

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES¹—COMMITTEES OTHER THAN APPROPRIATIONS—Continued
 [By fiscal year in millions of dollars]

		2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	Total	
							200–2007	203–2012
Discretionary Action	BA	516	652	1,025	1,605	2,006	5,804	n.a.
	OT	516	652	1,025	1,605	2,006	5,804	n.a.
Total	BA	76,606	79,010	81,634	84,739	87,785	409,774	n.a.
	OT	75,774	78,374	81,253	84,385	87,472	407,258	n.a.
Committee on Education and the Workforce:								
Current Law Base	BA	4,633	4,325	4,709	4,885	5,066	23,618	n.a.
	OT	3,264	3,172	3,475	3,604	3,744	17,259	n.a.
Energy and Commerce Committee:								
Current Law Base	BA	10,248	10,017	11,164	11,498	12,503	55,430	n.a.
	OT	11,401	11,496	11,562	11,871	11,881	58,211	n.a.
Discretionary Action	BA	95	285	606	801	922	2,709	n.a.
	OT	59	272	598	798	922	2,649	n.a.
Total	BA	10,343	10,302	11,770	12,299	13,425	58,139	n.a.
	OT	11,460	11,768	12,160	12,669	12,803	60,860	n.a.
Financial Services Committee:								
Current Law Base	BA	7,985	8,428	8,249	8,053	8,574	41,289	n.a.
	OT	2,696	1,578	541	-165	-344	4,306	n.a.
Government Reform Committee:								
Current Law Base	BA	66,536	69,943	73,568	76,706	79,236	365,989	n.a.
	OT	65,527	68,971	72,573	75,514	78,253	361,038	n.a.
Committee on House Administration:								
Current Law Base	BA	82	85	85	82	81	415	n.a.
	OT	37	161	18	14	14	244	n.a.
International Relations Committee:								
Current Law Base	BA	10,069	10,390	10,705	10,952	11,287	53,403	n.a.
	OT	10,075	10,127	10,364	10,591	10,864	52,021	n.a.
Judiciary Committee:								
Current Law Base	BA	6,404	5,133	5,116	5,092	5,112	26,857	n.a.
	OT	5,763	5,613	5,281	5,148	5,180	26,985	n.a.
Resources Committee:								
Current Law Base	BA	2,537	2,430	2,371	2,394	2,392	12,124	n.a.
	OT	2,471	2,313	2,052	2,297	2,154	11,287	n.a.
Discretionary Action	BA	0	113	498	89	0	700	n.a.
	OT	0	113	498	89	0	700	n.a.
Total	BA	2,537	2,543	2,869	2,483	2,392	12,824	n.a.
	OT	2,471	2,426	2,550	2,386	2,154	11,987	n.a.
Science Committee:								
Current Law Base	BA	143	20	17	17	18	215	n.a.
	OT	147	102	56	29	24	358	n.a.
Small Business Committee:								
Current Law Base	BA	3	2	1	1	1	8	n.a.
	OT	-238	-88	-32	-30	-28	-416	n.a.
Transportation and Infrastructure Committee:								
Current Law Base	BA	54,029	51,640	50,234	50,657	50,932	257,492	n.a.
	OT	14,910	12,014	10,429	10,651	10,774	58,778	n.a.
Discretionary Action	BA	0	4,369	4,369	4,369	4,369	17,476	n.a.
	OT	0	0	0	0	0	0	n.a.
Total	BA	54,029	56,009	54,603	55,026	55,301	274,968	n.a.
	OT	14,910	12,014	10,429	10,651	10,774	58,778	n.a.
Veterans' Affairs Committee:								
Current Law Base	BA	1,629	2,055	2,543	3,082	3,633	12,942	n.a.
	OT	1,570	1,999	2,590	3,065	3,431	12,655	n.a.
Ways and Means Committee:								
Current Law Base	BA	643,804	661,849	684,591	701,838	727,703	3,419,785	n.a.
	OT	645,017	661,964	684,461	701,118	727,005	3,419,565	n.a.
Discretionary Action	BA	2,203	858	1,280	1,639	1,875	7,855	n.a.
	OT	174	853	1,231	1,660	1,943	5,861	n.a.
Total	BA	646,007	662,707	685,871	703,477	729,578	3,427,640	n.a.
	OT	645,191	662,817	685,692	702,778	728,948	3,425,426	n.a.
Current Law Base, Medicare	BA	174,977	180,768	193,068	197,062	211,086	n.a.	2,224,058
	OT	174,843	181,045	192,994	196,851	211,379	n.a.	2,223,844
Discretionary Action	BA	4,650	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	347,270
	OT	4,575	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	347,270
Total	BA	174,977	180,768	193,068	197,062	211,086	n.a.	2,224,058
	OT	174,843	181,045	192,994	196,851	211,379	n.a.	2,223,844

n.a.—not applicable.
¹ Reflecting allocation adjustments through the end of the 107th Congress.

□ 1145

EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 2002

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 14, I call up the Senate bill (S. 23) to provide for a 5-month extension of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 and for a transition period for individuals receiving compensation when the program under such Act ends, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 14, the Senate bill is considered read for amendment.

The text of S. 23 is as follows:

S. 23

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF THE TEMPORARY EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 2002.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 208 of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–147; 116 Stat. 30) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 208. APPLICABILITY.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), an agreement entered into under this title shall apply to weeks of unemployment—

“(1) beginning after the date on which such agreement is entered into; and

“(2) ending before June 1, 2003.

“(b) TRANSITION FOR AMOUNT REMAINING IN ACCOUNT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), in the case of an individual who has amounts remaining in an account established under section 203 as of May 31, 2003, temporary extended unemployment compensation shall continue to be payable to such individual from such amounts for any week beginning after such date for which the individual meets the eligibility requirements of this title.

“(2) NO AUGMENTATION AFTER MAY 31, 2003.—If the account of an individual is exhausted

after May 31, 2003, then section 203(c) shall not apply and such account shall not be augmented under such section, regardless of whether such individual's State is in an extended benefit period (as determined under paragraph (2) of such section).

“(3) LIMITATION.—No compensation shall be payable by reason of paragraph (1) for any week beginning after August 30, 2003.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–147; 116 Stat. 21).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind Members why we are here today. We are here today to vote on an unemployment assistance bill because the House, in trying to respond to the needs of the

unemployed, passed legislation last December. The Senate, in attempting to respond to the needs of the unemployed, passed legislation last December. As we all know, constitutionally for it to go to the President, if the Senate passes legislation different than the House, and similarly if the House passes legislation different than the Senate, the differences in those bills need to be reconciled. They were not reconciled.

The last Congress adjourned without addressing unemployment needs with the understanding that some individuals, through no fault of their own, notwithstanding the fact that they had not received the full benefits entitled to them, would lose unemployment benefits on December 28. That is still technically the case. They have not yet lost those benefits, but if the President does not have a bill to sign by tomorrow, that technicality will in fact be a reality.

We are here today because the Senate modified the proposal that they had passed in the last Congress and they sent it to us yesterday by unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker, I imagine there are as many different ways to structure unemployment benefits as there are Members of the House; and if we are to debate the different ways in which it can be constructed and if we are to offer votes to try to produce a different result than the Senate, then it is inevitable that what we are trying to avoid will in fact occur.

I, as a Member of this body, do not like being put in the position of making a statement of this type. We are compelled to pass the unemployment provision as it was structured by the Senate because if we do not the President will not have a bill tomorrow.

I had visited with the leadership of the Senate and talked to them about offering amendments so we could really target unemployment to where it is most needed, give those most in need more benefits. They indicated while they may be sympathetic with that view, there was no way given the structure of the Senate's membership and the rules of Senate that that could be done in a day.

What we were able to do was to extend the period that the Senate had passed so instead of getting into this discussion in March, once again we are extending for 5 months the unemployment benefits to May with a phase-out through August. That means that we are going to see a continuation of assistance to the unemployed. It means that the President's commitment to make sure that those who would have lost their benefits on December 28 does not happen, and it means that there are going to be 1.9 million new recipients and 800,000 current recipients that will receive unemployment benefits at a cost of up to \$7.2 billion when the House votes on this measure.

We are going to hear people say we could have, would have, should have,

and the argument is that they are being denied rights because they cannot offer alternatives. If we do not pass this measure, people will lose their unemployment benefits. That should not happen.

Mr. Speaker, I hope I do not take the floor again in this session of the 108th Congress and say we have to do what the Senate has given us. I only hope we do that because we want to do it. I believe this is the right thing to do. More importantly, it is absolutely essential that we do it and that we do it today rather than argue that somebody is trying to withhold these unemployment benefits from these individuals. All we have to do is say yes, the President will sign, and the unemployment benefits will be available.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) to control the time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, news release, news release, news release. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has said that the Republican-controlled Senate and the Republican-controlled House cannot legislate, that they cannot provide for the one million Americans who are seeking jobs but whose unemployment compensation has expired. Who is going to deliver this message to the empowered Republican President who has now told the American people that he controls the agenda? And now we find out that the chairman of the awesome and powerful and influential Committee on Ways and Means cannot legislate in the people's House.

Well, I do not believe it. My colleagues do not believe it, and the only reason I am commenting on it is because I do not want the American people to believe it. We have a million people out there. They do not have dividends or savings; all they have is heart and are looking for work. They are Americans that will be called on to fight the wars. They have lost their jobs, lost health benefits, but they have not lost their dignity.

But we will have people to believe that somewhere down the line they will not have to pay taxes on their dividends and jobs will be created for them. The other side of the aisle says we would like to help them because of compassionate conservatism, but we just cannot do it.

We have majorities in the House and the Senate, but the House has to do what the Senate did; the Senate has to do what the House would do. Do not do this to these people. They should just say they do not want to do it because they do not believe in it. They did not do it before the Christmas holidays, and they are just giving a little interest today.

Mr. Speaker, so I do not know how the other side of the aisle is going to explain it back home, but I know one thing, and that is we have 84,000 New Yorkers. They took the hit for this Nation. They are looking for work. I will go back and tell them that we discussed it with the Republicans, and they said that Democrats and Republicans will not be able even to debate coverage for the 84,000 people who are without work who paid into the fund. I will tell them that we cannot even vote on it because we do not want to complicate it for the Republican-controlled Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) for the purposes of control.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the million worker comment made by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL). I think it is very important for us to know the history of what has already happened in the area of unemployment compensation and why we are going to add some additional assistance for people who come from States like mine.

The Democrats make it sound like we have not helped at all the unemployed, whom we already have helped. We have helped those million unemployed workers. We have helped them consistently through this last year. They make that assertion about the million people being let down, but already we have helped one million people under the Federal expanded benefits that we put into effect last year in March of 2002. They have all already received Federal unemployment benefits that averaged \$250 a week generally for 13 weeks. On top of that, generally 26 weeks of regular State benefits which they had received previously, and I think that is very important. In States like Washington State, my State, there have been additional expanded benefits.

So to talk about not helping one million folks who have been unemployed is to move from the truth, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is important to clear that up.

My second point is in addition to the one million folks, we are going to help two million additional people. Plus, we will be extending benefits that ran out on December 28 for 800,000 additional people. Let us not get mixed up in the rhetoric of partisanship here and let us talk about what we can do to help unemployed people who very much want to hold jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH).

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Washington

(Ms. DUNN) for all of her work on the issue of unemployment benefits because I know this has been a big focus of her efforts in this body for the last few months.

Mr. Speaker, last year Republican leadership in the House advanced a program of extended unemployment insurance which has assisted some four million Americans. Today we will be extending that critical program to help the millions of Americans who continue to face unemployment through no fault of their own.

□ 1200

These working families have borne the brunt of hard economic times and will continue to do so until our economy gets back on a growth path and begins to generate new jobs. We in Congress have a fundamental responsibility to help cushion the effects of economic displacement by providing a set of extended unemployment benefits for those who exhaust their regular State compensation. Under today's legislation, these workers who exhaust their 26 weeks of State benefits will be able to collect up to 13 more weeks of benefits; and in a couple of other States with very high unemployment, 13 more on top of that.

This program not only benefits working families but it also acts as an economic stabilizer for communities like the many that we have in western Pennsylvania that have been particularly hard hit by this downturn and its effect on the manufacturing sector, places like Erie, Warren, Meadville. These are communities where this program is going to be enormously beneficial to those who depend on jobs that are tied to the local economy.

Nonetheless, many Americans will continue to face difficulties as this economy recovers. For this reason I will be introducing legislation that reforms the trigger mechanism on extended benefits and that allows unemployed workers to receive up to 26 weeks of additional assistance. State unemployment numbers can mask big regional differences. I believe that a change in the trigger mechanism will allow us to more effectively respond to uneven economic recovery across the country within States.

I support the legislation before us. I believe that we need to continue to work to provide more relief for the unemployed where and when it is needed; and above all since these are workers who want a job, not just unemployment insurance, we need to pass a stimulus package that gets the economy back on a growth path.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, my heart goes out to the gentleman from Pennsylvania who is not allowed to put up an amendment. He is the only one I have ever heard of talk about exhaustees on the other side.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to speak further to clarify this issue that the gentlewoman from Washington has spoken about. There are a million people who exhausted their 13 weeks of extended benefits. There are 31,500 of them in your State. To the gentleman from Pennsylvania, 44,000 are in your State. In 1991, we provided 26 weeks of extended benefits. We did not need to change the trigger to do that.

We Democrats here today wanted to provide to those people an additional 13 weeks if they were still out of work. You keep talking about those who are out of work, who are hurting, who are looking for work. How about the million who have been out of work beyond the 39 weeks who are looking for work? Why do we not act today as we did 10 years ago? Why not? What is the obstacle? Is it because the Senate would have to act? All right. They would have to act. They are going to be in session. The Republicans control both Houses and the White House. This is a vivid example of those who have control not being willing to exercise it.

I understand covering one's tracks politically. We should have acted in December, and you failed to do it. But for the unemployed, it is not a question of covering tracks politically. It is covering the expenses day to day for food, for housing, and for health care if possible. There is no excuse for the refusal of the Republicans to let us bring extended benefits for the million of exhaustees up today. Zero excuse.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I would comment to the gentleman from Michigan that this assistance which we are providing in today's legislation will assist 86,000 new individuals from his State of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the issue is to get people back to work and for those that cannot find work, it is to help them out. The other side of the aisle opposed that.

One of the problems we have had in the past, in the Senate, we have had gridlock. James Carville wrote in a memo to the then-leader DASCHLE that he recommended two things: one, that the Senate not have a budget; two, that they gridlock all House bills.

The House passed an unemployment bill. It takes 60 votes in the Senate, unlike the House with a simple majority. Yes, we control the House and the Senate. We could pass the bill right here today. But in the Senate, the same Senate Democrats gridlock legislation, that would go forward in a bipartisan way.

We need to pull together on both sides of the aisle to make sure that the people that do not have work, work. But even more important, instead of handing out dollars to individuals, we need to create the jobs, whether it is tax relief which the President has offered. Not only long-term, instead of

just handing out money and having Davis-Bacon and unions reap the benefits of it, it creates jobs across the board and allows those same people, instead of having to receive benefits, will have a good job.

The gentlewoman from Washington has stated clearly that they have received both State and Federal moneys. That runs out, and we have got to come together today to make sure that that happens. Put aside the partisanship, and let us pass this bill.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would remind the gentleman from California that under the Republican bill, that if you had exhausted your benefits under your bill, you would have gotten absolutely nothing.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. There has been talk in recent months that if there is to be an economic recovery in our future, it will be a so-called "jobless recovery." I would submit that for the 8.5 million Americans who are currently unemployed, an economic recovery that does not provide jobs is no recovery at all. The Economic Policy Institute has reported that using even optimistic projections of the gross domestic product, the unemployment rate is expected to remain at 6 percent for all of 2003. An analysis projecting less optimistic growth numbers suggests the unemployment rate will climb to 6.4 percent by the last quarter of this year.

However, there is one factor that impacts the severity of the current downturn for American workers more than any other. That is, significantly more workers have exhausted their Federal benefits since the Federal extension of benefit program began in March than ran out of Federal benefits over a comparable number of months in the recession of the early nineties. Under the Federal extension program of the early nineties, each worker was eligible for 20 to 26 weeks of benefits some 10 months after the program was enacted. Under the program which just expired at the end of December, most workers were eligible for a maximum of 13 weeks of benefits. As a result, by the end of December, an estimated 2.2 million workers had exhausted all of their Federal benefits. And without congressional assistance, the new year brings these 2.2 million unemployed a job market that is stripped bare. It is a job market with 1.5 million fewer jobs than in March of 2001.

It is for this reason that it is critical that the Federal unemployment insurance system be extended now. However, the majority plan and the Democratic proposal, which was disallowed, offer two very different levels of compensation to American families. The majority plan would provide for 13 weeks of extended benefits over the next 5 months to the estimated 90,000 workers a week who will exhaust their State benefits without finding work. The Democratic plan would have offered 26 weeks.

I want to say that there is a difference in the economic benefit to families. We need to make sure that families have some of this uncertainty lifted from them. It is not enough to just say, well, another 13 weeks. This country has the money for a longer extension. Families should not have to wonder if they are going to have the ability to pay their mortgage or to buy clothes or to put food on the table. We have an obligation to the unemployed, and that is why I am supporting our Democratic proposal.

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

I would remind the gentleman from Ohio that our unemployment compensation assistance provided last year, from his State we assisted 123,000 individuals. And with the passage of today's bill, which is very important to be passed on the floor today, signed by the President tomorrow so there is no gap in assistance from December 28, we will be assisting an additional 61,600 folks from the State of Ohio.

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make the point that it is not the assistance that we are providing, that this is assistance that the American public has paid for through their unemployment contributions to the fund. I just share the concerns of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the principal thing that people are talking about, particularly the President of this country, is a \$600 billion economic stimulus plan. Yet here we are at the same time debating whether we should help a million families whose breadwinner has been out of work, who has been searching for work, whether we should provide them 38 percent of the income that they had been getting from their job to put food on the table for their families.

And if we do not extend this, what happens to those families? Think about the faces behind the statistics. They stop payment on their mortgage. They have to pull their kids out of college. All kinds of suffering we cannot imagine. Yet we can put up \$600 billion in tax cuts instead of providing five percent of that amount for people who would spend that money immediately.

Any economic stimulus needs to be fast acting, it needs to be fiscally responsible, and it needs to be fair. What could be fairer than providing the unemployment insurance for those people who have exhausted their benefits? All we asked for was an opportunity to

vote on whether or not we could and should do that. We were denied that opportunity to vote.

We are going to vote for extending unemployment insurance for the part of the people who will be helped by this, but it is not the population that needs it the most. That is what we should be doing today, providing economic stimulus to the people who need it the most, who have been hard working, who are suffering because we have the highest unemployment rate we have had for 9 years, who cannot find a job. So let us let them keep being able to feed their families, keep their homes until they find that job, until the economy recovers.

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

It is very important for us, Mr. Speaker, to debate, and we will debate over the ensuing months, an economic growth plan that will stimulate the economy and create more jobs. Everybody right now on unemployment wishes that he or she had a job. We are going to have that debate. It is vitally important. Today we are debating what we can do in the interim to assist people who, not by their own choice, are out of a job.

We are talking about a \$7 billion piece of legislation today that will assist a huge number of folks who were not covered before by unemployment compensation. We have already spent \$19 billion with assistance last year. I think it is vitally important that we continue the debate on this bill so we can get passage of it on the floor today, combined with the piece of legislation passed by the Senate yesterday, and get it to the President tomorrow so we can begin to help people whose unemployment benefits ended on December 28; and we can do this without disruption in the dollars they will receive so they can have some peace of mind as they move through this very, very tough time in their lives.

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

□ 1215

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more critical right now than responding to the very critical needs of our unemployed. We have almost a million people in this country who are unemployed, and for us to sit here and dally and not move forthright and push for the strongest measure we can, the people of this country are crying out for help. There are families to feed, there are bills to be paid, and we know we were derelict in our responsibilities not to do this last year, and it will be a shame if we do not move forcefully. Not just 13 weeks, we need 26 weeks of help at least, mainly because every economic adviser, every economic indicator, points out clearly that this economic downturn is going to last well into the next year.

Thirteen weeks is not enough. Furthermore, if we do it for 26 weeks, it will pump an immediate \$18 billion into the economy where people would be able to spend it, where the need is greatest, and not only will it do the good of helping those with their unemployment benefits, but by doing this, pumping the \$18 billion in, it will create badly needed jobs. The greatest need right now is not to dally, and with all due respect to the present administration, I say 13 weeks is not enough. We need 26 weeks. The people of this country are crying out for help, and they are looking to us in the Congress to speak with a loud voice for them.

I urge this House to move forthrightly, do the right thing. Let us not go home this week without passing the most significant resourceful bill we can that will help those in the greatest need.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I retain the balance of my time.

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

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I listened to my distinguished colleague from the State of Washington, and she had this list, and she said that the Republican bill helped 134,000 members or something in the State. I have my list here, which is the list of all those people we do not help, and the question is why can we not do that? I mean the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) and I have 31,500 people that this bill does nothing for. They are the people who exhausted their benefits. I know she cares about them. I am absolutely sure she does, and I care about them, but we are told that we cannot do anything about it because the Senate has acted unanimously.

I am sorry, but I have been in legislatures, State legislatures, the House and Senate, and I have been here in the House, and I have been doing this for 30 years, and I have seen things go through legislatures in an hour through both houses, no problem, if you want to do something. Of course if you do not want to do something, then you say, oh, the heavy burdens of the legislative process, the Senate has acted, the House has acted, oh, we cannot get it done, the President must have it on his desk tomorrow at 11 o'clock, that is the time his press conference is, I think, so he can sign it at the press conference tomorrow to put it out.

Now for those 31,000 people in the State of Washington that the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) and I care about, we are just saying to them we do not have time because the press release is already printed. I am sorry, folks. It might take an extra 3 or 4 hours to get the House and Senate to get it done, but have no fear, 31,000 people, the President has you on his mind,

deeply on his mind. He went to Chicago to make the speech about how big and how heavy his heart was about your problems. He is proposing to put \$674 billion into the economy, not to you of course, no, unless you have capital gains that you might benefit a little bit from his bill, but it is really for the rich people on the top. They are going to get 75 percent of it, and then they will think up some way to put you to work. So hold on and we will pass this tax bill and then in April of 2004 when they got this money back, then they are going to invest it and make you a job. So if you can hold your breath for a year for that tax break to take hold, why, things are going to be all right.

And the worst thing about this whole process, why it is an empty promise the President is making, is that in today's newspaper there is an article entitled War's Cost May Dwarf Stimulus Effect, from the Washington Post, January 8. This article says that as long as this country is threatening the whole world with the war in the Middle East that what is going to happen is that we are going to suck all the juice out of the stimulus package by the war.

The gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) and I represent an air company that makes airplanes. Last year they made 400 and some odd planes. Do my colleagues know what their orders are for this year? Two hundred twenty-one. Now, why are airlines not buying airplanes? Well, it probably has something to do with the fact that people are not flying. They are not getting on planes and flying all over the world like they used to. So this war on terrorism that is scaring the living day-lights out of the travelers is knocking the jobs out. We have lost 30,000 jobs at Boeing this last couple of years. And the President says, yes, but we are going to Iraq and we are going to have a war there and that is going to fix it all, and then after that Iraq war everybody will feel comfortable again and we will go back to living the way we have always lived.

Nonsense. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) was right. We are going to be back here in 3 months with this very same bill or something just like it because you are not going to get a stimulus in 90 days and you certainly would not want to have this linger on into the next election period. You had better have something on the table for them. Maybe you will wait until this time next year to put a little something more on the table, but by then there will be a million more. The long-term unemployment in the State of Washington has risen by 35 percent in the last 2 years, 35 percent. I admit we are the point persons, Washington and Oregon, for the unemployment problem in this country; so we have got it a little worse than the rest of you, but if you think it is not going to affect you, that somehow you are going to slide by this thing, you are wrong, and to say here today that we have not got an extra hour to add an amendment to

take care of a million people and then ship it back over to the Senate and say would they please accept the House amendment, I have done it. I am sure I have done it 500 times in the last 30 years, to send an amendment over and it gets accepted and that is the end of it. You know you could do it. You do not want to do it. You do not want to do it. You do not care about those million people. No matter what you say or how you wave your arms and whatever you want to say, the Republican Party does not care about those million unemployed because you have the Presidency, you have the Senate, and you have the House, and if you cannot do it, you have two choices, I guess. You could be stupid and not know how to do it. That is one possibility. I do not think that is true. The alternative is you do not want to do it. You ought to be ashamed of yourself.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 8, 2003]

WAR'S COST MAY DWARF STIMULUS EFFECT
(By Jonathan Weisman)

Mindful of his pending reelection bid and his father's political mistakes, President Bush is plowing ahead with an ambitious 10-year, \$674 billion economic stimulus plan even as U.S. troops pour into the Persian Gulf region preparing for war.

The president's determination to push more tax cuts as the nation prepares for war has struck some economists as folly, since the economic shock of war would likely dwarf the impact of Bush's stimulus plan. Moreover, no tax policy at the moment could actually address what many economists believe to be the greatest drag on the nation's economy: the uncertainty of war.

"Clearing away the clouds over Iraq would open the paths for expansion, regardless of what the Bush administration is proposing," said Robert DiClemente, a managing director at Salomon Smith Barney who has studied the potential impact of an Iraq war on the U.S. economy. "That is undoubtedly the biggest obstacle to expansion right now."

Bush was explicit about his two-track policymaking yesterday, beginning his speech in Chicago by addressing the threats of terrorism, Iraq and North Korea. He then added, "Even as we confront these dangers, you need to know I know we have needs here at home, especially the need for a vigorous and growing economy."

But it is becoming increasingly difficult to address those domestic needs without first confronting the problems abroad, economists said. The goal of the president's plan is to inject \$102 billion into the economy this year, by accelerating planned income tax cuts, excluding investment dividends from taxation, boosting the child tax credit and speeding tax relief to married couples. The elimination of dividend taxes alone could boost the stock market by 10 percent, according to White House allies.

But all of that could be undone by a war in the oil-rich Persian Gulf region, especially if the war were protracted and led to terrorist attacks and the use of weapons of mass destruction. Last month, Yale University economist William D. Nordhaus published an analysis that dramatized the uncertainties the United States faces. The cost to the Treasury of a war with Iraq could be as low as \$100 billion over the next decade or as high as \$1.6 trillion, he concluded. Most likely, the economy would take a \$391 billion hit in the next two years, Nordhaus predicted, which would dwarf the cash infusion the president is offering.

"If energy prices spike up, it wouldn't take much to offset all of this stimulus," said William G. Gale, a tax economist at the Brookings Institution.

A recent analysis by experts convened by the Center for Strategic and International Studies predicted that any war would knock down stock prices by as much as 25 percent, more than undoing the anticipated benefit of the dividend tax elimination.

Recovery would depend on how a war with Iraq unfolded. If the war ended swiftly, stocks and the economy as a whole would recover quickly and grow at a rate faster than they would if there were no war, thanks to the lifting of uncertainty, falling oil prices, higher government spending and rising consumer confidence. In that event, the Bush plan could end up harming the economy by fueling inflation or pushing interest rates higher, said Laurence Meyer, a former Federal Reserve Board governor who convened the CSIS conference.

But if the war lasted six to 12 weeks, stock prices would continue to fall, interest rates would rise and economic growth would slow by 1¼ percent, the CSIS analysis said. A worst-case scenario—in which the war dragged on for 90 to 180 days, oil supplies were significantly disrupted, and serious terrorists attacks ensued—would push the economy back into recession, regardless of economic policymaking.

In that case, the economic response would probably be far different from the one Bush is proposing now, Meyer said. That range of potential outcomes makes policymaking at this point "treacherous," he said.

"The best policy right now is to wait, to see what happens ahead, and to plan in the background some contingency plans, just in case we have an adverse outcome," Meyer said.

Not everyone is so cautious. DiClemente said the Bush proposal could provide a buffer for the shocks that would come from a war. Bruce Bartlett, a conservative economist with the National Center for Policy Analysis, noted that a war with Iraq could be long over by the time Congress passed a stimulus plan. In that case, he said, Bush might as well get the ball rolling now.

But, for the president's critics, the timing and boldness of the Bush plan present an irresistible target.

"Whenever the president talks about war, he talks about a spirit of shared sacrifice," Gale said. "But for rich people, shared sacrifice appears to be accepting tax cuts, and for the poor, it seems to be accepting cuts in social spending. There seems to be a disconnect bordering on the dishonest."

Fumed Rep. Charles B. Rangel (N.Y.), the ranking Democrat on the tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee, "Never in a time of war have we reduced the tax burden on the most privileged."

Even some of Bush's allies in past tax fights expressed exasperation yesterday, given the gathering clouds of war.

"I understand you can't just put everything on the back burner and ignore it," said Sen. John Breaux (D-La.), a key ally in the battle over the president's 2001 tax cut. "But what you can do is take modest steps, and \$670 billion is more than modest."

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am going to remind the gentleman from Washington of what the situation was last fall when we began to debate the extension of unemployment compensation. The leading plan was one that was proposed by

his party on the Senate side. It was a \$5 billion plan. It called for a 3-month extension of unemployment benefits. It called for an additional 3-month phase-out. What we have done in the interim, led by people who are from States like Alaska and Oregon and Washington, States where we are very, very concerned about our extremely high level of unemployment, not led by people from Virginia, where the unemployment rate is something like 3.8 percent over the last 3 months, or Georgia, where the unemployment rate is 4.6 percent, low unemployment rates never thought to be even possible to achieve by economists in years past, but we have put together a piece of legislation which considering the state of our economy is a generous piece of legislation. It takes care of an additional 2 million people who were not helped before. It extends benefits for some 800,000 folks nationwide whose benefits were interrupted on December 28, and this is specifically Federal dollars I am talking about. I am not including the State unemployment programs.

We are at the point where we have a 5-month extension that we are providing of unemployment benefits to folks who have been put out of their jobs through no choice of their own plus a 3-month phaseout of these benefits, plus we are helping an additional 800,000 whose benefits are interrupted. So this is a bill that is almost twice as much, certainly almost twice as much as what we were talking about last fall. It is generous, and I think it is a very good bill, and I think the fact that as we pass it today, as it is signed into law by the President tomorrow, that will allow for no interruption in the receipt of Federal unemployment benefits by people in the States. We are also assisting States so that they can use their funds later, not at the beginning.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON).

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) for her leadership on this issue.

The recovery is not as strong as any of us would like, and there are people who are out of jobs through no fault of their own. While our first priority has to be to get this economy back on a strong positive note, get the recovery to be stronger so that people have jobs and have paychecks, all of us know that we need to help people over the hump from their last job to their next job because they are desperate and because they do not have the kinds of options that they may have had in better economic times. That is why we are here. That is why we are doing this. All of us have constituents who ran out of benefits on December 28, and we need to act quickly so that those benefits will not be interrupted and they will be able to make the payments on their house, pay the rent, put food on the table.

The gentleman from the State of Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) said

what this really means, this vote really means, is that we just do not care. And he said it is a shame we do not care. I think it is a shame that a Member of this body would make that kind of accusation. We are here because we care and because we understand that there are real people and real lives at stake. This Congress will pass today, with the unanimous support of the United States Senate and I think with a broad bipartisan support here in the House, benefits extensions that will take us through June so that we can work on recovering this economy and get people back to paychecks but in the meantime make sure they can pay for the food to put on their table and take care of their families.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I guess if we look at what was proposed by the Republican majority today versus what was proposed last year, this is generous because this proposal that we have before us provides 13 weeks of unemployment compensation for about a million Americans. Last year the Republicans proposed a 5-week extension not for every American in every State but in only three States. Three States last year would have received unemployment benefit compensation for some of its workers.

□ 1230

Today, we are hearing more. That is absolutely correct.

What has changed between that proposal, which was puny, to today's, which is a more realistic proposal? Well, we had 800,000 Americans cut off from all of their benefits on December 28; and every week since then about 90,000 Americans, in addition, have been losing their unemployment benefits. And between now and June, we are going to see about another 2.5 million Americans run out of unemployment benefits.

So yes, it is more generous; but it does not take into account all of the millions of Americans who are going to be left out. And that is why we are saying, if nothing else, let us just have an up-or-down vote.

Why is it that Americans who probably will never get a chance to see this debate will not know that the Republican majority of this House used the rules of the House to deny just a vote on whether we could extend the benefits to those other Americans who are going to be left out by this bill? If we lose, we lose. But give Americans a chance to know that we tried to help them as well. If we lose, so be it. Let us go back home and tell them that we could not get a majority of Members of Congress to support extending benefits to more than a million Americans who have run out of their benefits, who are seeking work and trying to put food on the table for their kids. Why can we

not do this? We do this all the time. We put together amendments, as the gentleman from Washington said, in minutes. It would not even take that, because we have the language before us that we would need to extend those benefits to the more than 1 million Americans.

I have to go home now to California and tell more than 109,000 Americans that we did not extend benefits to them, while some of their coworkers who are out of work did get it. It makes no sense. What can I tell them? Well, you lost your job a little earlier than did your colleague who is getting benefits. That makes no sense. Everyone is working hard.

By the way, if we are talking about stimulus, instead of the President spending \$700 billion-or-so over 15 years to give investors money to try to stimulate the economy, give it to those who are out of work who otherwise would be spending their money if they were working to put food on the table, buy the necessities, pay the rent, pay the mortgage. That would stimulate the economy instead of having them run out of those things that are essential to the economy. We can do it, there is no reason why we cannot, and the American public should know that we can.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleagues for their diligent work in bringing this piece of legislation to the floor. It is certainly an admirable goal that we seek to achieve here today, trying to bring some relief to the people who find themselves unemployed in this economy, and I intend to support the legislation.

I must, however, say that there is a bit of irony here that I wanted to bring to the attention of the body, and that is that we are debating what we should do to help people who are unemployed. Again, appropriate. But we have steadfastly refused as a body and, as a matter of fact, as a government, to debate one other aspect of this, and that is the fact that many people are unemployed today in the United States because there are people here from other countries, here illegally, I should say, who have taken jobs. It is not just those jobs that we hear about all the time from people who say, well, there are jobs Americans will not take. I assure my colleagues, we can go to any factory town in America, we can go to any of the States that are identified in this bill that have significant unemployment, and we can find out whether or not people are willing to accept jobs that "others will not take."

I assure my colleagues, American citizens are willing to do so, citizens who are willing to take jobs that are being taken by people with H1B visas, people who are willing to take jobs from people who are here, as I say, illegally, and are working in menial jobs

with low wages. There are still many American citizens willing to take jobs that are being taken by between 8 million and 13 million people who are here illegally; and we refuse to debate that point while we come here today, of course, to do again, what I say is the right thing to do, and I will support it. But it is just an irony that I wanted to bring to the attention of the body. There is an aspect of this that we steadfastly, both sides, both parties, refuse to debate, and that is a shame.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would remind the gentleman from Colorado that according to the U.S. Department of Labor, for every job opening, there are 2.7 applicants. So if the problem is immigration, I do not know quite how we are going to fix this. We already have too many people looking for jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, it was bad enough when the Republicans adjourned Congress and went home for the holidays without doing the work of taking care of those who were unemployed through no fault of their own, hard-working Americans; but it is worse, it is a darker dereliction of duty to today bring a bill to the floor and refuse to allow an honest debate by America's representatives to truly cover the unemployed. That is a darker dereliction of duty, and it is darker because while the Republican Party says that there is no money in the Treasury to cover \$2 billion to \$4 billion to take care of people who are out of work, the day before that, the President said, but we have \$400 billion to give out to the wealthiest Americans. It is a dark day for democracy.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday we had all of these new Members of Congress who came here and they stood right here and they looked right up at their grandparents and their kids and they waved and they were really proud, rightfully so, to be Members of the people's House, because they knew that they were in a place that the entire world looks to for the practice of democracy. But on the first day of business, they are here for the shutdown of democracy. They are here where the Republican Party is basically saying to Americans, you poor peasants, take it or leave it. We are putting a bill out here, and you can take it or leave it. We are not going to allow an improved bill even to be voted on. That is a callous dereliction of the oath of office to democracy.

Now, I rarely get exercised about procedural issues. I do not think Americans could give two hoots normally about what happens procedurally here in the House and we spend too much time arguing about it is. But when we bring a substantive bill to the floor and tell people who are out of work who

cannot make their house payments, who cannot make their kids' tuition payments, that you are going to give them a take-it-or-leave-it proposal and if they do not like it, they can just walk out of here and sulk, that is simply wrong. It is wrong for democracy. I am not going to go down without raising my voice.

Mr. Speaker, up here we have Hamarabi, a bust of him for creating a great legal code, and now his country is ruled by a tyrant, Saddam Hussein.

Things can go backwards in democracy. This is a step backwards in the democratic process.

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

I would remind the gentleman from Washington State that just late last fall, I think in December, senior Members of his own party leadership were talking about what a wonderful bill the unemployment bill was that then was far less generous than what we would like to do today. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), for example, last fall said, "Tomorrow the House will meet one more time before adjourning for the year. We could simply take up the bipartisan Senate bill which has the 3-month extension and agree to it unanimously. That action would send a positive signal about our willingness to work together to solve our economic problems."

I submit that this additional 2-month extension, our bill is 5 months, plus a 3-month phaseout that assists 2 million additional people, is far more generous. So I think a dark day is perhaps not the right characterization for what we are doing today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HART).

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, I stand before my colleagues today supportive, clearly, of extending unemployment benefits. I represent parts of six counties in western Pennsylvania; and we have seen the unemployment rate rise, as others have in this body. But to call what we are doing today a dereliction of duty seems to me to be silly and extreme, and completely inaccurate.

A dereliction of duty would be to today avoid passing what the Senate has passed unanimously to extend unemployment benefits to those who are in danger of losing them. If, in fact, we pass this bill today, it will go directly to the President, the President can sign the bill, and that will prevent the interruption of benefits for those who will have those benefits interrupted if we are derelict in our duty.

Being derelict in our duty would be to not pass this bill today to fight what the Senate has unanimously approved, the Senators, who were elected as we were, by the people of the 50 States, sent here to do the best we can for them. This House has agreed that we should, without hesitation, pass an unemployment extension for those who are still in need.

It only makes sense for us today to unanimously, as a body, support those

who right now cannot support their families. It is our duty to do so.

My colleagues who have spoken prior to me have explained the generous benefit that is available in this bill. Clearly, the Senators debated it yesterday, with our families here, on the day of swearing in. All I heard yesterday from the folks who came here from my district was, that is a great thing for you to do. Please do it and do it forthwith. Get it done. The people need the help.

Mr. Speaker, a unanimous approval by the House today will show the American people that we are here to do business together, Republicans and Democrats, to make sure that we will not be derelict in the duty of making sure the American people get the benefits they need, and then continue working on the economy to make sure that those people will have a job once these benefits expire in several months.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania tell those 44,000 people in Pennsylvania to hold on, hold on.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as I look at this bill, it is too little and, for many, almost too late. Almost too late for them to avoid absolute disaster. As a matter of fact, I pulled out one of my old records the other day and was listening to it, and it said, every morning about this time, when I get to the breakfast table, my wife is there crying, get a job, get a job, that I could not find. Then the other part says, I read the paper through and through trying to see if there is any work for me to do; and, of course, in many instances, the individuals come up short.

The real deal is that if one represents a district like mine, over the last 30 years, we have lost more than 120,000 good-paying manufacturing jobs that are gone, that do not exist. Unemployment in many of the communities that I represent is 20 to 25 percent. So if we want to stimulate the economy, what do we do? Put some money in the pockets of those individuals so that they can go to the grocery store and buy a loaf of bread, so that they can get a gallon of milk, so that they can have something to plow back into the economy, to keep it moving, to keep it turning. Do not go to the top; stimulate the bottom. Then we can really stimulate the economy.

I would hope that 27 weeks would be the very minimum that we could do for some of the people who have been out of work even for 26 months. I am not sure that some have not been out for 26 years. We can do better than what we are proposing.

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of extending the Federal unemployment benefits. Everyone has heard

about the impact of the current recession on all of our constituents. The country, and especially my City of New York, continues to suffer from recession in part due to the terrorist attacks of 9-11 on our fair city, but in greater part, I believe, due to the economic policies of this White House, highlighted by the President's so-called economic stimulus plan.

The effects of this Bush recession have been devastating for far too many once-hard-working men and women, effects such as an economy that has shed 69,000 jobs a month and 2,000 jobs a day. New York State alone has lost over 502,000 jobs and workers. New York City has lost 281,000 jobs. New Yorkers want to work and provide for their families with good-paying jobs, but until America adopts responsible economic policies, these jobs will not be forthcoming.

For an economy to lose 69,000 jobs a month and 2,000 jobs a day since Mr. Bush has become President, the only answer is a jobs package and not a gift to the wealthy. This economy needs a shot in the arm and not a kick in the pants, which the Bush White House has given to the American people.

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

□ 1245

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA).

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I sat here and listened in amazement as my Republican colleagues came crying crocodile tears for the poor unemployed who lost their benefits as of December 28. As I recall, back before we adjourned in November the Senate sent an identical bill over here, but the Republican House leadership chose not to take it up and instead went home; so the House Republicans created this situation which now they decry as the poor unemployed workers, something that they actually caused.

But the problem even after we pass this bill is that they are forgetting about in excess of 1 million people whose benefits have expired that we could extend for another 13 weeks, knowing full well that the money is there. If this country has \$674 billion in additional tax cuts for people other than these unemployed, surely we have a couple of billion for the million unemployed workers and their families who get no money today.

So we are saying that the bill before us is incomplete. Add the rest of the people who are hurting and we have done a better job. Yes, we can do that in 2 seconds. The Senate will adopt it unanimously, and the President can sign it tomorrow.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will remind the gentleman from Wisconsin that 37,000 people would likely be helped by this additional bill; and also remind him that that piece of legislation we looked at

very late and very briefly last fall was a provision that was far less expansive than this one. In the time that we have had in order to put together legislation on which the Senate and the House together would agree and the President would sign, we have come up with a larger program that extends unemployment benefits for 5 months with a phaseout of 3 months, and I think a far better piece of legislation, I am sure the gentleman from Wisconsin would agree.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA).

Mr. KLECZKA. The gentlewoman from Washington is correct, Mr. Speaker, 37,000 people from Wisconsin will benefit under the bill, 37,000 that they cut off because we went home. However, let us worry about the other 22,000 who have been let go. I represent the City of Milwaukee, and I bet the bulk of those people come from the City of Milwaukee and have no income today.

So yes, I am with them on the 37,000, but why are they shafting the 22,000 who get nothing under this bill?

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to something my friend, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN), said about the basic improvement in this bill, or improvement in the Republicans' position since last year.

I think she is correct in what happened, that when the Republicans had a penurious proposal last year and then went home without adopting one, and caught heck when they went home, they improved their position. This is a better bill, I want to agree with her on that.

But there is another group that is being abused by this failure today, not just the unemployed. It is the unrepresented. Because when we bring a bill to the floor where two or three people get into a room and decide what the bill is going to be, and bring it out to this floor and tell the American people that that is their only solution, that is a form of tyranny. It is a step down the road to a government that does not respect democracy.

Unfortunately, it is the first time it is happening, and it is going to happen over and over and over again during this Congress. That is why I am here today raising my voice against it, saying that we cannot have a democracy if we bring a bill to the floor and do not have an alternative for the American people to consider. It is the wrong thing to do.

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, the unemployment rate in my State is 6.6 percent. That is a hugely, incredibly large

number of folks who, through no fault of their own, have found themselves without jobs. This is occurring in many States around the Nation.

The attempt we are making today, which is a huge assistance to folks who are out of jobs, a bill that totals \$7 billion, that includes 2 million additional people who will be assisted, 2 million people who will be assisted through additional help over the 4 million who we have already helped through our legislation that provided benefits last year, is hugely important.

In my own State, Washington State, many layoffs have been due to the aerospace industry. The adverse impact of the economy on our aerospace industry concerns me, because I have thousands of aerospace workers who live in my district. I do not want to see them without jobs. If they are without jobs, I want to help to stimulate the economy so they will not much longer be without jobs. But the fact is, they are now.

I am very pleased that we are beginning this new session of Congress by heading in the right direction by providing much needed benefits to all Americans who are out of jobs. Under this legislation, unemployed workers who had Federal unemployment benefits that remained after December 28, when, by the way, we had put into place on the floor of the House a 5-week extension which would overlap into this session, so we could take a look and see what additional work we needed to do, which is what we are doing today, these folks will now receive the balance of their benefits. It is very important to those whose benefits were interrupted.

Further, workers who exhaust the regular State unemployment benefits in the coming months will become eligible for up to 13 weeks of Federal benefits in all States and up to 26 weeks in States like mine that have high unemployment, as we do in Washington State. In my State, this will help 56,000 additional people. That is 2.7 million people all over the country who are recipients of unemployment benefits who need help. These are folks who are still looking for jobs.

I think we need to put ourselves in their place. I think we need to feel how they feel when they need to meet a mortgage, to pay for the costs of food and heat in their homes. This is a vitally important piece of legislation that we are discussing today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this vitally important bill. I know there is debate on what additions we could make to this, but this is a generous bill and it is going to help a lot of people in my State and other States around the Nation. It is going to assist almost 2 million additional people today, in addition to the 4 million we have assisted in the past through other provisions that were passed last year.

I think it is a generous piece of legislation, and I think it is an imperative

as we begin the debate to stimulate this economy and create those jobs that folks right now would like to be holding.

I have great faith in this body. I know that we will do the right thing: that we will pass this piece of legislation today so in coordination with the Senate we may send this to the President, so by tomorrow he can sign this bill, and create no interruption in the Federal benefits received by folks whose benefits were stopped on December 28.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I think all that needs to be said has been said already, but I would only emphasize the fact that what we are hearing today is what we heard from the Supreme Court of the United States at the time of the election of the President. The Supreme Court said, we do not have time to count the votes. We have to declare a winner here.

In this instance, we are telling a million people out there that we do not have time to do anything about extending their benefits. If they happened to run out of them last year, well, that is just tough luck. I guess they can wait for the economy to pick up, and we wish them well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

(Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this "day late and dollar short" Republican bill.

I fear that a lot of desperate families back in Springfield, North Hampton, and Milford, MA, are watching this debate today with confusion and anxiety. Well over 2,000 families of displaced workers in my district lost their unemployment compensation on December 28. Those desperate families, who thought losing their job in an economic slump was plenty to deal with, encountered even more pain with the loss of their financial life-line during the holidays.

Almost a million families around the country today, who are struggling to get back into the workplace, will not see their benefits resume if this bill is enacted.

In a successful effort to provide fewer benefits to fewer workers, the leaders of this House scuttled any chances for meaningful relief back in December when we knew this crisis was upon us.

What we are asking for in our substitute is not unusual. Congress has previously acted to temporarily extend unemployment benefits during periods of economic recession of high employment. And, unfortunately, the Nation reached an 8-year high for unemployment in November, 2002.

While the majority has recently decided that extending these benefits is the right thing to do, this bill is literally too little and too late. I urge my colleagues to support the substitute providing more financial security to more dis-

placed workers. Every penny we provide to the families of laid-off workers goes right back into the economy. Support this economic stimulus proposal.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I regret that Congress did not pass an extension of unemployment benefits last year. Last November, the other body passed a bill that cost \$5 billion and would have provided 13 weeks of additional UI benefits to jobless Americans. The House passed a paltry bill that cost \$900 million that would have extended benefits only through the end of January.

I'm delighted that this bill is closer to the one that was proposed by the Democrats in the other body last year. The bill we are considering today costs \$7.6 billion and it extends unemployment benefits through the end of May. It gives an additional 13 weeks of unemployment benefits to jobless Americans who have exhausted their 26 weeks of unemployment benefits. I am pleased that the bill is retroactive to December 28, so that those who had their benefits cut off on this date would receive the remainder of the 13 weeks owed to them.

Even though the bill is an improvement over last year's attempt, it is not enough. The bill excludes from coverage one million Americans who have exhausted their unemployment benefits and who have not found a job. These people will not be eligible for the extended benefits proposed under this bill, and they need our help. But this bill slams the door shut on their need for extended benefits.

This action should come as no surprise. The majority has consistently voted to exclude segments of the unemployed from receiving jobless benefits. Although the majority has changed the scope of coverage of the bill, it has not had a change of heart. At a time when we need national unity, the majority party continues to pit Americans against their fellow Americans. The economic policies of this Administration and the majority party of this chamber pits the well-off against the not-so-well off, working Americans against the jobless, and the jobless with benefits against those without.

While I support the passage of S. 23, I encourage my colleagues to support the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Washington, Mr. McDERMOTT. We can do more to assist those 1 million unemployed Americans who need our help, and we should take this opportunity to do so.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly rise today in support of S. 23, a bill to extend unemployment benefits for thousands of Americans.

Every day, too many American workers are exhausting their unemployment benefits and must use their retirement savings or make other sacrifices just to cover basic living expenses. More than 800,000 people have already exhausted their 13 weeks of extended unemployment insurance benefits that were provided in the economic stimulus legislation enacted in March, which means they have no federal assistance as they search for new jobs.

In my home State of Hawaii, over 23,540 workers are currently unemployed, and 3,100 workers who have exhausted their extended unemployment benefits in 2002 remain unemployed. Over 1,800 workers in Hawaii could lose their benefits because the State of Hawaii must cut off extended unemployment benefits

unless we continue the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation (TEUC) program.

I am pleased that the 108th Congress is passing legislation to retroactively extend unemployment compensation to laid-off workers who have exhausted their normal benefits. Congress has an obligation to make sure individuals who believed they would receive 13 weeks of extended benefits are not arbitrarily denied these benefits because the TEUC program expired on December 28.

When I was elected by the people of Hawaii, I quickly committed myself to helping working family struggling to survive this recession. I decided to join with my Democratic colleagues to introduce legislation to extend unemployment benefits for those who were going to lose their benefits because Congress failed to extend the TEUC program.

I wish the House could pass the Democratic proposal because it would give every worker 26 weeks of extended unemployment benefits, up from 13 weeks under the current program. During the last recession in the early 1990s, Congress provided 26 weeks of extended benefits, and struggling families need this type of temporary assistance once again. The Democratic proposal would help the 1 million American workers who have already exhausted their extended unemployment benefits.

Nevertheless, I reluctantly support S. 23. Unemployed American workers need our help. We must immediately pass this legislation and then develop a comprehensive economic program to help unemployed workers and stimulate our struggling economy.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, although with great hesitancy, I rise today in support of this overdue legislation to extend unemployment benefits. I had greatly hoped that Congress would have passed this extension prior to adjournment of the 107th Congress. I also am very disappointed that the bill before us today does not extend 26 weeks of extended benefits to all unemployed workers. However, I will vote in favor of S. 23 because we must expedite the extension of unemployment benefits.

As we all well know, and as I hope the American people are aware, last year, before the 107th Congress adjourned, and fully cognizant that the expiration deadline of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation, TEUC, program was fast approaching, the majority refused to act on a good compromise bill that the Senate had passed unanimously. As a result, the TEUC program expired on December 28, 2002, and with it so did federal unemployment benefits for more than 800,000 jobless Americans. In New Mexico, that delay meant 2,200 families lost their benefits.

S. 23 is certainly a step in the right direction. It is imperative that we extend these benefits as the sluggish economy struggles to regain the vibrancy and growth it experienced under the previous administration. The unemployment rate has climbed from 4.2 percent when President Bush was inaugurated to 6.0 percent today. Additionally, there are now 8 million unemployed Americans.

However, while the bill before us is a good start, I vow to continue fighting for passage of the comprehensive unemployment Federal benefits bill offered by Representatives RANGEL, CARDIN, and LEVIN, that would guarantee at least 26 weeks of extended benefits and

would expand access to unemployment benefits for workers who are low-wage earners or work part time. I am greatly disappointed that the rule stipulating the guidelines for debate over this legislation precluded us from debating Mr. RANGEL's substitute.

It is worth noting, that during the recession of the early 1990s the first President Bush signed into law the unemployment benefit extensions. It is estimated, however, that 800,000 more workers than during the 90s are expecting to exhaust their benefits this year. As such, it is clear to me that there is a need to extend the benefits beyond the 13 weeks provided by this bill.

Nevertheless, I will vote in support of S. 23, but do so with the hope that the leadership of the House and Senate will take up additional legislation to further extend unemployment benefits during this slow economic growth period.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to reluctantly support this bill. Today the House must once again come together to provide relief to America's unemployed. The president says that the economy is improving, but those words are cold comfort to those who have not only lost their jobs but also their unemployment benefits in recent weeks. These folks have been left with no job or assistance and are struggling to provide for their families this winter.

Unfortunately, this bill only extends unemployment benefits for workers who had not yet exhausted their 13 weeks before the program expired in December, doing nothing for those who exhausted their benefits yet still have not been able to find work.

But Mr. Speaker, the inability to find work is hardly due to a lack of trying. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, there are approximately 1½ million fewer jobs today than there were in March of 2001. And roughly 1 million workers have used up their unemployment insurance without finding a new job—more than 15,000 in Connecticut alone.

That is why, with America experiencing the lowest job growth in 58 years, we should not only be extending unemployment insurance, but also giving the unemployed opportunities to purchase health insurance. And we should guarantee an additional 26 weeks of benefits for everyone—whether they have exhausted their previous benefits or not.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the least we can do. Too many families were left out in the cold this holiday season due to the Republican's refusal to address this issue and a president who only voiced his support for an extension of benefits well after Congress had left town. Mr. Speaker, this bill is not enough, but it is better than nothing, which until now is all this majority has supported.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 23, which will finally provide for a 5-month extension of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002.

I say "finally" because this legislation is long overdue. We all knew for months that on December 28th, in the middle of the holiday season, an estimated one million people out of work would be cut off from receiving unemployment benefits. Yet neither House Republicans nor the President took action to help suffering Americans provide for themselves or for their families.

Mr. Speaker, our economy continues to weaken. The latest figures show that unem-

ployment claims in my district, which includes part of Miami-Dade County, reached a record high of 80,554 during October 2002. In only one year, unemployment claims were up an overwhelming 30%.

The unemployment rate in Miami-Dade County, a major international trading and tourist hub of the Americas, has climbed to an outrageous 8.0%, considerably higher than the national average. In Broward County, which is also a part of my district, the unemployment rate has reached a national rate of 6.0%.

Last week alone, there were more than 13,000 new jobless applicants filing for unemployment benefits. It is no wonder that Americans are enraged. The House has waited until today, 11 days after the expiration, to provide benefits to jobless Americans.

When a building is on fire, does a fire rescue team wait 11 days to put the fire out? When a patient is seriously ill, does a hospital wait 11 days to attend to this patient? In a crisis situation, we act immediately. The House has waited too long, putting Americans in fear.

My district and the country are in an unemployment crisis. Everyday, more and more of my constituents join the hundreds of thousands of Americans in my colleagues' districts in the unemployment line.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we help displaced American workers today. It is terrible that we have waited so long to do so.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill before us today which will provide as much as 26 weeks of additional unemployment benefits to laid off workers across America in "high unemployment states" and will ensure that those workers who still had benefits remaining on the December 28 cutoff date will receive all of their 13 weeks.

The Unemployment Insurance Benefits Extension Act, much like the provisions in the American Worker Temporary Relief Act that I introduced yesterday, will allow approximately 800,000 Americans, including nearly 6,000 workers in my state of Kansas, to once again begin receiving benefits. Like my bill, it also allows workers who may in the months ahead exhaust their regular 26 weeks of State unemployment benefits to become eligible for up to 13 weeks of extended benefits.

Unfortunately, this bill does nothing for those in my state and other states who have exhausted their 13 week extension and do not live in a state meeting the definition of a "high unemployment state."

This legislation is an important step in helping our workers through these tough economic times. Many have suffered from the lingering effects of a recession and the economic impact of the September 11th attacks.

Mr. Speaker, we must remember, however, that this is short term aid. The best and most responsible approach Congress can take is to adopt policies designed to get our economy growing again. We can all agree that America's workers would rather earn a paycheck than receive an unemployment benefit.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and approve this new extension in order to avoid a disruption in benefits to our nation's unemployed workers.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, today, we are considering one of the most important legislative initiatives that we, as members of the House of Representatives, can enact this year the extension of unemployment benefits for the millions of this nation's workers who have lost

their jobs in the current economic downturn. I am pleased to join with the overwhelming majority of my colleagues in the House in approving this bill, which will extend unemployment benefits for the more than 800,000 American workers lost their benefits on December 28, 2002 for an additional 13 weeks.

As the economy has stagnated and the job growth that characterized the economic boom of the 1990s has dissipated, the American economy has lost nearly one and one-half million jobs. In November of last year, the national unemployment rate reached an eight-year high of 6 percent.

Mr. Speaker, last month, the Democratic staff of the House Government Reform Committee, completed a study of the current state of unemployment in Chicago, Illinois. The study verified what we who live in Chicago already know—that unemployment in the Chicago metropolitan area, at 6.3 percent, is higher than both the statewide and national average. The Committee's study illustrated that of the 377,000 unemployed workers identified by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in Illinois, the vast majority of those individuals—263,000—are in the Chicago metropolitan area.

Many of these workers have exhausted their basic unemployment benefits in their search for new employment and were relying on the extended benefits provided under the law that expired on December 28, 2002. Without the passage of this most critical legislation, more than 65,000 workers in the Chicago area would have lost an estimated \$236 million in unemployment benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Congress has adopted this extension of unemployment benefits, but much more needs to be done. Unemployment nationwide is higher now than it was when Congress first passed the extended unemployment benefits in March of last year; the economic and fiscal condition of the nation is weaker. We need a strong, sound and fiscally responsible economic stimulus package that will create real jobs to support real families and provide real permanent relief to laid off workers and states.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 23, legislation to extend Temporary Unemployment Benefits. Millions of American workers are in trouble today, including many of my constituents, and it is high time we did something about it.

Back in March 2002, Congress created the Temporary Emergency Unemployment Benefits Compensation (TEUC) program to provide 13 weeks of federally funded unemployment insurance to qualified workers who had exhausted their state unemployment benefits, and an additional 13 weeks to some in "high unemployment" states. The TEUC program was a great idea, but we underestimated the economic trouble that we were in. At that time, the unemployment rate in my home state of Texas was 5.6% and that quickly rose to 6.9% by June of 2002. By November 2002, the latest month for which the Texas Workforce Commission has data, the official unemployment rate still stood at 6.0%, meaning that over 640,000 Texas workers are out of work.

So, we can see that the problem is not over. The need for an unemployment compensation extension is still very urgent. However, the TEUC program expired, three days after Christmas, on December 28, 2002. Congress was fully aware of the unemployment problem

when we were here in November and December, but the House leadership would not agree to the Senate compromise legislation, which was partly the work of the Republican Whip in the Senate. So, it is with great relief that I have the opportunity to vote in favor of the Senate compromise today.

While I am relieved that we are delivering relief to the people that need it most—those who are out of work and are trying their best to find it—I do not believe that we are doing enough. The legislation before us today only restores TEUC benefits for those who lost their eligibility on or after December 28, 2002. I am an original cosponsor of the Rangel-Cardin alternative, H.R. 17, which would restore these unemployed workers' benefits while they continue to look for work. H.R. 17 should be under consideration today by the House of Representatives, but the Republican leadership has denied us the opportunity to even let it come to vote.

Now I agree that partisan conflicts over how much unemployment assistance to provide during one of the longest economic slowdowns in recent history should not prevent us from doing something, today. So I strongly urge my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to support this legislation and send it to the president so that some unemployed workers can get something soon. After that, I also urge all of my colleagues to look at what we have done today and compare that to H.R. 17. If you do that, I think you will realize how much more needs to be done. Let us pass S. 23 today, and pass more relief as soon as possible.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened that the first major action of Congress will begin with a flawed process. One can only hope that this is not a sign of things to come with the Republican leadership at the helm of both chambers. Over 20,000 workers in Oregon alone were affected by the failure of Congress to pass this extension last session. These people deserve our best, not the lowest common denominator of benefits that the Republican leadership has decided it has to offer. Furthermore, the Republican leadership is not even allowing debate to occur on more reasonable options, instead choosing to limit the democratic process. The Democratic alternative provides for 26 weeks of extended unemployment benefits, helping nearly 2.5 million Americans over the next six months, while the Republican proposal only offers 13 weeks. While I am grateful for my jobless constituents that an extension will now be implemented, it is too little and too late.

Extending unemployment insurance is the fastest way to help the people that need it most, since it provides targeted and effective economic stimulus. These critical benefits increase consumer spending in the hardest-hit areas and sustain and strengthen economic recovery. It makes more sense to invest in expanded unemployment benefits now to help millions of Americans, than exploding the budget deficit with President Bush's economic stimulus plan which will cost almost \$850 billion, including debt service, and whose own economists say will create less than 200,000 jobs.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the measure passed by the Senate yesterday that would provide an extension of federal unemployment insurance benefits to jobless workers.

I am pleased that Congress is finally extending unemployment benefits to the 800,000 Americans and 2,800 Rhode Islanders whose federal benefits were cut off on December 28, 2002. However, I would be remiss if I did not remind the House Republican Leadership that even with passage of this legislation, Congress would still leave out over 1 million workers nationwide, including thousands of Rhode Islanders, who have already exhausted their benefits and are still unable to find a job.

Many Rhode Islanders, and Americans across the nation, are still struggling to find employment. The national unemployment rate reached 6 percent in November last year, its highest point in eight years, and Rhode Island's unemployment rate currently stands above 5 percent. Congress must provide all unemployed workers the resources they need to put food on the table and pay the bills while they weather this economic downturn.

While I intend to support the underlying legislation, I would point out that passage of this bill, as important as it is, will leave too many people without any means of support, and I would strongly urge my colleagues to turn their attention to the unemployed workers who have already exhausted their extended benefits. In addition, I am very disappointed that the Republican Leadership has denied our colleagues the opportunity to debate and vote on a Democratic alternative, which would provide 26 weeks of additional benefits to struggling workers. We must not turn our backs on those who are most vulnerable during these trying times.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, the House is finally acting to provide relief to some of the unemployed. This bill will be retroactive to December 28th, so those who had their benefits cut off will receive the remainder of the 13 weeks of benefits that is due to them. The relief will continue until June. It will also allow those who begin to receive their benefits to receive the full 13 weeks in the event that they are unable to find a job. That is good. However, this bill is not complete. This legislation fails to provide benefits to those who have already exhausted their benefits and are still unable to find a job. Why is the leadership forgetting those that need the benefits the most?

In Wisconsin, 22,200 people exhausted their unemployment benefits and remained unemployed at the end of December. This bill leaves these people and their families without help. Over one million people across our country have absolutely no recourse and have no assistance whatsoever because their benefits have expired. We are leaving them out in the cold when they need help the most.

These unemployment benefits don't just help the unemployed; they also help our economy as recipients will pay for immediate needs such as housing, utilities and food. Economists have said that every dollar spent on unemployment generates \$2.15 in economic stimulus. Offering assistance to those whose benefits have already expired would help these families and our economy. They are paying for basic necessities with their benefits. They are trying to keep their heads above water. Unfortunately, this bill is offering to help some of the unemployed, but not the thousands of Wisconsin families who have been without a paycheck for ten months or more.

I am glad we are providing the relief included in this bill, but we have to do more. We

must help those who continue to look for work in our weak economy. And we should do it today.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, there has been talk in recent months that if there is to be an economic recovery in our future, it will be a so-called "jobless recovery". I would submit that for the 8.5 million Americans who are currently unemployed, an economic recovery that does not provide jobs is no recovery at all.

The Economic Policy (EPI) has reported that using even optimistic projections of GDP growth, the unemployment rate is expected to remain at 6 percent for all of 2003. An analysis projecting less optimistic growth numbers suggest the unemployment rate will climb to 6.4 percent by the last quarter of this year. However, there is one factor that impacts the severity of the current downturn for American workers more than any other. That is, significantly more workers have exhausted their federal benefits since the federal extension of benefit program began in March than ran out of federal benefits over a comparable number of months in the recession of the early nineties.

Under the federal extension program of the early 90s, each worker was eligible for 20 to 26 weeks of benefits some ten months after the program was enacted. Under the program which just expired at the end of last December, most workers were eligible for a maximum of 13 weeks of benefits. As a result, by the end of December, an estimated 2.2 million workers had exhausted all of their federal benefits. And without Congressional assistance, the New Year brings these 2.2 million unemployed a job market that is stripped bare. It is a job market with 1.5 million fewer jobs today than in March of 2001.

For this reason it is critical that the federal unemployment insurance system be extended now. However, the Republican plan, and Democratic proposal which was disallowed, offer two very different levels of compensation to American families.

The Republican plan would provide 13 weeks of extended benefits over the next five months to the estimated 90,000 workers a week who will exhaust their state benefits without finding work. The Democratic plan would have offered 26 weeks. The Republican plan will also provide the remainder of 13 weeks of benefits to the nearly 800,000 workers who were cut off from federal unemployment benefits on December 28th when the program was allowed to expire. The Democratic plan offered workers those 13 weeks and adds 13 more for a total of 26 weeks.

In an even starker comparison, even in the face of economic data suggesting the current economic conditions are no better, and maybe even worse than when the current program began in March, The Republican proposal mysteriously provides no extension of benefits to the 1 million workers who exhausted their federal benefits by December and remain jobless.

The Democratic proposal gave those workers an extra 13 weeks of job-hunting cushioned by unemployment insurance. Indeed, the Democratic plan did not selectively pick and choose which group of unemployed workers it deemed worthy of coverage. For in a so-called "jobless recovery" millions of Americans will remain jobless. But under the Republican's so-called unemployment plan, 1 million

Americans will also be without unemployment insurance.

In covering these 1 million Americans, the Democratic proposal did not ignore the over \$24 million sitting unused in the Federal Unemployment Trust Fund. Instead it honors the basic purpose of the trust funds: to build large resources when work is plentiful in order to provide relief to the unemployed when they need it most. The Republican proposal "writes off" 1 million people. Contrary to the thinking behind the Republican proposal, there is no reason 1 million unemployed workers should be denied unemployment compensation when they need it the most. The Democratic plan suggest the time for them to receive it is now. So do I. Vote for the Motion to Recommit.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, each day Americans are losing their jobs across the country and in all sectors of the economy. My state of Texas and city of Houston have suffered job losses. I have heard from many constituents whose have been laid off and from those whose unemployment benefits expired shortly after Christmas on December 28.

The Republican plan passed by the Senate yesterday does not go far enough. The Republican plan does not help those workers who have already exhausted their benefits. I am appalled. I support the Democratic alternative plan offered by Congressman CHARLES RANGEL.

The Rangel/Cardin bill would extend unemployment insurance benefits an additional 13 weeks to those in need. The Republican plan does not; these workers would not receive any additional assistance. About one million workers have exhausted their 13 weeks of extended benefits under the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation (TEUC) program and still remain unemployed.

Every week about 90,000 workers run out of regular, state provided unemployment benefits before finding a job. During the last recession, Congress initially provided these workers with 26 weeks of extended benefits. The Democratic plan would provide these workers with at least 26 weeks of extended benefits, which would help nearly 2.5 million Americans over the next six months. The Republican plan would generally provide 13 weeks of extended benefits over the next five months (only three states currently qualify under a trigger to provide 26 weeks).

The Republican proposal would allow these workers to receive the remainder of their initial 13 weeks of extended benefits (not clear if benefits are retroactive). The Democratic bill would provide these workers with the remainder of their first 13 weeks (retroactively), and an additional 13 weeks, for a total 26 weeks of extended benefits.

We need to help those people whose unemployment benefits expired on December 28. I have heard from many of my constituents in the 18th Congressional District in Houston who have exhausted their unemployment benefits. I agree with one of my constituents who said that we should "Leave no jobless worker behind."

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation to reinstate the extended unemployment benefits program. These are bad economic times we are living in and few places have it tougher than my home state of Washington which had a 6.6 percent unemployment rate in November. I

know from my constituents that these extra weeks of benefits are a vital lifeline which I wish we had extended back in December. While I am relieved that we finally are passing this bill, I wish that we had the chance to vote on an unemployment package that more fully meets the needs of those Americans who are out of work.

While I am grateful that this bill contains a provision that provides an additional 13 weeks of extended benefits for states with exceptionally high jobless rates—which includes Washington State and two others—it is a mistake that the eligibility requirements are so stringent that the jobless in 47 states cannot receive them. These additional benefits will result in 26 weeks of extended benefits for those of my constituents who have been unable to find new employment. But I do not understand why those unfortunate people living in other states who find themselves in a similar dire situation are limited to only 13 weeks of extended benefits because the unemployment rate is lower in their home state. Being out of work is devastating for people and their families wherever they live and Congress should pass a bill reflecting that reality.

The extended benefits authorized by this legislation expire at the end of May. It is doubtful that the economy will have improved significantly by then. Therefore, we will need to re-visit this issue before these benefits expire. I hope at that time we will pass legislation that better meets the tremendous needs of those Americans who are having a hard time finding new jobs. Compassion demands that action.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I don't have to lecture my colleagues on the difficult economic problems facing the country, state and local governments, and far too many of our constituents who have lost jobs or are losing benefits and support services due to budget pressures. We're all much too familiar with those facts.

But, I was elected to be a voice for those who need help. And, Mr. Speaker, there are 18,000 Oregonians who need help and this bill isn't going to provide it. I'm grateful that this bill will provide extended benefits for some 20,000 unemployed Oregonians who were at some stage of the Temporary Emergency Unemployment Compensation (TEUC) program that expired on December 28, 2002, and the 35,000 Oregonians that are expected to lose work between now and the end of May when this extension expires. However, the bill turns a cold shoulder on the 18,000 long-term unemployed Oregonians who have already exhausted 26 weeks of TEUC.

The unemployment rate in Oregon has hovered between 7 and 8 percent for more than a year. Several counties have double digit unemployment rates, and new layoff are announced weekly. The workers of the Pacific Northwest need help. And we should give it to them.

The Congressional Budget Office projects the national unemployment rate will remain at about six percent until the second half of 2003. The Oregon rate is expected to be higher than the national average.

Unemployment insurance provides targeted and effective economic stimulus. These critical benefits increase consumer spending in the hardest hit areas and sustain and strengthen economic recovery. Fortunately, the federal unemployment insurance trust funds contain

large reserves that can be used to strengthen TEUC without additional unemployment insurance taxes.

I sat here today and listened to the debate on this legislation and heard member after member on the other side of the aisle say how important this legislation is and how much workers need this assistance, but we just can't afford to provide additional benefits for the long-term unemployed. That's not true, and it's unconscionable that we're not providing additional benefits for those who, through no fault of their own, have found themselves on the wrong side of this "economic recovery," and haven't been able to find work.

Somehow, we could afford to give members of Congress a generous 3.4 percent cost-of-living adjustment, but could only give senior citizens a paltry 1.4 percent increase. Somehow, there was money to throw all sorts of favors to corporate special interests at the end of the session, and there's money for more tax breaks for those earning more than \$373,000 a year. Somehow, there was money to give President Bush's political appointee's bonuses at the end of the year, but we can't use the huge surpluses in the unemployment trust funds to give a hand to the 800,000 long-term unemployed who are trying to hang on to their homes, pay the heating bill, keep food on the table, and keep their families together. There's something very wrong with the priorities here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 14, the Senate bill is considered as read for amendment and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO COMMIT OFFERED BY MR. MC DERMOTT

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. McDERMOTT. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The clerk read as follows:

Mr. McDERMOTT moves to commit the bill S. 23 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions that the Committee report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 2003".

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Extension of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002.
- Sec. 3. Entitlement to additional weeks of temporary extended unemployment compensation.
- Sec. 4. Application of revised rate of insured unemployment.
- Sec. 5. Additional TEUC extended benefit period trigger.

Sec. 6. Additional weeks of benefits for workers in high unemployment States.

Sec. 7. Effective date.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF THE TEMPORARY EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 2002.

(a) SIX-MONTH EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.—Section 208 of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 30) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 208. APPLICABILITY.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), an agreement entered into under this title shall apply to weeks of unemployment—

“(1) beginning after the date on which such agreement is entered into; and

“(2) ending before July 1, 2003.

“(b) TRANSITION.—In the case of an individual who is receiving temporary extended unemployment compensation for the week which immediately precedes July 1, 2003, temporary extended unemployment compensation shall continue to be payable to such individual for any week thereafter from the account from which such individual received compensation for the week immediately preceding that termination date. No compensation shall be payable by reason of the preceding sentence for any week beginning after December 31, 2003.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21).

SEC. 3. ENTITLEMENT TO ADDITIONAL WEEKS OF TEMPORARY EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.

Paragraph (1) of section 203(b) of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount established in an account under subsection (a) shall be equal to 26 times the individual’s weekly benefit amount for the benefit year.”

SEC. 4. APPLICATION OF REVISED RATE OF INSURED UNEMPLOYMENT.

Section 207 of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21) is amended—

(1) by striking “In” and inserting “(a) GENERAL DEFINITIONS.—In”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(b) ADJUSTED INSURED UNEMPLOYMENT RATE.—For purposes of carrying out section 203(c) with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of enactment of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 2003, the term ‘rate of insured unemployment’, as used in section 203(d) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note), has the meaning given such term under section 203(e)(1) of such Act, except that individuals exhausting their right to regular compensation during the most recent 3 calendar months for which data are available before the close of the period for which such rate is being determined shall be taken into account as if they were individuals filing claims for regular compensation for each week during the period for which such rate is being determined.”

SEC. 5. ADDITIONAL TEUC EXTENDED BENEFIT PERIOD TRIGGER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 203(c) of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) ADDITIONAL EXTENDED BENEFIT PERIOD TRIGGER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Effective with respect to compensation for weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of enactment of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 2003, an agreement under this title shall provide that, in addition to any other extended benefit period trigger, for purposes of beginning or ending any extended benefit period under this section—

“(i) there is a State ‘on’ indicator for a week if—

“(I) the average rate of total unemployment in such State (seasonally adjusted) for the period consisting of the most recent 3 months for which data for all States are published before the close of such week equals or exceeds 6 percent; and

“(II) the average rate of total unemployment in such State (seasonally adjusted) for the 3-month period referred to in clause (i) equals or exceeds 110 percent of such average rate for either (or both) of the corresponding 3-month periods ending in the 2 preceding calendar years; and

“(ii) there is a State ‘off’ indicator for a week if either the requirements of subclause (I) or (II) of clause (i) are not satisfied.

“(B) NO EFFECT ON OTHER DETERMINATIONS.—Notwithstanding the provisions of any agreement described in subparagraph (A), any week for which there would otherwise be a State ‘on’ indicator shall continue to be such a week and shall not be determined to be a week for which there is a State ‘off’ indicator.

“(C) DETERMINATIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY.—For purposes of this subsection, determinations of the rate of total unemployment in any State for any period (and of any seasonal adjustment) shall be made by the Secretary.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 203(c)(1) of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21) is amended by inserting “or (3)” after “paragraph (2)”

SEC. 6. ADDITIONAL WEEKS OF BENEFITS FOR WORKERS IN HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT STATES.

Section 203(c)(1) of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 30) is amended by striking “an amount equal to the amount originally established in such account (as determined under subsection (b)(1))” and inserting “7 times the individual’s weekly benefit amount for the benefit year”.

SEC. 7. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of enactment this Act.

(b) RESUMPTION OF BENEFITS.—

(1) RULE APPLICABLE TO EXHAUSTEES.—In the case of any individual—

(A) to whom any temporary extended unemployment compensation was payable for any week beginning before January 1, 2003, and

(B) who exhausted such individual’s rights to such compensation (by reason of the payment of all amounts in such individual’s temporary extended unemployment compensation account) before January 1, 2003,

such individual’s eligibility for any additional weeks of temporary extended unemployment compensation by reason of the amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) RULE APPLICABLE TO NON-EXHAUSTEES.—In the case of any individual—

(A) to whom any temporary extended unemployment compensation was payable for

any week beginning before January 1, 2003, and

(B) as to whom the condition described in paragraph (1)(B) does not apply,

such individual shall, upon appropriate application, be eligible for temporary extended unemployment compensation (in accordance with the provisions of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002, as amended by this Act) with respect to any weeks of unemployment beginning on or after December 29, 2002.

(c) DATE FOR DETERMINING ELIGIBILITY OF EXHAUSTEES FOR AUGMENTED BENEFITS.—In the case of any individual described in subsection (b)(1), the determination under section 203(c) as to whether such individual’s State is in an extended benefit period (for purposes of determining eligibility for augmented benefits under the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002, as amended by this Act) shall be made—

(1) as of the date of enactment of this Act, and

(2) without regard to whether or not such a determination was made under the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002, as in effect before the amendments made by this Act.

Mr. McDERMOTT (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to commit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to considering the motion as having been read, but I object to the motion to commit on the basis of its violation of the Budget Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman make a point of order?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I object and make the point of order because this motion, if passed, would cause the allocation to the Committee on Ways and Means to be further exceeded in the first year and over the 5-year period governed by the budget resolution currently deemed in force. The motion therefore violates section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act, and I make a point of order that it violates section 302(f) of the Budget Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there any other Member who wishes to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, if I understand the objection, it is based upon the fact that, as I understand it, the bill before us has a waiver on the Budget Act from the Committee on Rules, but that because there is no waiver of the Budget Act provided in the rules, the minority will not have a chance to offer a similar type of a motion to recommit.

I would ask the chairman, is that the basis that we were not protected in the rule, whereas the underlying bill did not get a waiver in the rule?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would tell the gentleman that that is the

technical effect. However, had the minority offered an amendment which was in the—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman suspend? Members will not engage in colloquy on a point of order. The Chair will hear argument on the point of order from each Member in turn.

Mr. THOMAS. Might I make an argument on the point of order, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) may complete his argument first.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, may I yield on my reservation or argument?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is no yielding on a point of order.

Mr. CARDIN. Let me just complete my argument, and then I would welcome the chairman's response.

Mr. Speaker, I think that there needs to be some discretion here as far as fairness in the rules. I know that yesterday we adopted the rules of the House. It seems to me that the minority needs to be protected to be able to offer a motion to recommit.

I understand the chairman's point, but it would seem to me that the rules should permit the minority to offer a motion to recommit if we are going to have an open and full debate in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Are there other Members who wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Further on my point of order, Mr. Speaker, the reason I believe a 302(f) budget point of order lies against this measure is that it significantly exceeds in its amount the underlying bill.

The legislation before us was not reported by any committee of the House; rather, it was passed by the Senate, and the Committee on Rules has presented it to us.

So my point of order is not based on the fact that the underlying measure has a waiver from the Committee on Rules; it is that if the minority had offered an amendment equal to or less than the Senate position, it would have been in order and not subject to a point of order. Since it is significantly in excess of the Senate measure, it does in fact violate 302(f) of the Budget Act.

□ 1300

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Are there other Members who wish to be heard on the point of order?

The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) makes a point of order that the amendment proposed by the instructions in the motion to commit offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) violates section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

Section 302(f) of the Budget Act precludes consideration of an amendment providing new budget authority if the adoption of the amendment and enactment of the bill, as amended, would cause the pertinent allocation of new budget authority under section 302(a) of the act to be exceeded.

The Chair is persuasively guided by an estimate of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) that an amendment providing any net increase in new budget authority for fiscal year 2003, or the period of fiscal years 2003 through 2007, over that provided by the bill would exacerbate the breach of the applicable section 302(a) allocations of the Committee on Ways and Means.

As such, the motion to commit violates section 302(f) of the Budget Act. The point of order is sustained, and the motion is not in order.

MOTION TO COMMIT OFFERED BY MR. McDERMOTT

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. McDERMOTT. Yes, in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to commit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McDERMOTT moves to commit the bill S. 23 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions that the Committee report the same back to the House promptly with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the ‘‘Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 2003’’.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Extension of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002.
- Sec. 3. Entitlement to additional weeks of temporary extended unemployment compensation.
- Sec. 4. Application of revised rate of insured unemployment.
- Sec. 5. Additional TEUC extended benefit period trigger.
- Sec. 6. Additional weeks of benefits for workers in high unemployment States.
- Sec. 7. Effective date.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF THE TEMPORARY EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 2002.

(a) **SIX-MONTH EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.**—Section 208 of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 30) is amended to read as follows:

‘‘SEC. 208. APPLICABILITY.

‘‘(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subsection (b), an agreement entered into under this title shall apply to weeks of unemployment—

- ‘‘(1) beginning after the date on which such agreement is entered into; and
- ‘‘(2) ending before July 1, 2003.

‘‘(b) **TRANSITION.**—In the case of an individual who is receiving temporary extended unemployment compensation for the week which immediately precedes July 1, 2003, temporary extended unemployment com-

pensation shall continue to be payable to such individual for any week thereafter from the account from which such individual received compensation for the week immediately preceding that termination date. No compensation shall be payable by reason of the preceding sentence for any week beginning after December 31, 2003.’’.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21).

SEC. 3. ENTITLEMENT TO ADDITIONAL WEEKS OF TEMPORARY EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.

Paragraph (1) of section 203(b) of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21) is amended to read as follows:

‘‘(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The amount established in an account under subsection (a) shall be equal to 26 times the individual's weekly benefit amount for the benefit year.’’.

SEC. 4. APPLICATION OF REVISED RATE OF INSURED UNEMPLOYMENT.

Section 207 of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21) is amended—

(1) by striking ‘‘In’’ and inserting ‘‘(a) **GENERAL DEFINITIONS.**—In’’; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

‘‘(b) **ADJUSTED INSURED UNEMPLOYMENT RATE.**—For purposes of carrying out section 203(c) with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of enactment of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 2003, the term ‘rate of insured unemployment’, as used in section 203(d) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note), has the meaning given such term under section 203(e)(1) of such Act, except that individuals exhausting their right to regular compensation during the most recent 3 calendar months for which data are available before the close of the period for which such rate is being determined shall be taken into account as if they were individuals filing claims for regular compensation for each week during the period for which such rate is being determined.’’.

SEC. 5. ADDITIONAL TEUC EXTENDED BENEFIT PERIOD TRIGGER.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 203(c) of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

‘‘(3) **ADDITIONAL EXTENDED BENEFIT PERIOD TRIGGER.**—

‘‘(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Effective with respect to compensation for weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of enactment of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 2003, an agreement under this title shall provide that, in addition to any other extended benefit period trigger, for purposes of beginning or ending any extended benefit period under this section—

‘‘(i) there is a State ‘on’ indicator for a week if—

‘‘(I) the average rate of total unemployment in such State (seasonally adjusted) for the period consisting of the most recent 3 months for which data for all States are published before the close of such week equals or exceeds 6 percent; and

‘‘(II) the average rate of total unemployment in such State (seasonally adjusted) for the 3-month period referred to in clause (i) equals or exceeds 110 percent of such average rate for either (or both) of the corresponding 3-month periods ending in the 2 preceding calendar years; and

‘‘(ii) there is a State ‘off’ indicator for a week if either the requirements of subclause (I) or (II) of clause (i) are not satisfied.

“(B) NO EFFECT ON OTHER DETERMINATIONS.—Notwithstanding the provisions of any agreement described in subparagraph (A), any week for which there would otherwise be a State ‘on’ indicator shall continue to be such a week and shall not be determined to be a week for which there is a State ‘off’ indicator.

“(C) DETERMINATIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY.—For purposes of this subsection, determinations of the rate of total unemployment in any State for any period (and of any seasonal adjustment) shall be made by the Secretary.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 203(c)(1) of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21) is amended by inserting “or (3)” after “paragraph (2)”.

SEC. 6. ADDITIONAL WEEKS OF BENEFITS FOR WORKERS IN HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT STATES.

Section 203(c)(1) of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 30) is amended by striking “an amount equal to the amount originally established in such account (as determined under subsection (b)(1))” and inserting “7 times the individual’s weekly benefit amount for the benefit year”.

SEC. 7. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of enactment this Act.

(b) RESUMPTION OF BENEFITS.—

(1) RULE APPLICABLE TO EXHAUSTEES.—In the case of any individual—

(A) to whom any temporary extended unemployment compensation was payable for any week beginning before January 1, 2003, and

(B) who exhausted such individual’s rights to such compensation (by reason of the payment of all amounts in such individual’s temporary extended unemployment compensation account) before January 1, 2003,

such individual’s eligibility for any additional weeks of temporary extended unemployment compensation by reason of the amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) RULE APPLICABLE TO NON-EXHAUSTEES.—In the case of any individual—

(A) to whom any temporary extended unemployment compensation was payable for any week beginning before January 1, 2003, and

(B) as to whom the condition described in paragraph (1)(B) does not apply,

such individual shall, upon appropriate application, be eligible for temporary extended unemployment compensation (in accordance with the provisions of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002, as amended by this Act) with respect to any weeks of unemployment beginning on or after December 29, 2002.

(c) DATE FOR DETERMINING ELIGIBILITY OF EXHAUSTEES FOR AUGMENTED BENEFITS.—In the case of any individual described in subsection (b)(1), the determination under section 203(c) as to whether such individual’s State is in an extended benefit period (for purposes of determining eligibility for augmented benefits under the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002, as amended by this Act) shall be made—

(1) as of the date of enactment of this Act, and

(2) without regard to whether or not such a determination was made under the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation

Act of 2002, as in effect before the amendments made by this Act.

Mr. THOMAS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD since the appropriate part has already been read.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we need to pass legislation today, so I support legislation. I think it is important that we deal with the people who lost their benefits in December because we failed to extend the law. I think it is important that we pass legislation that will provide the additional weeks of benefits for those who exhaust their regular unemployment insurance, and the underlying legislation does that and it is worthy of support.

The problem is, as we have heard during the course of this debate, that the legislation does not go far enough. There will be a million people during the next several months who will exhaust their extended benefits, and the gentleman’s motion to commit urges us to deal with that group of unemployed who have lost their unemployment insurance benefits through no fault of their own; and if we do not take action immediately, these individuals will not have any unemployment insurance benefits.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the motion before us will not delay the issue. I know I will hear that from my friends. The conference could be appointed today. It could act today. This is not a controversial issue. This is unfinished business from the last Congress. The funds are there. The funds are in the Federal unemployment trust account to pay for these benefits.

In 1990, the last recession we had, we extended benefits for 26 additional weeks. This tells us to do at least as well for the unemployed today as we did in the 1990s so we can get this done. We can get it done quickly, and we can get it done before we adjourn this week, and that is the essence of the gentleman’s motion. So I support the underlying bill, but we need to do better now on the unfinished business of the last Congress.

Then, Mr. Speaker, let me urge my chairman who is on the floor that we look at reforming the unemployment insurance and we do it quickly, that we deal with the part-time employees who pay into the unemployment insurance funds and do not get unemployment benefits. And we deal with the people, many of whom left the welfare system for work only to find that their jobs

have been lost and we deal with the most recent quarter of their earnings so they can qualify for unemployment insurance. As we look at a stimulus package, let us also look at increasing the benefits for those people who are unemployed. That would certainly stimulate our economy and is far less costly than the tax legislation that the President brought forward yesterday.

So I would urge my colleagues to support the gentleman from Washington’s motion to commit. It urges us to do more. It allows us to move forward with the underlying bill but to do more; and we can get it done today, make no mistake about it. The conference report could be back to us before we leave this evening. There is no question about that in anyone’s mind. We know exactly what needs to be done, and I would urge my colleagues to support the motion to commit.

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

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that you have a calendar which says we will be here until 8 or 9 o’clock tonight, so there is plenty of time to make this small change, and any argument that we do not have time is simply a bogus argument.

Now, the fact is that as my colleague from Maryland has said, this is unfinished business from before. I have tried two different ways and the majority is intent on killing any attempt to modify what they have agreed to with the Senate. Now, I guess from now on we will just wait for the Senate to tell us what we need to do because the House clearly has no power to ever confront the Senate and tell the Senate that they have made not quite the right bill.

This is a historic moment. I do not ever remember being in the House of Representatives any place where they conceded to the Senate that whatever the Senate says is what we have to do.

We could do this by 3 o’clock very easily and cover a million people. Now, for anybody to say that because they have already exhausted, because of that technicality on the 28th of December they should not get any more, I find that incredible that you would say that to somebody who is unemployed, that the law we wrote did not work so you do not get any money. Explain that to your kids when you are sitting there at the dinner table. We do not have any food, kids, because the law that the Congress wrote did not work right so I did not get a check this month. I paid for it, I paid into the benefits, and we do not get them.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the motion.

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

Mr. Speaker, apparently we have come full circle. I opened this debate

by saying I had the uncomfortable requirement of informing the House and hoped that it would be the last time that we did so, that I was presenting a bill passed by the Senate and that we would be compelled to have to pass the bill that was passed by the Senate.

I did mention at that time that the Senate passed it unanimously. Notwithstanding the difficulties the other body has in coming together to pass legislation, when time is up, they were able to come together and agree that we needed to address a problem, and they passed this legislation.

For my friends on the other side of the aisle to offer this motion to commit versus the previous one, and the reason I said you did not need to read any further is all you have to do is look at the first paragraph that said the House should report it forthwith. That, in fact, means it comes immediately back and it could go to the Senate. They changed the word "forthwith" to "promptly." That means it has to go to committee. And for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, members of the Committee on Ways and Means say all we have to do is get the Committee on Ways and Means together so we can go ahead and hold a meeting, I have to tell you, who are your appointees to the Committee on Ways and Means?

The Committee on Ways and Means has not been constituted. We do not have a functioning committee. And yet they say blithely all we have to do is come together.

I cannot imagine the mental set that says notwithstanding the Senate came together in time of need and worked cooperatively that even at 11:30 to midnight my friends on the other side of the aisle are offering motions to commit which will kill this provision.

This provision allows for those December 28 folks to continue their benefits. In fact, it allows for almost 4 million to continue to receive benefits, an additional 2 million under the time extension, for a total of 6 million Americans to receive their unemployment benefits. If the motion to commit passes, it effectively kills the measure. The Senate's attempt to unify and put politics aside will have been destroyed by my colleagues' willingness to even today play politics.

In December, the House passed a short-term extension, only 5 weeks. We were criticized for making it only 5 weeks. Why? Because we wanted to address the question when we came back.

My friend from Maryland says we ought to address this promptly. You voted against the measure that would have required us to address it promptly. The Senate failed to pass it. So we are in a position of having the President sign a bill tomorrow or not sign a bill tomorrow.

If you vote "yes" for the motion to commit, there will be no bill signed tomorrow and people will really lose the unemployment benefits that they have earned, those people that you appar-

ently shed crocodile tears over. If you vote against the motion to commit and for passage of the measure, we will pick up those folks who inadvertently were dropped on December 28; and 6 million people will continue to receive benefits and hopefully we will pass legislation which will in fact spur the economy and provide them with a job instead of unemployment insurance. And I am quite sure my colleagues will be opposed to the proposals to stimulate the economy as well. So those will be future battles.

Today the line is drawn very simply. Vote for the motion to commit and kill the opportunity to help people get their well-deserved unemployment. Vote against the motion to commit, vote for the underlying bill, and the President can have a bill-signing ceremony tomorrow, and we can do what we should have done back in December.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to commit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to commit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote, if ordered, on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 202, nays 224, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—202

Abercrombie	Davis (AL)	Hinojosa
Ackerman	Davis (CA)	Hoeffel
Alexander	Davis (FL)	Holden
Allen	Davis (IL)	Holt
Andrews	Davis (TN)	Honda
Baca	DeFazio	Houghton
Baird	DeGette	Hoyer
Baldwin	Delahunt	Inslee
Ballance	DeLauro	Israel
Becerra	Deutsch	Jackson (IL)
Bell	Dicks	Jackson-Lee
Berkley	Dingell	(TX)
Berman	Doggett	Jefferson
Berry	Dooley (CA)	John
Bishop (GA)	Doyle	Johnson, E. B.
Bishop (NY)	Edwards	Jones (OH)
Blumenauer	Emanuel	Kanjorski
Boswell	Engel	Kaptur
Boucher	Eshoo	Kennedy (RI)
Boyd	Etheridge	Kildee
Brady (PA)	Evans	Kleczka
Brown (OH)	Farr	Kucinich
Brown, Corrine	Fattah	Lampson
Capps	Filner	Langevin
Capuano	Ford	Lantos
Cardin	Frank (MA)	Larsen (WA)
Cardoza	Frost	Larson (CT)
Carson (IN)	Gephardt	Lee
Carson (OK)	Gonzalez	Levin
Case	Gordon	Lewis (GA)
Clay	Green (TX)	Lipinski
Clyburn	Grijalva	Lofgren
Conyers	Gutierrez	Lowey
Cooper	Hall	Lucas (KY)
Costello	Harman	Lynch
Cramer	Hastings (FL)	Majette
Crowley	Hill	Maloney
Cummings	Hinchev	Markey

Marshall	Pallone	Smith (WA)
Matheson	Pascarell	Snyder
Matsui	Pastor	Solis
McCarthy (MO)	Payne	Spratt
McCarthy (NY)	Pelosi	Stark
McCollum	Peterson (MN)	Stenholm
McDermott	Pomeroy	Strickland
McGovern	Price (NC)	Stupak
McIntyre	Rahall	Tanner
McNulty	Rangel	Tauscher
Meehan	Reyes	Taylor (MS)
Meek (FL)	Rodriguez	Thompson (CA)
Meeks (NY)	Ross	Thompson (MS)
Menendez	Rothman	Tierney
Michaud	Roybal-Allard	Turner (TX)
Millender	Ruppersberger	Udall (CO)
McDonald	Rush	Udall (NM)
Miller (NC)	Ryan (OH)	Van Hollen
Miller, George	Sabo	Velazquez
Mollohan	Sanchez, Linda	Visclosky
Moore	T.	Walters
Moran (VA)	Sanchez, Loretta	Watson
Murtha	Sanders	Watt
Nadler	Sandlin	Waxman
Napolitano	Schakowsky	Weiner
Neal (MA)	Schiff	Wexler
Oberstar	Scott (GA)	Woolsey
Obey	Scott (VA)	Wu
Olver	Serrano	Wynn
Ortiz	Sherman	
Owens	Slaughter	

NAYS—224

Aderholt	Ferguson	McCotter
Akin	Flake	McCrery
Bachus	Fletcher	McHugh
Baker	Foley	McInnis
Ballenger	Forbes	McKeon
Barrett (SC)	Fossella	Mica
Bartlett (MD)	Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)
Barton (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)
Bass	Gallegly	Miller, Gary
Beauprez	Garrett (NJ)	Moran (KS)
Bereuter	Gilchrest	Murphy
Biggett	Gillmor	Musgrave
Billirakis	Gingrey	Myrick
Bishop (UT)	Goode	Ney
Blackburn	Goodlatte	Northup
Blunt	Goss	Norwood
Boehlert	Granger	Nunes
Boehner	Graves	Nussle
Bonilla	Green (WI)	Osborne
Bonner	Greenwood	Ose
Bono	Gutknecht	Otter
Boozman	Harris	Oxley
Bradley (NH)	Hart	Paul
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Pearce
Brown (SC)	Hayes	Pence
Brown-Waite,	Hayworth	Peterson (PA)
Ginny	Hefley	Petri
Burgess	Hensarling	Pickering
Burns	Herger	Pitts
Burr	Hobson	Platts
Buyer	Hoekstra	Pombo
Calvert	Hostettler	Porter
Camp	Hulshof	Portman
Cannon	Hunter	Pryce (OH)
Cantor	Hyde	Putnam
Capito	Isakson	Quinn
Carter	Issa	Radanovich
Castle	Istook	Ramstad
Chabot	Janklow	Regula
Chocola	Jenkins	Rehberg
Coble	Johnson (CT)	Renzi
Cole	Johnson (IL)	Reynolds
Collins	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Combest	Jones (NC)	Rogers (KY)
Cox	Keller	Rogers (MI)
Crane	Kelly	Rohrabacher
Crenshaw	Kennedy (MN)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cubin	King (IA)	Royce
Culberson	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Cunningham	Kingston	Ryun (KS)
Davis, Jo Ann	Kirk	Saxton
Davis, Tom	Kline	Schrock
Deal (GA)	Knollenberg	Sensenbrenner
DeLay	Kolbe	Sessions
DeMint	LaHood	Shadegg
DeMint	Latham	Shaw
Diaz-Balart, L.	LaTourrette	Shays
Diaz-Balart, M.	Leach	Sherwood
Doolittle	Lewis (CA)	Shimkus
Dreier	Lewis (KY)	Shuster
Duncan	Linder	Simmons
Dunn	LoBiondo	Simpson
Ehlers	Lucas (OK)	Skelton
Emerson	Manzullo	Smith (MI)
English		Smith (NJ)
Everett		Smith (TX)
Feeney		

Souder	Thornberry	Weldon (FL)
Stearns	Tiahrt	Weldon (PA)
Sullivan	Tiberi	Weller
Sweeney	Toomey	Whitfield
Tancredo	Turner (OH)	Wicker
Tauzin	Upton	Wilson (NM)
Taylor (NC)	Walden (OR)	Wilson (SC)
Terry	Walsh	Young (AK)
Thomas	Wamp	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Burton (IN)	Nethercutt	Wolf
Killpatrick	Towns	
Kind	Vitter	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). The Chair advises Members that approximately 2 minutes remain in this 15-minute vote.

□ 1333

Messrs. LARSON of Connecticut, CRAMER, SMITH of Washington, CARSON of Oklahoma, GORDON, and HALL changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Messrs. JOHNSON of Illinois, BOEHLERT, and OXLEY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to commit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 6 I inadvertently pressed the “yea” button. I meant to vote “nay” on the McDermott motion to commit.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has a statement about the length of electronic votes.

Clause 4 of rule XX says that Members shall have at least 15 minutes to respond on an ordinary record vote or quorum call. But with cooperation among the Members, it is possible to complete a vote in that time.

The Chair believes that closing votes as soon as possible after the guaranteed minimum time should be the regular practice. The Chair is certain that votes can be shortened if Members simply resolve to head to the Chamber as soon as they are notified by the bell-and-light signal. The Chair will remind Members when 2 minutes remain on the clock.

The goal of completing votes in as close to the minimum time as possible is even more reasonable in the case of a 5-minute vote, because every 5-minute vote necessarily follows another electronic vote, and is always preceded by an announcement from the Chair and a distinctive bell-and-light signal.

No occupant of the chair would prevent a Member who is in the well of the Chamber before a result is announced from casting his or her vote. But each occupant of the chair will have the full support of the Speaker in striving to close each electronic vote at the earliest opportunity. Members should not rely on signals relayed from outside the Chamber to assume that votes will be held open until they arrive in the Chamber.

The question is on the passage of the Senate bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 4, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie	Cubin	Herger
Ackerman	Culberson	Hill
Aderholt	Cummings	Hinchey
Alexander	Cunningham	Hinojosa
Allen	Davis (AL)	Hobson
Andrews	Davis (CA)	Hoeffel
Baca	Davis (FL)	Hoekstra
Baird	Davis (IL)	Holden
Baker	Davis (TN)	Holt
Baldwin	Davis, Jo Ann	Honda
Ballance	Davis, Tom	Hostettler
Ballenger	Deal (GA)	Houghton
Barrett (SC)	DeFazio	Hoyer
Bartlett (MD)	DeGette	Hulshof
Barton (TX)	DeLauro	Hunter
Bass	DeLay	Hyde
Beauprez	DeMint	Inslee
Beceerra	Deutsch	Isakson
Bereuter	Diaz-Balart, L.	Israel
Berkley	Diaz-Balart, M.	Issa
Berman	Dicks	Istook
Berry	Dingell	Jackson (IL)
Biggart	Doggett	Jackson-Lee
Bilirakis	Dooley (CA)	(TX)
Bishop (GA)	Doolittle	Janklow
Bishop (NY)	Doyle	Jefferson
Bishop (UT)	Dreier	Jenkins
Blackburn	Duncan	John
Blumenauer	Dunn	Johnson (CT)
Blunt	Edwards	Johnson (IL)
Boehlert	Ehlers	Johnson, E. B.
Boehner	Emanuel	Johnson, Sam
Bonilla	Emerson	Jones (NC)
Bonner	Engel	Jones (OH)
Bono	English	Kanjorski
Boozman	Eshoo	Kaptur
Boswell	Etheridge	Keller
Boucher	Evans	Kelly
Boyd	Everett	Kennedy (MN)
Bradley (NH)	Farr	Kennedy (RI)
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Kildee
Brady (TX)	Feeney	King (IA)
Brown (OH)	Ferguson	King (NY)
Brown (SC)	Filner	Kingston
Brown, Corrine	Fletcher	Kirk
Brown-Waite,	Foley	Klecza
Ginny	Forbes	Kline
Burgess	Ford	Knollenberg
Burns	Fossella	Kolbe
Burr	Frank (MA)	Kucinich
Burton (IN)	Franks (AZ)	LaHood
Buyer	Frelinghuysen	Lampson
Calvert	Frost	Langevin
Camp	Gephardt	Lantos
Cannon	Gerlach	Larsen (WA)
Cantor	Gibbons	Latham
Capito	Gilchrest	LaTourette
Capps	Gillmor	Leach
Capuano	Gingrey	Lee
Cardin	Gonzalez	Levin
Cardoza	Goode	Lewis (CA)
Carson (IN)	Goodlatte	Lewis (GA)
Carson (OK)	Gordon	Lewis (KY)
Carter	Goss	Linder
Case	Granger	Lipinski
Castle	Graves	LoBiondo
Chabot	Green (TX)	Lofgren
Chocola	Green (WI)	Lowey
Clay	Greenwood	Lucas (KY)
Clyburn	Grijalva	Lucas (OK)
Coble	Gutierrez	Lynch
Cole	Gutknecht	Majette
Collins	Hall	Maloney
Combest	Harman	Manzullo
Conyers	Harris	Markey
Cooper	Hart	Marshall
Costello	Hastings (FL)	Matheson
Cox	Hastings (WA)	Matsui
Cramer	Hayes	McCarthy (MO)
Crane	Hayworth	McCarthy (NY)
Crenshaw	Hefley	McCollum
Crowley	Hensarling	McCotter

McCrery	Pomeroy	Smith (NJ)
McGovern	Porter	Smith (TX)
McHugh	Portman	Smith (WA)
McInnis	Price (NC)	Snyder
McIntyre	Pryce (OH)	Solis
McKeon	Putnam	Souder
McNulty	Quinn	Spratt
Meehan	Radanovich	Stark
Meek (FL)	Rahall	Stearns
Meeks (NY)	Ramstad	Stenholm
Menendez	Rangel	Strickland
Mica	Regula	Stupak
Michaud	Rehberg	Sullivan
Millender-	Renzi	Sweeney
McDonald	Reyes	Tancredo
Miller (MI)	Reynolds	Tanner
Miller (NC)	Rodriguez	Tauscher
Miller, Gary	Rogers (AL)	Taylor (MS)
Miller, George	Rogers (KY)	Taylor (NC)
Mollohan	Rogers (MI)	Terry
Moore	Rohrabacher	Thomas
Moran (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (CA)
Moran (VA)	Ross	Thompson (MS)
Murphy	Rothman	Thornberry
Murtha	Roybal-Allard	Tiahrt
Musgrave	Royce	Tiberi
Myrick	Ruppersberger	Tierney
Nadler	Rush	Toomey
Napolitano	Ryan (OH)	Turner (OH)
Neal (MA)	Ryan (WI)	Turner (TX)
Ney	Ryun (KS)	Udall (CO)
Northup	Sabo	Udall (NM)
Norwood	Sanchez, Linda	Upton
Nunes	T.	Van Hollen
Nussle	Sanchez, Loretta	Velazquez
Oberstar	Sanders	Visclosky
Obey	Sandin	Vitter
Olver	Saxton	Walden (OR)
Ortiz	Schakowsky	Walsh
Osborne	Schiff	Wamp
Ose	Schrock	Waters
Otter	Scott (VA)	Watson
Owens	Scott (VA)	Watt
Oxley	Sensenbrenner	Waxman
Pallone	Serrano	Weiner
Pascrell	Sessions	Weldon (FL)
Pastor	Shadegg	Weldon (PA)
Payne	Shaw	Weller
Pearce	Shays	Wexler
Pelosi	Sherman	Whitfield
Pence	Sherwood	Wicker
Peterson (MN)	Shimkus	Wilson (NM)
Peterson (PA)	Shuster	Wilson (SC)
Petri	Simmons	Woolsey
Pickering	Simpson	Wu
Pitts	Skelton	Wynn
Platts	Slaughter	Young (AK)
Pombo	Smith (MI)	Young (FL)

NAYS—4

Flake	Miller (FL)
Garrett (NJ)	Paul

NOT VOTING—13

Akin	Kilpatrick	Tauzin
Bachus	Kind	Towns
Bell	Larson (CT)	Wolf
Delahunt	McDermott	
Gallegly	Nethercutt	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that approximately 2 minutes remain in this 5-minute vote.

□ 1341

So the Senate bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I was pushing the button when time went off. I understand it, but had I been present, I would like to have been recorded as voting “yea.”

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and unable to record my vote on rollcall vote No. 7, the Unemployment Insurance Benefits Extension Act. Had I been able to record my vote, I would have voted “yea”

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 7 I am not recorded. I would have voted "yea."

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 7, apparently the card did not register a "yes" vote. Let the RECORD show had the machine recorded the vote, I would have voted in the affirmative.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained this afternoon at a news conference reporting on my recent fact-finding trip to Ethiopia to observe the famine conditions and did not vote on rollcall Nos. 6 and 7. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on the motion to recommit S. 23, and "yea" on final passage of S. 23, to extend unemployment insurance benefits.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1 AND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 2, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2003

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 15 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 15

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the joint resolution equally divided and controlled by Representative Young of Florida and Representative Obey of Wisconsin; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 2) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the joint resolution equally divided and controlled by Representative Young of Florida and Representative Obey of Wisconsin; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 15 is a closed rule providing for the consideration of two continuing resolutions, H.J. Res. 1 and H.J. Res. 2, both of which make further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2003. The rule provides that

H.J. Res. 1 will be debatable in the House for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of H.J. Res. 1, and it provides one motion to recommit the underlying measure. H.J. Res. 15 also provides that H.J. Res. 2 will be debatable in the House for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of H.J. Res. 2. It provides one motion to recommit.

As we start this year's legislative session, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule so we may proceed to consideration of the two underlying continuing resolutions, both of which will allow the Federal Government to remain open until the end of this month. Failure to pass these measures would mean the government, outside of the defense and military construction appropriations bills, would have to shut down on midnight this Friday, January 10. We simply cannot allow that to happen to the American people.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of a good reason, other than nostalgia, to explain why we are still trying to complete our work from 2002. The rest of America has already celebrated the new year. They have already started to write 2003 on their checks. But for the House of Representatives, the calendar year has not turned.

Every year this House has the responsibility to pass the 13 appropriation bills that keep this government running.

□ 1345

Funding for education, health care, environmental protection, homeland security, national defense all must originate here. The scorecard from the last Congress shows that the majority could only pass 2 of these 13 bills. So we are here today to consider a sixth continuing resolution to keep the government open and running. We are here for one simple reason: The majority party in this House has failed. They did not do their job, and the American people deserve to know that.

Members of this House get up all of the time and give great speeches about how much they value education, about how no child should be left behind. But when it comes to actually funding education, the majority says maybe we will get to it later.

I just met with leaders from hospitals and home health care agencies and nursing homes in Massachusetts

that are struggling just to hold on. They need relief and they need it now; but when it comes to actually funding our health care system, the majority says maybe we will get to it later.

Where is our commitment to our police, our firefighters and other first responders? Where is our commitment to environmental protection, and funding for our transportation and infrastructure needs? Certainly not in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, later is not good enough. We need to act now on the issues that matter to the American people. Indeed, we should have acted yesterday. As even senior Republican appropriators have pointed out, we are leaving ourselves extremely underfunded in the area of homeland security. Take a look at port security, for example. Right now 21,000 shipping containers arrive in U.S. ports every day, each one big enough to carry a weapon of mass destruction, but less than 2 percent are actually screened.

As the Washington Post has reported, Customs Commissioner Robert Bonner has said there is virtually no security for what is the primary system to transport global trade.

Worse yet, the rule before us prevents Democrats from even offering amendments to correct that mistake and provide that critical funding. Somehow, the majority found time last year to pass huge tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans, but not much else. We hear a lot of talk about homeland security, but we are not funding our homeland security needs.

This is a time for New Year's resolutions. I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will resolve to bring our appropriation bills to the floor in a timely manner and let the House work its will, vote and move on. The American people deserve a House of Representatives that functions, that does the job given to it by the Constitution, and I hope that we can at least achieve that much during this new year.

Mr. Speaker, there will be a vote on the previous question, and I urge my colleagues to vote no on that previous question. A no vote will allow Democrats to offer important amendments to fund some of our vital interests.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, of course the CR before us is not supposed to have items that raise the cost of government, nor agreement on what the cost should be. There is a sleeper item in this CR that Members need to know about because it certainly raises the cost of government a great deal and a great deal more than was necessary.

We are treated in this CR to a lease. That is I must say an unprecedented circumvention of the committee process. Perhaps that could be justified