

[Roll No. 409]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie Davis, David
Ackerman Davis, Lincoln
Aderholt Davis, Tom
Akin Deal (GA)
Alexander DeFazio
Allen DeGette
Altmire Delahunt
Andrews DeLauro
Arcuri Dent
Baca Diaz-Balart, L.
Bachmann Diaz-Balart, M.
Bachus Dicks
Baird Dingell
Baldwin Donnelly
Barrett (SC) Doolittle
Barrow Doyle
Bartlett (MD) Drake
Barton (TX) Dreier
Bean Duncan
Becerra Edwards
Berkley Ehlers
Berman Ellison
Berry Ellsworth
Biggert Emanuel
Blibray Emerson
Bilirakis Engel
Bishop (GA) English (PA)
Bishop (NY) Eshoo
Bishop (UT) Etheridge
Blackburn Everett
Blumenauer Fallin
Blunt Farr
Boehner Fattah
Bonner Feeney
Bono Mack Ferguson
Boozman Filner
Boren Forbes
Boswell Fortenberry
Boucher Fossella
Boustany Foster
Boyd (FL) Foxx
Boyd (KS) Frank (MA)
Brady (PA) Franks (AZ)
Brady (TX) Frelinghuysen
Brown (SC) Gallegly
Brown, Corrine Garrett (NJ)
Brown-Waite, Gerlach
Ginny Giffords
Buchanan Gilchrest
Burgess Gillibrand
Burton (IN) Gingrey
Butterfield Gohmert
Buyer Gonzalez
Calvert Goode
Camp (MI) Goodlatte
Campbell (CA) Goodlatte
Cannon Granger
Cantor Graves
Capito Green, Al
Capps Green, Gene
Capuano Grijalva
Cardoza Gutierrez
Carnahan Hall (NY)
Carney Hall (TX)
Carson Hare
Carter Harman
Castle Hastings (FL)
Castor Hastings (WA)
Cazayoux Hayes
Chabot Heller
Chandler Hensarling
Childers Herger
Clarke Herseth Sandlin
Clay Hill
Clever Hinchey
Clyburn Hinojosa
Coble Hirono
Cohen Hobson
Cole (OK) Hodes
Conaway Hoekstra
Conyers Holden
Cooper Holt
Costa Honda
Costello Hooley
Courtney Hoyer
Cramer Hunter
Crenshaw Inglis (SC)
Crowley Inslee
Cubin Israel
Cuellar Issa
Culberson Jackson (IL)
Cummings Jackson-Lee
Davis (AL) (TX)
Davis (CA) Jefferson
Davis (IL) Johnson (GA)
Davis (KY) Johnson (IL)

Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver

Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skeltton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Kind
Loeb sack
McCrary
Meeks (NY)
Moran (KS)
Ortiz
Paul
Rogers (MI)
Rush
Stark
Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain on this vote.

□ 1224

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to advance medical research and treatments into pediatric cancers, ensure patients and families have access to information regarding pediatric cancers and current treatments for such cancers, establish a national childhood cancer registry, and promote public awareness of pediatric cancer."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMERGENCY EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 2008

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1265, I call up the bill (H.R. 5749) to provide for a program of emergency unemployment compensation, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5749

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 Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2008".

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Federal-State agreements.
Sec. 3. Emergency unemployment compensation account.
Sec. 4. Payments to States having agreements for the payment of emergency unemployment compensation.
Sec. 5. Financing provisions.
Sec. 6. Fraud and overpayments.
Sec. 7. Definitions.
Sec. 8. Applicability.

SEC. 2. FEDERAL-STATE AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any State which desires to do so may enter into and participate in an agreement under this Act with the Secretary of Labor (in this Act referred to as the "Secretary"). Any State which is a party to an agreement under this Act may, upon providing 30 days' written notice to the Secretary, terminate such agreement.

(b) PROVISIONS OF AGREEMENT.—Any agreement under subsection (a) shall provide that the State agency of the State will make payments of emergency unemployment compensation to individuals who—

(1) have exhausted all rights to regular compensation under the State law or under Federal law with respect to a benefit year (excluding any benefit year that ended before May 1, 2007);

(2) have no rights to regular compensation or extended compensation with respect to a week under such law or any other State unemployment compensation law or to compensation under any other Federal law; and

(3) are not receiving compensation with respect to such week under the unemployment compensation law of Canada.

(c) EXHAUSTION OF BENEFITS.—For purposes of subsection (b)(1), an individual shall be deemed to have exhausted such individual's rights to regular compensation under a State law when—

(1) no payments of regular compensation can be made under such law because such individual has received all regular compensation available to such individual based on employment or wages during such individual's base period; or

(2) such individual's rights to such compensation have been terminated by reason of the expiration of the benefit year with respect to which such rights existed.

(d) WEEKLY BENEFIT AMOUNT, ETC.—For purposes of any agreement under this Act—

(1) the amount of emergency unemployment compensation which shall be payable to any individual for any week of total unemployment shall be equal to the amount of the regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable to such individual during such individual's benefit year under the State law for a week of total unemployment;

(2) the terms and conditions of the State law which apply to claims for regular compensation and to the payment thereof shall apply to claims for emergency unemployment compensation and the payment thereof, except where otherwise inconsistent with the provisions of this Act or with the regulations or operating instructions of the Secretary promulgated to carry out this Act; and

(3) the maximum amount of emergency unemployment compensation payable to any individual for whom an emergency unemployment compensation account is established under section 3 shall not exceed the amount established in such account for such individual.

(e) **ELECTION BY STATES.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal law (and if State law permits), the Governor of a State that is in an extended benefit period may provide for the payment of emergency unemployment compensation prior to extended compensation to individuals who otherwise meet the requirements of this section.

SEC. 3. EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACCOUNT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Any agreement under this Act shall provide that the State will establish, for each eligible individual who files an application for emergency unemployment compensation, an emergency unemployment compensation account with respect to such individual's benefit year.

(b) **AMOUNT IN ACCOUNT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The amount established in an account under subsection (a) shall be equal to the lesser of—

(A) 50 percent of the total amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable to the individual during the individual's benefit year under such law, or

(B) 13 times the individual's average weekly benefit amount for the benefit year.

(2) **WEEKLY BENEFIT AMOUNT.**—For purposes of this subsection, an individual's weekly benefit amount for any week is the amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) under the State law payable to such individual for such week for total unemployment.

(c) **SPECIAL RULE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, if, at the time that the individual's account is exhausted, such individual's State is in an extended benefit period (as determined under paragraph (2)), then, such account shall be augmented by an amount equal to the amount originally established in such account (as determined under subsection (b)(1)).

(2) **EXTENDED BENEFIT PERIOD.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), a State shall be considered to be in an extended benefit period if, at the time of exhaustion (as described in paragraph (1))—

(A) such a period is then in effect for such State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970;

(B) such a period would then be in effect for such State under such Act if section 203(d) of such Act—

(i) were applied by substituting "4" for "5" each place it appears; and

(ii) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A); or

(C) such a period would then be in effect for such State under such Act if—

(i) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State (regardless of whether the State by law had provided for such application); and

(ii) such section 203(f)—

(i) were applied by substituting "6.0" for "6.5" in paragraph (1)(A)(i); and

(ii) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii).

SEC. 4. PAYMENTS TO STATES HAVING AGREEMENTS FOR THE PAYMENT OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.

(a) **GENERAL RULE.**—There shall be paid to each State that has entered into an agreement under this Act an amount equal to 100 percent of the emergency unemployment compensation paid to individuals by the State pursuant to such agreement.

(b) **TREATMENT OF REIMBURSABLE COMPENSATION.**—No payment shall be made to any State under this section in respect of any compensation to the extent the State is entitled to reimbursement in respect of such compensation under the provisions of any Federal law other than this Act or chapter 85 of title 5, United States Code. A State shall not be entitled to any reimbursement under such chapter 85 in respect of any compensation to the extent the State is entitled to reimbursement under this Act in respect of such compensation.

(c) **DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT.**—Sums payable to any State by reason of such State having an agreement under this Act shall be payable, either in advance or by way of reimbursement (as may be determined by the Secretary), in such amounts as the Secretary estimates the State will be entitled to receive under this Act for each calendar month, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any amount by which the Secretary finds that the Secretary's estimates for any prior calendar month were greater or less than the amounts which should have been paid to the State. Such estimates may be made on the basis of such statistical, sampling, or other method as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State agency of the State involved.

SEC. 5. FINANCING PROVISIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Funds in the extended unemployment compensation account (as established by section 905(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1105(a)) of the Unemployment Trust Fund (as established by section 904(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1104(a))) shall be used for the making of payments to States having agreements entered into under this Act.

(b) **CERTIFICATION.**—The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State the sums payable to such State under this Act. The Secretary of the Treasury, prior to audit or settlement by the Government Accountability Office, shall make payments to the State in accordance with such certification, by transfers from the extended unemployment compensation account (as so established) to the account of such State in the Unemployment Trust Fund (as so established).

(c) **ASSISTANCE TO STATES.**—There are appropriated out of the employment security administration account (as established by section 901(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1101(a)) of the Unemployment Trust Fund, without fiscal year limitation, such funds as may be necessary for purposes of assisting States (as provided in title III of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 501 et seq.)) in meeting the costs of administration of agreements under this Act.

(d) **APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN PAYMENTS.**—There are appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury, without fiscal year limitation, to the extended unemployment compensation account (as so established) of the Unemployment Trust Fund (as so established) such sums as the Secretary estimates to be necessary to make the payments under this section in respect of—

(1) compensation payable under chapter 85 of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) compensation payable on the basis of services to which section 3309(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 applies.

Amounts appropriated pursuant to the preceding sentence shall not be required to be repaid.

SEC. 6. FRAUD AND OVERPAYMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—If an individual knowingly has made, or caused to be made by another, a false statement or representation of a material fact, or knowingly has failed, or

caused another to fail, to disclose a material fact, and as a result of such false statement or representation or of such nondisclosure such individual has received an amount of emergency unemployment compensation under this Act to which he was not entitled, such individual—

(1) shall be ineligible for further emergency unemployment compensation under this Act in accordance with the provisions of the applicable State unemployment compensation law relating to fraud in connection with a claim for unemployment compensation; and

(2) shall be subject to prosecution under section 1001 of title 18, United States Code.

(b) **REPAYMENT.**—In the case of individuals who have received amounts of emergency unemployment compensation under this Act to which they were not entitled, the State shall require such individuals to repay the amounts of such emergency unemployment compensation to the State agency, except that the State agency may waive such repayment if it determines that—

(1) the payment of such emergency unemployment compensation was without fault on the part of any such individual; and

(2) such repayment would be contrary to equity and good conscience.

(c) **RECOVERY BY STATE AGENCY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The State agency may recover the amount to be repaid, or any part thereof, by deductions from any emergency unemployment compensation payable to such individual under this Act or from any unemployment compensation payable to such individual under any State or Federal unemployment compensation law administered by the State agency or under any other Federal law administered by the State agency which provides for the payment of any assistance or allowance with respect to any week of unemployment, during the 3-year period after the date such individuals received the payment of the emergency unemployment compensation to which they were not entitled, except that no single deduction may exceed 50 percent of the weekly benefit amount from which such deduction is made.

(2) **OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING.**—No repayment shall be required, and no deduction shall be made, until a determination has been made, notice thereof and an opportunity for a fair hearing has been given to the individual, and the determination has become final.

(d) **REVIEW.**—Any determination by a State agency under this section shall be subject to review in the same manner and to the same extent as determinations under the State unemployment compensation law, and only in that manner and to that extent.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the terms "compensation", "regular compensation", "extended compensation", "additional compensation", "benefit year", "base period", "State", "State agency", "State law", and "week" have the respective meanings given such terms under section 205 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note).

SEC. 8. APPLICABILITY.

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

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

(2) ending on or before February 1, 2009.

(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 3 as of the last day of

the last week (as determined in accordance with the applicable State law) ending on or before February 1, 2009, emergency unemployment compensation shall continue to be payable to such individual from such amounts for any week beginning after such last day for which the individual meets the eligibility requirements of this Act.

(2) LIMIT ON AUGMENTATION.—If the account of an individual is exhausted after the last day of such last week (as so determined), then section 3(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) LIMIT ON COMPENSATION.—No compensation shall be payable by reason of paragraph (1) for any week beginning after April 30, 2009.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I raise a point of order against consideration of this bill.

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

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I raise a point of order against consideration of this bill because the bill violates clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives which provides in pertinent part that "it shall not be in order to consider any bill if the provisions of such measure affecting direct spending and revenues have the net effect of increasing the deficit" over the 5- or 10-year budget scoring window.

This rule is commonly referred to as the pay-as-you-go rule or PAYGO and was enacted by the majority with great fanfare at the beginning of this Congress.

In reviewing the estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office, I note that they have scored this bill as increasing the deficit by \$14 billion over the next 5 years, and nearly \$10 billion over the coming decade.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the table prepared by the Congressional Budget Office appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, given this overwhelming evidence that this bill does have the net effect of increasing the deficit over both scoring windows, I must respectfully insist on my point of order that the bill violates the PAYGO rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard?

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I ask that the gentleman's motion receive the consideration it deserves.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois makes a point of order against consideration of H.R. 5749 on the ground that the bill includes provisions affecting direct spending or revenues that would have the net effect of increasing the Federal budget deficit. That point of order sounds in clause 10 of rule XXI.

The special order of business prescribed by the adoption of House Reso-

lution 1265 waives any such point of order. The Chair will read the operative sentence of House Resolution 1265: "All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 of rule XXI."

The Chair finds that the point of order raised by the gentleman from Illinois has been waived.

The Chair therefore holds that the point of order is overruled.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, on that I respectfully appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. RANGEL

Mr. RANGEL. I move to table the appeal.

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

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

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 185, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 410]

YEAS—217

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Lincoln

DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Gillibrand
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inlee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy

Kildee
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)

Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano

Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns

Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—185

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Forbes
Fortenberry

Fossella
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley (TX)
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary

Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Putnam
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—31

Baca
Braley (IA)
Davis (IL)
Dicks
Flake
Gonzalez
Gutierrez
Higgins
Hinojosa

Hulshof
Kagen
Kilpatrick
Kind
Loebach
Maloney (NY)
McCrery
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)

Murphy, Tim
Ortiz
Pence
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Reyes
Rogers (MI)

Rush Stark Walsh (NY)
Smith (NJ) Tancredo Wolf

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1245

So the motion to table was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SALAZAR). The Chair would clarify that the insertion by the gentleman from Illinois will appear separately from the point of order in the RECORD.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1265, in lieu of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 110-710 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

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 Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2008’’.

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

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Federal-State agreements.
- Sec. 3. Emergency unemployment compensation account.
- Sec. 4. Payments to States having agreements for the payment of emergency unemployment compensation.
- Sec. 5. Financing provisions.
- Sec. 6. Fraud and overpayments.
- Sec. 7. Definitions.
- Sec. 8. Applicability.

SEC. 2. FEDERAL-STATE AGREEMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Any State which desires to do so may enter into and participate in an agreement under this Act with the Secretary of Labor (in this Act referred to as the ‘‘Secretary’’). Any State which is a party to an agreement under this Act may, upon providing 30 days’ written notice to the Secretary, terminate such agreement.

(b) **PROVISIONS OF AGREEMENT.**—Any agreement under subsection (a) shall provide that the State agency of the State will make payments of emergency unemployment compensation to individuals who—

(1) have exhausted all rights to regular compensation under the State law or under Federal law with respect to a benefit year (excluding any benefit year that ended before May 1, 2007);

(2) have no rights to regular compensation or extended compensation with respect to a week under such law or any other State unemployment compensation law or to compensation under any other Federal law (except as provided under subsection (e)); and

(3) are not receiving compensation with respect to such week under the unemployment compensation law of Canada.

(c) **EXHAUSTION OF BENEFITS.**—For purposes of subsection (b)(1), an individual shall be deemed to have exhausted such individual’s rights to regular compensation under a State law when—

(1) no payments of regular compensation can be made under such law because such in-

dividual has received all regular compensation available to such individual based on employment or wages during such individual’s base period; or

(2) such individual’s rights to such compensation have been terminated by reason of the expiration of the benefit year with respect to which such rights existed.

(d) **WEEKLY BENEFIT AMOUNT, ETC.**—For purposes of any agreement under this Act—

(1) the amount of emergency unemployment compensation which shall be payable to any individual for any week of total unemployment shall be equal to the amount of the regular compensation (including dependents’ allowances) payable to such individual during such individual’s benefit year under the State law for a week of total unemployment;

(2) the terms and conditions of the State law which apply to claims for regular compensation and to the payment thereof shall apply to claims for emergency unemployment compensation and the payment thereof, except where otherwise inconsistent with the provisions of this Act or with the regulations or operating instructions of the Secretary promulgated to carry out this Act; and

(3) the maximum amount of emergency unemployment compensation payable to any individual for whom an emergency unemployment compensation account is established under section 3 shall not exceed the amount established in such account for such individual.

(e) **ELECTION BY STATES.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal law (and if State law permits), the Governor of a State that is in an extended benefit period may provide for the payment of emergency unemployment compensation prior to extended compensation to individuals who otherwise meet the requirements of this section.

(f) **UNAUTHORIZED ALIENS INELIGIBLE.**—A State shall require as a condition of eligibility for emergency unemployment compensation under this Act that each alien who receives such compensation must be legally authorized to work in the United States, as defined for purposes of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act (26 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.). In determining whether an alien meets the requirements of this subsection, a State must follow the procedures provided in section 1137(d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320b-7(d)).

SEC. 3. EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACCOUNT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Any agreement under this Act shall provide that the State will establish, for each eligible individual who files an application for emergency unemployment compensation, an emergency unemployment compensation account with respect to such individual’s benefit year.

(b) **AMOUNT IN ACCOUNT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The amount established in an account under subsection (a) shall be equal to the lesser of—

(A) 50 percent of the total amount of regular compensation (including dependents’ allowances) payable to the individual during the individual’s benefit year under such law, or

(B) 13 times the individual’s average weekly benefit amount for the benefit year.

(2) **WEEKLY BENEFIT AMOUNT.**—For purposes of this subsection, an individual’s weekly benefit amount for any week is the amount of regular compensation (including dependents’ allowances) under the State law payable to such individual for such week for total unemployment.

(c) **SPECIAL RULE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, if, at the time that the individual’s account is ex-

hausted or at any time thereafter, such individual’s State is in an extended benefit period (as determined under paragraph (2)), then, such account shall be augmented by an amount equal to the amount originally established in such account (as determined under subsection (b)(1)).

(2) **EXTENDED BENEFIT PERIOD.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), a State shall be considered to be in an extended benefit period, as of any given time, if—

(A) such a period is then in effect for such State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970;

(B) such a period would then be in effect for such State under such Act if section 203(d) of such Act—

(i) were applied by substituting ‘‘4’’ for ‘‘5’’ each place it appears; and

(ii) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A); or

(C) such a period would then be in effect for such State under such Act if—

(i) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State (regardless of whether the State by law had provided for such application); and

(ii) such section 203(f)—

(I) were applied by substituting ‘‘6.0’’ for ‘‘6.5’’ in paragraph (1)(A)(i); and

(II) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii).

SEC. 4. PAYMENTS TO STATES HAVING AGREEMENTS FOR THE PAYMENT OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.

(a) **GENERAL RULE.**—There shall be paid to each State that has entered into an agreement under this Act an amount equal to 100 percent of the emergency unemployment compensation paid to individuals by the State pursuant to such agreement.

(b) **TREATMENT OF REIMBURSABLE COMPENSATION.**—No payment shall be made to any State under this section in respect of any compensation to the extent the State is entitled to reimbursement in respect of such compensation under the provisions of any Federal law other than this Act or chapter 85 of title 5, United States Code. A State shall not be entitled to any reimbursement under such chapter 85 in respect of any compensation to the extent the State is entitled to reimbursement under this Act in respect of such compensation.

(c) **DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT.**—Sums payable to any State by reason of such State having an agreement under this Act shall be payable, either in advance or by way of reimbursement (as may be determined by the Secretary), in such amounts as the Secretary estimates the State will be entitled to receive under this Act for each calendar month, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any amount by which the Secretary finds that the Secretary’s estimates for any prior calendar month were greater or less than the amounts which should have been paid to the State. Such estimates may be made on the basis of such statistical, sampling, or other method as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State agency of the State involved.

SEC. 5. FINANCING PROVISIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Funds in the extended unemployment compensation account (as established by section 905(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1105(a))) of the Unemployment Trust Fund (as established by section 904(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1104(a))) shall be used for the making of payments to States having agreements entered into under this Act.

(b) **CERTIFICATION.**—The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State the sums payable to such State under this Act. The Secretary of the Treasury, prior to audit

or settlement by the Government Accountability Office, shall make payments to the State in accordance with such certification, by transfers from the extended unemployment compensation account (as so established) to the account of such State in the Unemployment Trust Fund (as so established).

(c) ASSISTANCE TO STATES.—There are appropriated out of the employment security administration account (as established by section 901(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1101(a))) of the Unemployment Trust Fund, without fiscal year limitation, such funds as may be necessary for purposes of assisting States (as provided in title III of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 501 et seq.)) in meeting the costs of administration of agreements under this Act.

(d) APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN PAYMENTS.—There are appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury, without fiscal year limitation, to the extended unemployment compensation account (as so established) of the Unemployment Trust Fund (as so established) such sums as the Secretary estimates to be necessary to make the payments under this section in respect of—

(1) compensation payable under chapter 85 of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) compensation payable on the basis of services to which section 3309(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 applies.

Amounts appropriated pursuant to the preceding sentence shall not be required to be repaid.

SEC. 6. FRAUD AND OVERPAYMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If an individual knowingly has made, or caused to be made by another, a false statement or representation of a material fact, or knowingly has failed, or caused another to fail, to disclose a material fact, and as a result of such false statement or representation or of such nondisclosure such individual has received an amount of emergency unemployment compensation under this Act to which he was not entitled, such individual—

(1) shall be ineligible for further emergency unemployment compensation under this Act in accordance with the provisions of the applicable State unemployment compensation law relating to fraud in connection with a claim for unemployment compensation; and

(2) shall be subject to prosecution under section 1001 of title 18, United States Code.

(b) REPAYMENT.—In the case of individuals who have received amounts of emergency unemployment compensation under this Act to which they were not entitled, the State shall require such individuals to repay the amounts of such emergency unemployment compensation to the State agency, except that the State agency may waive such repayment if it determines that—

(1) the payment of such emergency unemployment compensation was without fault on the part of any such individual; and

(2) such repayment would be contrary to equity and good conscience.

(c) RECOVERY BY STATE AGENCY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The State agency may recover the amount to be repaid, or any part thereof, by deductions from any emergency unemployment compensation payable to such individual under this Act or from any unemployment compensation payable to such individual under any State or Federal unemployment compensation law administered by the State agency or under any other Federal law administered by the State agency which provides for the payment of any assistance or allowance with respect to any week of unemployment, during the 3-year period after the date such individuals received the payment of the emergency unemploy-

ment compensation to which they were not entitled, except that no single deduction may exceed 50 percent of the weekly benefit amount from which such deduction is made.

(2) OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING.—No repayment shall be required, and no deduction shall be made, until a determination has been made, notice thereof and an opportunity for a fair hearing has been given to the individual, and the determination has become final.

(d) REVIEW.—Any determination by a State agency under this section shall be subject to review in the same manner and to the same extent as determinations under the State unemployment compensation law, and only in that manner and to that extent.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the terms “compensation”, “regular compensation”, “extended compensation”, “benefit year”, “base period”, “State”, “State agency”, “State law”, and “week” have the respective meanings given such terms under section 205 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note).

SEC. 8. APPLICABILITY.

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

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

(2) ending on or before March 31, 2009.

(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 3 as of the last day of the last week (as determined in accordance with the applicable State law) ending on or before March 31, 2009, emergency unemployment compensation shall continue to be payable to such individual from such amounts for any week beginning after such last day for which the individual meets the eligibility requirements of this Act.

(2) LIMIT ON AUGMENTATION.—If the account of an individual is exhausted after the last day of such last week (as so determined), then section 3(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) LIMIT ON COMPENSATION.—No compensation shall be payable by reason of paragraph (1) for any week beginning after June 30, 2009.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I ask unanimous consent that I yield to myself such time as I may consume and at that conclusion the balance of the time allotted be given to Dr. MCDERMOTT, a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee, who was the major drafter of the bill that is before the House.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, here we are again, once again fighting for the dignity of millions of Americans who

worked every day of their adult lives, paid into a trust fund, believing if there ever was a need, that their Congress, their Members would respond to it.

The compensation that we are offering in this legislation is so meager that it is almost embarrassing to have to fight to get it, and the whole concept that maybe the President believes that if they are given assistance, they would rather not look for a job but rather have these checks. But I think I want America to know that as long as good people want to work, as long as they don't have money to pay their bills, as long as oil prices are up, education, health care, as long as these good people cannot survive and begin to lose their dignity and their pride, as long as these great Americans, middle Americans find themselves in this position, that we on our side will continue to fight no matter what you do.

So you can attack us on parliamentary grounds, you can talk about PAYGO, you can talk about suspension, you can go get a veto, but the American people should know that we are not going to give up. We are not going to give in, and that we will prevail. So whatever tactics, language, rhetoric you come up with, at the end of the day when the family says I know I can depend on our Congress, they will be asking: And how do your congressmen vote on this issue? And I hope that you will be guided by your conscience and not your party.

So I would like to yield the balance of my time to Dr. MCDERMOTT to get into the specifics, but I hope that we will be able, with our vote today, to get into the heart of the American people and let them know that this Congress and this country will not let them down.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as Yogi Berra once said, this is like déjà vu all over again. Yesterday after an 8-week delay, the House considered and failed to pass the legislation once again before us today. I continue to support providing extended unemployment benefits to workers who need it most. In fact, every Republican on the Ways and Means Committee supported extending unemployment benefits when this legislation was considered in committee 2 months ago; again, 8 weeks ago.

Again, Republicans want to extend unemployment benefits. And we want to help those who are hurting the most. We also recognize that it is time that we pass legislation that can become law.

Ladies and gentlemen, that is why I rise in strong opposition to the legislation before us today which does not satisfy the simple standard of helping those who need it most and who have worked a modest number of weeks to earn these benefits.

Yesterday, the Democratic leadership brought identical legislation to the

floor under a process normally reserved for naming post offices and honoring sports teams. This resulted in a take-it-or-leave-it approach to this very important issue of extending unemployment benefits, and the bill failed to gain enough votes, forcing us to return to the floor again today.

Now have our Democratic colleagues budged an inch? Absolutely not. Today we are considering the same legislation which once again fails to include a long-standing and reasonable policy requiring at least 20 weeks of work to qualify for extended unemployment benefits.

As several of us on this side of the aisle have noted, without this sensible requirement under H.R. 5749, workers could qualify for as many as 52 weeks of unemployment benefits, a full year, after having worked as little as one or two weeks. But whether someone worked two or 10 weeks or even 19 weeks, the simple fact is that current Federal law includes a straightforward rule that requires a modest minimum amount of work before someone can qualify for months, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 months of unemployment benefits courtesy of our taxpayers.

This 20-weeks rule is not too much to ask. It is fair, and it is inexcusable for the other side not to include such a reasonable, long-standing rule. In fact, to not include it, as the bill before us would do, is a radical, and I say that again, radical change, radical departure from current law.

My friends in the majority have called this issue a straw man. If it is just a straw man, why did they make the change? Why did they make this radical policy change that breaks 27 years of bipartisan policy which requires 20 weeks of work to qualify for a full year of unemployment benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I have a United States Department of Labor document that shows examples of States that would allow 1 year's benefits for only 1 or 2 weeks' work, including a State like Michigan where you would only have to work one week to be able to obtain,

under this legislation, 52 weeks worth of benefits.

I would like to insert this Department of Labor document into the RECORD.

STATES IN WHICH INDIVIDUALS COULD QUALIFY FOR UI WITH ONLY 2 WEEKS OF WORK

State	Minimum wages needed to qualify:	
	Wages in 1 week	Total wages in 2 weeks
AL	>\$1,157	>\$2,214
AK		\$1,000
AZ	\$1,500	\$2,250
AR		\$1,971
CA	\$900	\$1,125
CO	¹ \$1,084	\$2,500
CT		¹ \$780
DE		¹ \$920
DC	\$1,300	\$1,950
FL	\$2,267	\$3,400
GA	\$1,232	¹ \$1,848
HI		\$130
ID	\$1,508	\$1,885
IL		\$1,600
IN	\$1,000	\$2,750
IA	\$1,190	\$1,790
KS	\$2,377	\$3,030
KY	\$1,963	\$2,944
LA		\$800
ME	² \$1,276	\$3,828
MD	>\$576	\$900
MA		\$3,000
MI	\$2,757	\$4,136
MN	\$1,000	\$1,250
MS	\$780	\$1,200
MO	\$1,500	\$2,250
MT	\$1,392	³ \$2,087
NE	\$800	\$2,651
NV	\$400	\$600
NH	\$1,400	\$2,800
NJ		\$2,860
NM	\$1,604	
NY	\$1,600	\$2,400
NC	\$1,066	\$4,291
ND	\$1,984	\$2,975
OK	\$1,000	\$1,500
OR	\$667	\$1,000
PR	\$77	\$280
RI	\$1,480	\$2,960
SC	\$540	\$900
SD	\$728	\$1,288
TN	>\$780	>\$1,560
TX	\$1,413	\$2,091
UT	\$1,933	\$2,900
VT	\$1,981	\$2,773
VA		¹ \$2,700
VI	\$858	\$1,287
WV		\$2,200
WI	\$1,325	\$1,590
WY	\$2,072	\$2,900

¹ In 2 HQs.

² In each of 2 Qs

³ In 2 Qs.

Note: Most states require wages in 2 different calendar quarters in order to meet monetary eligibility requirements.

The source of this information is the 2008 Comparison of State Unemployment Insurance Laws, Chapter 3, Table 3-3.

Yesterday the majority called up this legislation under special rules that

barred any amendments. Today we are considering this legislation in much the same way, no amendments to be considered, no substitute to be considered, and every rule of the House except one is waived.

The majority even waived the House Democrat's so-called PAYGO rule. That admits that the cost of this legislation would simply be added to the deficit. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office confirms this much. Their estimate of the cost of this legislation shows it will increase the deficit by \$14 billion over the next 5 years, and that is probably just a start.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD a copy of the Congressional Budget Office score of H.R. 5749 as approved by the Ways and Means Committee which provides a fuller discussion of this point.

H.R. 5749—Emergency Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2008

Summary: H.R. 5749 would make individuals who exhaust their regular benefits eligible for unemployment compensation for an additional period of time. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that enacting the bill would:

Increase direct spending by \$6.2 billion in 2008 and \$11.7 billion over the 2008–2018 period; and

Increase revenues by a net amount of \$3.2 billion of the 2008–2018 period.

In total, these changes would increase budget deficits (or reduce future surpluses) by \$6.2 billion in 2008 and by a net of \$8.5 billion over the 2008–2018 period.

The bill contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA).

Estimated cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary impact of H.R. 5749 is shown in the following table. The spending effects of this legislation fall within budget function 600 (income security).

	By fiscal year, in billions of dollars—												
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2008–2013	2008–2018
Changes in Direct Spending (Outlays) ¹	6.2	6.7	0	0	0	0	0	-0.2	-0.3	-0.3	-0.4	12.8	11.7
Changes in Revenues	0	*	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.6	3.2
Net Change in Deficits or Surpluses ²	6.2	6.6	-0.1	-0.2	-0.2	-0.1	-0.3	-0.6	-0.7	-1.0	-1.2	12.2	8.5

¹ For direct spending changes, budget authority equals outlays.

² Positive numbers indicate an increase in deficits or decrease in surpluses.

Note: * = gain of less than \$50 million; components may not add to totals because of rounding.

Basis of estimate: For this estimate, CBO assumes that the bill will be enacted by June 1, 2008, and that spending will follow historical patterns for similar activities.

Direct Spending

Most states' regular unemployment compensation programs provide up to 26 weeks of benefits to qualified individuals. The bill would authorize a program for emergency extended unemployment compensation (EEUC), which would provide federal funding for additional benefits—up to 13 weeks in all states—to beneficiaries who exhaust their regular benefits. (Certain individuals who exhausted their regular benefits prior to the

bill's enactment also would be eligible for EEUC). An additional 13 weeks of benefits would be provided in states that meet certain thresholds or triggers with respect to unemployment. States would be eligible to provide the additional 13 weeks of benefits if unemployment levels reach an insured unemployment rate of 4 percent or higher, or a total unemployment rate of 6 percent or higher. (CBO estimates that around one quarter of beneficiaries would be in states that would qualify to provide that additional 13 weeks.) Benefits would be available from the date of enactment through April 30, 2009,

but no new beneficiaries could be added to the program after February 1, 2009.

Based on the number of people who previously exhausted regular benefits, as well as those anticipated to exhaust benefits in the coming months, CBO estimates that over the 2008–2009 period:

About 3.2 million people would collect EEUC and that benefits paid over that time period would total \$11.7 billion;

Administrative costs related to the EEUC program would total \$0.6 billion; and

Outlays for regular unemployment benefits would increase by \$0.9 billion because the availability of the EEUC benefits would affect some recipients' employment decisions.

(Most of those costs would be offset by increases in State revenues over fiscal years 2009 through 2013, as discussed below under "Revenues.")

Those costs would be slightly offset by reduced payments from other federal programs that provide extended unemployment benefits—the extended benefits program and trade adjustment assistance for workers. CBO estimates those offsets would amount to \$0.3 billion in 2008 and 2009.

Under the financing provisions of the bill, funds in the Extended Unemployment Compensation Account would be transferred to the state accounts for the benefit and administrative expenses incurred for the EEUC program. Because the state unemployment funds are included in the federal budget, those transfers would have no immediate budgetary effect. However, they would interact with provisions of the federal unemployment law known as the "Reed Act." Under those provisions, when funds in the federal accounts of the unemployment trust fund exceed certain statutory limits, excess revenues from the federal unemployment tax are transferred to the state accounts. In CBO's current baseline, we project that the federal government will transfer \$8.6 billion to the states over the 2013–2018 period. CBO's baseline includes outlays from the Reed Act transfers totaling \$1.1 billion from 2014 to 2018. Under the bill, outlays for EEUC would reduce the federal trust fund balances to levels that would preclude such Reed Act transfers. Thus, relative to CBO's baseline projections, outlays under the bill would be \$1.1 billion lower.

CBO estimates that the net effect of unemployment-related provisions on direct spending would total \$12.8 billion over the 2008–2013 period and \$11.7 billion over the 2008–2018 period.

Revenues

The availability of EEUC benefits may discourage recipients from searching for work and accepting less-desirable jobs as quickly as they would in the absence of this act. Thus, some recipients may remain unemployed for slightly longer than they would have otherwise, and direct spending for regular benefits would increase during 2008 and 2009. CBO expects that some states would respond to the lower balances in their unemployment trust funds by increasing their unemployment taxes, resulting in an increase of \$0.6 billion in revenues over the 2009–2013 period.

The interaction between EEUC and Reed Act transfers also would affect revenues. Under the baseline, CBO estimates that, as a result of the estimated \$8.6 billion in Reed Act transfers, states would reduce unemployment taxes by about \$2.5 billion over the 2014–2018 period, with additional revenue losses occurring after 2018. CBO estimates that transfers to the states under the EEUC program would reduce the federal trust fund balances to levels that would preclude such Reed Act transfers, resulting in revenues that would be \$2.5 billion higher than our baseline projections of revenues over the five-year period beginning in 2014.

Intergovernmental and private-sector impact: H.R. 5749 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA. CBO estimates that the changes to the unemployment compensation system would result in decreased federal transfers to states and also would lead to increased unemployment taxes in some states. These effects, however, would result from states' participation in the federal unemployment insurance program, which is voluntary, and would not result from intergovernmental mandates as defined in UMRA.

Previous CBO estimate: On February 6, 2008, CBO transmitted an estimate of the

budgetary effects of the Economic Stimulus Act of 2008, as ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Finance on January 30, 2008. That bill contained provisions for the extension of unemployment compensation that are similar to provisions in H.R. 5749. Differences between the estimated costs reflect small economic and technical adjustments to CBO's baseline and differences in the legislation.

Estimate prepared by: Federal Spending; Christina Hawley Anthony; Federal Revenues; Barbara Edwards; Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments; Lisa Ramirez-Branum; and Impact on the Private Sector; Ralph Smith.

Estimate approved by: Peter H. Fontaine, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

These facts directly contradict the majority's pledges for a more open and honest operation of the House, as well as their pledges to pay for every piece of legislation that comes to the floor. Now we are seeing the fine print of these pledges, including that new spending deemed temporary does not have to be paid for. This is yet another violation of the majority Democrats' PAYGO rule which is looking more and more like Swiss cheese than effective budget policy. I hope my friends in the fiscally conservative Blue Dog Coalition are watching as their leadership once again waives the rules of the House to increase spending and to increase taxes.

Make no mistake, this legislation will do both, living up to the true spirit of the Democrats' PAYGO rule.

Mr. Speaker, the President has stated his intent to veto this legislation because it does not include the 20 weeks of work requirement and proposes untargeted benefits, among other reasons. Republicans noted these flaws in our debate on the floor yesterday, and we offered to work with the majority to correct them so that we have legislation that could become law quickly to help those who need help, so the path to passage of a truly bipartisan and responsible bill is clear to address these concerns.

Two months ago, that was 8 weeks ago, every Republican on the Ways and Means Committee supported extending unemployment benefits, and I introduced a bill and offered as an amendment legislation that would have paid extended benefits in high unemployment States like Michigan, and many others, and that was in April, 8 weeks ago. Yet for the past 2 months, 8 weeks, the residents of those States where jobs are hardest to come by and these benefits are most needed, have been forced to wait on the majority in Congress. It is election-year politics. Members should have a chance to vote on a targeted proposal that would actually provide extended benefits in high-unemployment States like Michigan and others. And importantly, a vote on legislation the President would sign so these benefits can actually start being paid.

In contrast to such a constructive approach, the majority wants to continue playing politics, election-year politics, with unemployment benefits. So today,

Members will once again we forced to vote on legislation the President says he will not sign and includes a radical departure from current policy when it comes to the balance between work and benefits.

Again I ask my colleagues to vote against this legislation so we can work together in a bipartisan way because I truly believe both Republicans and Democrats want to help those who are unemployed. We need to craft an appropriate bipartisan solution quickly to this immediate concern. The legislation before us does not meet that challenge and will not be signed into law. We want to help those who need help. We can extend unemployment benefits for those who have exhausted them. It is time we work together.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5749.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a wonderful debate. I love to hear the Republican talking points said over and over again. I have counted now the phrase "8 weeks" since we passed this bill out of the committee. I have heard it 19 times so far and I expect we will hear it at least nineteen hundred times before we pass the bill.

But the fact is that the ranking member knows he could have voted "yes" when it came out of committee. He could have voted "yes" when it was on the floor on the 15th of May which is when we voted on this. We already have taken action on it once; and he had a chance yesterday to vote "yes" on it, but he said "no" again. And I suspect today—well, we'll see what he does. Maybe he will change his mind.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume because it is a new day and we woke up with some bad news about the U.S. economy. The Washington Post has the story, "A new report from the Federal Reserve paints a portrait of the U.S. economy under pressure from almost every sector. Across the board, the U.S. economy is deteriorating, including jobs." And here we are again today trying to help the American people by passing the Emergency Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2008.

Yesterday, 144 Republican Members ignored the will of the people and instead followed the whim of a lame duck President.

□ 1300

If three votes had switched, we would have had enough votes to pass this bill and give the American people the help they need. They didn't, so we're back here today because we're going to make it happen.

The economic data paint a compelling case for immediate action. But my Republican colleague stood at the podium yesterday, and did it again today, waving a veto threat from the White House.

This is the President who's given us this war that's put us in a terrible mess. He's given us bank problems and every other thing that's going on, gas prices. And now he waves a letter and says, we don't want to do anything for the unemployed who've exhausted their benefits.

They hid behind rhetoric that pretends to contend itself with people qualifying for benefits. They served up a real cold red herring for dinner last night for those people that exhausted their benefits, because they simply want to deny American workers unemployment benefits.

Remember, this money didn't come out of the tax base. It came from their employers who paid it into a trust fund for exactly this purpose; when they lose their job, they should have access to it.

Now, let me be clear. This 20-week rule that we hear yelled about here, that many Republicans want included in the bill, would mean that workers could work for over 10 straight months and be denied extended benefits, depending on the vagaries of the various laws in States across this country.

The Department of Labor has estimated that around 10 percent of those who've exhausted their benefits might be excluded from extended benefits if we were to include this 20-week rule. These workers are disproportionately low-wage, part-time, minority and women.

In other words, the Republicans propose to solve a problem by creating one. Instead of helping people, the Republicans' alternative is to penalize workers on the lowest rung of the economic ladder. Very typical. Look at the tax cuts.

The American people need solutions, and that's what H.R. 5749 is about. It would immediately provide 13 weeks of extended benefits for workers in every State who've exhausted their benefits. It provides an additional 13 weeks of benefits in States with an unemployment rate of 6 percent or higher.

This bill is targeted. You hear them say we want a targeted bill. Of course it's targeted. It's targeted to do one thing, to help those people who need it the most.

Here's how it works. Anyone a State qualifies for unemployment benefits, and who has exhausted what the State has provided them, would be eligible for extended benefits of the same amount for half as long as the State provided them. So, if you received 26 weeks in your State from the State, and you run out, you get 13 more weeks of extended benefits. If you get 10 weeks from your State, you will get 5 weeks more of extended benefits.

The Federal Reserve outlook wasn't the only piece of information we re-

ceived yesterday. A little while ago the Labor Department announced that initial claims for unemployment benefits jumped more than expected last week. The number of people filing for unemployment benefits last week increased 384,000 people, in 1 week. And all the Republicans want to do is wave a veto letter from the White House.

Helping the American people should not be a partisan issue; but the Republicans and the president are trying to make it just that.

Yesterday we had a bipartisan bill. Almost 50 Republicans voted for it. I urge my Republican colleagues to follow their conscience and not their caucus and vote with the Democrats to help the American people. The Emergency Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2008 is the least we can do for the American people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, would you share with us how much time remains on each side, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 22 minutes. The gentleman from Washington has 21½.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as we continue to debate this legislation which makes a radical change, eliminating the Federal work requirement to qualify for federally funded unemployment benefits, I wish to yield 3 minutes to the senior Republican on the House Ways and Means Committee, Mr. HERGER of California.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle want to help U.S. workers during this period of economic uncertainty. Yet, the question has always been: How do we best provide this assistance?

Under the proposal before us today, workers in States with historically low levels of unemployment would receive 13 weeks of Federal unemployment benefits, on top of their current 26 weeks of regular State unemployment benefits. This means that workers in States like Iowa, that have a documented labor shortage, would receive 39 weeks of unemployment benefits. This makes no sense.

Instead of creating an untargeted expansion of unemployment benefits, we should be focusing on growing the economy. We want to see every State have a job surplus, not a surplus of extended unemployment benefits.

Today's legislation will result in higher taxes on our small businesses, resulting in slower job creation. This won't help U.S. workers.

The best way to help our workers is to foster economic growth that creates jobs. We can do that by passing pro-growth tax policies that keep our businesses competitive globally, and provide them with certainty to make important investments in our economy with our work, without worrying about a massive tax increase.

We can also help our workers by passing our fair trade agreements, which would create tens of thousands of jobs here in the United States.

And if we really want to help workers, we also need to be confronting rising gas prices so people can afford to get to work. We should remove our self-imposed embargo on domestic energy production, which will make energy more affordable and create more jobs.

These are the policies that Congress should be talking about here today. These are the types of policies that are going to create a strong and growing economy that will provide our workers with the jobs they need to support their families.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today is the wrong approach. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. LEVIN from Michigan will have 3 minutes. I yield to the gentleman.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I think the more we discuss this, the clearer the issue becomes, including the last statement that we heard. There's no disagreement about the need for growth policies. But to say that, and use it as an excuse not to provide extended unemployment benefits is really indefensible.

You can't say to people who have been out of work for 26 weeks, who are there through no fault of their own, and who must be looking for work, that because of the absence of growth policies they should, essentially, be out in the cold. That's close to a cold-blooded approach to this issue.

And, if you mention States like Iowa, look, in some States, if there's a surplus, people who are out of work, in most cases, if they're looking for work, and they must, will find other work.

But it makes no sense to take the position of the administration, and that's what the gentleman from California, essentially, was reflecting, where they say that historically, the unemployment rate has had to be at a certain level in order for Unemployment Compensation to be extended.

And there was, they say, an exception after September 11, 2001. It's really hard to fathom who people would use 2001, September 11, as an excuse not to extend benefits.

The unemployment rate when President Bush signed the extension was 5.7. It's now 5.5. And essentially, what you're saying is we're going to deny benefits to well over a million, with 3 million more likely to come, because of a difference of ¼ of 1 percent.

And then you say you want it to be targeted. But, as we pointed out, the data vary from month to month. One month it's 100 metropolitan areas with unemployment rates over 6 percent. More recently, it's been 65 or 66. It will probably go up. How do you, in good conscience, stand before people in those areas and say no?

I mentioned to the gentleman from Illinois—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I ask for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. I asked the gentleman from Illinois how he would respond to people in certain areas. I don't know how you do that.

I asked the gentleman, and I didn't mean to get personal really, but just to raise the issue poignantly. If you're from the State of Washington, as he is, and there's higher unemployment than 6 percent in Yakima, how do you say to the people there, you don't get the extension, while people in other States receive it. It is simply not—

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Is the gentleman yielding time?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Well, I would first point out to my friend from Michigan that I represent the State of Illinois. And under the legislation which we offered in committee, my State of Illinois would receive extended unemployment benefits.

I would also state that the Republican minority on the committee supported extension of unemployment benefits.

Mr. LEVIN. Let me just take back my time. Look, the position, that hasn't been the position of the administration. It's used the 6 percent level. That's what they're talking about here. And you have to go home and explain to the areas, I mentioned three in Illinois, because the State isn't above a certain level, but areas are, you don't get it, while people who are in a State like Michigan with over 6 percent, everybody does.

But the trouble is, everybody counts in this country. Everybody who's out of work 26 weeks, through no fault of their own, and looking for work, they have to be looking for work.

I read these letters from people in Michigan, and I just say this: Just read letters from people in your State. No longer can you go to unemployment offices in most States, because they're not there, so people aren't in line. But they're in line in this country.

As I said, if you're counted—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I guess 1 more minute if I might.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. LEVIN. If you counted the people who are now exhausting their benefits, or have, and those who are likely, it would reach, the line, from here, this Capitol to Denver.

So don't talk about energy policy. We have to face up to that. Don't talk about trade policy. We have to face up to that. Talk about the lives in the homes of over a million people.

I just hope that, you withheld, or there were withheld the three votes necessary to get to two-thirds yesterday.

But essentially, they're obeying the position, if not the orders, from the White House instead of the orders from the people at home.

I urge strong support of this. I urge that we pass it with even more votes than was passed last time and send it to the Senate so we can get this job done.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would note that the Ways and Means Committee passed a bill on unemployment benefits 8 weeks ago. And for 8 weeks, unemployed workers who've exhausted their unemployment benefits in Michigan and Illinois have gone without unemployment benefits during election-year politics.

Mr. Speaker, as we continue debate, this legislation before us, which includes a radical policy change, eliminating the Federal work requirement to qualify for federally funded unemployment benefits, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the State of Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS), a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I think the American people, the American workers, they're fed up. They're probably fed up with the fact that we have to be here today debating an extension of unemployment compensation, and if we don't do something about the energy crisis in this country, we're going to be back time and time again to talk about extending compensation to unemployed workers because it's going to lead to more and more unemployment.

You know, it is a shame, and I think the American people are starting to say, What is wrong in Washington when America has 496 billion barrels of oil that can be used, but the Democrat leadership in Congress says, No, not one dime for American oil. But they're willing to spend billions upon trillions of dollars to foreign countries for oil.

What is wrong with that picture? It's okay for gas to be maybe at \$5 a gallon by the end of the summer, but no, we can't do anything about building new refineries here. We can't do anything about drilling oil here. We can't do anything about mining coal here, coal gasification.

The energy bill that the Democrats offered was solar, wind, and renewable. Not one dime for oil, not one dime for coal, not one dime for natural gas. You can't put solar in your gas tank. You can't put wind in your gas tank.

Now, I'm wondering how the United Miner Workers feel about the fact that they have a 300-year supply of coal but no help for coal gasification. I wonder how the United Auto Workers feel in Michigan, talking about losing jobs. When GM and Ford are moving as quickly as they can to electric automobiles but the Chinese are buying SUVs as fast as they can get them. There's something wrong with this picture.

And I wonder how the Teamsters feel when their trucks are sitting idly by

not being able to move the goods across this country, out of work because the Democrat Congress—where is the leadership? We need in this country leadership to step forward and say by a date certain, we are going to be energy independent from the Middle East, from Venezuela, and we're going to have our own energy, our own opportunities to create jobs.

Can you imagine the millions of jobs that would be created by building pipelines, by going after our resources? Can you imagine the millions of jobs that the United Mine Workers would have, the United Auto Workers would have, the construction union workers would have? I think the rank and file members of our unions in this country have got to say, What is wrong with these people that we've been supporting all of these years? What are they doing for us now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. I think they're starting to ask.

I talked to a group of citizens this morning, and they're wanting to know what is wrong with the Congress; what is wrong with the Democrat leadership; what is wrong with their presumptive nominee for the presidency who says, Yeah, I think this is good that gas is at this all-time high price. I just wish it had come along a little slower.

You know, I think there is going to have to be some answers, and they're going to have to come up fairly soon because the American people are fed up. They're not wanting worker compensation, unemployment compensation. They're wanting jobs, and energy provides jobs.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I don't know if I walked into the wrong place or not. I thought we were talking about unemployment, but all I hear is a lot of talk about energy. Now, I don't know if the Members on the other side have forgotten what the subject is today or exactly what the problem is, but the fact is that we didn't wait 8 weeks. My ranking member, Mr. WELLER, knows better than that. We voted on May 15 on this issue, and it's sitting over in the Senate. The Senate Republicans have got their foot on it. And the White House hasn't said "boo" to them.

So the Republicans are killing this proposal over there in the Senate. We're going to send it back to them another way. And I think they will have a second chance to think about it. The closer we get to the election, I think the more interested they will get in this issue.

But there's one issue here that I think somehow with the straw man that keeps getting put up here for everybody to look at, this person out there somewhere in Oregon or Illinois that worked for two weeks and is going to get unemployment benefits. We're

not talking about somebody on welfare here. We're talking about somebody who worked.

Now, my opponents on the other side keep sounding like we're talking about the dregs of the earth, people who are just stealing or somehow sneaking in and maneuvering and somehow getting something they're not entitled to. When they worked, their employer put money into the unemployment trust for their benefit.

Some people on the other side believe that we ought to have States' rights. States ought to be able to do stuff. Okay. States write the unemployment laws for their State. And in Illinois, it is true that if you work for two weeks, one week in one quarter and one week in another quarter, and your total wages are \$1,600, so that means you worked one week and got \$800; and then, just lucky, your next week of work was in another quarter, you got \$800, you would be eligible in Illinois for \$51 a week for 26 weeks for a grand total of \$1,326. That comes from a letter from the Department of Employment Security signed by Joseph Mueller, which I will now insert into the RECORD.

ILLINOIS, DEPARTMENT
OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY,
Chicago, IL, June 12, 2008.

Mr. INDIVAR DUTTA-GUPTA,
*House of Representatives, Committee on Ways
and Means, Subcommittee on Income Security
and Family Support, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. DUTTA-GUPTA: With regard to the hypothetical you pose, if worker X worked three weeks in IL, he or she might well not be entitled to any unemployment benefits.

To qualify for unemployment benefits in IL, an individual must have been paid at least \$1600 during his/her "base period," receiving at least \$440 outside the base period quarter in which his/her wages were the highest. Consequently, to qualify, worker X's three weeks of wages would have had to straddle two base period quarters, with at least \$440 being paid in the "low quarter."

Assuming he/she did qualify, worker X's benefit amount would depend upon the amount of wages he/she was paid during his/her base period. A claimant's weekly benefit amount in IL can range from \$51 to \$376.

If worker X just met the \$1,600/\$440 requirement, he/she would be entitled to \$51/wk for up to 26 weeks (a total of \$1,326).

To qualify for what is the current average weekly benefit payment in IL, worker X would have had to receive over \$4700/wk.

As an aside, three weeks' worth of wages would not qualify an individual receiving IL's current minimum wage of \$7.75/hr, even if the payments did straddle two base period quarters.

In conclusion, it would be theoretically possible for an individual with three weeks' worth of base period wages—and 49 weeks with no wages for employment—to qualify for benefits in IL. However, the three weeks would have to fall "just right" and average over \$500/wk. IDES's system does not track the number of weeks individuals work. However, based on anecdotal feedback from program staff, it does not seem this theoretical possibility has been a common occurrence, if it has ever occurred.

You also pose a hypothetical in which worker X works just two weeks. It would be theoretically possible to qualify for benefits with just two weeks' worth of wages. Again,

however, the wages would have to straddle two base period quarters and, in that scenario, average \$800/wk. It seems this has not been a common occurrence either.

Sincerely,

JOSPEH P. MUELLER,
Legal Counsel.

I don't know. Maybe Illinois is a lot easier to live in than Washington State, but getting \$1,326 for 6 months is not exactly a living wage. I mean, anybody who sits at home and waits for their \$51 check and says, Oh great, I'm going to live on \$51 this week. I don't know where they live in Illinois. I don't believe it is in Chicago. Must be way down somewhere in the south end of the State or somewhere. I don't know how you could live on that. To think that that person is a slug who's just sitting there and saying, Well, I have got this \$51 check coming, I don't believe I'm going to go look for work, is implying that that person is not a responsible human being who's been trying to get work and has worked in the past and is getting benefits that they earned to which they are entitled.

Now, if that's the reason the Republicans want to hang it up and not vote for this bill and say we're not going to give those extended benefits because there's one person in Illinois somewhere who worked for 2 weeks and made the minimum benefit and gets 26 weeks of \$51 a week, if that's what you're going to go home and explain on the campaign trail why you didn't extend unemployment benefits to people who had exhausted their benefits, that's going to be real interesting to watch because I don't think the people of Illinois or any other State are going to buy this kind of an argument.

When we asked this question in Oregon, they said it isn't true. There isn't anybody getting benefits like that.

Now, it seems to me that it just comes back to the point that you really don't want to vote for unemployment benefits. I understand it's been the party's policy since 1935. You have never liked it because you thought it weakened people's resolve. That is the talk of somebody who has never been unemployed. If you have lived in a house where somebody has been unemployed and have seen what it does to the family when the father or the mother can't bring home a paycheck, you don't look at those people and say, Well, they're taking something that isn't theirs, when they paid for this benefit into the unemployment trust. They are entitled to this. It would be the same as saying to old people, Well, you're taking that Social Security that was paid into the trust for you, and somehow you're not entitled to it.

We don't do that.

America looks after the weakest. That's how you judge whether a society is really strong or not.

I recognize the Speaker for 1 minute.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his outstanding leadership on this issue. He has been a relentless and persistent advocate for America's working families, for hard

workers in our country who, through no fault of their own, and in large measure because of the poor economic policies of the Bush administration, have lost their job.

Mr. Speaker, it is said, and it's been said directly by George Bernard Shaw, that it is the mark of a truly intelligent person to be moved by statistics. My colleagues have made the case for why we need this unemployment insurance, and I want to address once again, as they have, some of the statistics and see if it is the mark of truly intelligent people to respond to that.

Today we have the opportunity to help 3.8 million Americans who are out of work and their families in large part because of the disastrous economic policies of the White House and the Republicans in Congress.

There are 3.8 million Americans for whom 13 weeks of the unemployment insurance system, a system, as the gentleman indicated, that they have paid for, could mean not losing a home or a job or skipping meals or needed health care. Today we have that opportunity to provide that help.

More statistics.

In the Bush economy, gas prices have skyrocketed to \$4 a gallon. One in ten Americans are at risk of losing their homes, and even more families are seeing the value of their greatest financial assets, their homes, plummet.

More statistics.

On Friday, we received the alarming news that since the beginning of the year, our Nation has lost more than 325,000 jobs, including 49,000 in the month of May alone.

The Nation's unemployment rate has risen to 5.5 percent, the biggest monthly increase since 1986. In two decades, last Friday on that day, it jumped 0.5 percent to 5½ percent.

On that same day, by the way, my colleagues, the price per barrel of oil increased by over \$11 in that 1 day. In the 1990s, in 1998, the price per barrel was that exact same figure, just over \$11. 1998, price per barrel of oil, \$11-plus. Last Friday, price per barrel jumped, increased over \$11 to over \$130 per barrel.

□ 1330

So this is the economic situation in which these families find themselves. They have been hardworking, played by the rules, paid into the system, paid into the system for occasions like this where there's a downturn in the economy, and they lose their jobs through no fault of their own. And the Republicans want to make them look like charity cases.

These are strong people. They are the backbone of America. We have a responsibility to them. And if they are not moved by statistics, as George Bernard Shaw says any intelligent person should be, perhaps you would be moved by their personal stories.

This extension of unemployment benefits will help people like Kathy Henry. She was laid off her job at an advertising company last August. In February, her unemployment benefits ran

out. As she says, "I must have had 100 interviews, and no one wants to hire me." Many times people think the people that are being interviewed for these jobs are overqualified. "An extension of unemployment benefits would give me more time to look for a job," Kathy says.

And Liz Waller of Missouri, she just has 3 weeks of unemployment benefits left. She said, "Absolutely, an extension would make a big difference for me. I'm dying to get back to work." I'm dying to get back to work, "but I've done interview after interview and there are just way too many job candidates out there. I just keep getting told I'm overqualified."

There is a concern on the part of some employers that as people continue to look for work and look for jobs at lower pay, that if they hire them, then they will leave when they can find a job at higher pay with an upturn in the economy.

This isn't about people sitting on their butts back home saying, goody, I'm getting an unemployment check; now I can really look my family in the eye and say I'm providing. These people want to provide for their families. To imply anything else is an insult to these millions of people who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own and, in large measure, because of the Bush administration's failed economic policies.

Let's think about our veterans. This legislation is especially important to our returning military veterans. A recent government report prepared for the Veterans Affairs Department found that young veterans earn less and have a harder time finding work than do civilians in the same age group. The percentage of veterans not in the labor force—because they couldn't find jobs, stopped looking for work because they couldn't find jobs, or went back to school—jumped to 23 percent in 2005 from 10 percent in the year 2000.

Our veterans come home; they can't find work. Some of them need this unemployment insurance, and the Republicans are saying, "Just say no."

Extending unemployment benefits not only helps those who are looking for work, it stimulates the economy. According to the Congressional Budget Office, it is one of the most cost-effective and fast-acting ways to stimulate the economy because the money is spent quickly. For every \$1 spent on unemployment benefits, \$1 spent generates \$1.64 in new economic demand. Stimulates the economy.

All Americans who work pay unemployment insurance, pay into a trust fund for a rainy day. The rainy day is here. Today, across the country and for millions of Americans, that rainy day is here. Congress should ensure that those who paid into the system for the benefits now can receive them, and we can do this by passing this legislation today.

Mr. Speaker, the issue and the debate is not a partisan one. All Americans

are feeling serious and deep economic pain. The people who will benefit from this are Democrats, Republicans, non-partisans, Independents, people who aren't even interested in the political system. Yet, President Bush has issued a veto threat against this legislation, despite the fact that it will help—let's get back to our statistics—3.8 million Americans and, in fact, the entire economy.

And so I get back to our friend George Bernard Shaw. "It is the mark of a truly intelligent person to be moved by statistics."

I thank Chairman McDERMOTT for your important work on this subcommittee, on this legislation. I also want to commend the chairman of the full committee for being a truly intelligent man, moved by statistics, Chairman RANGEL for his relentless work on this important legislation. To Mr. LEVIN as well and to all of the members of the committee, thank you for bringing this important legislation to the floor.

The American people are waiting to see if Congress will act to help them on a matter that is relevant to their economic survival at a difficult time in their lives for money that they paid into the system. I urge my colleagues to vote "aye."

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to state that I share the Speaker's admiration for Mr. RANGEL and Mr. McDERMOTT. I consider Mr. RANGEL very intelligent, and I enjoy working with Mr. McDERMOTT as well, but I do disagree with the distinguished Speaker on a point that she made.

You know, she was talking about 5.5 percent unemployment, which in my view is too high, but I would note that it seems sometimes the definition of a bad economy is who's in the White House.

In 1996, President Clinton stood before us at the State of the Union in January 1996. Unemployment was at 5.6 percent, higher than it is today. President Clinton said the economy was the healthiest it has been in three decades. Well, today unemployment is lower than it was when President Clinton made that statement.

So, we all agree the economy needs to be improved, but President Clinton would say it's the healthiest in decades, if he were standing again before us based on his definition of a healthy economy.

I would also note, as my good friend from Washington has made the point, that why are we talking about energy. When I talk to the folks back home in Illinois at the local grocery store, at the gas station, and people are commenting about food prices and energy prices, they say that when you have over \$4 gasoline, that's bad for the economy. There's people losing jobs because energy costs are so high.

As we talk about statistics, and the distinguished Speaker referred to statistics, I would note that the approval

rating of the Democrat Congress today is 16 percent. Only 16 percent of the American people think the Democrat majority is doing a good job. Now, historically, that would tell us that today's Congress is the least popular in recorded history.

No Congress has had a lower approval rating than the current Democrat majority. Why? Because since the Democratic majority became the majority in 2007, gasoline prices have gone up \$1.73. Think about that. The Democrat majority has refused to expand the supply of gasoline, has refused to expand the supply of oil. Why? Because they are locking away, under their policies, domestic sources of oil and gasoline, and continuing to make us more dependent on foreign sources of oil, people like Hugo Chavez in Venezuela and sources in the Mideast that we're dependent upon because of the Democrat majority's policies.

Again, there's a reason this Congress is the least popular in recorded history, because gasoline prices have gone up \$1.73 since our Democratic friends gained the majority.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. DRAKE).

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, for 2 days now, this Congress has addressed a bill to provide increased unemployment benefits. The irony is what we are not talking about.

We must talk about why are businesses leaving America, why are we losing these jobs. The answer is overwhelmingly the cost of energy and our refusal as a Congress to capture our natural resources.

Dow Chemical stood beside us when Representative JOHN PETERSON announced the NEED Act, the bill that lifts the moratorium for natural gas in the Outer Continental Shelf. They told us of a \$30 billion expansion and 10,000 jobs that they wished were here in America, but they were going to China, Libya and Saudi Arabia. Why? The price of natural gas. You can't pay \$8 to \$10 in America for an energy source that's 85 cents in those countries. We all know we lost the fertilizer industry a long time ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. I would be happy to yield 1 additional minute to the gentlelady from Virginia.

Mrs. DRAKE. Think of the jobs that could be created, the jobs that we could keep here just by this industry.

And just yesterday, the subcommittee voted on a 9-6 vote, with the Democrat majority all voting not to allow us to lift the moratorium on the Outer Continental Shelf. In the last 25 years, we've captured 7 billion barrels of oil in the Outer Continental Shelf. Do you realize the spillage has been one one-thousandth of 1 percent?

We also need to talk about those American families, those American workers who have purchased homes where they wanted them to be, not

worried about a commute to their job, but today, for several of those, their gas cost is the same as their mortgage. That impacts business in America.

Mr. Speaker, America is a great Nation because of her people. It's our responsibility to put the policies in place that allow them to have a quality of life and to create the jobs.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as I had noted earlier, this Congress, the Democrat majority in the House today, has the lowest level of popularity, lowest level approval in recorded history, 16 percent. Why? Because of actions like today.

This legislation that is before us came out of committee 8 weeks ago. Eight weeks, 2 months, that those who are unemployed have exhausted their benefits and been asking for extended unemployment benefits. We in the Republicans on the Ways and Means Committee said we want to work with our Democrat friends in the majority so we can pass a bill that's bipartisan, provides extend unemployment benefits and, frankly, becomes law.

I would note, there's a publication on Capitol Hill called Congress Daily. It shows that today's exercise is frankly just election-year politics, probably one more reason this Democratic majority has the lowest level of approval in recorded history of any Congress. This Democrat leadership today is quoted as saying, It's not what we had hoped. We'll keep trying. But ultimately this is clearly going to only be possible on the supplemental.

So, ladies and gentlemen, what we're doing today is an election-year exercise, and unfortunately, we've lost 8 weeks, which means that for 8 weeks, unemployed workers who have exhausted their unemployment benefits have had to painfully wait for the action of this Congress. We want to work together in a bipartisan way. We want to pass legislation that will become law, and as my friend on the other side of the aisle knows, this bill isn't going to become law.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to one of the newest Members of the House of Representatives, the distinguished Member from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, why would we want to extend unemployment benefits when we can instead pass legislation that will create more American jobs and lower gas prices at the same time? We can create American jobs by passing legislation to increase the supply of oil by exploring our own natural resources, in places like ANWR and the Outer Continental Shelf. We can create more American jobs by passing legislation to expedite the permitting process to increase refining capacity here in our own country. We can create more American jobs by passing legislation to explore alternative sources of energy.

We can create more American jobs, and not only will these pieces of legislation do that, these pieces of legislation will also reduce unemployment and lead to lower gas prices at the pumps.

Rather than passing a bill that pays unemployment benefits for a year to someone who only worked for 2 weeks, like this legislation does, rather than passing a bill that adds more than \$8.5 billion to the Federal deficit, I call on Speaker PELOSI and the Democratic leadership in Congress to set this bill on the side and bring up our legislation that will increase the supply of American oil, reduce our dependence on Middle Eastern oil and, most importantly, create more American jobs and reduce gas prices.

□ 1345

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, several speakers have suggested that there is plenty of funds in Federal unemployment accounts to support these benefits. Today, those trust funds include \$35 billion, and the Congressional Budget Office suggests this legislation will spend about \$14 billion over the next 2 years.

But that's just the start. This program will run from July through March of 2009; that's 9 months. But once started, such programs have always been extended. The average duration of these temporary programs is about 30 months. Do the math. That's more than three times as long as the legislation before us suggests. So this program could very well wind up costing at least three times as much as the score of this bill says. Three times 14 billion is 42 billion; 42 billion is more than the 35 billion in the current unemployment trust funds.

The last time Congress created a program like this that drained the Federal unemployment accounts in the 1970s, it had to create a temporary surtax that applies to all workers. That temporary surtax still exists today; it is more than 30 years old.

It's important to note, Mr. Speaker, this legislation not only adds to the deficit, but it's going to force a tax increase.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Republican leader of the House, Mr. BOEHNER of Ohio.

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague from Illinois for yielding and make clear once again that Republicans in the House want to pass a responsible extension of unemployment benefits.

We realize that there are people in America who are hurting, who need help. But the bill that we have before us is an irresponsible bill. And it's irresponsible for two reasons; one, it's not targeted to the States that have high unemployment. It says we're going to extend 13 additional weeks of unemployment in all 50 States regardless of what the unemployment rate is. I'll use the example I used yesterday. Oklahoma has a 2.6 percent unemployment

rate. Why would we need an additional 13 weeks of unemployment in that State? And so it's not targeted to the States that need the help, and it could be targeted.

The second problem is the fact that we reduce—or basically eliminate—the work requirements. Under the current law, you've got to work 20 weeks in order to be entitled to unemployment benefits. Under this bill, you could work as little as 2 weeks and be entitled to up to a year of unemployment benefits. I just think that that's a poor use of our taxpayer funds.

Why aren't they thinking about the hardworking men and women in America, who go to work every day, they pay taxes, they do tough jobs, they have to give part of their money to us so that we can spend it on behalf of the American people to provide services? We should always remember that it's the hardworking people in America that provide the taxpayer funds that we spend. And our job is to spend those funds in a responsible way, and this is not, in my view, a responsible bill.

Republicans want to work with Democrats to pass a responsible extension of unemployment benefits. And we can do it together if we will just sit down and work it out. But we all know this bill is going nowhere. This bill is dead on arrival, the Senate is not going to take it up, it's going nowhere. And so instead of wasting all of this time having this debate about an irresponsible bill, we actually could have legislation on the floor today that allows us to produce more American energy.

I think the American people want us to achieve energy independence, and the only way we're going to get there is to do what I call, "all of the above." We need to conserve more in America. We need biofuels; we need alternative fuels; we need to get serious about nuclear energy; and we need to produce more oil and gas here in the United States instead of depending on some 70 percent of it coming from foreign sources.

But over the course of the last 18 years that I've been a Member of Congress there have been 46 energy votes on the floor of this House that would allow us to produce more American energy. And guess what? Forty-six times I voted to bring more American energy to the market. The Speaker of the House got to vote over those last 18 years on the same 46 votes. Do you know how many times she voted in favor of American energy? Twice.

When it comes to American energy, it's pretty clear what party is in favor of bringing more American energy to the marketplace. Bringing American energy to the marketplace in an environmentally safe way is possible, and we ought to do it in order to achieve energy independence and bring down the price of energy and gasoline in America. It would be far more productive doing that bill on the floor today than doing the bill that we're doing.

Mr. McDERMOTT. We have no more speakers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time we have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as I would note, the legislation before us, as was so eloquently described by the Republican leader of the House, makes some radical changes. For 27 years, Republicans and Democrats have had in place a work rule requirement for federally funded unemployment benefits. It said, to qualify for up to a year, 12 months, you should work 20 weeks. That seems a fair trade off between work and benefits. And this legislation before us, Mr. Speaker, removes that requirement.

Now, my friends on the other side of the aisle refer to that concern as just kind of a straw man, it doesn't really matter. Well, why did they do it? Why is there a need to remove a 20-week work requirement to qualify for 12 months or a full year of unemployment benefits? We've had no hearings in committee. No one has explained why they're making this radical change. It just seems to be omitted from the presentations by the majority side of the aisle. So again we ask why. You know, under this policy that they're putting forward, someone would only need to work 2 weeks in a State like Michigan or Illinois and qualify for a full 1 year or 12 months of federally funded unemployment benefits. That's a radical policy change.

And let me just repeat what every Republican has stated: We want to extend unemployment benefits for those workers in hard-hit States who have exhausted their benefits. And we have repeatedly offered to our friends on the other side of the aisle saying we want to get a bill signed into law. Let's set aside election-year politics, let's work together, let's extend benefits for those who have exhausted their benefits another 13, and in some cases, 26 weeks. But we want to work together to get it done, because if we don't, and we just do the usual politics as usual, election-year politics, bring legislation to the floor we know is not going to become law, make speeches, the folks back home are going to be disappointed.

As has been noted by many, this Congress today only enjoys a 16-percent approval rating amongst the people of Illinois, the people of America. That is the lowest approval rating of any Congress in recorded history. Why? Because of the election-year politics that are being practiced today.

So I'm going to again offer to my good friends on the other side of the aisle, people who I am very fond of, people I enjoy working with, we need to work together because people are hurting. We need to work together to help those in our States who are unemployed and who have exhausted their benefits. And because of election-year

politics, unemployed workers in States like Michigan and Illinois, who have exhausted their benefits, have gone without. Why? Because Congress has played election-year politics.

So let's work together. I urge a "no" vote on this legislation because it's not going to become law. I urge a "no" vote so that we work together to solve this challenge and quickly place on the President's desk legislation that will become law that extends unemployment benefits because we support extending unemployment benefits.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have trouble following the logic that you would vote "no" because it isn't going to become law. Why don't you vote "yes" and put it over there, and maybe the Senate this time will come to their senses and do something with this proposal? It's been over there since May 15. And I think that it really is an issue that we ought to give them one more chance to come to their senses.

Now, when you compare the unemployment rate of today with 1996, I really appreciate that because during the Clinton administration there were 20 million new jobs created, and in 1996, they were creating hundreds of thousands of jobs per month. In this administration, over the last 5 months we've lost a quarter of a million jobs. This is a totally different time.

There are huge problems out there, and they're not getting any better. And they're not going to get solved here today by, "let's open up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to drilling." Even if we did that, the oil wouldn't be here for about 4 years, and a lot of people on unemployment would be pretty hungry waiting for that job in the oil industry 4 years from now.

Mr. Speaker, the American people should only have one question in their minds today: How bad does it have to get before the President and the Republican leadership decide to join the Democrats in extending a helping hand for unemployment benefits? The revised data released by the Labor Department today shows things are even worse than we thought. Now the decision is up to us.

I introduced this legislation and invited my friend and colleague, Republican Representative PHIL ENGLISH, to join me because helping the American people to survive during tough economic times should not be a partisan issue. People say it has become a partisan issue here. Well, yeah, the White House has made it a partisan issue. They've said there's no problem, and they will not sign a bill that we craft. They've made their mind up before they even have a chance to look at it.

But too many others on the other side have made it just that. The American people woke up this morning to some bad economic news, and our efforts to help them were derailed by the Republican obstructionists. Those

headlines, "Republicans kill extended unemployment benefits," you're going to have another set if you're not careful.

We talked a lot yesterday and today about unemployment rates exceeding 6 or 7 percent in several parts of the country, and the devastating impact of those rates. Now, I confess I'm not an economist—I know that's no surprise—but let me predict that the unemployment rate among House Republican Members will go a whole lot higher than 7 percent if they continue to refuse to help the American people in this growing economic crisis.

It's called the Emergency Extended Unemployment Insurance Act of 2008 because it is an emergency, and the time to act is right now.

A vote for H.R. 5749 is a vote to help the American people and the American economy.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, democrats in Congress have pushed to extend unemployment benefits since the beginning of the year, as the economy weakened, but have faced continued resistance from the Bush Administration. Nobody can argue that our economy is struggling. For five consecutive months, the U.S. economy has lost jobs, totaling 324,000. Over the last year, the number of unemployed workers has grown by 1.6 million. The number of people looking for work climbed to 8.5 million in May. Nearly 1 in 5 jobless workers (1.6 million) is long-term unemployed (jobless for more than 26 weeks). There are 200,000 more long-term jobless Americans now than when President Bush signed the last extension of unemployment benefits into law in 2002.

The airline industry has eliminated 22,000 jobs so far this year, more than in all of 2007, most recently at Continental (3,000 jobs) and United (up to 1,600 jobs), and the automobile industry continues to face job cuts, leading industries with announced layoffs in May with over 30,000.

In May, we had the biggest one-month jump in the unemployment rate in two decades. The unemployment rate surged to 5.5 percent from 5.0 percent—the biggest one-month jump in more than two decades (since February 1986) and climbing to the highest level in nearly four years (October 2004). The unemployment rate is now a full percentage point higher than a year ago. Families can wait no longer, and neither will this Congress.

Today, the House will take up H.R. 5749, the Emergency Extended Unemployment Compensation Act:

To immediately provide up to 13 weeks of extended unemployment benefits in every state to workers exhausting the 26 weeks of regular unemployment benefits.

In states with higher levels of unemployment (six percent or higher), an additional 13 weeks would be available, for a total of 26 weeks of extended benefits.

Relief would run through March 2009.

The bill would provide much-needed relief to 3.8 million unemployed workers to assist them with rapidly rising gas and food costs, while they continue to struggle to find work in the slowing economy.

Federal unemployment trust funds, which have more than enough reserves to cover the cost, will finance these benefits.

In Texas, this bill would help 160,239 unemployed workers. Extending these benefits is one of the most cost-effective and fast-acting ways to stimulate the economy because the money is spent quickly. According to the Congressional Budget Office, every \$1 spent on unemployment benefits generates \$1.64 in new economic demand. This bill costs \$11 billion over 10 years, or 1.1 billion per year. That is approximately 3 days in Iraq.

I commend my colleagues, Congressman McDERMOTT and Congressman ENGLISH for introducing this bill and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5749, Emergency Extended Unemployment Act of 2008, introduced by my distinguished colleague Representative McDERMOTT. This important legislation will provide much-needed relief to 3.8 million unemployed workers who are besieged to cope with rapidly rising gas and food costs, while they continue to struggle to find work in the slowing economy.

Democrats in Congress have pushed to extend unemployment benefits since the beginning of the year, as the economy weakened, but have faced continued resistance from the Bush Administration. Today, the House will take up H.R. 5749, the Emergency Extended Unemployment Compensation Act on the suspension calendar. The legislation would immediately provide up to 13 weeks of extended unemployment benefits in every state to workers who have exhausted the 26 weeks of regular unemployment benefits. For states with especially high unemployment rates, an additional 13 weeks would be offered, bringing the total to 26 weeks of extended benefits.

The need for action is clear. For the fifth straight month, the economy lost jobs and unemployment rose from 5.0 percent in April to 5.5 percent in May, with 49,000 jobs lost in May alone. The economy has lost nearly 325,000 jobs this year and 3.8 million Americans are unemployed. These grim statistics are yet another signal that the Bush Administration's economic policies have failed the American people. Americans are now facing higher costs for basic necessities, unemployment is up, millions of families have lost their homes or value in their homes due to the housing crisis, and 7 million more Americans are uninsured.

Extending unemployment benefits is one of the most cost-effective and fast-acting ways to stimulate the economy because the money is spent quickly, according to the Congressional Budget Office. Every \$1 spent on unemployment benefits generates \$1.64 in new economic demand. Unfortunately, President Bush and some Republicans oppose our effort to help unemployed workers and to get our economy moving again. Instead, they want more of the same.

Middle class families can't afford four more years of the kind of policies that have weakened our economy and left hundreds of thousands of Americans looking for work and struggling to make ends meet. We hope the President and his Republican allies will change course and work with us to assist unemployed workers. Today, gas prices hit an average of \$4.05 per gallon, a new historic high. The price of a barrel of oil increased more on Friday, in one single day, than a barrel cost a decade ago, before George W. Bush became President. Even in the face of

these record increases, Senate Republicans blocked consideration of the Renewable Energy and Job Creation Act of 2008. The Renewable Energy and Job Creation Act of 2008 passed the House, and would retain and create hundreds of thousands of green energy jobs. Experts estimate biofuel blends are keeping gas prices about 15 percent lower than they otherwise would be now—and the energy law increases our commitment to these and other American-grown biofuels.

While Democrats are taking action to lessen our dependence on foreign oil and lower prices, Republicans continue to repeat the same old rhetoric: continued calling for drilling in ANWR, even though the Department of Energy has concluded that opening up the Arctic for drilling would not reduce the price of a gallon of gasoline until 20 years from now—and then only by about 1 penny. Since 2000, drilling has increased dramatically—climbing about 66 percent—while gas prices continue to increase. Additionally, the federal government has already opened up leases to 68 million acres of federal land that oil companies aren't even tapping.

From day one, the New Direction Congress has been fighting to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, bring down record gas prices, and launch a cleaner, smarter energy future for America that lowers costs and creates hundreds of thousands of green jobs. Democrats in Congress have already taken action to bring down the price of gas, passing legislation to suspend the filling of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, SPR, starting June 30th and going through the end of the year. The House also approved the Gas Price Relief for Consumers Act of 2008. The legislation gives U.S. authorities the ability to prosecute anticompetitive conduct committed by international cartels like OPEC that restricts supply and drives up prices. The House also continues to build on the work of the Energy Independence and Security Act which will transition the American economy to more efficient vehicles and reduce our dependence on foreign fuels.

I am proud to support this important legislation that will address the economic needs of the American people, and I urge my colleagues to join in so doing.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this urgently needed legislation.

The latest statistics, show that the national unemployment rate has risen from 5 percent to 5.5 percent, the biggest increase in a single month in over 20 years, and now is at the highest level in nearly four years.

The economy has been slowing and has been losing jobs for at least five months. In May the number of people looking for work reached 8.5 million—and nearly one in five has been unemployed for more than 26 weeks.

Colorado has not been as hard hit as some other States, but we are not immune. For example, Denver will be affected by United Airlines' discontinuing its low-fare "Ted" carrier as well by layoffs by other airlines and companies in other sectors.

And, in the Nation as a whole the number of long-term unemployed Americans is higher now than when Congress last extended unemployment benefits in 2002.

This legislation will respond to that problem by immediately providing up to 13 weeks of extended unemployment benefits in every

state to workers exhausting the 26 weeks of regular unemployment benefits. In addition, another 13 weeks of extended benefits will be available in States with unemployment rates of six percent or higher. According to the Congressional Budget Office, this will help some 3.8 million Americans.

And by helping them, we help the country—because extending unemployment compensation benefits is one of the most cost-effective and fast-acting ways to stimulate the economy. In fact, an estimate by an independent expert—the chief economist of Moody's Economy.com—indicates that each dollar of unemployment benefits generates \$1.64 in new economic demand, while the existing federal unemployment trust funds have more than enough reserves to cover the cost.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this legislation deserves prompt approval. In fact, I think it should have been passed yesterday—and would have been if just 3 more of our Republican colleagues had voted for it then, when we considered it under a procedure that required a two-thirds majority for passage.

But even a day late, we still have an opportunity to do the right thing, so I urge its approval by the House.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support today's legislation to extend unemployment benefits at a time of economic hardship for families in Oregon and across the country. There are currently over 106,000 unemployed workers in Oregon and as many as 3.8 million nationally who are struggling with the rising cost of food and fuel.

Today's legislation will immediately provide up to 13 weeks of extended unemployment benefits in every state to workers exhausting their 26 weeks of regular unemployment benefits. In states with levels of unemployment at 6 percent or higher, an additional 13 weeks would be available for a total of 26 weeks of extended benefits.

In my home state of Oregon, our economy has weakened but remained at the relative national average of 5.5 percent. However, that is an unemployment rate 0.5 percent higher than this time last year. Although Oregonians would not qualify at this time for the second extension of benefits, it gives me peace of mind to know that safety nets are in place if the Oregon economy gets bleaker. Many in Oregon well remember the downturn in 2003 when during the summer the unemployment exceeded 8.5 percent, the highest in the country.

During major economic slowdowns, unemployed workers are the hardest hit. Not only do they suffer a loss of wages, but they face a tighter job market in which to return. Extending these workers' benefits is not only morally correct; it is also good for our ailing economy. The Congressional Budget office estimates that every \$1 spent on unemployment benefits generates \$1.64 in new economic demand.

I am pleased that Democrats have moved quickly to pass this benefits extension for the workers who need it most. I hope that the Senate will move quickly and the President will refrain from vetoing this legislation so that American families can get the help they need.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1265, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. WELLER OF ILLINOIS

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. In its current form I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Weller of Illinois moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5749 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendments:

In section 2(a), strike "Any State which desires to do so" and insert "Any State whose average rate of total unemployment equals or exceeds 5.0 percent or equals or exceeds 120 percent of the average rate of total unemployment in such State for the corresponding period in the preceding calendar year (as determined by the Secretary of Labor in a manner based on clause (i) or (ii) of section 203(f)(1)(A) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970, as the case may be)".

Strike paragraph (2) of section 2(d) and insert the following:

(2) the terms and conditions of the State law which apply to claims for regular compensation and to the payment thereof shall apply to claims for emergency unemployment compensation and the payment thereof, except—

(A) that an individual shall not be eligible for emergency unemployment compensation under this Act unless, in the base period with respect to which the individual exhausted all rights to regular compensation under the State law, the individual had 20 weeks of full-time insured employment or the equivalent in insured wages, as determined under the provisions of the State law implementing section 202(a)(5) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note); and

(B) where otherwise inconsistent with the provisions of this Act or with the regulations or operating instructions of the Secretary promulgated to carry out this Act; and

At the end of section 3, add the following:

(d) TRANSPORTATION SUBSIDIES TO ASSIST THOSE RETURNING TO WORK.—

(1) APPLICABILITY.—This subsection applies in the case of any individual who becomes reemployed for at least one full week after an account under this section is established for such individual but before such individual has exhausted such individual's rights under this Act (including the right to have such account augmented under subsection (c), if applicable).

(2) ELIGIBILITY FOR TRANSPORTATION SUBSIDY.—In order to subsidize transportation expenses associated with returning to work, an individual described in paragraph (1) shall, for purposes of any determination of rights under this Act, be entitled to have such individual's first full week of reemployment (as referred to in paragraph (1)) treated in the same manner as if it were a week during which such individual had remained unemployed and had satisfied the work search and other requirements for receiving emergency unemployment compensation (other than filing a claim).

Mr. WELLER of Illinois (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

□ 1400

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit supports extension of unemployment benefits for long-term unemployed, those who have exhausted their unemployment benefits. And this motion to recommit makes three simple changes to the legislation before us. It adds a requirement of 20 weeks of work for workers to qualify for the extended unemployment benefits. It targets benefits to high unemployment States, and it provides additional money to many of the newly hired individuals to help them deal with the high price of gasoline.

I particularly want to thank my colleagues, Mr. KIRK, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BILIRAKIS and others for the help that they have given in crafting this motion to recommit as we work towards extension of unemployment benefits to those who need help.

First, I would note that this motion reinserts the current law requirement that workers who qualify for Federal extended unemployment benefits must have worked at least 20 weeks before being laid off. This requirement was removed by the majority with the underlying legislation.

This commonsense Federal requirement has been in place since 1981 and was included in the temporary extended benefits program Congress created in 2002, our last extended benefit program.

Nearly every Democrat Member voted for that bill then, and as we have discussed on this floor for the last 2 days, there is no good reason, there is no argument that has been made by the other side to impose the reestablishment of this long-standing Federal policy now.

Second, this motion would specify that only individuals in States with unemployment rates above 5 percent or that have seen a sharp rise in unemployment would be eligible for 13 weeks of Federal extended benefits. As under H.R. 5749, individuals in States with unemployment rates above 6 percent would be eligible for up to 26 weeks of Federal extended benefits.

Today, 22 States have unemployment rates above 5 percent or have seen a sharp rise in rates, including six States above 6 percent. So workers in nearly half of the States would be eligible for extended benefits, which could rise, or more would be eligible if States experience a rise in unemployment rates.

In contrast with H.R. 5749, this motion would not extend benefits in States that currently have unemploy-

ment rates below 5 percent, and I would note that 5 percent is low by historical standards, and that have not been experiencing rising rates. They will continue to be eligible for their basic 26 weeks of unemployment benefits. So I would note that they will continue to have unemployment benefits available to laid-off workers.

Moreover, by targeting benefits to where they are needed most, this motion actually reduces the cost of the bill, reduces the deficit, and makes it much more fiscally responsible than the untargeted, unpaid-for, "in violation of the House rules" legislation that has been offered by the majority.

And third, we all know that every American family is struggling with record gasoline prices. That struggle is especially pronounced for unemployed workers and in particular the long-term unemployed. Those who return to work, however, may face high commuting costs, starting with the high price of gas they must put in their tanks to get to a new job.

And I would note that this Democratic Congress, which is the least popular Congress in recorded history because of its lack of action on energy, has refused to allow for increases in domestically produced fuels which we need to help our economy.

In fact, it is the Democrat policies in the last year and a half since January 2007 which are responsible for an increase in gasoline prices of \$1.73, basically a doubling of gasoline prices since our Democratic friends gained the majority. That's why gasoline prices are over \$4.

We want to help American workers. And that is why we are offering help to alleviate the high price of gasoline for unemployed individuals. This motion would provide 1 extra week of extended unemployment benefits for those who return to work without exhausting their extended benefits. On average, this would mean an extra \$290 per eligible worker. So for an unemployed mother who goes back to work with two children, that could mean up to four tanks of gasoline at today's \$4 gasoline prices, probably enough to get her to and from her first full month on the job. Especially for someone who might not have much money left after a long spell of unemployment, that is real relief where today it is desperately needed, at the pump and in the pocketbook.

Mr. Speaker, this motion provides timely, targeted and temporary assistance, something the Speaker herself called for earlier this year. So we talked about boosting the economy. I urge its adoption so we can send this bill to the Senate and down to the White House as soon as possible. As the President said, he will veto the underlying bill. Passage of this motion to recommit will give us a bill the President will sign, and it will become law, and we can help unemployed workers.

I urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, sometimes I am kind of appalled. I didn't think they could write a motion to recommit that would be worse than already their public stance is. But this motion to recommit would deny extended unemployment benefits to long-term jobless workers in 31 States. As you know, Mr. Speaker, some Members may be in their offices. They ought to listen to the list.

Alabama gets nothing. Arizona gets nothing. Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts is gone too. Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, New Mexico. Why, it goes on and on. North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Vermont. The way they have written this, those States get nothing. They don't even get 13 weeks. Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming. None of them get a single benefit from this bill if that amendment is adopted.

Now let's just talk for a second here about what we are talking about. New Jersey. Atlantic City has an unemployment rate of 6.1 percent right now. But since they are in the State of New Jersey where the unemployment rate is only 4 percent, in Atlantic City, people are tough out of luck. They aren't going to get a single benefit. Or if they live in Ocean City where it is 6.6 percent, or they live in Vineland, Millville or Bridgeton where it is 7.1 percent, not a single penny goes to those people because they live in a State where it is only 4 percent.

Now I would like to see the community meeting that the Members go to when they explain to people that they voted "no" on giving extended benefits to people who have unemployment benefits and have exhausted them in these States. This makes it much worse than the bill we have. It clearly confirms that the Republicans really want to give unemployment benefits to no one.

Now as to the question of whether or not we have given a reason, we took the 20-week provision out for a very simple reason, because it denies benefits to 10 percent of the people who are presently in our workforce. These are benefits they earned by having money taken out of their paycheck. Their employer said, "I am not going to give you this. I am going to put this in the unemployment fund." That is how it works.

So those employees that had that money being put in there and now they lose their benefits because of the fact that they have worked 10 months and they didn't get to the right place in the right time to get their 20 weeks, it is simply a denial of benefits to women, to low-wage workers and to minorities. It is basically people at the bottom of the economic rungs. And the Republicans are pleased to do that. Not only do they take it away from them, but they also take it away from 31 States.

I urge the Members to think about the election when they vote "no" on this amendment.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I do not support the minority's effort to weaken the impact of extended unemployment benefits for Americans. In this economic downturn, our workers should be able to receive the same 13-week extension granted to workers exhausting the regular 26 weeks of unemployment benefits in other states.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, since January 2001, only 5.3 million jobs have been created nationwide. In Arizona, an average of 1,470 jobs have been lost each month for the past 6 months. Only 389,700 new jobs have been created since January 2001—or 4,480 new jobs per month—as compared with a total of 691,700 new jobs during the previous decade—or 7,950 per month.

This year, Arizona's job losses have been concentrated in construction and housing-related industries, including real estate and finance, but they are beginning to appear across a wide range of industries as this economic decline continues. I support the benefits provided by H.R. 5749 because according to the Congressional Budget Office, they are a cost-effective and fast-acting means of stimulating the economy. Every \$1 spent on unemployment benefits generates \$1.64 in new economic demand.

I will vote "yea" on final passage of H.R. 574 the Emergency Extended Unemployment Compensation Act, and do not support the minority's efforts to undermine effective economic relief for Arizonans.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. 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.

Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on the question of passage, and the motion to suspend the rules on S. 2146.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 170, nays 243, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 411]

YEAS—170

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)

Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny

Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway

Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (NY)

Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula

Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—243

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar

Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Goode
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hookey
Hoyer

Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (IA)
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell

Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez

Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Speier
Spratt

Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Sarbanes
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—21

Braley (IA)
Burgess
Buyer
Davis, Tom
Ferguson
Flake
Gonzalez

Higgins
Hinojosa
Hulshof
Kind
LaHood
Loeb sack
McCrery

Moran (KS)
Ortiz
Paul
Pryce (OH)
Rogers (MI)
Rush
Tancredo

□ 1432

Messrs. LARSON of Connecticut, DEFAZIO, CLYBURN, GERLACH, MURPHY of Connecticut, MITCHELL, FILNER, HODES, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Messrs. PORTER, PLATTS, JOHNSON of Illinois, KING of Iowa, JOHNSON of Georgia and SHUSTER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. BOOZMAN, SIMPSON, POE and REYNOLDS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, today I intended to vote “no” on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 5749, the Emergency Extended Unemployment Compensation Act, vote No. 411. Despite my efforts to ensure that my vote was recorded as “no,” it was recorded as “yea.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. 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 274, nays 137, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 412]

YEAS—274

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca

Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry

Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)

Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Butterfield
Camp (MI)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chabot
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Coutney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fossella
Foster
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Goode
Gordon
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Heller
Herseeth Sandlin
Hill
Hinchey
Hirono

Boya (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Butterfield
Camp (MI)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chabot
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Coutney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fossella
Foster
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Goode
Gordon
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Heller
Herseeth Sandlin
Hill
Hinchey
Hirono

Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Johnson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lampson
Langvin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)

Petri
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NAYS—137

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis

Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)

Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway

Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Lucas
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)

Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley (TX)
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam

Radanovich
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—23

Berman
Braley (IA)
Burgess
Buyer
Davis, Tom
Ferguson
Flake
Gonzalez

Higgins
Hinojosa
Hulshof
Kind
LaHood
Loeb sack
McCrery
Moran (KS)

Ortiz
Paul
Pryce (OH)
Rogers (MI)
Rush
Speier
Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1439

So the 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. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my support for H.R. 5749, the Emergency Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2008. I am not able to cast my vote today. However, as a co-sponsor of this bill if I had been present, I would have voted “yea” on final passage of H.R. 5749.

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 412, H.R. 5749, to provide for a program of emergency unemployment compensation, I was mistakenly recorded as voting “no.” I should have been recorded as voting “yea” on final passage. I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 5749.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 412, I was speaking with a constituent right off the floor and by the time I realized a second vote was called, I was too late to cast my vote in favor of this important legislation. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT DIESEL EMISSION REDUCTION SUPPLE- MENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2146, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.