

Now, Mr. Speaker, because the household survey looks at the entire workforce and the payroll survey only looks at a certain kind of employment, it is no surprise at all that the household survey shows a net gain of over 1.5 million jobs since the end of the recession in November of 2001. Over the same period, the payroll survey shows a net loss of about 350,000 jobs. While even the payroll survey has not recently begun indicating robust job growth, 308,000 new jobs in the month of March and 204,000 new jobs in the previous 2 months, the two surveys still show a discrepancy of almost two million jobs since the end of the recession.

□ 2045

Furthermore, trends in job creation indicate that the payroll survey is increasingly inadequate for counting new jobs. The household survey shows that one-third of all new job creation is in self-employment. This means that the fastest-growing part of our workforce is missed entirely by the payroll or establishment survey. If we are going to have an accurate picture on job creation, we need jobs statistics that account for the kinds of jobs our 21st century economy is creating.

The second reason I believe job creation has not yet reached expectation is that our economy is in the process of creating entirely new types of jobs in entirely new types of fields.

In recent decades, job losses and gains have primarily been the product of the business cycle. Employers would be forced to lay off workers during tough economic times and would rehire them during the recovery. Because the job opportunities before and after a recovery looked very similar, reemployment happened very quickly.

Today, we still go through cyclical change, but we are also experiencing a great deal of structural change. As I discussed earlier, we are in the midst of a major economic transformation. In our 21st century economy, a new job is often new in every sense of the word, new work in a new field demanding completely new skills.

Rather than simply going back to their old jobs, workers are increasingly finding work in cutting-edge fields and learning very, very different skills. Part of our focus in the 21st century economy should be helping to match workers with employers so that reemployment can take place so that we can see reemployment take place just as quickly as possible. We need to help match workers with employers, workers who were laid off so that we can help them.

The third factor, Mr. Speaker, that I believe is affecting net job creation in this country, and the perception that we are experiencing a jobless recovery is the fact that there are very real barriers to job creation that still exist here in America. These include the rising cost of providing health care for workers, frivolous lawsuits, the cost of complying with ever-growing govern-

ment regulations, and a Byzantine corporate Tax Code.

In fact, the National Association of Manufacturers estimates that these factors raise the cost of doing business in the United States by almost 25 percent, that is, these factors, the things that exist, the frivolous lawsuits, the regulations, the tax burden and the cost of health care, they have increased the cost of doing business by almost a quarter. That can be devastating to any company, particularly small- and medium-sized businesses, and it can significantly impede the ability of entrepreneurs to turn their innovations into new jobs for Americans.

These three factors, inadequate job statistics, the structural changes that are taking place in our economy and the barriers to job creation, are all impacting our jobs numbers; and each presents an opportunity for us, Mr. Speaker, as policy-makers.

Improving our data analysis, helping to match workers with new jobs and training for new skills, seeking reforms that will lower the cost of doing business in the United States from tort reform to health savings accounts, these are a number of initiatives that the Congress of the United States can pursue to boost job creation in this country. The most important part is that we keep our focus on the job creation side of the equation.

It is true that, as in an earlier era of buggy whip makers and blacksmiths, some jobs are disappearing forever; but I reject the belief that we have reached the end of American innovation. Call centers in India are simply not a harbinger of stagnation and decline. To say that they are is defeatism in its most basic form.

Admittedly, I cannot stand here and tell my colleagues exactly what the jobs of tomorrow will be, just as a defeatist in 1850 could not have foreseen jobs in film production or software engineering. What I can tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, is that Americans have a long history of adapting and growing and being innovative and creative. If we allow workers to continue down that road towards innovation, we will continue to create lots of new opportunities for Americans.

Mr. Speaker, Senator KERRY and many on the other side of the aisle want us to pursue the French and German models; and we know from that experience that what we have seen from the French and the Germans does, in fact, create stagnation and stifling regulation and jeopardizes the ability for Americans to be innovative and creative.

Mr. Speaker, I will take the American way, with confidence in the American worker and the American employer for the future.

VISIT TO THE CAPITOL OF HAITI'S SO-CALLED PRIME MINISTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE). Under a previous order of the

House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to place on the record what happened here today with the visit by Mr. Gerard Latortue, who is the illegally appointed Prime Minister of Haiti. Somebody invited him to come here to the House of Representatives; and two meetings were set up, one at 10:30 where members of the Congressional Black Caucus were invited to meet with him, and a later one at 1:30 where members of the Committee on International Relations were invited to meet with him.

Those meetings were not attended in any appreciable numbers by either the members of the Congressional Black Caucus at the 10:30 meeting or the members of the Committee on International Relations. Of the 39 members of the Congressional Black Caucus, I am told that perhaps maybe six people showed up; and for the Committee on International Relations, where there are 49 Members, 26 Republicans and 23 Democrats, only about six members of that committee showed up.

I think it is important to note that this took place. It is important for the world community to know and understand that just as CARICOM, that is, the nations of the Caribbean, rejected Latortue, and do not accept him as a legitimate representative of that government, the Congressional Black Caucus does not accept him and recognize him as a legitimate Prime Minister for Haiti; and it was indicated today by the lack of attendance.

It is important for me to say this because Latortue is trying to make the world community believe that he is gaining the support of the Congressional Black Caucus. That absolutely is not true. We consider that he was illegally appointed. It is in violation of the Haiti Constitution, and he is presiding over crisis and chaos in Haiti.

Haiti is worse off than it has ever been. Not only do we have killings that are going on every night; we have members of the Lavalas Party, the party of President Aristide, in hiding. They are being killed. Their lives are being threatened; but worse than that, this so-called Prime Minister, Mr. Gerard Latortue, embraced the known killers who have occupied the northern part of Haiti and recently appeared on a platform with Mr. Guy Philippe, Mr. Louis Jodel Chamblain, Mr. Jean Tatoun, all of whom are known to be criminals. Mr. Guy Philippe is a known drug trafficker. Mr. Chamblain and Mr. Tatoun have been convicted in absentia for their role in the massacre of thousands of Haitians at Raboteau in 1994.

They were all in exile. They were all recruited to come back into Haiti and join with the so-called opposition, and they played a role in the coup d'etat. They threatened to kill President Aristide, and they are still running around Haiti, armed, trying to reestablish an army, recruiting Haitians,

burning down police stations and killing members of Lavalas. This so-called Prime Minister called them in a public meeting freedom fighters. It is so outrageous, it is so ridiculous, and that is one of the reasons he is not being accepted. He is not being respected, and he is not considered as a serious person with any leadership ability or any vision for Haiti's future.

So, let the record indicate that he came to the Capitol; that he was not received by any appreciable number of people; that he did not get his message across. We have said to the State Department and to Secretary Colin Powell that it is important, it is imperative that they arrest and incarcerate the thugs and the criminals who are in control of Haiti. There is no way that they can ask us to recognize this puppet and this puppet government and to recognize this illegally appointed so-called Prime Minister until at least they take those steps.

THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the words of my friend from California (Ms. WATERS) and her passion about what has happened in Haiti and how our government has not been exactly on the right side of that. Equally important, I want to say something about my friend from California (Mr. DREIER) and his comments.

To try to make it sound like the Democrats and Senator KERRY want the French and the German model, while he wants the red, white, blue American model is just a bit much. We are all proud of the economic growth. We are all proud of the freedoms of our country. We are all proud of our strong environmental laws, our worker safety laws, our laws to protect the public and the dynamic economy we have. No one is arguing, nobody I know, JOHN KERRY, anybody else is arguing we want the French economy or we want to be Germany.

What we are arguing is that we can do better with this economy than George Bush has done. We look back at the 1990s during Bill Clinton's 8 years and saw 25 million jobs created. We look at George Bush's 3½ years and see 3 million jobs lost, and we see a President who, during his term, will be the first since Herbert Hoover that has expressed, that has experienced a net loss of jobs.

I look at my State when I hear the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) speaking about this incredible economy. Then I look at my State, and we hope we had an economy like he was talking about. I do not think very many places in this country, if any places, do have that kind of economy, the picture he painted; but we know

what we need to do to make the economy better.

Instead, President Bush has used the same old tired bromides, tax cuts for the wealthiest people in the society. If you make a million dollars in a year under the Bush plan, you get a \$20,000 tax cut. The Republicans hope this tax cut will trickle down and create jobs. It clearly has not worked. We lost 3 million jobs in the last 3½ years.

The second part of his economic plan over and over is let us do more NAFTAs, let us do more trade agreements that continue to ship jobs overseas, that outsource, that hemorrhage jobs to China and Mexico. That clearly is not working, but I understand my friend from California. I understand his viewpoint.

Members of Congress do not feel the anxiety that my constituents feel. In my State, we have lost 177,000 manufacturing jobs. One out of six manufacturing jobs in my State has simply disappeared during George Bush's Presidency. Yet George Bush's answer continues to be more tax cuts for the most privileged and continues to be trade agreements that do not work and continues to be this ideological mission to give tax cuts and say that automatically tax cuts to the wealthy automatically create jobs. It simply has not worked.

What we need to do is extend unemployment benefits to the 1 million Americans, fifty-some thousand Ohioans, whose benefits have expired since January. We need to, instead of rewarding those companies that go offshore and change their corporate headquarters to Bermuda so they can avoid taxes and have continued to get various kinds of Federal contracts, on-bid contracts in the case of Halliburton, and all of that, we need to pass legislation that will actually give tax breaks to those companies that stay in the United States and manufacture here.

□ 2100

Several manufacturing companies from my State came to see me today. They cannot believe we continue to give tax breaks to these big, multinational corporations who ship jobs overseas, who outsource to India, and we do not give any kind of tax incentives to American manufacturers. I just wanted to say that in response to my friend from California.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I know we are going to talk about prescription drugs tonight, but I just want to say that I heard the gentleman from California also, and he kept referencing France and Germany and how their economies were not doing well and the U.S. was doing so well. I do not know how he can make those comparisons because I do not think the United States is doing well at all.

I saw an analysis yesterday in terms of what was happening to the United States in terms of job losses as opposed

to Canada, and it showed dramatically that even though the Canadian economy is very dependent on the U.S. economy, the Canadian economy actually increased the number of jobs over the 4 years at the same time that jobs were being lost here under President Bush's Presidency. It said the reason was because in Canada, although they gave tax cuts, the tax cuts all went to the middle class and working people, and those people basically got that money and reinvested it and created more jobs, and it also talked about how productivity in Canada and the United States increased at about the same amount over the last 4 years, but in the United States the profits from the increased productivity went to corporate profit whereas in Canada, the increase in productivity was passed on to workers in higher wages and they invested it and created more jobs.

The gentleman from California was comparing other countries, and he did not mention Canada. The reality is if we look at the Canadian experience in the last 4 years, it is the Republican policies in the United States, huge tax cuts to the rich, taking the money from increased productivity and giving it back in corporate profits and not giving it to workers, this has resulted in a huge difference between our two countries. We lose the jobs, and in Canada they increase the number of jobs.

It is the President's policies which have caused these job losses. It is not something that is inevitable, it is something that he has caused with his Republican majority.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, tonight I am joined by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and I want to talk about Medicare and the discount card program that has been unveiled this week.

Enrollment began for the prescription drug discount card through the Medicare bill passed last year. For some seniors in Ohio, this can mean \$600 in prescription drug benefits. On the surface that sounds good, and we want seniors to look into these cards. If they can get any help, that is a good thing.

However, the real story about the discount cards is found in the details. The discount drug cards will further complicate an already confusing process for America's seniors. Instead of implementing a prescription drug benefit under one program, Medicare, the simplest, cleanest and the deepest discount available and possible, which 40 million of America's seniors know and trust, the administration fought on behalf of the insurance and the drug companies, who really wrote this bill, the administration fought to create an unnecessarily complex system that diverts money away from benefits and gives it to drug companies, insurance