

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

(Mr. EDWARDS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

BUSH ADMINISTRATION SHOULD REEVALUATE SPENDING PRIORITIES

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, tonight, several Members on the Republican side of the aisle gave 5-minute Special Orders on government waste, while today's New York Times talks about the war in Iraq and the difficulty that the Bush administration is facing in managing that war and in restoring Iraq's economy. Now, I do not think most Americans thought when we went into Iraq that we were supposed to restore the economy, but there has been a great deal of mission creep, obviously, and with no stability there and, with no security, investment does not happen. Of course, it is not a free-enterprise economy, and a lot of their former businesses and State-owned companies are in trouble.

This particular article talks about a shoe company that would fashion leather and finish shoes. Thousands of people there are without work as a result of the war and the bad conditions. So the Bush administration is taking cash and paying over 2,000 workers in just that company; imagine how many companies there are in Iraq, just to kind of "buy the peace" so that there is not more unrest.

Meanwhile, here in Congress, about a week ago, we tried to get a bill passed that would give \$1,500 to each of our soldiers' families who are in combat in Iraq and Afghanistan. Guess what? The very same Republican party that is handing out \$100 bills in Iraq forced the defeat of that measure offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) here in the House. Very interesting pri-

orities, in my opinion, and absolutely wrong.

Now, last Friday, President Bush came to Ohio, our State, and I thought he might be coming to stop the loss of jobs, because that particular day there had been an announcement of another 525 jobs, this time Federal jobs, that had to do with the Department of Defense that were being taken out of Cleveland, Ohio. The President did not say anything about those jobs when he came. He probably did not want to because his own Department of Defense made a big mistake. They took these Federal jobs that had been with the Defense Finance Accounting Service at the Department of Defense through the Cleveland office, and they decided they were going to move them to Texas. They said, we are going to contract these jobs out. Now, did they provide the workers in Cleveland with the same kind of money they are providing to the workers in Iraq? No.

What they did was they moved the jobs to Dallas, Texas because they contracted out the jobs to a company, and I want to get the name of the private company correctly here; oh, Dallas-based Affiliated Computer Services. The President said he was going to save money by contracting out these Federal jobs. But do my colleagues know what? They made a big mistake, because the government workers actually saved the taxpayers \$20 million. The subcontractors that the President hired in Texas and, gee, is that a coincidence, is going to cost the taxpayers of our country 20 million more dollars, not less dollars. It is funny that it was in Texas. While the President was in Ohio, while our jobs were leaving for Texas and costing the taxpayers of our country \$20 million more, the President took down a cool \$1.2 billion in Columbus, Ohio for his campaign. He bagged a cool million in Ohio, a little bit over \$1 million. Then he went to Texas and took \$1.4 million down there in a big fund-raiser. Very interesting.

Now, he was in California, I think it was yesterday, and he stood in front of people's homes that have had their properties burned to the ground. Unlike Iraq, he did not hand out any money; he just sympathized, empathized with the people and said they would get FEMA loans. Give them loans in California. And then he proceeded, while these people have just lost everything and they are getting loans from FEMA, to talk about Iraq and the \$87 billion that he is going to spend in Iraq.

What I really want to know from President Bush is, how are we going to know, as the American people, when we have won in Iraq?

Now, back in May, I think the President got on a ship and it said, "mission accomplished." So the American people thought things were winding down. Well, they were just beginning. We have now lost more troops in Iraq than before the President stood in front of the sign that said "mission accom-

plished," and I want to know how will we know when we have won? When we have trained 200,000 Iraqi police to keep the security in the country? At what level will we have to have their force in order to know that we have to leave? Will we have won when we finally find Saddam Hussein? Will we have won when Iraq holds their own elections next year? Will we have won when we assure ourselves that there are no weapons of mass destruction? The President already said when Hurricane Isabel hit the East Coast here and captured all the headlines, there was a story that was buried in the paper where he said: Well, there were not any weapons of mass destruction. But that is why we went in.

So I would like to ask the President, please, tell us what the exit strategy is. How will we know when we win in Iraq, and how much is it going to cost us?

\$87 BILLION BETTER SPENT IN AMERICA

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the Senate on a voice vote yesterday, kind of pathetic, voted to borrow \$87 billion from the American people for the conflict in Iraq. A substantial portion of that is to go to rebuild, or build, not rebuild, build the infrastructure of Iraq. As the gentlewoman from Ohio said, some of it is going to pay Iraqis for make-work or no-show jobs when we cannot get unemployment benefits for Americans here. If we took that money and we divided it up, there are 435 of us here in the House of Representatives, and we divided it up among our congressional districts, that would be \$220 million per congressional district.

Now, my district has just about the highest rate of unemployment in the United States. My State has the highest rate of unemployment, my district and the gentleman from Oregon's (Mr. WALDEN) are unfortunately right up there in the State. Mr. Speaker, \$22 million could mean a lot for us. It could put a lot of people to work.

Albany, Oregon, under Federal mandate, is going to borrow money to build a new water system. Of course, we are going to give \$50 million to Iraq to build a new water system for one city. Sweet Home, Oregon, same thing. Federal mandate. They can borrow some money, but we are going to give money to Iraq to build them new water systems.

My port of Port Orifice sewage system, fell into the ocean after a big storm. Problem. The Federal Government says this depressed little coastal community, they will lend them some money to help them do that project; lend them some money. But, in Iraq, we are going to give them new sewer systems. The American people are borrowing money to build these projects

in Iraq with no prospect of being repaid under the leadership of President Bush.

We could also, with the same \$220 million, guarantee my coastal ports, which were zeroed out in the President's budget for continued dredging maintenance, we could dredge those ports for 5 years. We still have not spent \$220 million yet. We are working on it. This is just one district. Just imagine what this would mean across the United States of America if every Member of Congress got to take that \$220 million home instead of sending it over to this deep pit in Iraq.

We could give 1,000 students full tuition, room and board at the University of Oregon or Oregon State in my district; 10,000 community college scholarships. Instead of them having to borrow money from the Federal Government, we could have given them scholarships. This is just one congressional district. We could give thousands, more than 10,000 students full tuition, a free ride for the year. We could put thousands to work on infrastructure projects meeting Federal mandates. That is just one congressional district. Imagine if that were repeated across the United States of America. If only the President would borrow money to invest here, or even spend money like the unemployment trust fund.

Now, since this \$87 billion that was borrowed or authorized yesterday by the Senate, the President will probably sign the bill soon, following the \$79 billion that we borrowed last April which is not yet spent, we have to wonder, what is the plan? The plan was to vote on borrowing another \$87 billion before they spent the \$79 billion. And so what are we going to do to bring stability? Well, now they say what they are going to do is train Iraqis. Now, on September 5, Donald Rumsfeld said there were 55,000 Iraqis all told, including security guards, et cetera, trained. Since then the estimates of the Iraqi forces have grown at the rate that would mean they have trained 1,000 people a day. Wow. Must be some program. Unfortunately, they have not yet begun the \$1.2 billion program to train Iraqis in Jordan to become police and security. Yes, that is right. We are going to pay \$1.2 billion. The French and the Germans offered to do it for free, and they are good at training people do to that, but God forbid that we should save the American taxpayers \$1.2 billion and take something from the French and Germans that they are good at. So the Jordanians and, of course, we know they are really good at this, are going to be training the Iraqis to become police. But somehow, magically the numbers keep going on up. It is like zip, zip, zip.

Then last week Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz speaking in Georgetown raised that figure to 90,000. Three days later Rumsfeld said 100,000.

Now, how is this happening? Do we think this is really happening? Do we think we can believe these folks? Now remember, these are the same people

who told us, this is a country that can afford to rebuild itself and pay for its own reconstruction, and soon. That is what we were told. That is what the American people were told. They would be waving little flags, welcoming us as victors. Our kids do not have the flak jackets they need because Rummy said there would only be 30,000 Americans there by now, and we have more than 30,000 flak jackets. They have planned miserably.

I would recommend to my colleagues and everybody, Blueprint for a Mess from the New York Times on Sunday, November 2, New York Times magazine, the best compilation of the total abysmal failure to plan and, in fact, to reject planning for the postwar Iraq by this administration.

ECONOMY SUFFERS UNDER BUSH ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Commerce Department released the growth rate for the third quarter. It was good news, welcome news, the kind of news we can all cheer. According to the Commerce Department, the economy grew at a rate of 7.2 percent in the third quarter this year.

Now, we all doubt, the President and all the rest of us, that this pace can be sustained, but we all hope that it signals the start of a strong recovery because, Mr. Speaker, it has been a long time coming.

Most Americans will be surprised to hear it, but this economy officially moved out of recession 2 years ago, November 2001.

□ 2045

And yet for 3 solid years, ever since even the recovery from the recession, the official recovery, the economy has continued to creep along, to scrape bottom.

All together, we have had a net job loss in the private sector since 2001 of 3.2 million jobs; 3.2 million jobs have been lost; 2.6 to 2.7 million of those jobs have been lost in manufacturing, some of the best jobs we have got. And I am afraid some of those jobs are not coming back, even if the economy recovers.

So before anybody hangs out a "mission accomplished" banner over this economy, I think it is important we recognize tonight and henceforth that there is a lot left to be done.

Here in a nutshell is what this administration has been able to accomplish, or not accomplish, on its watch with respect to the budget and the economy since January of 2001, things that still cry out for correction, notwithstanding the growth rate that we are experiencing right now.

This chart shows that the private sector has shed 3.2 million jobs. That is the worst job record since the Hoover administration, the Great Depression. Long-term unemployment, that is, people who are unemployed for 6 months or more, has tripled. That is when it really begins to get tough. The growth in the economy over the last 3 years, it has grown, it has not been all recession, but the growth has been 2.1 percent on average for 3 straight years. There is only one administration in history who has a worse record than that, that is George Walker Herbert Bush in the 1990s, early 1990s.

Real business investment, that is investment in productive assets, business assets that generate jobs and generate profits, has fallen 6.6 percent a year, the worst rate for real business investment since the Second World War.

And our other deficit, the so-called balance-the-payments deficit, the trade gap, has also increased by \$100 billion over the last 3 years.

Let me just show you in further detail more about what has happened to the economy. Growth during this administration, 2.1 percent for the last 3 years. As I said, to find an administration with a worse record since the beginning of the Truman administration, the end of the Second World War, you only go back to the Bush administration. Every other administration has experienced better growth than that.

The unemployment rate has increased from 6 million people to 8 million people. You can see from this chart what has happened to unemployment. It has gone from 4 percent to as high as 6.5 percent and now rests at around 6.1 percent, persistent unemployment, even though we pulled out of the recession.

Let me make that point more clearly. As I said earlier, the economy pulled out of recession in November of 2001. Now, in all of the postwar recessions since the end of the Second World War, if you measure them in jobs lost and jobs recovered, from peak to peak the length of the business cycle downturn has been about 26, 27 months. And here you see that average recession plotted on this chart. You also see across the bottom the red line which indicates the path of this recession. Typically, in every other recession of nine that have occurred since the end of the Second World War at about the 13th, 14th month, you begin to see the job recovery. We begin to regain the jobs that we have lost in the first 13 months. And by the 25th or 26th month we are back to where we were a couple of years before, the jobs have been restored.

But look what has happened here. In the 13th, 14th, 15th month of this recession, this red line keeps going down. It does not turn up. And this is where we are right now today in November of 2003, barely holding our own, hardly improving at all over the dismal loss of 3.2 million jobs over the last 3 years. That is what is happening to jobs in