down in Iraq. And our Defense Appropriation bill speaks to helping move the defense of Iraq to the Iraqi National Forces.

I offer my deepest sadness and reflection on those lives that have been lost, our soldiers on the front line, those that are now being lost in Afghanistan, and we will work hard to stand down there to ensure that the country of Afghanistan can stand up. But we've been working hard to ensure that that happens.

I've been working hard to help the people of Pakistan. We passed a Pakistan relief bill, in essence, out of Foreign Affairs so that they can stand up, so they can help with social programs, they can help economically, that we can help those who are in the camps because of the violence that was perpetrated, that we can show the respect for the soldiers in Afghanistan, their own soldiers in Afghanistan, Afghanis and the Pakistanis, who have lost soldiers themselves fighting terrorism.

We passed H.R. 2200, the bill I authored, helping to secure transportation—airports, trains, busses—to emphasize more training for flight attendants, to provide more resources for the Transportation Security Administration, to ensure that America is safe.

And so this House has been busy. And as we go home to our districts, we will not run away from the idea of good health plans. Because, my friends, I don't know what my friends on the other side of the aisle have, a bunch of question marks about the health plan that my friends on the other side of the aisle have offered.

I want them to join us. I can articulate what we have done. I realize that we've made great strides. I know that the people want, if you will, good health care.

And so as I close, I want to thank the Speaker. And I just want to leave you with this forceful message: We're going to get the job done. We're going to get health care for all Americans, and the stimulus is going to work for you. And celebrate Gospel Music Heritage Month in September as we help our automobile dealers return to their jobs and to retain their jobs. You know we've been working.

HEALTH CARE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege to be recognized here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. And having had an opportunity to listen to some of the dialogue that went on previously, I'm glad that I have a chance to raise these issues.

On the front of everybody's mind in this country is the situation of our health care and our health insurance for 306 million people in the United States. And I would point out that if we look at the size of this economy and the size of this population, it is a huge endeavor to think that we would take 17.5 percent of the American economy, 17.5 percent of our gross domestic product and switch it over to a government-run plan, and do so in almost the blink of a legislative eye, and do so without the full deliberation of the floor of the House of Representatives or without the American people having an opportunity to weigh in.

I am glad that this process has been slowed down—however great the price has been—so that there is an opportunity now for some of the legislation that has been more closely refined, shall we say, in its 1,100 or so-page form to be available to the public, a public that has more access to this information that is going on in the House than ever before because of being able to access this information now by the Internet. And all of us in this Congress have Web sites, and I would think there is at least one link on every Member of

Congress' Web site that will help you access this information on where we are with bills that are being deliberated here in this Congress.

And as I look at where we are today and what's out there, I'm very interested in the entire month of August and I'm very interested in the first week of September. Those are the times when the American people will have had a chance to read the bill, talk to the people within their profession or whatever their interest group is that have read the bill, weigh their ideas, do this across the backyard fence and do this at the coffee table at work, and be able to give us the benefit of the wisdom of the American people to weigh in on all the components that have been created here that are promised to come at us and perhaps have a vote on a final passage; not here, not any longer this week or next week or in the month of August, but perhaps in the first or second week in September, and something that—this will decide the fate, if it's passed, of the health care system of the United States, I believe, at least as far as we can look into the future. And it is a national health care plan. It is a government-run health care plan. It is a model that transforms the entire health care system in the United States.

Today we have more than 1,300 private health insurance companies competing for premium dollars. And they do so by providing the best value for the dollar and marketing that best value for the dollar and trying to adjust those policies to meet the demands of the American people. Over 1,300 private health insurance companies, and among them they offer, in the aggregate, perhaps as many as 100,000 different health insurance options. And the President of the United States has said he just wants to offer one more option, 100,001 policies now for everybody in America to choose from if this bill should pass.

And this extra government option that he would offer, as if there wasn't enough competition out there among the 1,300 health insurance companies and the roughly 100,000 policies that are there, how can anyone presume that one more policy that would just compete with the other policies out there would result in anything other than one one-hundredth more options for the people of the United States?

I would submit that there is a lot more afoot here, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot more afoot here. The people that are advocating for this public option, the people that are advocating that the Federal Government should run their own health insurance policy in order to compete against the private sector are the people who sometimes they will leak it into the media, sometimes they will shout it out in a private meeting, but in their soul they want a single-payer, government-run, socialized medicine, one-option government plan for everybody. And they want to run every private health insurance company out

of business and take the 100,000 options that the American people have with them. That is their agenda.

And I can put together a string of quotes from the very liberal Members of this Congress that find themselves in powerful positions in this Congress, gavels in hand, that are determined to take away the private health insurance options and turn it into one government plan.

Even the President of the United States believes in that, however much lip service he has paid to the idea of telling the American people, well, if you like your health insurance that you have today, then you get to keep it. That's one thing that I cannot accept that the President believes when he says it. He is a very smart man. He's got to understand that if it says in the bill—and it does, section 102 of the bill—that every private health insurance policy has to be rewritten in the first 5 years of the passage of the legislation that's proposed, that means the American people's individual policies will all change within 5 years and they will have to accommodate themselves to the new qualifications that will be written by a health insurance czar to be appointed by the President later, and regulations that are not in the bill, but regulations that would grant that health insurance czar the power and the authority to set the standard.

So he might rule that every health insurance policy in America has to pay for abortion. He might rule that everyone has to pay for mental health. He might rule that everyone has to pay for all pharmaceuticals, or maybe only generic pharmaceuticals.

□ 1700

Whatever he may decide, he'll be looking at the costs of the premium, the percentages of copayments, and the regulations will be written so that the public option, which is so carefully defined and that language that's determined to be defended by the Democrats in this Congress—so that the public option can compete with all of these 1,300 private health insurance companies that have competed in the marketplace for years and found their niche in the market and done it the American way.

Now, if somebody thinks that there's too much money in the health insurance business, why don't they get in that business and provide that health insurance and lower the premiums and cut down on the administrative overhead and take some money and take some profit out of it?

That's how this works in the free market system. If there's something out there in the marketplace that has too much profit in it, you don't need government to come in and do it for you. You need to take a look and determine is it a monopoly? If it's a monopoly, then Teddy Roosevelt rides again. Let's bring him in and let's bust the trust. But if you have 1,300 health insurance companies and 100,000 health