

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that mercury is a toxic substance. If it is spilled on the ground, they evacuate the area and they bring in the fire department and they clean it up with all kinds of paraphernalia to protect the citizens and the firemen that are working on it, and yet it is injected into our children's bodies in our vaccinations, and in the Homeland Security bill this year they eliminated the possibility of the families who have been damaged and the children who have been damaged by the mercury in these vaccines from having any chance to get restitution from the pharmaceutical companies or from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Fund. That is criminal. It needs to be changed.

We have the fastest growing epidemic in America and the parents have nowhere to go, and it is caused in large part by the mercury in the vaccines. This is just tragic. We need to correct that in the technical corrections bill very, very quickly so these parents have some recourse. They are mortgaging their homes. They are going bankrupt trying to take care of these children. One in 10,000 children used to be autistic. Now it is one in 180. It is an absolute epidemic and this government prohibited the families from finding a way to take care of their children, and these kids are going to grow up. These kids are going to grow up, and they are going to be a burden on society unless we do something about it now.

And in addition Mr. Speaker, I just found out that the vaccines that we are giving to our military personnel who are over in the Persian Gulf who may be going to war with Iraq, they are being vaccinated with vaccines that contain mercury as well.

We need to get mercury out of all vaccines and we need to make absolutely sure that the parents who have damaged children have some course to get restitution this government should not block. It is criminal.

PRESIDENT'S STIMULUS PACKAGE

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say how disappointed I was with the President's so-called economic stimulus package that was announced yesterday. First of all, there is no immediate jumpstart to the economy, and this is just more of the same: Tax breaks essentially to the wealthy, to corporate interests, and very little that means anything for the average American.

Mr. Speaker, we have a tremendous problem with an economic downturn. We have more and more people who have lost their jobs. This is not the time to continue the same failed economic policies. The Democrats have talked about basically giving money

back to consumers in the form of a rebate. We have talked about extending unemployment compensation for at least 26 weeks. In addition to that, our plan is a real economic stimulus. It gets the economy going again and does not basically put together long-term deficits.

If you listen to what the President and the Republicans have been proposing, it is just going to put the economy and the Federal Government into debt even greater, as much as \$2 trillion perhaps over the next 10 years. Why do we continue with the same failed Republican policies? Let us do something that gets people back to work, that creates jobs, that gives some money back to the States because the States have so many problems now with their own deficits. The Federal Government has to do something now that is going to make a difference for the average American, and that is not what we are hearing from the Bush administration. We are just hearing the same thing about giving more tax breaks, eliminating dividends with regard to stocks. These things are not going to do anything in the next year to actually help the American people. In fact, I am very fearful that there is a potential that the economic situation even gets worse unless we get together on a bipartisan basis.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). 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 recorded vote or quorum call. But with the cooperation of 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 two 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 it is always preceded by an announcement from the Chair and a distinctive bell and light signal.

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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 23, EXTENSION OF TEM- PORARY EXTENDED UNEMPLOY- MENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 2002

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 14 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 14

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 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. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by Representative Thomas of California and Representative Rangel of New York; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. The allocations referred to in section 3(a)(4)(B)(i) of House Resolution 5 may be submitted by Representative Nussle of Iowa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), 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.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate and waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. As we begin the 108th Congress I would like to point out that we intend to continue the courtesy that we began when the Republicans became the majority. This rule allows us to continue in the tradition of extending the minority party an opportunity to offer a motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today allows us to debate and consider a most important measure, S-23, which provides for a 5-month extension of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002. Last Congress we passed the Job Creation and Worker Assistance Act of 2002, which became Public Law 107-147. This economic stimulus bill includes a temporary extension of unemployment compensation and provides for the temporary extended unemployment compensation program.

□ 1030

This program provided up to 13 additional weeks of federally funded benefits for unemployed workers in all States. Benefits were payable to qualified workers through December 28, 2002. Though several attempts were made, and language extending this program was passed by the House, the 107th Congress unfortunately adjourned without having passed an extension.

Today, we have the opportunity to consider legislation that would immediately provide for a 5-month extension of unemployed benefits, through May 2003, with a 3-month phaseout. This also allows for newly eligible workers by the end of May 2003 to receive extended unemployment benefits through August of this year.

Mr. Speaker, 1.9 million new recipients would be aided by this extension, as well as nearly 800,000 continuing recipients who have been affected by the December 28 "cliff." This comes to a total of 2.7 million workers and their families who would benefit from the legislation that will hopefully pass today.

This measure is similar to the language that was championed by Senators CLINTON and NICKLES at the end of the last Congress. Yesterday, the Senate passed this legislation by unanimous consent. Today, the House has the opportunity to pass and to send this measure to President Bush for his signature. By moving expeditiously, we could ensure that unemployed workers do not suffer from a significant delay in the receipt of their checks. I hope that we can mirror the Senate's actions on this bill with a strong, bipartisan vote. I believe that it would be a strong indication of this new Congress's commitment to American workers and their families. Furthermore, extending unemployment benefits and providing unemployed workers with additional purchasing power would be yet another way to help stimulate the economy which, in turn, would help us to keep unemployment down.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentlewoman from New York, I would like to offer a brief explanation of the second part of this resolution. Section 2 of this resolution provides that allocations referred to in section 3(a) of House Resolution 5 may be submitted by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE). This is merely a technical clarification of the rules package we adopted yesterday, which contained a provision to allow the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 302(a) allocations. This is necessary so that the House might complete its obligation to fund this through the current year FY 03 fiscal year.

As everyone knows, the Committee on Rules is currently the only committee up and running, so my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), has technically not been appointed the chairman of the Committee on the Budget yet. This provision merely lets him carry out his duties as if he already were the committee chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for

yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to read a letter from a constituent of mine in Rochester, New York, whom we will call Mary.

"Dear Louise: I am a 52-year-old mother with a handicapped child at home and a daughter in graduate school. I am writing because I am tired of freezing. Our thermostat is set at 55 and the electric company is still sending us threatening letters every month. We pay as much as we can, but without extended unemployment benefits, my son will have to go to an institution. I have 42 job rejections and I have a B.A. in sociology. It's very hard for me to worry about home security issues and terrorism when I am cold. Maybe I can make it through the winter with extended benefits."

Another received over the holidays:

"Dear Louise: My husband was laid off in January. We have taken out two loans against our house in addition to our mortgage to survive and we have a 2-year-old child who is getting almost nothing under the Christmas tree."

There are more where that came from, Mr. Speaker. Another wrote me, "I am 34 years old. A year ago today I was making \$76,000 a year as a software engineer at Xerox, and today I cannot find a job. I have a newborn baby girl, and I am going to run out of my benefits next week. I consistently made \$60,000 a year for the past 5 years and paid taxes accordingly."

None of these people will be helped by this legislation today. None of them.

Mr. Speaker, last month I asked some unemployed workers in my district to sign a petition that calls on Congress to make the extension of Federal unemployment benefits a priority. During the last 2 weeks alone, more than 300 constituents have signed on to the petition. They are losing their homes. They have sold their cars. They cannot support their families, their children; and these are not people who sit back and passively collect checks to avoid working. They have been pounding the pavement in an economy that is shutting them out. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I have been told that it is almost impossible at this time to get even a part-time job or a temporary job in Rochester.

These are people who have worked all of their lives and paid into the unemployment insurance fund and now simply are asking to get some back. Through no fault of their own, they find themselves reeling in an economic slowdown.

While working, they did all of their part; and the cushion that they are given now is resonating like a hard thud. The money is sitting there, Mr. Speaker, in a trust fund that we are failing to fully utilize. That is bad

stewardship. These constituents are not comforted by an abstract proposal to reduce the tax on corporate dividends or other so-called stimulus. A victory for them would be to keep their homes heated and a roof over their heads. To add insult to injury, my constituents were greeted with this headline 3 days after Christmas reading nationwide, "800,000 lose jobless benefits," with the kicker that Congress went home and failed to okay funds.

All during the holidays, Mr. Speaker, we talked about getting back here and the first thing we wanted to do, there was this great sense that we would come back to help the people whose benefits expired on December 28. Unfortunately, that is not the case. If benefits expire later, this bill will do some help, but this is appalling. I have been at a loss to explain to my constituents why a majority in this House let them down. A recent report suggests that without an extension package, a projected 12,000 unemployed workers in Rochester, in the Buffalo-Niagara area are scheduled to lose their benefits between December 28 and March 31. But, as I said before, this measure before us today will be too little and too late for thousands in my region and perhaps in others.

The version we are considering today would only allow for a 13-week extension of benefits for those who are still eligible. It would not address the needs of the nearly 84,000 unemployed in the State of New York alone who have already exhausted their benefits.

Mr. Speaker, it seems almost superfluous to note that the 108th Congress kicks off its legislative program with a rule so closed and restricted that the minority party was prevented from offering even a single substitute. I remember the day that this institution was considered one of the great deliberative bodies, brimming with ideas and a host of viewpoints befitting a democracy, but no more, Mr. Speaker. Today, 205 Members of this body and their constituents have been disenfranchised and shut out. My colleagues, a cold wind is blowing in this institution, and the needs and voices of our most vulnerable constituents are feeling the chill.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic substitute that was blocked by the Committee on Rules last night would have made a real difference to thousands. First and foremost, the measure would reestablish the Federal extended unemployment compensation program and guarantee all jobless workers at least 26 weeks of extended benefits. The program would be extended until June 30, 2003. Workers in every State would be eligible for 26 weeks of extended unemployment benefits after they exhaust their regular unemployment compensation. This provision would provide extended unemployment benefits to merely 2½ million workers over the first half of 2003, and the unemployment rate becomes more and more shocking every day.

Moreover, any workers who exhausted their initial 13 weeks of temporary extended unemployment compensation in 2002 would receive an additional 13 weeks. Any worker who was cut off on December 28 because of the termination of the current program would receive the remainder of their original 13 weeks on a retroactive basis, plus the additional 13 weeks. Finally, any worker who exhausted 26 weeks which they received because their State hit the requisite unemployment trigger would receive an additional 7 weeks if their State remained designated as having high unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that literally broke my heart was when one Member of Congress was quoted as saying, "We don't want to extend these benefits; they will not go out and look for work." We are talking about people who are having a very difficult time; in fact, probably will not be able to find the kind of work commensurate with their education and their skills. I am very much afraid that my district, like many others, will lose them to other parts of the country. It is a tragedy that is happening here today, Mr. Speaker. We could be doing something good for the unemployed of America; but instead, we are turning our back on them and saying, have a little dividend tax relief.

I do want to point out too on the stimulus package, because it is so important that most people who have stock in the United States have either a 401(k) program or a mutual fund, they will not see anything from any kind of tax relief.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, last night the Committee on Rules had an opportunity to hold a hearing on this unemployment compensation bill. However, for months our chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), has been involved in the negotiations as a member of the leadership of the House and is a person who has taken a lead on this important issue. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I congratulate him on his fine management on this very important rule.

I will begin by saying that none of us is enthused by the prospect of having to extend unemployment benefits. Why? Because we want to focus on job creation and economic growth; and we know that the people who are out there who, unfortunately, are suffering, want to have opportunity, and that is why we are bound and determined to do everything possible to ensure that they have it. But I see what we are doing here today, Mr. Speaker, as really part of our national security responsibility. We all know that on September 11 of

2001 we had the worst attack and the loss of civilian life in our Nation's history. We know that the aftermath of that has cost us over \$100 billion in direct appropriations. We also know, Mr. Speaker, that it has created a very, very large drain on our Nation's economy, and there are people out there who are hurting.

Last November 14, we passed out of the House of Representatives a bill to make sure that there would be no interruption in unemployment benefits that were provided. Unfortunately, the Senate did not bring that measure up. But they did, however, pass a bill that is identical to this. A bill that is identical to this measure passed the Democratic-controlled United States Senate. This is the measure which was known as the Clinton-Nichols bill. Senator CLINTON from New York who got her start in elective office thanks to my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), who encouraged her from the outset, as the author of this measure that we are going to be voting on today. I believe that this is a measure which will go a long way towards mitigating the pain which has come about because of the aftermath of September 11 and the economic downturn.

So that is why this measure should enjoy broad bipartisan support. As the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) pointed out, we do have, in fact, in the rules of the House, since this is the second day of the 108th Congress, I underscore again, we have guaranteed the minority the right to a motion to recommit, so they will have a chance to deal with this issue if they want to in a different way. But I underscore the fact that the measure we are going to be voting on today is a bipartisan measure. It passed unanimously, under unanimous consent in the Senate.

So in light of the fact that it has passed there and we have this measure here, we want to make sure that there is no interruption. One of the reasons that we need to make sure that this is done today is so that there is not an interruption. We want to pass this bill so that we can get it to the President's desk, so that he can sign the bill to ensure that we get this much-needed assistance to those who are hurting.

Now, a number of my colleagues have today gotten up and talked about the President's plan that he unveiled yesterday in Chicago to get the economy moving, and I heard criticism of the opportunity to eliminate double taxation of dividends. We know, Mr. Speaker, that more than half of the American people are members of the investor class.

□ 1045

They have over the past several years been involved in some kind of investment. Guess what? Most of us who are members of the investor class have suffered because of the economic downturn. We all know that.

One of the things we need to do is we need to encourage investment. I be-

lieve that the President's proposal that he unveiled yesterday will go a long way towards doing that. The by-product is that it will create jobs and opportunity out there for people who are hurting today, those people who we are going to be assisting with this plan that we have to extend unemployment benefits.

I yesterday introduced legislation which I believe can help make the President's plan even better. It gets back to an issue that my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), and I have worked on for years. That has to do with the capital gains tax.

A lot of people say, when we talk about a capital gains tax, they laughingly say, who has capital gains? We have had tremendous losses. Why would you think about cutting the capital gains tax?

H.R. 44, which I introduced yesterday, will bring about a halving of the top rate on capital gains from 20 percent to 10 percent, and from 10 percent to 5 percent for those in the 15 percent bracket for those who prospectively invest. We believe that having a 1-year holding period will guarantee that.

While some argue that it creates a loss in revenues to the Federal Treasury, it in fact will not do that. It will create, obviously, that 1-year holding period, so we are going to see revenues increase to the Treasury, but there would be absolutely no cost regardless of how we score it in the first year because of the fact that we would have had that 1-year holding period.

But it encourages people to get into the market, and allows them to have that top rate go from 20 percent down to 10 percent if they get in and realize some kind of capital gains during that period of time. It is during a 2-year window, and I think that is the kind of thing which, once again, can encourage savings, investment, and productivity.

These are the kinds of things we are working on. So while we are unfortunately, unfortunately in a position where we have no choice but to extend unemployment benefits, and we very much want to do that because we know people are suffering, the key thing for us to do as a Congress is to make sure that we create incentives for people to invest and save and produce.

So that is why this is a very fair rule. It is one which I believe will create a good opportunity for us to deal with the challenges that are out there. I urge my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, to support it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3¼ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, those of us that come from urban communities know of circumstances when someone is grabbed by the police and they are

interrogated, and they have what is called a "good cop-bad cop" rule. The good cop talks about compassion and sensitivity and why he is our friend, and why he wants to help us; but the bad cop is the one that is mean-spirited, the one that is in the back, and the one that ultimately is going to see that we get hurt.

Our beloved President is the good cop. He is the one that talks about conservatism, but with compassion. He is the one that says that he does not know why the Congress did not take care of the 800,000 people who lost their unemployment compensation after the Christmas holidays.

But, Mr. Speaker, someplace in the House of Representatives lurks the bad cop. He was the one that would not allow us to vote for workmen's compensation before we left here for the Christmas holidays. While the President talks about unemployment compensation and benefits, and while all of us will be voting for the President's package, the bad cop is there saying, yes, but do not give benefits to the 1 million people whose extended benefits have expired, that have worked every day, that have paid into the unemployment compensation, that are looking for jobs.

The bad cop says that we cannot afford to help those million people. Eighty-four thousand New Yorkers who took the hit for 9-11, not for our city, not for our State, but for the United States of America and for the free world, they are looking for work. They are looking to listen to the good cop. They are looking for compassion.

But the bad cop says, no, we will help you later, much later, because we have to cut taxes on dividends. And if you live long enough and survive long enough, you will be able to get a job. Where is the compassion?

But, Mr. Speaker, I am just as hard-nosed as any Republican that is in this House. I know when one wins the majority, he or she wins the votes and does what they want to do. The difference between me and the bad cop is that I thought we had the right to come here and at least debate our position. If Members do not want the substitute that really takes care, in a small part, of a million people who are seeking work, why do they not give us a chance to at least debate it? How does the bad cop just cut off debate, and then they tell us that we have a motion to recommit?

So all we are saying is, can we not lose with dignity? Can we not lose with compassion? Can they not give us a chance, as they have found \$675 billion for the wealthy, to at least let us debate to provide unemployment compensation benefits for a million people? If they will not give us the substitute, could they not waive the point of order for at least the motion to recommit?

No, Mr. Speaker, the bad cop is in charge here, and the compassionate cop remains in the White House.

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

Mr. Speaker, what we are trying to work on today is a bill that was passed by the Senate last night. Last year, this House passed a bill very similar to this. We tried to do the very best we could. The process is that two bodies of Congress, the House and Senate, have to get together. That is what is happening today.

Yesterday, the Senate acted, or last night. Immediately last night the Committee on Rules had a meeting. We had a hearing where we talked directly about this bill. Today it is on the floor. I think we are doing the timely things. I think we are doing the right things. I do not think we are delaying this in any manner. It is process, and it is a process that we intend to follow.

I am proud that we had this on the floor today, and I am also proud that by presenting this rule and by having this debate perhaps as early as tonight or tomorrow the President of the United States, George W. Bush, will have the chance to sign this bill. That is what this is about. I am proud that we are able to do that today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the gentleman who is to be chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished friend and colleague for yielding time to me.

I rise in support of S. 23, which will provide a 5-month extension of the Federal emergency unemployment insurance benefits. I do so both as a member of the Committee on the Budget with an interest in the enforcement of the budget resolution deemed in effect for fiscal year 2003, and as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, under whose jurisdiction this legislation has been prepared.

This measure is not inexpensive. The bill carries a \$7.25 billion price tag for fiscal year 2003, and moreover, that price tag fails to take into account an additional \$650 billion in costs that the Congressional Budget Office will recognize for this bill when it adjusts its budget projections at the end of this month.

However, for those among the Nation's unemployed, they will find this to be a lifeline. They will find a lifeline in this legislation that will help them pay their bills, help them pay their family's bills, while they continue to look for work.

As the incoming chairman of the committee charged with enforcing the budget resolution, I must, however, point out that S. 23 will exceed the budget resolution which the House adopted for fiscal year 2003 in March of last year. It would specifically exceed the allocation for the Committee on Ways and Means by \$5.69 billion in budget authority for 2003, and by \$1.9 billion in budget authority during the period 2003-2007.

I, however, like the President and most in Congress, recognize the seriousness of the Nation's continuing

challenge regarding the unemployment rate. We must take into consideration and we must take that action now to ensure economic security for families of those who have been unemployed as a result of the continuing economic trauma our Nation has suffered since the September 11 terrorist attacks.

It is with understandable reluctance that I would ever support bringing a bill to the floor that exceeds the budget resolution, but I believe that it may be warranted during periods of economic instability and insecurity. This is one of them.

As of December 28, 2002, more than 800,000 American workers have had their eligibility for unemployment insurance benefits terminated. Although they have not yet found new jobs, S. 23 will prevent these workers and others who exhaust the benefits prior to May of this year from having their benefits terminated.

In summary, I support this bill despite its cost because of my concern for Iowa workers and American workers who may have a hard time finding jobs during this period of instability and challenging unemployment rate. More important, I commit to drafting a budget again this year which will support and help strengthen the economic recovery and encourage long-term economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of S. 23, and I urge support of this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am fascinated by the comments of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have this new-found compassion for the plight of the unemployed in our country. There is nothing like spending a couple of weeks at home with constituents to open one's eyes.

After months of callously ignoring the unemployed American workers, the Republican majority turned tail and adjourned the 107th Congress without providing any unemployment compensation for people out of work, providing nothing. Now, after almost 800,000 Americans lost their unemployment benefits on December 28, the majority acts like they have seen the light and that they are fully supportive of helping the unemployed.

But while we consider a bill to help these 800,000 Americans, there are 1 million American workers who have already exhausted their benefits who will not be covered by the bill that we are considering today. This is wrong. The selective assistance the majority is attempting to provide does not come soon enough, does not go far enough, and will not help enough. Congress should provide unemployment assistance to every worker who needs it. The bill that we are considering today does not do that.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), on behalf of the minority, offered a substitute in the Committee on Rules last night, but the majority, in the now-traditional House spirit of nonbipartisanship, denied us the opportunity to even consider the substitute. Our substitute would extend unemployment benefits by 26 weeks instead of 13 weeks for people losing their unemployment compensation during the first half of this year, and it would provide an additional 13 weeks to the 1 million jobless Americans who exhausted their benefits last year. There is no question we need to help the unemployed, but we should not be providing selective assistance. Unemployed Americans deserve better than this.

I would say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, if they do not want to help these people, it is their right to do nothing. They could vote against the Rangel substitute. But they should not deny us the opportunity to try to bring this substitute to the floor and debate our position and have an up-or-down vote. They can vote no if they want to, but we should all have that opportunity to vote up or down.

They give speeches about democracy in all these countries all around the world. We need a little democracy here in the United States House of Representatives. We should not be denied the opportunity to bring this substitute to the floor. This is supposed to be the people's House. The people should work their will. We should not be denied this opportunity. It is outrageous that they are not giving us the opportunity to help these 1 million workers who have exhausted their benefits.

I would urge Members to vote no on this rule as a protest to the fact that we are being denied the right to offer a substitute to help these people.

□ 1100

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

Mr. Speaker, speech after speech we hear about how we have been delayed in this process. I agree. Part of the process is, however, that the two bodies, the House and the Senate, have a process. What we are doing today is taking a Senate bill that is even more generous than the one which the Senate passed last year. We are accepting this because we believe it is the right thing to do.

Our President, George W. Bush, spoke very clearly and very passionately about his belief that when the House of Representatives and the Senate would come back, this was several weeks ago when he spoke, that he was asking us to make sure that we held the necessary meetings and committee mark-ups to make sure that this bill did come to the floor. That is what we are doing today. I am proud of what we are doing. I offer no apologies for what our party stands for.

We are here on the floor of the House of Representatives as a majority party with a great bill. It happens to be a better bill now than what was marked up last year and passed by the United States Senate. But it is one that we agree on, and it is one that we should be proud of.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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, it has been said here that unfortunately the 107th adjourned without passage of a bill like this. I was here with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) that day of sine die adjournment. We tried to bring up this issue. We were thwarted by the Republican majority. We asked that we bring up the Senate bill. Unanimous consent is all that was needed.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) says the President has spoken passionately. On that day the President was silent. Now there has been political pressure. Now some of the faces of the unemployed have appeared in the newspapers and on television. And so now you are ready to act. The Senate has acted. But, look, I think we can do better and there is time for us to do even better.

One of my colleagues on the Republican side said there should be no interruptions to those who are hurting, if I got the words down correctly. What about the million who have exhausted their extended benefits and who are hurting? To the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), 56,000 from your State. The gentleman from Iowa talked about the unemployed in his State. How about the 8,500-plus who have exhausted their benefits and who are looking for work who are hurting. Why do we not act?

Well, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) talks about the budget process. You are waiving it today up to a point. There is an unwillingness to waive it to let us bring up coverage of those who have exhausted their benefits. There is \$25 billion in the trust fund for this purpose. And our proposal would include enough people so that everybody would be covered within the \$25 billion.

Look, I remember so vividly on that day when we adjourned sine die, we held a press conference, and distributed by the Republicans on the Committee on Ways and Means "Debunking Liberal Myths on the Unemployment Picture." That was distributed as we came out of the press conference. "Debunking liberal Myths on the Unemployment Picture."

Look, I suggest to people who think unemployment is a liberal myth, talk to the unemployed when you go home tomorrow. Talk to their families. Find

out the trials and the tribulations. I think if you will do that, you will agree today we could have done even better. We could have done better.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I have no further speakers. I would like to inquire from the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) as to how many speakers and the time remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 13¾ minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I do have three or four more speakers, Mr. Speaker.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose, and strenuously oppose, this bill. It is fundamentally unfair. We talk in this body about the need for open and fair debate, but the Republicans have shut off the Democrats' ideas on this very important subject, how we can help those people who are unemployed.

Years ago the legendary singer Marvin Gaye had a song out called "What's Going On." Let me talk about what is going on. September 11 and its aftermath are going on, mergers, bankruptcy, failed dot-coms, closed plants, airline restructuring, corporate downsizing. That is what is going on in America. And the bottom line is people are unemployed.

Now, today we could have a debate about two opposing views, the Democrats and the Republicans. Let us talk about what Democrats would do versus the Republicans' approach to Americans who are unemployed.

First, those people we call exhaustees, those who have exhausted their benefits. There are 1 million Americans who have exhausted their benefits. The Democrats would give them 13 weeks of additional benefits. The Republican plan before us today gives them zero. That is unfair.

Let us talk about what we call new entries, that is, the 93,000 people each week who become unemployed, exhaust all of their benefits at the State level. The Democrats would give them 26 weeks, roughly 6½ months. The Republicans would only give them 3½ months, 13 weeks. The Democrat plan is clearly fair. And critically the people who have been cut off, 800,000 workers were cut off on December 28. The Democrats would give them a total of 26 weeks. The Republicans say, well, whatever is left, that is what you get. If you only have 2 weeks of benefits left, you only get 2 weeks of unemployment benefits. That is not fair.

Now the Republicans say we do not want to talk about unemployment. We want to talk about growth and that is why we are proposing to give a big tax

break to the wealthy in the form of eliminating the tax on dividends and that will spur growth in jobs. Sounds good, does it not?

The problem is that conservative compassion or compassionate conservatism is out of sync because their job creation comes sometimes years after these people are unemployed. They need benefits and help now. Then if the jobs come, fine. But we ought to be helping Americans now and the Republicans do not do it. That is tragedy. I will vote down this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for yielding me time.

The President is intent on going to war. He continues to take us down a path to war. The papers carry today the story that the stimulus package is going to be eaten up by the war. You can pour that \$700 billion into the economy, and it will not do any good because nobody is going to invest, which means we are going to continue to have long-term unemployment.

My State has the highest rate of unemployment. The distinguished gentleman from California says, well, they are going to get some money from the stimulus package when they get their capital gains excuse there.

I am going to tell the 30,000 people in my State that are not covered by this bill that we will try to get an address where they can go and get their money for their non-existent tax benefits.

This is a travesty, and what you are doing is you are putting a little Band-Aid on it today because you have got public pressure. You will be back. I guarantee you will be back in March. You will be out here saying, well, amazingly, the economy has not picked up. We do not know what to do, so we have to give a few more benefits, a few more nickels and dimes out the door.

If you continue down this path to war and spend the money out of the Treasury of the United States in a stupid tax giveaway to the wealthy, 70 percent of the people in this country will not get more than a \$100 out of it. If you think that is a stimulus to the economy, you do not understand ordinary people.

So you are wasting \$700 billion. You are taking us into a senseless war, and you will not take care of people who are sitting in your own districts. And you will not let us debate it. You say, well, we have the budget, we have the budget, you know, we have to keep the budget in balance. You gave that up and you are going to give it up.

The President says we are having a wartime budget. So in a wartime budget you do not have to worry about what is going on. You can just spend money on all kinds of things but not on the unemployed, even though the \$25 billion is sitting right in the account right now, and they will not acquire a damn dime.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members that remarks in debate should avoid profanity.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we live in a cold world, and we are in a cold and somewhat impassioned Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, we live in a world that does not seem to care that people who deserve or get unemployment insurance are, in fact, the workers of America who have built this Nation. Now we have a bill given by now the singular government of the United States, Republican Presidency, Republican Senate, Republican House. There is no two-party system in this Nation, which means that the railroad train, the train of no return, will be the legislative call of the day.

How in the world can you argue that we live in a democracy when you are denying the opposition the right to present their proposal that will, in fact, save families and save lives?

The Democrats realize that people are unemployed because there is no work. And the Bill Clinton administration, in the first term he created 11 million jobs in America. Right now the Bush administration has seen 2 million jobs go down the drain. So are you telling me that the 56,000 people in the State of Texas are ne're-do-wells who do not want to work? No.

They have fallen upon hard times. They are trying to work. Their mortgage payments are coming. The college tuition payments are coming. The car payments are coming. And we are leaving them to fall on their spears.

We have got a war that we do not need that is costing us a trillion dollars, but yet a lousy \$7.2 billion is all we are going to give. We cannot afford to give 26 full weeks and pay for the million people that are about to lose their homes right now because they are not included in this bill that we have to vote for. I never knew or thought as a child growing up in America that had unemployed parents, saw the hardship of trying to make ends meet, borrowing from relatives to stay alive, that we would have a government that would be so uncaring, that we would stand here and force down this legislative initiative because we do not like the opposition, because we are in control now.

The only thing I can say is that this is an abomination and Lord have mercy on all of us as we try to be compassionate for those who are in need.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

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

Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat painful to say that we begin the 108th Congress today with new Members, a new majority in the Senate under Republican control, a Republican-controlled House, a Republican in the White House, and the first order of legislative business in the 108th Congress in the year 2003 is a plan which gags the minority party in the greatest democracy in the world to discuss something very important to millions of Americans who are working and about to lose their jobs or who are trying to work but cannot find a job. It is difficult to believe that today, January 8 of 2003, that in the House of Representatives, the people's House, we will not have an opportunity to discuss how we can provide unemployment benefits, emergency unemployment benefits to a million Americans who are struggling to find work.

In my State of California, over 100,000 Americans are out of a job and are trying to find ways to put food on the table. But in this House of Representatives, I cannot put a proposal before my colleagues for a vote, whether it wins or loses, up or down, to decide whether or not those 1 million Americans, and more than 100,000 of them in my State of California, cannot see unemployment benefits extended for them as this proposal would do for some other Americans.

□ 1115

Why Peter gets it and Paul does not, I do not understand, but that is the case, and when we look at the sad history of this, we see that a year ago, less than a year ago, a few months ago, Democrats put a proposal to do exactly what is on the table now, to extend benefits.

At the end of last year, when we knew that people were losing work, when we knew that on December 28, close to a million people would run out of benefits and that we knew more than 80,000 people a week were becoming unemployed and without unemployment benefits, this Congress did try to do something, at least the Democratic side of the Congress.

We had a proposal under the leadership of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) to provide those extended benefits, but we could not get it heard in this House for the same reason we cannot have the proposal heard today. We were gagged. It was bad then but it is shameful today that we begin a new session on what should be a bipartisan note for Americans who are looking for work, and we cannot do it.

Yet just yesterday the President proposed close to \$700 billion worth of tax cuts to help mostly wealthy investors, not folks who are out there working with their hands, but folks who invested money and can make money because the company happens to earn a little bit more on their stock. The folks who are willing to use their legs,

their hands, their minds, who are right now out of work, will not get any assistance, not just one American, not just 1,000 Americans, but about a million Americans.

I am going to go back to California. If we pass something I will be able to tell some of my Californians and colleagues there we got them that extended benefit that they needed to put food on the table, but I am going, in the same moment, to turn over to the next American in California and say, sorry, I could not even take a vote to see if I could extend their benefits. That is not the note we should start on, but that is the note that this Congress and the House of Representatives starts on.

I believe we have an opportunity today to change that. We should not for us, not for politicians but for hard-working Americans who probably will not even listen to this debate, but this is still their House, this is the people's House, and we should do the people's work, and to leave today or tomorrow or this week, as we did back in December, without concluding the work for our working Americans who are seeking jobs is unfair, too little too late. Let us do something right. Let us do it for all Americans, not just for some.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

Today, we have had a fabulous debate, an opportunity to have people from both parties, both sides of the aisle to be able to talk about this bill that is before us, S. 23. It is a Senate bill. It is an agreement that was reached in the other body just last night.

Last night, this body, through the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) had the Committee on Rules come into order. We had a hearing last night. We talked about this important issue. We deliberated. We heard from both sides. We followed the process. That process that the Committee on Rules went through is one that this body has gone through for many years, and we came up with a product.

The product that we chose was exactly the same bill that the Senate had approved last year but made better, and was done all last night.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Texas to yield for a unanimous consent.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, it is my time and I do not choose to yield at this time. I am offering to close as is provided for by the rules, and I will allow the gentlewoman to insert something into the RECORD if that is a request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Does the gentlewoman have a request?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I meant to say at the end of my time that we will call for a vote on the previous question. If it is defeated, we

have an amendment to the rule, that we would like to offer the Rangel substitute for 26 weeks of extended benefits. We are concerned that we were denied an opportunity to put that on the floor, and by voting no on the previous question we will be able to substitute.

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 14 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

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 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. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by Representative Thomas of California and Representative Rangel of New York; (2) the amendment specified in section 2, if offered by Representative Rangel of New York or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Sec. 2. The amendment referred to in the first section of this resolution is as follows:

H.R.—

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

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.

“(i) 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. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yielded to the gentlewoman for the purpose of allowing something to be placed into the RECORD. It is my time and I wish to gain that time back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman may insert her comments into the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker for allowing the gentlewoman to insert that into the RECORD.

So now we are at the point where we have completed part of the process where we are going to vote on the rule, and in a few minutes, I assume after a vote on that, then we will have a debate where we will talk about the substance further of the bill. This has allowed both parties the time to place forward their ideas, and for anyone to think that we have not allowed free time or gagged someone to tell them what they can or cannot discuss is simply ludicrous. That is why we allow the time on the floor.

I am proud of what the Committee on Rules has done. I am proud of the debate that we have had today, and I look forward to the President of the United States having an opportunity, perhaps as early as this afternoon or tomorrow, to sign this bill to get these benefits to the people that need it the most. I am proud of what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule and the underlying legislation which is so critical.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this closed rule and to speak about the need for extending unemployment benefits. I’m happy to see that our Republican colleagues have finally gotten around to agreeing with us that the working people of this country need help in the economic downturn that is plaguing our country. Democrats tried to pass emergency extensions for unemployed workers across the country during our November session, but the Republican leadership only wanted to extend benefits for unemployed workers in Alaska, Oregon, and Washington.

What did this legislative delay mean for my 9th California district? It meant that three days after Christmas almost 7,500 in the Oakland metropolitan area lost their federal extended unemployment benefits. It meant that these people, who are already struggling in an environment of high housing costs, are struggling to survive. It meant that in an economy that is already miserable we had fewer spending consumers.

I applaud the fact that the Republicans have agreed to extend unemployment benefits, and I will vote for this legislation. But I also want to insist that we do more. For those people who have exhausted their benefits, for instance, the President’s plan provides no more help. On the other hand, the Democratic legislation would provide 13 weeks more of benefits for those who have already exhausted their extended federal benefits, perhaps the people with the greatest need.

President Bush’s so-called economic stimulus package spends billions to fatten the wal-

lets of the wealthy, but our plan focuses aid on lower- and middle-class workers who need that help immediately.

That’s why I urge a “no” vote on this closed rule.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Before placing the question, 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 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 5-minute votes 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 ordering the previous question.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 196, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—224

| | | |
|----------|--------|--------------|
| Aderholt | Bachus | Ballenger |
| Akin | Baker | Barrett (SC) |

Bartlett (MD) Gillmor Otter
Barton (TX) Gingrey Oxley
Bass Goode Paul
Beauprez Goodlatte Pearce
Bereuter Goss Pence
Biggert Granger Peterson (PA)
Bilirakis Graves Petri
Bishop (UT) Green (WI) Pickering
Blackburn Greenwood Pitts
Blunt Gutknecht Platts
Boehrlert Harris Pombo
Boehmer Hart Porter
Bonilla Hastings (WA) Portman
Bonner Hayes Pryce (OH)
Bono Hayworth Putnam
Boozman Hefley Quinn
Bradley (NH) Hensarling Radanovich
Brady (TX) Herger Ramstad
Brown (SC) Hobson Regula
Brown-Waite, Hoekstra Rehberg
Ginny Hostettler Renzi
Burgess Houghton Reynolds
Burns Hulshof Rogers (AL)
Burr Hunter Rogers (KY)
Burton (IN) Hyde Rogers (MI)
Buyer Isakson Rohrabacher
Calvert Issa Ros-Lehtinen
Camp Istook Royce
Cannon Janklow Ryan (WI)
Cantor Jenkins Ryon (KS)
Capito Johnson (CT) Saxton
Carter Johnson (IL) Schrock
Castle Johnson, Sam Sensenbrenner
Chabot Jones (NC) Sessions
Chocola Keller Shadegg
Coble Kelly Shaw
Cole Kennedy (MN) Shays
Collins King (IA) Sherwood
Combest King (NY) Shimkus
Cox Kingston Shuster
Crane Kirk Simmons
Crenshaw Kline Simpson
Cubin Knollenberg Smith (MI)
Culberson Kolbe Smith (NJ)
Cunningham LaHood Smith (TX)
Davis, Jo Ann Latham Souder
Davis, Tom LaTourette Stearns
Deal (GA) Leach Sullivan
DeLay Lewis (CA) Sweeney
DeMint Lewis (KY) Tancredo
Diaz-Balart, L. Linder Tauzin
Doolittle LoBiondo Taylor (NC)
Dreier Lucas (OK) Terry
Duncan Manzullo Thomas
Dunn McCotter Thornberry
Ehlers McCrery Tiahrt
Emerson McHugh Tiberi
English McInnis Toomey
Everett McKeon Turner (OH)
Feeney Mica Upton
Ferguson Miller (FL) Vitter
Flake Miller (MI) Walden (OR)
Fletcher Miller, Gary Walsh
Foley Moran (KS) Wamp
Forbes Murphy Weldon (FL)
Fossella Musgrave Weldon (PA)
Franks (AZ) Ney Whitfield
Frelinghuysen Northup Wicker
Gallegly Norwood Wilson (NM)
Garrett (NJ) Nunes Wilson (SC)
Gerlach Nussle Wolf
Gibbons Osborne Young (AK)
Gilchrest Ose Young (FL)

NAYS—196

Abercrombie Ballance Blumenauer
Ackerman Becerra Boswell
Alexander Bell Boucher
Allen Berkley Boyd
Andrews Berman Brady (PA)
Baca Berry Brown (OH)
Baird Bishop (GA) Brown, Corrine
Baldwin Bishop (NY) Capps

Capuano Jackson-Lee Pastor
Cardoza (TX) Payne
Carson (IN) Jefferson Pelosi
Carson (OK) John Peterson (MN)
Case Johnson, E. B. Pomeroy
Clay Jones (OH) Price (NC)
Clyburn Kanjorski Rahall
Cooper Kaptur Rangel
Costello Kennedy (RI) Reyes
Cramer Kildee Rodriguez
Crowley Kleczka Ross
Cummings Kucinich Rothman
Davis (AL) Lampson Roybal-Allard
Davis (CA) Langevin Ruppertsberger
Davis (FL) Lantos Rush
Davis (IL) Larsen (WA) Ryan (OH)
Davis (TN) Larson (CT) Sabo
DeFazio Lee Sanchez, Linda
DeGette Levin T.
DeLauro Lewis (GA) Sanchez, Loretta
Deutsch Lipinski Sanders
Dicks Lofgren Sandlin
Dingell Lowey Schakowsky
Doggett Lucas (KY) Schiff
Dooley (CA) Lynch Scott (GA)
Doyle Maloney Scott (VA)
Edwards Markey Serrano
Emanuel Marshall Sherman
Engel Matheson Skelton
Eshoo McCarthy (MO) Slaughter
Etheridge McCarthy (NY) Smith (WA)
Evans McColium Snyder
Farr McDermott Solis
Fattah McGovern Spratt
Filner McIntyre Stark
Ford McNulty Strickland
Frank (MA) Meehan Stupak
Frost Meek (FL) Tanner
Gephardt Meeke (NY) Tauscher
Gonzalez Menendez Taylor (MS)
Gordon Michaud Thompson (CA)
Green (TX) Millender Thompson (MS)
Grijalva McDonald Tierney
Gutierrez Miller (NC) Turner (TX)
Hall Mollohan Udall (CO)
Harman Moore Udall (NM)
Hastings (FL) Moran (VA) Van Hollen
Hill Murtha Velazquez
Hinchev Nadler Visclosky
Hinojosa Napolitano Waters
Hoefel Neal (MA) Watson
Holden Oberstar Watt
Obey Waxman
Olver Weiner
Ortiz Wexler
Owens Woolsey
Pallone Israel Wu
Pascrell Pascrell Wynn

NOT VOTING—13

Cardin Kind Stenholm
Conyers Majette Towns
Delahunt Miller, George Weller
Diaz-Balart, M. Myrick
Kilpatrick Nethercutt

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1144

Mr. STARK changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. STEARNS and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

As stated for: Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 5 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 5 I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

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

The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolutions 5 and 14, I am submitting for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the committees' spending allocations contemplated by section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Washington, DC, January 8, 2003.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Office of the Speaker, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Section 2 of House Resolution 14 provides that I may submit the 302(a) allocations contemplated by House Concurrent Resolution 353 of the One Hundred Seventh Congress, as adopted by the House.

The attached tables, which I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, provide that information.

Sincerely, JIM NUSSLE.

Attachments.

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES 1—APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

(In millions of dollars)

Table with columns for Committee, Type, and Year (2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, Total 200-2007, Total 203-2012). Rows include General Purpose, Highways, Mass Transit, Conservation, Total Discretionary Action, and Current Law Mandatory.

* Shown for display purposes only. 1 Reflecting allocation adjustments through the end of the 107th Congress.

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES 1—COMMITTEES OTHER THAN APPROPRIATIONS

(By fiscal year in millions of dollars)

Table with columns for Committee, Type, and Year (2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, Total 200-2007, Total 203-2012). Rows include Agriculture Committee (Current Law Base, Discretionary Action, Total) and Armed Services Committee (Current Law Base).