Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We will see you at the third annual congressional women's softball game next year.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL POLLINATOR WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution (H. Res. 1460) recognizing the important role pollinators play in supporting the ecosystem and supporting the goals and ideals of National Pollinator Week.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 412, noes 0, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 417]

AYES—412

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Djou
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Culberson

NOT VOTING—19

Carnahan
Delahunt
Flake
Gutierrez
Herger
Hoekstra
Kennedy
Lynch
Payne
Radanovich
Richardson
Rodriguez
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Skelton
Velázquez
Wamp
Woolsey
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1115

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed the first series of votes in the House Chamber today. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 415, 416 and 417.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5618, RESTORATION OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 2010, AND WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1495 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1495

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5618) to continue Federal unemployment programs. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of July 3, 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman

from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1495.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1495 provides for consideration of H.R. 5618, the Restoration of Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 2010, under a closed rule. The resolution provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The amendment printed in the Rules Committee report shall be considered as adopted. The resolution waives all points of order against the bill as amended. The resolution provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Finally, the resolution allows for certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules to be considered the same day they are reported. The resolution applies the waiver to any resolution reported through the legislative day of July 3, 2010.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to not traffic the well when another Member is under recognition.

□ 1120

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, our country is facing enormous troubles like we have not seen since the Great Depression. At the national level, there is clear evidence that some of the actions that the Democratic Congress have taken are, in fact, working. The economy is again growing, and employers are starting once again to hire.

In 2009, we saw the Nation's GDP grow by 2.8 percent in the third quarter, representing the biggest 6-month turnaround in our economy since 1980. In each successive quarter, we have continued to see positive GDP growth. Since the end of 2009, we have created jobs every single month; and in the last 3 months alone, we have created an average of over 300,000 jobs per month. This is a dramatic change in direction from when President Obama took office and the economy had previously been shrinking at minus 5.4 percent and we were losing jobs at an average of 726,000 jobs per month under the Bush administration.

However, although our economic indicators continue to show that we are making significant progress towards recovery, this does not mean that we are out of the woods yet by any stretch of the imagination. We know that all too well in many pockets of the country, including my own district in the Central Valley of California, the recovery continues to lag well behind the national economic picture. In far too many areas of the country, businesses continue to shed payroll, job losses continue to mount, and hardworking families across America continue to struggle.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, we have not seen times like this since the Great Depression. These are extraordinary circumstances, and they call for extraordinary measures. Despite what my friends on the other side of the aisle may say, what people who are struggling right now need is a hand up; and this Democratic Congress, despite all the obstacles from the other side of the aisle and the other body, will continue to reach out and try to assist Americans with that hand up.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5618 would retroactively restore the emergency unemployment compensation benefits and restore funding for the extended benefits program through the month of November of this year. It would also ensure that States do not cut the level of regular unemployment benefits when they receive these extended Federal benefits, and it would protect workers from having their benefits cut if they experience intermittent earnings which requalify them for regular State unemployment benefits. Without the sort of help provided by this bill, more people will lose their homes, fall behind on their bills and be unable to feed their families. There is a very real risk that the economic crisis could get worse, not better, if we pull the safety net out from under the 1.7 million Americans that are facing these economic conditions right now.

Mr. Speaker, never before in our history has Congress allowed extended unemployment benefits to lapse when the unemployment rate was anywhere close to 10 percent; yet here we are again trying to extend this critical program to keep food on the table for millions of households, including millions of American children across this great Nation simply because the other side of the aisle repeatedly can only say ''no.''

The current emergency unemployment compensation program began to phase out at the end of May, and many of those now losing benefits have only received 26 weeks of regular State-provided unemployment compensation or one of the first tiers of Federal benefits. This means individuals exhausting their 26 weeks of unemployment benefits are not eligible for emergency unemployment benefits at all. This bill will retroactively restore those benefits and continue them and the program through November.

Without this extension, as I said before, an estimated 1.7 million individuals who have lost their jobs will lose their unemployment benefits by July 3. Mr. Speaker, that's no way to celebrate America's independence holiday. This includes well over 300,000 people in California, where our unemployment level is over 12 percent, well above the national average of 9.3. In my own district, the unemployment rates are much higher than even that. In fact, we have numbers that are near the 20 percent mark; and I have in my district the fourth, fifth and sixth highest unemployment rates in my counties in the country.

Nearly every economist will tell you that cutting off unemployment benefits will undermine the economic recovery by suppressing consumer demand at a critical time when we should be enhancing it, and by exacerbating problems, like the home foreclosure crisis that plagues many areas of our country.

I want to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) for bringing this bill forward and for his steadfast commitment to America's hardworking families. It is vitally important that we pass this bill and provide the much-needed help that our constituents need during these trying times.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague from California for yielding time, Mr. Speaker, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to this closed rule which rewrites H.R. 5618, the Restoration of Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act and provides martial law/same-day authority for any resolution reported from the Rules Committee through Saturday, July 3.

This bill has been rushed through Congress, avoiding committee action. When the Democrats, who are in charge, brought the bill up before the House for consideration on June 29, it failed to garner the necessary two-thirds majority required for passage. There was bipartisan opposition to this bill.

But why are our colleagues rushing this through? The Senate is not meeting, except to honor Senator Byrd. They know the bill is going nowhere. They say ''extraordinary circumstances require extraordinary measures'' and that the economic crisis is going to get worse if we don't pass this. But this bill is going nowhere, and they know it. They want to be able to go home and say, We voted to extend unemployment benefits and that Republicans voted ''no.''

Well, Republicans want to reduce the deficit; and if the underlying bill had been offset with reduced spending elsewhere, Republicans would have supported it. But it is not. Instead, Democrats are relying on budgetary tricks to avoid their own PAYGO rules. They are waiting until the last minute to address important issues and labeling the cost as ''emergency spending'' so they don't have to account for it in terms of our spending rules.

Frankly, the need for this bill in the first place is a direct admission of the failure of the Obama-Pelosi policies because the many spending bills, which

have already been passed, have failed to create the jobs promised by Speaker PELOSI and President Obama. So they're admitting by saying, We have to extend unemployment benefits, that all the spending has failed. Economists on both sides of the political spectrum are expressing concern over the fiscal health of the U.S. Government. Yesterday, CBO said, ''Our debt is now 62 percent of GDP, up 20 percent in 2 years''—the 2 years when Democrats controlled all of Congress and had a Democratic President—and it's the ''highest since World War II.''

□ 1130

Congress cannot continue this spending spree. We're simply living beyond our means, and I fear the consequences of our actions are not far off.

Here are a few lines from an article written by John Goodman on June 28 entitled How Bad is Our Fiscal Crisis?

''Already, we've seen some local governments declare bankruptcy. Expect more of that. In the next several years I believe some very large cities are going to announce they cannot pay their bills. State governments will be next. Whereas local governments can declare bankruptcy, State governments can only default. A default by the State of California seems almost inevitable.

''But is it conceivable that the U.S. Government could default? Actually, yes. Every projection shows the gap between spending and tax revenues rising through time.

''Two years ago the first of the baby boomers started claiming early retirement under Social Security. Next year they'll start signing up for Medicare. Before they're through, 78 million people will quit working, quit paying taxes, quit contributing to our retirement system and start drawing benefits instead.''

That's the end of Mr. Goodman's quote.

The underlying bill adds $34 billion to our ever-increasing debt. When Democrats passed their only unemployment insurance extender bill that was offset by other spending cuts last November, the administration hailed it as a ''fiscally responsible approach to expanding unemployment benefits,'' adding that ''fiscal responsibility is central to the medium-term recovery of the economy and the creation of jobs.''

The cost of extending the Democrats' unemployment insurance policy is growing because their failed stimulus bill has not created the promised jobs. Democrats predicted their trillion-dollar 2009 stimulus bill would create 3.7 million jobs. Instead, the debt has grown by $2 trillion, and nearly 3 million more private sector jobs have been eliminated since then.

Democrats promised unemployment would remain under 8 percent if their stimulus passed. Yet it remains stuck near 10 percent today. A total of 48 out of 50 States have lost jobs since the stimulus passed.

However, our colleagues keep spending and keep ignoring economic realities. That is totally irresponsible.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the gentlelady and her party don't understand what's happening in Middle America. They don't appreciate what's happening to folks like in my district. They may not hang out in places like my family's bowling alley, where a person who loses their job, and 20 percent of my constituents are nearly out of work, there isn't jobs around every corner. She may have plenty of jobs in her home State. She may not have to worry about that for her constituents.

But in my world, Mr. Speaker, when someone who comes to our bowling alley loses their job, they have nothing else. They don't have the Wall Street bonuses. They don't have the big pension, retirement systems, and the big 401(k) set-aside. They don't have the situation that so many of us need.

We have to provide a safety net for these people, these hardworking Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. There are some numbers that bear reflection right now that came out of the marketwatch.com report today that the Labor Department estimates 3.3 million people could lose extended unemployment benefits by the end of July if they're not renewed. And all together, 9.2 million people were collecting some type of unemployment benefits in the weekend of June 12.

It goes on to say that the 4-week average of initial claims rose by 3,250, to 466,500, the highest level in almost 3 months. And then it says the claims data, however, had little impact on the U.S. stock market.

So there's a separation between Wall Street, which is still doing well, because the taxpayers bailed out Wall Street, and Main Street, which, in many places across the country, is falling apart.

Now, I've traveled my district at countless meetings and events, parades and church services, festivals; and I hear the same thing. People are calling out from crowds asking for help. And this unemployment compensation issue is huge because people are having trouble putting food on the table.

We're going to give them a lecture about the budget? Who among us, if our brother asks for a loaf of bread, we give him a stone instead?

This Congress this afternoon is due to appropriate $33 billion to keep the war in Afghanistan going. And yet the amount of money we're asking here for the unemployed workers of America, for those who are trying to support their families, almost an identical amount, about $34 billion. And we're saying, well, we can't afford that. But you don't hear many people saying we can't afford the war, because the truth is we can't afford the war. We have to afford to put people back to economic sustenance and pass the unemployment compensation bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from California may have been trying to be a little humorous in his comments, but job loss in this economy is very serious business.

The American people are asking this Congress controlled by the Democrats, Where are the jobs?

I yield 5 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and to the underlying bill, but it pains me to do so.

As the RECORD will reflect, I, and most of my colleagues in this body, have supported repeated extensions of unemployment benefits. And as I told my constituents yesterday, I was anxious to do so again.

American families are hurting. This economy is struggling in the aftermath of the worst recession in a quarter of a century. And as my colleague just suggested, this economy is also struggling in the midst of the failed economic policies of this administration and this Congress.

Millions of American families are struggling to make ends meet. Since the passage of the so-called stimulus bill, 2.6 million jobs have been lost, and unemployment hovers near 10 percent.

So I was anxious to be able to come to this floor before heading home for the Independence Day break, having supported an extension of unemployment benefits. But I rise in opposition because I think what the American people expect us to do is what they've been doing at kitchen tables and sitting around desks and small businesses and on family farms, and that is making the hard choices.

We can provide an extension of unemployment insurance benefits in this Congress, and we can make the decisions to pay for it. And I'm sure it is a mystery to millions of Americans that will be looking on as to why we didn't even try. This Democrat majority, after adopting so-called PAYGO rules, after hearing from so-called fiscal conservative Members of the Democrat majority early in this Congress about how we were going to pay for what we spent, has waived their own PAYGO rules to add $34 billion to the national debt. And I just have to think millions of Americans are asking why.

□ 1140

There are any number of actions that we could take, decisions we could make, reordering our priorities to provide for the families at the point of the need here.

The gentleman from Ohio just said that many of us in the minority were saying that we can't afford to extend unemployment benefits. We can afford it. But at my kitchen table when we say we can afford something, it means

we can afford to pay for it. Not just simply—when my wife comes to me and says, I want to make a major expenditure, I say can we afford it? That means can we pay for it. Here it just means getting out the credit card of our children and grandchildren and running up the national debt by $34 billion.

I also rise with a heavy heart in opposition to this bill because we are here extending unemployment benefits again because the economic policies of this administration and this Congress have failed. Would that the economic policies of the so-called stimulus had worked. The President said we needed to borrow about a trillion dollars from future generations of Americans a year-and-a-half ago or unemployment, he said, that was then 7.6 percent, would go over 8 percent. Now it's 10 percent on average around the country, and higher, as has been said, in many jurisdictions.

Remarkably, yesterday the President of the United States goes to Racine, Wisconsin, a place that has a 14 percent unemployment rate, and he made these comments. He said, Things just aren't as bad as they could have been. There could have been a catastrophe. And in that sense, the stimulus worked. The President of the United States yesterday in Racine, Wisconsin, said the stimulus worked. And then remarkably he went on to suggest that the Republican leader in Congress was out of touch.

It's mind-boggling that at a time when so many—I mean what would this administration and this majority say to a father who's been struggling to make ends meet, who has been borrowing money from family members to pay the mortgage because he can't find work? What would he say to the word of the President of the United States that ''the stimulus worked''? What would the single mother say who has been out of work persistently, who has applied for dozens and dozens of jobs, and has gone deeper and deeper in debt during these difficult times? What would she say to word that the stimulus worked?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. FOXX. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. PENCE. The reality is that we have got to bring new ideas to bear on this economy. The American people know what's necessary to get this economy moving again. It's fiscal discipline in Washington, D.C., and it's fast-acting, across the board tax relief for working families, small businesses, and family farms.

What we hear from corporations across this country is that there is over $2 trillion in idled capital. We need to release the inherent power in this economy. We need to restore the confidence of capital markets in our commitment to fiscal discipline in Washington, D.C. And we can do all of that today and meet the needs of families struggling with unemployment.

By passing a fiscally responsible extension of unemployment insurance, we would send a message that we get it. We know people are hurting, we know the policies aren't working, but we want to practice fiscal responsibility. And for heaven's sakes, let's stop saying the stimulus worked. Let's try some new ideas. Let's come together across this aisle and do what's necessary to get America working again.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I look at today's Hill newspaper and I look on page 31. And I oftentimes believe that cartoons and political satire speak much more clearly than the words that we can use in big long speeches. And in today's cartoon, although I can't say that it's very funny to the American people who are being affected by it, you see an American citizen bungee jumping off an unemployment benefit bridge. And the elephant in the cartoon, signifying the other party, snips the line as the American's jumping off. And the comment in the caption reads, ''Don't worry, I'm sure you will land on your feet.'' I think too oftentimes we have this situation where we just expect that Americans are going to land on their feet, and we don't care about those who get left behind. That's what my discussion was today.

The gentleman just referred to the President's comments in Wisconsin about Mr. BOEHNER. And I would just refer to those comments that Mr. BOEHNER equated the financial bill that we passed yesterday, the regulatory reform bill that so many Americans are yearning for, he said it was a nuclear weapon to be used on an ant. The problem was an ant. Well, my constituents certainly don't think they were ants until they started being walked over by Wall Street.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. CARDOZA, I thank you for sharing with us what is not a funny anecdotal story or cartoon. I think from your words you are saying to the American people that their predicament is not a cartoon. And it is interesting when one of my colleagues comes to the floor of the House and poses a question, What do we say to the unemployed mother or what do we say to the person who is trying to manage themselves and pay their mortgage? Or what do you say to the caller that called in I believe from Florida this morning on C–SPAN and said he's laid off from a furniture store that closed and he is looking for work. And if I might paraphrase him, he said something about getting off our rears here in Congress and helping him. Why are we blocking his unemployment insurance?

Now, I can quote a lot of statistics, and somebody said something about numbers of individuals who are unemployed. There are double-digit communities with high unemployment, 13 percent, 15 percent, 16 percent, high numbers among our youth in their twenties, recent college graduates, individuals who are likewise looking for work as those who have been employed and are now unemployed.

Ladies and gentlemen, unemployment insurance is the prerogative, it is the owned by the worker who has worked. Unemployment insurance is what this is called. Why do the Republicans want to block it, why do the Republicans in the other body stand against unemployment insurance, this is an outrage. There is no explanation for it.

For the people who can get unemployment insurance, they are paying their mortgage. It churns back into the economy. They are buying groceries. They're paying car payments. Maybe they will have an opportunity to keep a young person in a community college by putting their pennies together. But here we stand today having to go back again because the Republicans had the audacity to vote against unemployment insurance coverage. So to the man who is saying, I'm going out looking for a job every day, to the mother who is saying, I am looking for a job every day, no hope is being given to them. This is not explainable.

So I am on the floor today, because we must go forward on a supplemental. Maybe my colleagues will join me and vote against the war supplemental so we will be able to balance the budget. But if they are not going to be serious about saving money, they cannot stop the vote to help provide unemployment insurance for Americans out of work. We have created 200,000 jobs in the last month; some are public jobs, but you cannot get the private-sector engaged until you begin to see the churning of the overall economy.

The Federal Government is the umbrella for a rainy day. We are in a rainy day. But I have faith in this Nation. We always rise. We are going to rise now. We are going to stand with the unemployed so they can soon get work and we are going to give this money to them today. And I dare my Republican friends to vote against this effort to help our fellow Americans.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair, and to not traffic the well when another Member is under recognition.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend from Grandfather Community, North Carolina, for yielding me the time.

I would like to say that it's very sad and unfortunate that we are here. And, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I believe that it's really unnecessary, really unnecessary for us to be here. Why? Because if we had 17 months ago put into

place a bipartisan vision for economic growth that was utilized very effectively by John F. Kennedy during the decade of the 1960s, and Ronald Reagan during the decade of the 1980s, that's why I call it bipartisan, I am convinced that we would in fact have attained what President Obama promised us would have happened with passage of the trillion-dollar stimulus bill.

□ 1150

You'll recall he said that if that measure passed, that the unemployment rate would not exceed 8 percent and that at this point we would be at an unemployment rate of somewhere around 7.4 percent.

Mr. Speaker, my friend from California is joining in managing of this rule, and he knows very well that we not only don't have a 7.4 percent unemployment rate, we not only don't have an 8 percent unemployment rate as was promised by the President, but we nationally have just under 10 percent unemployment. And tomorrow we're going to be getting numbers which, according to reports, are not going to be terribly positive.

But in our State of California and the area that my friend represents, the unemployment rate is far beyond that. The area I represent in southern California has unemployment in the Inland Empire of right around 14 percent. And I know that it's well in the double digits in the Central Valley of California.

So when I say it should be unnecessary for us to be here, Mr. Speaker, the reason I say it is that if we were to take the bipartisan John F. Kennedy-Ronald Reagan model and use that for economic growth, we could have an unemployment rate which would be significantly less than we are facing today, and we could have a GDP growth rate which would be significantly higher.

Now, what is that model? That model, the one that worked, that actually doubled the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury during the 1960s and the 1980s, is one which is designed to bring about marginal tax rate reduction to encourage savings and productivity. Now, Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of thing that we should be doing to avoid where we are today facing this continued extension of unemployment benefits.

The notion that somehow those of us who want to put into place pro-growth economic policies aren't concerned about those who are today in need of unemployment benefits is a preposterous argument because we believe very passionately that the level of compassion of a government should be based not on the number of people who have to draw unemployment benefits but based instead on the number of people who do not need to draw unemployment benefits.

That's why we found that over the past 17 months clearly the economic plan, which was put into place by President Obama and Speaker PELOSI and the Democratic leadership, is one that has not met up to what was promised. In fact, from my perspective, it's been an abject failure when you have an unemployment rate that nationally is nearly 2 percent greater than the level that we were promised.

I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have an opportunity that emerged from the discussion that took place last weekend at the G–20 meeting. That plan that the President—and I congratulate him for putting forward—calls for moving ahead in a lame duck session after renegotiating a U.S.-South Korea free trade agreement. And I look forward to working with my friend, the distinguished chair of the Committee on Ways and Means, on this just as soon as we are able to move forward with it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. FOXX. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I believe that if we were to take that vision of opening up markets when 96 percent of the world's consumers are outside of our borders and pass not only the U.S.-South Korea agreement but right here in this hemisphere, if we were to pass the Panama and Colombia agreements, which were negotiated before the South Korea agreement was put into place, we would have tens of millions of new consumers. In Colombia alone, 40 million consumers. American jobs could be created for Caterpillar, John Deere, Whirlpool. Other great U.S. companies could create U.S. jobs.

And I hope very much, Mr. Speaker, that we're able to put those kinds of pro-growth policies into place so we don't have to face what we're facing today.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how much time each side has remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 16 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 14¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to respond to my colleague from California by saying that the gentleman is once again talking about the long-term questions—whether we need tax cuts or whether we need to have more stimulus. All of those things are open to debate.

What is not open to debate is the fact that 1.7 million Americans today and over the next 3 days and over the last few weeks have lost their unemployment benefits. That is an emergency. That's why we have emergency spending provisions. We have to take care of those Americans who will not be able to feed their families, pay their mortgage payments. That's why we have an unemployment insurance compensation program, to protect those Americans when they find themselves in this kind of a situation.

We can have the other debates on other days. And we certainly have had and we will have. But on today's question of whether we're going to extend those benefits, we need to have the Republicans join us in supporting the American people, in supporting those out-of-work folks.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there's been discussion on the floor of the long term. For the long-term unemployed in this country, the long term happened yesterday, or today, actually, the first of the month when the rent comes due and you can't pay it or your mortgage comes due and you can't pay it. They're living in the long term right now, and they need some help. And I think that considering this bill today is the right thing to do.

I do want to reference the remarks which preceded me a few minutes ago by my friend from California, the senior member of the Rules Committee, about how, had the Congress embarked on the path he suggested early in 2009, that the economy would be so much stronger. And he is a fierce and articulate advocate of that point of view. But let's examine what that point of view is and what its track record is.

The gentleman from California argued for cuts in marginal tax rates, mostly distributed to people at the top end—not all, but mostly. He argued for deregulation of the domestic markets and for a policy that pursues that goal. That is a quite accurate description of the economic policies of the administration of President George W. Bush. They cut marginal tax rates—mostly at the upper end of the scale—almost all at the upper end of the scale. They engaged in a systematic practice of deregulation of Wall Street and other industries. And it yielded, quite frankly, the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression.

Were those policies the sole cause of that? Of course not. Is what the American people need a rehashing of that failure? Of course not.

The American people need a policy that will grow jobs, and although the jobs are growing much more slowly than I think any of us hoped, the reality is the economy shed 8½ million jobs following the policy that my friend from California would like us to go back to; and it has gained just over a million jobs since the beginning of this year. Those are the facts.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Our colleagues across the aisle are saying yes, what the American people want is to see jobs and they keep asking where are the jobs. We keep being told that these failed policies passed by this administration and this Congress

are going to produce jobs. That is not the case.

They like to tout the May employment report issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics which appears to be positive with the addition of 431,000 new jobs. However, 412,000 of those new positions are for temporary government census workers. In other words, 96 percent of May's job growth will be eliminated in just a few weeks. That's almost half of the jobs that my colleague from New Jersey wants to point out.

The June unemployment rate we believe, as my colleague from California said, will edge up to 9.8 percent from 9.7 percent in May. But they keep bragging about how effective they've been at providing jobs.

□ 1200

The bottom line is, since February 2009, with Democrats in charge of Congress and the White House, more than 3.3 million jobs have been lost in the private sector. The Federal Government has gained more than 590,000 jobs over the same period. I hate to tell you, but the government jobs don't provide a viable solution in helping get the economy back on its feet. Government jobs are supported by tax dollars, and that tax burden is ultimately borne by the entrepreneurs and small businesses that are the engines of economic growth. Further strain on these employers will not help facilitate a healthy economy over the long term.

Now, my colleague from New Jersey just talked about a myth that our colleagues continue to perpetuate, which is about how many jobs were lost in the Bush administration and about how many jobs were gained.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD a piece by Keith Hennessey.

This is a fairly new Democratic claim about job creation. Our colleagues are really searching for ways to justify their terrible policies; but as Mr. Hennessey points out, the Democrats are picking their time frames very carefully. They ignore the 4 million jobs lost during the first 11 months of a Presidency that is, so far, 16 months old. What they don't point out is the fact that President Bush inherited a recession and that their statistics, again, are totally unfounded.

If you will look at the Bureau of Labor Statistics' payroll survey that was done in 2001 to mid-2003, you will see a steady employment decline, followed by a steady, strong, and sustained period of job growth for almost 4 years.

This is the chart put out by Keith Hennessey. He notes that, in the 46 months that we had job growth in the Bush administration, it is the second longest in recorded history for sustained job creation in the U.S. More than 8 million jobs were created during this period. A mild recession began in late 2007—who was in charge of the Congress at that time? The Democrats. They always fail to mention that—followed by a severe contraction in the second half of 2008 and continuing into the Obama administration.

So this chart shows it very well, and it is very objective, Mr. Speaker. It isn't opinion on my part. It's the numbers. As I said, our colleagues are very, very selective in how they make the comparison.

[From Keith Hennessey.com, June 8, 2010]

THE NEW DEMOCRATIC CLAIM ABOUT JOB CREATION

A new claim about job creation appears to be bubbling up through the Democratic ranks. Here is the clearest statement of that claim, from Rep. Debbie Wasserman Schultz (D-FL) on Stuart Varney's show:

On the pace that we're on, with job creation in the last four months, if we continue on that pace, and all the leading economists say that it is likely that we will, we will have created more jobs in this year than in the entire Bush Presidency.

Ms. Wasserman Schultz is picking her timeframes carefully, in particular by ignoring the four million jobs lost during the first 11 months of a Presidency that is so far 16 months old.

Even today, after five straight months of job growth, three million fewer people are working than when President Obama took office. That's hardly something to brag about.

And looking just at last month's strong net increase of 431,000 jobs, we see that nine out of ten net new jobs were temporary government jobs for census takers. We all hope the pace of private job creation accelerates, but it's too soon to declare this a strong and consistent employment recovery or to project its trend into the rest of the year.

Let me point out one other chart that has been put together, and that is to compare the unemployment over time between administrations, or among administrations, using the average unemployment rate. You will see it is very low under President Johnson at 4.2 percent. Under President Eisenhower, 4.9 percent. The average under President Bush 43, 5.3 percent. The average under President Obama, 9.5 percent.

This is what the American people are interested in. They are asking: Where are the jobs? Why do the Obama administration and Pelosi policies continue to have us lose jobs? Unemployment is at almost 10 percent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SALAZAR). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to take this time to correct the statistics and the statements that we just heard from my colleague from North Carolina.

My colleague forgets that in the Clinton administration we created—not ''we,'' because I wasn't here—but the Democrats and Mr. Clinton created 22 million new jobs for America.

Mr. Bush, when he took over, did not, in fact, inherit a recession. That recession happened after he was in office, and it was a severe one. We started to come out of that. Again, the Bush administration policies caused a second recession. When you look at Mr. Bush's term of office, there were some jobs created; but they were not private-sector jobs, as the gentlelady is so fond of talking about. In fact, if you look at the statistics, there were no new private-sector jobs created during the Bush administration. When Mr. Bush left office, he left a recession that was shedding 750,000-plus jobs a month.

When the good lady from North Carolina talks about the fact that there have been job losses during the Obama administration, many of those are the carryovers. You don't turn around the economy overnight. Mr. Obama can't flip a light switch and create the jobs overnight. It took time to get the policies in place to start bringing the country out of the Bush recession. In fact, in the last 3 months, we have averaged 300,000-plus jobs instead of losing 750,000 a month under the last few months of the Bush administration.

This rewriting of history, this total denial of the economic policies that got us into this mess, is something that, frankly, the American people understand very well. The 20 percent of the population which are unemployed in my district right now understand that very well. The 30 percent of my constituents who have lost their homes to foreclosure understand who got them into this situation. I think that we will, in fact, see a situation where the American people will judge what is going on here.

We will have to work hard to create more jobs in the future. As I said before, we are going to debate those policies. There have been discussions on tax cuts and on the stimulus. The statistics tell us that the average American has not paid this low of a percentage of his taxes in quite some time, since Mr. Truman was in office, I believe it is.

So I believe that there are significant facts that we need to set straight here, facts which represent a positive side of the ledger to my party and to the policies we are advocating.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, it is not we Republicans who are rewriting history. It is our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

I will point out once again that Republicans were in charge of the Congress during 6 of the 8 years of Mr. Clinton's administration, and that is when we had the job growth—when Republicans were making the policy here. Mr. Obama did promise to create the jobs. He promised that unemployment would not go above 8 percent. He made lots of promises. As far as I've been able to see, none of the good ones have been kept.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I was listening intently to the debate. I must say that the people in my district would not recognize

the America that has been described by the gentleman from California. They would not believe that the economy is moving up. They would not believe that jobs are being created. They would not believe that they have low taxes. Frankly, they believe all of the opposite because that is what their reality is.

All of us have been home in our districts, as have I. All of us, I hope, have polled our constituents, both informally and formally. I find what my constituents say in my district is similar to what I see in the national polls.

The number one thing they are concerned about are jobs. They are concerned about good jobs, permanent jobs. They understand the agony of those who are unemployed and of those who are having difficulty, if not discovering the impossibility, of finding prospects for jobs at the present time; and we understand that on this side, though the other thing my constituents have said to me over and over again is, while ''jobs'' is the number one issue, the number two issue is the spending, which is out of control by this Congress.

So I hear my friends on the other side of the aisle who say we have an emergency in terms of the unemployment benefits running out. I understand that. Yet what my constituents are telling me and what Americans are saying all over the country is that there are at least two emergencies. Jobs, yes, are an emergency; but spending, out-of-control spending, irresponsible spending by this Congress under this Democratic leadership is a major concern to them.

Under this rule, we can't deal with both emergencies. We can only deal with the question of jobs in the unemployment compensation arena, but we are prohibited from dealing with how you pay for the government spending here. That's what we have been asking for. Deal with the second emergency so that you don't have further people unemployed for years and so that you don't impose your debt on my children and my grandchildren so that they will not have the prospect of jobs in the future.

□ 1210

It is not original with me, but it often has been said the best social welfare program is a job. While we want to have unemployment insurance to cushion people, to transition people from a period of employment to unemployment to employment, that is not the prospect we want for them short-term or long-term. What we want is creation of jobs, and the irresponsibility of this administration and this Democratic leadership in not facing up to the fact that our persistent irresponsibility in not paying our bills is something that exacerbates the problem—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. So as I hear the people on the other side of the aisle try and say, look, Republicans are those Scrooge-like people who are not concerned about people who are unemployed, let me just say we have people unemployed as well as you do in your districts. We have friends and family members who are suffering under this. We understand that. But we also understand they are saying at the same time, when you pass legislation in the Congress that costs money, find a way to pay for it. Find a way to pay for it.

You can be both for creation of jobs as well as being responsible in the carrying out of our duties. That is all we are saying. Don't promise the American people a free lunch, and don't say, well, we will think about that in the future, because we have got to think about spending right now.

Now, I understand this rule doesn't allow us to do this. The leadership on the Democratic side doesn't want to face up to the concerns we have. We are not even going to have a budget. But at some point in time we have to stand up for what is right, and we can do two things at once.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman.

This rule makes it possible for us to consider today a supplemental appropriations bill that contains some vital support for public education across America.

Now, most schoolchildren learn that 3 plus 3 equals 6. Last year, the schoolchildren of my State of Texas received an unfortunate lesson in State Republican math. In Texas, 3 plus 3 only equaled 3. How is that?

Well, last year, Texas received more than $3 billion in State Stabilization, economic recovery, or stimulus funds designated for our local school districts, for our schoolchildren. But by exploiting ambiguous language, for every dime of Federal support in State Stabilization moneys that went to Texas, the State took away money that it had already committed for the same purpose. So instead of a historic boost in local school support, our schoolchildren were left no better off than if we had not passed the Economic Recovery Act with these provisions at all. The $3 billion more made no difference for our local schools.

Congressional support for our local school districts reflects a two-fold understanding. First, that our local districts know best what the needs of their students and their teachers and administrators are. Second, that especially in times of a difficult economy, we need to invest in public education. A solid education is the foundation on which our economy and our democracy rests.

Now, our Texas Republican leadership disagreed with both those propositions. They balanced the State budget with Federal economic recovery funds at the same time our Governor was out talking about secession and attacking the economic recovery, much as we have heard this morning.

I am hopeful that this supplemental appropriation will include specific language for Texas made at the request of our Texas Democratic Congressional delegation to ensure that this never happens again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CARDOZA. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. To ensure that any money that goes for teachers and public education in Texas actually goes to improve our schools and the lives of our schoolchildren.

Earlier this month, statewide groups representing teachers, principals, school boards and school administrators joined about 40 superintendents from across the State to endorse this approach. Through this bill today, with specific language for Texas, we can ensure that our goals last year are achieved and we do something at this difficult time to address the needs of our Texas teachers and our Texas schoolchildren.

I hope this rule can be adopted in order to approve this important language.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans want to help the long-term unemployed, but agree with the American people that new spending needs to be offset by cuts otherwise.

During the Rules Committee markup of the Democrats' H.R. 5618, Mr. HELLER from Nevada offered a Republican amendment in the nature of a substitute which was not made in order by a vote of two to seven. This fiscally responsible alternative would have extended unemployment insurance, COBRA, and the current poverty guidelines until September 25th, and paid for it with unused funds from the failed stimulus bill.

Again, the bill before us extends Federal unemployment benefits only through November 2010 and is not paid for, adding its $34 billion price tag to our $13 trillion debt.

Democrats claim their bill satisfies their PAYGO requirements by declaring it is spending in an emergency. But that is simply an excuse for not paying for it. Let me tell you how an emergency is defined in their rules.

In general, the criteria to be considered in determining whether a proposed expenditure or tax change meets an emergency designation includes, one, necessary, essential, or vital, not merely useful or beneficial; two, sudden, quickly coming into being and not building up over time; three, an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action; four, unforeseen, unpredictable, unanticipated, and not permanent, but rather temporary in nature.

We have known about this for a long time. This does not meet the criteria for emergency spending. Declaring it emergency spending is just a gimmick. It is a way to not have to comply with PAYGO. In fact, there are 160 spending programs already exempt from PAYGO or operating under special rules.

You know, just because our colleagues say that it is so, doesn't make it so. Saying that it is PAYGO compliant doesn't mean that there is an offset to it. So our colleagues are very clever in the way they say things.

President Obama said in February 2010, Now Congress will have to pay for what it spends, just like everybody else. After a decade of profligacy, the American people are tired of politicians who talk the talk but don't walk the walk when it comes to fiscal responsibility.

Both the President and our colleagues across the aisle are talking out of both sides of their mouths. They go out and announce that they are making something PAYGO compliant, but they don't. Rather than face facts and support sound economic policies like lowering taxes and reducing regulatory burdens, the Democrats continue to advocate misguided policies that expand the government's control and increase the Nation's debt.

This is not the way to create jobs. The American people continue to ask the question, where are the jobs? Mr. Speaker, this bill is not going to create the jobs, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. Speaker, the President has said that every economist that has looked at his stimulus plan and all the plans that he has put forth agree with him.

□ 1220

But let me quote Carnegie Mellon economist Allan H. Meltzer, in an article in the Wall Street Journal op-ed June 30: Why Obamanomics Has Failed. ''The administration's stimulus program has failed. Growth is slow and unemployment remains high. The President and his friends and advisers talk endlessly about the circumstances they inherited as a way of avoiding responsibility for the 18 months for which they are responsible. Two overarching reasons explain the failure of Obamanomics. First, administration economists and their outside supporters neglected the longer-term costs and consequences of their actions. Second, the administration and Congress have, through their deeds and words, heightened uncertainty about the economic future. High uncertainty is the enemy of investment and growth.''

Economists get it, Republicans get it, and the American people get it. It's high time the Democrats wake up to the fact that the stimulus isn't working as promised. We need to cut government spending, repeal nonsensical regulations, and lower taxes. We should not be passing this extension without an offset in spending.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule, and ''no'' on the bill. Let's answer the question the American people are asking, Where are the jobs? Let's put in policies that really create jobs.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to close today by discussing a little bit of what the gentlelady just talked about with regard to PAYGO. I'd like to point out that I'm quite sure that the gentlelady from North Carolina did not vote for the PAYGO resolution in the House rules that we passed at the beginning of this Congress, nor did she vote for statutory PAYGO. They have always talked about tax cuts as the answer to all of America's problems. We could take the tax cut to zero and my, wouldn't we pay for government well?

The reality is that they only want to pay for things that affect common folks—the common Americans that get up every day, put their shoes on, and just want a job to make a living and pay for their family, pay for their home, and earn a better life. They don't want to pay for the tax cuts for the Wall Street big shots. They never want to pay for that. They don't want the PAYGO rules to apply to them.

As I said before in this debate, I grew up in my parents' bowling alley. I saw firsthand what happened to those folks—those hardworking American folks that would come into my parents' establishment just wanting a little bit of fun on a Friday or Saturday night. I saw what happened when they lost their job. They lost their home, they couldn't feed their family. Families disbanded because of the stress and tension under those economic situations.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted against, for the most part, the financial regulatory reform bill. They were protecting their friends on Wall Street, the very people that got us into this calamity. Thirty percent of my constituents—around that—have lost their home to foreclosure because of the financial collapse that was caused by the greed on Wall Street. Yet my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to defend them. But, for the most part, they will not vote for emergency funding to put food on unemployed workers' tables or to allow them to keep their homes in this time of crisis. I say that it's not all of them because on June 29, 2010, 30 courageous Republicans voted with the Democrats—the 231 Democrats—to extend unemployment benefits and to protect those workers who have lost their job in this economic situation.

Mr. Speaker, I can't sit here today and tell you that every policy that we've put in place since Mr. Obama has been in place has worked as well as I'd like. Frankly, I've been critical on a number of issues that I thought the administration could have done a better job. But I will tell you that when it comes time to taking care of Americans who are in an emergency situation, who have lost their job for no fault of their own but for the fact that the economic situation was a tsunami that swamped them, it is our party who is standing up to make sure that those workers can survive for another day. And for those workers, this absolutely is an emergency.

Mr. Speaker, no one can legitimately doubt that the situation we face right now is an emergency for the American people who are unemployed. And until our economy is firmly on track and moving forward, I believe we must provide help for those unemployed workers to pay their bills and feed their families. If not, we risk falling further into a further economic crisis and we risk leaving way too many families behind.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this rule and to support the underlying bill. I urge a ''yes'' vote on the previous question, and on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on House Resolution 1495 will be followed by 5-minute votes on suspending the rules with regard to House Resolution 1321, if ordered; and House Resolution 1405, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 189, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 418]

YEAS—231

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (TX)
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind

Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wilson (OH)
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—189

Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Djou
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Baird
Edwards (MD)
Ellison
Hoekstra
Lynch
Moran (VA)
Payne
Rodriguez
Wamp
Welch
Woolsey
Young (AK)

□ 1253

Messrs. GALLEGLY, NUNES, SESSIONS, POSEY, and KLINE of Minnesota changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. COHEN and CLEAVER changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AFFIRMING SUPPORT FOR A STRONG ALLIANCE WITH THAILAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution (H. Res. 1321) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the political situation in Thailand be solved peacefully and through democratic means, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 411, noes 4, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 419]

AYES—411

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Djou
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano