

to introduce or bring to the attention of the House an occupant in the galleries.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I frankly believe that this legislation of the mourning doves will not help those Texans in my State. But I do know what will help them and that is a concern about unemployment benefits that need to be extended.

If you want to know what unemployment is about, just come to my home town of Houston. Although we are the can-do city, we fought against the stress of Tropical Storm Alison, the number of layoffs of our corporate friends like Continental and the disaster of Enron with some 4,500 employees being laid off, we know we can pull ourselves up by our boot straps when people are hurting. It is time for this Congress to address the question of the devastation of extended unemployment just like we went to the aid of many of those corporate friends who were devastated after September 11. Thirteen weeks, I will support that; but I also believe 52 weeks of extension because in April my State will see an exhaustion of unemployment benefits of some 175,000 individuals.

I have heard the stories of individuals who cannot pay for health coverage, cannot provide the dollars that allow them to have the COBRA. We need to respond to the crisis of Americans right now and need to talk about unemployment to the extent that we provide the bridge and support for those who are in need.

I have my constituents talking to me about saving Social Security and the prescription drug benefit, but there are working families now who have contributed to this economy and through no fault of their own they are no longer working. I think we are wasting America's time by not coming to this floor, extending unemployment benefits like the Senate did for 13 weeks; and if we can do more we should do more. My advocacy is for the extended 52 weeks because I know in April and May there will be people in my home town who will be hurting.

We have to face reality, Mr. Speaker. Legislation that does not help all of us maybe should be reconsidered. I will be voting against this rule because I want to vote for extended unemployment benefits for Americans. I want them back on their feet. I want them to pay for tuition for the young people going to college. I want them to have health care. I want to make sure they pay their mortgages. I want them to be proud to be an American. I want to thank those men and women who are fighting in Afghanistan to help free us and free Afghanistan. Let us do something for the people here in the United States and extend the unemployment benefits.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), a very much-distinguished member of the Committee on Rules and of this body.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, this morning the morning news from Rochester tells me that this year my district has lost 12,400 jobs. That is almost unheard of in Rochester, New York.

In 1929 when the crash came, we hardly noticed it up there. Our unemployment rate has been always steady and very good, but we are bleeding jobs. I suspect for many of you, your mail must reflect mine. Can you do something about unemployment? I have lost my unemployment. My unemployment is running out. Now to add to the rest of our woes, we also have a lot of people employed by Global Crossing.

I am embarrassed that the people in my district are seeing this morning that what we are most concerned about is the shooting of mourning doves, as the previous speaker said, the peace bird of the State of Wisconsin. I do not know if enough people in my district will be able to shoot enough birds to feed their family, but it does not look like we will be able to do much here on extending their unemployment benefits.

I am sure they understand that we do not control the agenda of this House, or it would have been done a long time ago; and we should have been taking up the Senate bill. I urge Members to vote against the previous question and the rule to try to get some unemployment insurance up here.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield back the time, I would just like to say that it has been nearly 6 months since the tragic events of September 11. Millions of American jobs have been lost since then. The unemployment benefits for 1.3 million Americans have already expired. Millions more will be losing benefits in the coming weeks. We must act.

Last month the other body passed a very clean extension of these critically needed benefits. Every day we fail to act means economic hardship for more and more Americans. In a bipartisan fashion we should not be wasting time and be together on this and vote to extend unemployment benefits.

As far as the rule is concerned, the rule is okay and it is open. We have no problem with it.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind Members because there is a lot of concern on both sides of the aisle regard-

ing the unemployment benefits for those who were adversely harmed by what happened on September 11 and because of the economy, we intend to take that up and we will take that up; and I just wanted to remind my colleagues of that.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, this rule would clear the way for the House to debate a nonbinding resolution about changing the hunting seasons for migratory mourning doves.

That is an interesting resolution, and it could make for an interesting debate. But the fact that it is proposed for debate today on the House floor is little short of a disgrace because of what it says about the priorities of the House's Republican leadership.

In short, they have made it a priority to debate this nonbinding resolution, instead of trying to help people who have lost their jobs and are in an economic bind.

I know we are all encouraged by the signs the economy is recovering from recession. But the recovery is far from complete, and unemployment insurance is running out for thousands of people who have lost their jobs.

Extending those benefits is something they need and something that will help the economy because it will enable them to continue paying their bills. And it is what we should be doing today instead of debating whether Congress should go on record with some opinions about changing a hunting season.

There should not be any partisan disagreement about this. That is why the Senate has already twice unanimously approved bills that would extend unemployment compensation benefits for 13 weeks.

And that is what we should be doing today, instead of debating hunting seasons. We should be passing that bill—the bill supported by every Senator, regardless of party—and sending it to the President so he can sign it into law.

It's too bad the Republican leadership does not think that should have priority over this resolution. I don't share that view, and so I cannot support this rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 354 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 354

Resolved, That it shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of Wednesday, March 6, 2002, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules relating to the following measures:

(1) The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 32) congratulating the United States Military Academy at West Point on its bicentennial anniversary, and commending its outstanding contributions to the Nation.

(2) The bill (S. 1857) to encourage the negotiated settlement of tribal claims.

(3) The bill (H.R. 1870) to provide for the sale of certain real property within the Newlands Project in Nevada, to the city of Fallon, Nevada.

(4) The bill (H.R. 1883) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a feasibility study on water optimization in the Burnt River basin, Malheur River basin, Owyhee River basin, and Powder River basin, Oregon.

(5) The bill (H.R. 1963) to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the route taken by American soldier and frontiersman George Rogers Clark and his men during the Revolutionary War to capture the British forts at Kaskaskia and Cahokia, Illinois, and Vincennes, Indiana, for study for potential addition to the National Trails System.

(6) A bill to provide assistance to displaced workers by extending unemployment benefits and by providing a credit for health insurance costs, and for other purposes.

(7) A resolution expressing support for the democratically elected government of Colombia and its efforts to counter threats from United States-designated foreign terrorist organizations.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 354 is a rule providing for the consideration of motions to suspend the rules at any time on the legislative day Wednesday, March 6, 2002. This is a fair rule that will allow for consideration of several pieces of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, last night the Committee on Rules in fact had the debate and the vote about those things which we are going to choose to consider today and one of those that we talked about at the time we have now made a decision that we are not going to present at this time; and it should be noted that though, while the unemployment benefits bill is listed under the rule, it will not be called up for consideration today, meaning that it will not be a part of the package that we are seeking at this time.

Mr. Speaker, since the tragic events of September 11, the House has worked with speed and deliberation to pass much-needed legislation that will provide an extension of critical-needed unemployment benefits to dislocated workers. It is regrettable that though this bill has passed several times with bipartisan votes that there will be no action on this today and also that there has been no action by the other body on this.

As the 6-month anniversary of September 11 approaches us, there are people across the country who are still struggling to recover from the tragic events of that day, whether it be emotional, physically, financially or otherwise. It is my hope that the issue will stay at the forefront of our legislative

business until we pass and enact a bill that will help each of those people.

Mr. Speaker, I have outlined those things which we will be considering, or hope to consider, today under suspension of the rules; and I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule which will allow us to consider these pieces of legislation.

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

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this rule will allow us to consider a number of suspension bills today, bills that many of us had hoped would be of critical importance to our constituents. In fact, last night rumors circulated that the leadership of the body was preparing to do what we hoped it would have done long ago and extend unemployment benefits to the thousands of workers who were laid off in the wake of the September 11 attacks.

For weeks we have begged the leadership of the body time and time again to pass a clean unemployment extension bill. Recently released Labor Department data for January 2002 shows that from September 11 through January of this year more than 1.3 million workers exhausted their regular unemployment benefits. As of January, about 7.9 million Americans, or about 5.6 percent of the workforce, were unemployed. Over 12,000 people a day are exhausting their unemployment insurance. And earlier this year the Senate adopted a simple extension of unemployment benefits by unanimous consent.

The House leadership, rather than acting expeditiously, refused to pass the same extension without tying it to a package of dying stimulus plans.

□ 1130

The plan, no one was surprised to learn, consisted almost entirely of tax cuts for corporations and the wealthy. And the measure, no one was surprised to learn, went nowhere in the Senate.

We now have an opportunity to do today, or we did have, what should have been done weeks ago, pass a clean unemployment bill. Were we to pass such a measure this morning, the bill could be on the President's desk immediately. But, instead, the leadership of the body is preparing to push a measure that would augment a simple extension of jobs benefits with controversial tax provisions that will kill it in the Senate.

Why can we not simply extend unemployment benefits by an additional 13 weeks? Tax credits do little to aid the unemployed, many of whom are not paying taxes in the first place while out of work. A clean bill could go

straight to the President, and the leadership in the body could signal to the unemployed that this House cares about the plight of their families. Today's confusion, however, will ensure just the opposite, more delay and not a penny of relief for impacted families.

Mr. Speaker, this is not leadership; this is petulance. Having failed three times to pass accelerated tax breaks for upper brackets and reducing the alternative tax on corporations or actually doing away with them, the leadership is taking a fourth swing at the other body. What is stunning about this maneuver is the sheer cynicism it embraces. The leadership is making it perfectly clear that it is willing to inflict further pain on desperate families in order to have another crack at a divisive, partisan agenda.

Moreover, Members of this body are being afforded little notice of what these bills contain. The House of Representatives is not a shadow government. Our rules mandate that we deliberate in the open. What aversion do we have here to regular order? Instead of informed deliberations, my colleagues are left with scant information. In fact, the bill we have been talking about has not yet been seen, and my colleagues and I have no information and no debate time on which to base decisions impacting millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this extraordinary rule we are considering today is normally reserved for those times when Congress is hard at work, not when we are working 2½ days a week, and it needs flexibility to meet its commitments. But not today. The long stretches of idleness in this body can surely be replaced with meaningful deliberation on important measures.

We just got the report of people being abused in nursing homes. We should be concerned about all the corporations in America that are registering themselves over in Bermuda to avoid paying America's taxes. While we name post offices and contemplate shooting mourning doves, the measures that impact prescription drugs and saving Social Security languish.

I have a bill that would ban genetic discrimination in health insurance that has over 258 bipartisan cosponsors; and it would affect every man, woman, and child in the United States. But for over 6 years we have not been able to have that on the floor. I implore, then, if they are going to abuse the power of suspensions, to put it to good use and make a real difference in the lives of American people.

Mr. Speaker, we intend to try to defeat the previous question on the rule in order to amend the rule simply to allow what should be done, a straight 13-week unemployment benefits extension bill. I urge all my colleagues on both sides of this House to support this effort because the American public demands and deserves it.

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

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

We are hearing a lot about this unemployment problem, and it is a problem, and the health care problems, and there are health care problems. This body has addressed this issue numerous times. This issue was prepared to be on the floor today, except there was some disagreement as to whether it would be on suspension or whether we would have long enough even to speak about it. The bottom line is, I do not believe we should be playing politics with the health and livelihood of American workers, whose families' jobs and their own jobs, their own problems, are right on the line.

But for those who would call for a clean bill, I would quote Speaker HASTERT, who yesterday said this is about as clean as you could get it. And I would add that it is also a straightforward approach to addressing the real needs of laid-off workers as we can get. That was what this bill was supposed to do. It was clean. It was about unemployment and health care tax credits. Oh, but then we find out that they simply do not like the way we have done it, and that is why the other side is opposed to what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, we disagree on lots of issues, and they are honest disagreements that we have in Washington, about taxes, about the size of government, about how much we are going to tax the American people, about who will be paying in and who will be receiving what. But the bottom line is that this Republican Congress has attempted expeditiously and carefully to address the needs and the issues of people who are having tough times. But we also believe, as Republicans, that it is important for us to put out a plan that addresses the needs of the Nation. That is why we asked for tax cuts.

We believe that people not only want a job but they want the ability to have a secure job. Savings and investment and the opportunity for people to have more take-home pay to protect the jobs that we have is what the Republican plan is, also. It is not just about the health care needs, where we offer tax credits. It is not just about unemployment. It is about a broad, overarching idea that we believe that this government can, must and will react and respond properly to people. And that is what the Republican plan has been since September 11.

I am sorry we are not addressing that issue today. We will continue to wait for the other body as they deliberate and deliberate and deliberate on this issue, but we will keep going with the things we know are good for people.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to my friend.

I appreciate that people who are unemployed, who have families to feed, who have mortgages to pay, who have no prospects immediately of a job are not terribly interested whether or not we do away with an Alternative Min-

imum Tax and give money back to IBM and money back to Enron and money back to major corporations in the United States. They simply want some kind of action here.

In all times of trouble, when we have this kind of unemployment rate, it has been the policy of the government of the United States to extend unemployment. For some reason, we simply cannot seem to get that done here. I am appalled at that and urge that that be rectified.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my colleague on the other side, he just said that we are playing politics. I would say the problem here is that the Republicans are in charge of the floor. They are in charge of the House. They are in the leadership because they are in the majority. They are playing politics because they are not allowing a clean bill on unemployment insurance extension to come up.

I cannot believe I am hearing this from my Republican colleagues, somehow suggesting that if we take action on this bill that they put in order under this rule that we will have some relief for the unemployed. It is not true. We know if this bill goes over to the other body and it includes anything other than extension of unemployment compensation it will never pass and it will die.

The other body has already taken up I do not know how many stimulus packages, tried all kinds of options, with or without different kinds of health care benefits, with or without Alternative Minimum Tax, and finally the leadership said, look, there is nothing we can pass here other than a clean unemployment compensation extension, passed, I believe, 100 to nothing.

So the lesson is learned. The only thing that will work, the only thing that will provide relief for Americans who are running out of their unemployment insurance is if we just pass a clean bill that has nothing else attached to it.

We have done the same thing over here. The Republican leadership has brought up three stimulus packages, pretty much the same. I suspect if this bill is voted down today they will bring up another stimulus package tomorrow or next week. They are playing politics because they will not allow a clean bill to pass. It passed the other body 100 to nothing. It will pass here probably unanimously. Let us just do it.

Now, let me talk about the tax credits for health care that are in this bill. My Republican colleagues know that this is a very controversial issue because the Democrats do not believe it will work. When we talk about tax credits for health care, most of the people who are uninsured, very few are going to be able to go out in the individual market and buy insurance, which is \$4,000 or \$5,000 a year, with the

piddly tax credits the Republicans are proposing.

So the Democrats have been saying this is not going to work, this tax credit. We have talked about extending COBRA, we have talked about the need to extend Medicaid to cover more people at a little higher level of income. My own State of New Jersey, a perfect example, is suffering because they do not have the money, and so many States are not able to provide the Medicaid benefits they have now and cover the people they now have and are considering cutting back on Medicaid.

So we have a major difference here. Democrats believe COBRA extension and Medicaid extension will bring more people and provide insurance. We do not believe the Republican proposal with tax credits will work. So forget about this for the time being. We do not have agreement. Let us go with the thing we do have agreement on, which is unemployment expansion, a clean bill. We should bring it up and get it over with.

The Republican side is playing politics and not giving a fair shake to those people in my district and around the country that need these extra weeks of unemployment compensation.

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

We can keep talking about this. It has passed this House four times. This body has dealt with this issue. Now what we hear is my colleagues on the other side suggesting we have to bow down to what the other body wants to do, that we must do what the other body wants to do. Well, that is not the way it works. This body has its own leadership, has the two sides of the aisle. We work on the things that we work on, just like the items that we passed and have sent to the other body.

Mr. Speaker, we have been open and clear about what we are trying to do. We are offering an opportunity to put together unemployment benefits, health care, and, at the same time, make sure that it would be done in a way which we believe would work. Now, what we understand from the other side is, we disagree that it is not going to work that way, so we are going to oppose what you are doing.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have heard this lots of time. We heard this about the balanced budget. A balanced budget will never work. We can never have a balanced budget.

Secondly, we heard when we went to welfare reform, oh, my gosh, welfare reform will never, ever work. We heard this about the capital gains tax cut, that it is going to cost our government \$9 billion. In fact, it did work and brought in \$90 billion to the government and created an economic stimulus that our country has lived off for several years now.

Republican ideas are simply bad to the other side every time, and that is where they play politics, and I am sorry that it is that way. But what we are doing is proposing something that

will allow families who today have to use pre-tax dollars to pay for their health care, and we are trying to make it easier to where they can then deduct this amount.

Tax credits do work. They work for the families that use them over and over and over. Tens of thousands of African Americans, tens of thousands of Hispanics, and, oh, yes, tens of thousands of Caucasians will get this same tax credit. It works for people. It works for people who have health care today by helping them pay for what they want and they need.

I am proud of what we are doing. I am sorry that my colleagues on the other side simply disagree and so they are not willing to venture in to helping anybody because they do not like what we have done. That is the politics, Mr. Speaker, and it is a real shame that it is happening again today on the floor of the House of Representatives right before our very eyes.

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

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

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas has made it clear what this is all about. He says we are waiting for the other body. The other body has twice unanimously passed an unemployment compensation extension bill. Twice. What is my colleague waiting for? He says we should not bow down to the Senate. To whom? TRENT LOTT? Every other Republican in the Senate who voted for this extension?

□ 1145

Bowing down, this is a fight with Republicans in the Senate. It is not only a fight with us. The gentleman is all alone.

Secondly, the gentleman says this issue is not just about unemployment. That is the problem. The gentleman is ignoring the needs of the unemployed because the gentleman has another agenda. I want the gentleman to go and talk to the 356,000 people who exhausted their benefits in January and tell them this is not just about unemployment. It is the largest number of people exhausting their regular benefits without receiving additional aid in a single month, in any single month on record. So I suggest that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) go to the 50 States of this Union and tell them that this is not just about unemployment. Shame.

The other side of the aisle insists on adding to this unemployment bill controversial issues, and the gentleman knows they are. The health provision is the same one that has created the controversy in the Senate. This is what Mr. LOTT said on February 7.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). Members are reminded to

refrain from improper references to Senators.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this is what has been said. "My recommendation is that they send just a clean bill." That is the gentleman's leader over in the Senate. I shall not name his name.

This is what this is all about. The other side wants a package, and then they change it. They want a package that essentially says to the unemployed of this country that their unemployment is not enough for Congress to act.

Mr. Speaker, my suggestion to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) and Members on the Republican side, including many of the leaders who said they wanted a clean bill, is to think again. These millions of people are not getting unemployment on their watch. They are disregarding them. They have another agenda. Take up unemployment compensation today, pass it, send it to the President. I am sure he will sign it, and then we will go on to other issues.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will reiterate that Members must avoid improper references to Senators, whether specifically by name or otherwise.

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

Mr. Speaker, we do have a broader agenda. It is about jobs in this country. It is about the ability that we have to make sure through stimulus or through tax cuts or through those things that will allow people to have more money in their own pocket. That is also what this is about.

Yes, it is bigger than unemployment. It also includes health care. It includes the things that are the essence of what will maintain the vitality of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I learned a long time ago when I came to Congress, some 6 years ago, that virtually every single bill, every single debate that takes place on this floor is about more government, more spending, more taxes, or about the reverse.

I am falling off on the side of the people who want jobs in this country, who want to make sure we have a sound economy and make sure that what this government does, it does, and is done efficiently. I am proud of what we are doing and what we have passed.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind this entire body that if we can lay aside our differences, lay aside the things that we think will not work and get to work on the things that we are going to propose that will work, that means real money to real people in the time of their need, that in fact we will achieve the things that we are after. Government should not pick the winners and losers. We should help the people that need help.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is to try to help the people that need help. I know the un-

employed do want jobs. I am sure that all unemployed workers thought that, during their working years when they paid their taxes, they believed that should a catastrophe hit and they lose their jobs that this government would help them out. That has been in the best tradition, to tide them over until a new job can be found; and when that job is found, I hope it will be as good as the job they lost.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to vote on a straight 13-week extension of the unemployment benefits.

Mr. Speaker, it has been nearly 6 months since the tragic events of September 11. In addition to the horrendous loss of life that occurred as a result of that day, the economic destruction has been enormous. Our economy, which was already in an economic downturn before the event, has worsened considerably. Millions of American jobs have been lost since then.

The unemployment benefits for many of these jobless workers have already expired. Many, many more will lose benefits in the coming weeks. We must act immediately. The other body has already passed a clean extension of these critically-needed benefits. Every day that we fail to act means economic hardships for thousands of Americans and their families. Let us stop wasting time and vote to extend the unemployment benefits. I urge a "no" vote on the previous question.

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES. 354—MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

In the resolution after "(6)" strike "the bill (H.R. 1963)" and all that follows through "health insurance costs, and for other purposes" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 3090) to provide tax incentives for economic recovery."

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we have heard it here today. Republicans have this hidden agenda. The other side of the aisle is right. Our hidden agenda is jobs and growing the economy, getting people back in their jobs, having an extension of unemployment benefits, having health care tax credits. And yet we have heard now what the other side of the aisle says about that. That is that they do not like the way that we have done it, and because they do not like the way we have done this, they oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to continue this Republican conference, and Congress is going to continue passing things that are great for people, good for workers, continues economic opportunities. We are going to keep talking about how America's greatest days lie in our future. Opportunities for people who are going to school and want jobs,

people who today may not have a job. We are going to rebound this economy. It is going to head back.

I believe that the President, working with this Congress, will have a lot of success. That is what this is about. That is our hidden agenda. Our hidden agenda is simple. It is about jobs. It is about economic growth and the opportunity for people to get a job, keep a job and know that they can have more take-home pay.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic voting on adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 191, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 49]

YEAS—218

Aderholt	Duncan	Issa
Akin	Dunn	Istook
Armedy	Ehlers	Jenkins
Bachus	Ehrlich	Johnson (CT)
Baker	Emerson	Johnson (IL)
Ballenger	English	Johnson, Sam
Barr	Everett	Jones (NC)
Bartlett	Ferguson	Keller
Barton	Flake	Kelly
Bass	Fletcher	Kennedy (MN)
Bereuter	Foley	Kerns
Biggart	Forbes	King (NY)
Billakis	Fossella	Kingston
Blunt	Frelinghuysen	Kirk
Boehlert	Galleghy	Knollenberg
Boehner	Ganske	Kolbe
Bonilla	Gekas	LaHood
Bono	Gibbons	Latham
Boozman	Gilchrest	LaTourette
Brady (TX)	Gillmor	Leach
Brown (SC)	Gilman	Lewis (CA)
Bryant	Goode	Lewis (KY)
Burr	Goodlatte	Linder
Burton	Goss	LoBiondo
Callahan	Graham	Lucas (OK)
Camp	Granger	Manzullo
Cannon	Graves	McCrery
Cantor	Green (WI)	McHugh
Capito	Greenwood	McInnis
Castle	Grucci	McKeon
Chabot	Gutknecht	Mica
Chambliss	Hall (TX)	Miller, Dan
Coble	Hansen	Miller, Gary
Collins	Hart	Miller, Jeff
Combest	Hastings (WA)	Moran (KS)
Cooksey	Hayes	Morella
Cox	Hayworth	Myrick
Crane	Hefley	Nethercutt
Crenshaw	Herger	Ney
Culberson	Hilleary	Northup
Cunningham	Hobson	Norwood
Davis, Jo Ann	Hoekstra	Nussle
Davis, Tom	Horn	Osborne
Deal	Hostettler	Ose
DeLay	Houghton	Otter
DeMint	Hulshof	Oxley
Diaz-Balart	Hunter	Paul
Dreier	Isakson	Pence

Peterson (PA)	Schaffer	Terry
Petri	Schrock	Thomas
Pickering	Sensenbrenner	Thornberry
Pitts	Sessions	Thune
Platts	Shadegg	Tiahrt
Pombo	Shaw	Tiberi
Portman	Shays	Toomey
Pryce (OH)	Sherwood	Upton
Putnam	Shimkus	Vitter
Quinn	Shuster	Walden
Radanovich	Simmons	Walsh
Ramstad	Simpson	Wamp
Regula	Skeen	Watkins (OK)
Rehberg	Smith (MI)	Watts (OK)
Reynolds	Smith (NJ)	Weldon (FL)
Riley	Smith (TX)	Weldon (PA)
Rogers (KY)	Souder	Weller
Rogers (MI)	Stearns	Whitfield
Rohrabacher	Stump	Wicker
Ros-Lehtinen	Sullivan	Wilson (NM)
Roukema	Sununu	Wilson (SC)
Royce	Sweeney	Wolf
Ryan (WI)	Tancredo	Young (AK)
Ryun (KS)	Tauzin	Young (FL)
Saxton	Taylor (NC)	

NAYS—191

Ackerman	Gutierrez	Moran (VA)
Allen	Hall (OH)	Murtha
Andrews	Harman	Nadler
Baca	Hastings (FL)	Neal
Baird	Hill	Oberstar
Baldacci	Hilliard	Obey
Baldwin	Hinche	Olver
Barcia	Hinojosa	Ortiz
Barrett	Hoefel	Owens
Becerra	Holden	Pallone
Berkley	Holt	Pascarell
Berman	Honda	Pastor
Berry	Hooley	Payne
Bishop	Hoyer	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Inslee	Peterson (MN)
Bonior	Israel	Phelps
Borski	Jackson (IL)	Pomeroy
Boswell	Jackson-Lee	Price (NC)
Boucher	(TX)	Rahall
Boyd	Jefferson	Rangel
Brady (PA)	John	Reyes
Brown (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Rivers
Brown (OH)	Jones (OH)	Rodriguez
Capps	Kanjorski	Roemer
Capuano	Kaptur	Ross
Cardin	Kennedy (RI)	Rothman
Carson (IN)	Kildee	Rush
Carson (OK)	Kind (WI)	Sabo
Clay	Klecza	Sanders
Clayton	Kucinich	Sandlin
Clement	LaFalce	Sawyer
Clyburn	Lampson	Schakowsky
Conyers	Langevin	Schiff
Costello	Larsen (WA)	Scott
Coyne	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Cramer	Levin	Sherman
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Shows
Cummings	Lipinski	Skelton
Davis (CA)	Lowe	Slaughter
Davis (FL)	Lucas (KY)	Smith (WA)
Davis (IL)	Luther	Snyder
DeFazio	Lynch	Spratt
DeGette	Maloney (CT)	Stark
Delahunt	Maloney (NY)	Stenholm
DeLauro	Markey	Strickland
Deutsch	Mascara	Stupak
Dicks	Matheson	Tanner
Dingell	Matsui	Tauscher
Doggett	McCarthy (MO)	Taylor (MS)
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Edwards	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Engel	McDermott	Thurman
Eshoo	McGovern	Tierney
Etheridge	McIntyre	Towns
Evans	McKinney	Turner
Farr	McNulty	Udall (CO)
Fattah	Meehan	Udall (NM)
Ford	Meek (FL)	Velazquez
Frank	Meeks (NY)	Visclosky
Frost	Menendez	Watt (NC)
Gephardt	Miller, George	Waxman
Gonzalez	Mink	Weiner
Gordon	Mollohan	Wu
Green (TX)	Moore	Wynn

NOT VOTING—25

Abercrombie	Cubin	Lantos
Bentsen	Dooley	Lee
Blagojevich	Doolittle	Lofgren
Buyer	Filner	Millender
Calvert	Hyde	McDonald
Condit	Kilpatrick	Napolitano

Roybal-Allard	Traficant	Wexler
Sanchez	Waters	Woolsey
Solis	Watson (CA)	

□ 1222

Messrs. LARSON of Connecticut, DINGELL, BARRETT of WISCONSIN, ALLEN, FORD, HINOJOSA and ISRAEL changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. REGULA changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 49, I was conducting official business in my San Diego, California, district. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 49 on ordering the previous question I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I was unable to cast my vote on two rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: Rollcall 48, Approval of the Journal: “aye”; rollcall 49, Previous Question: “nay.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6, rule XX.

Any record votes on postponed questions will be taken after disposition of House Concurrent Resolution 275 relating to mourning doves.

CONGRATULATING THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY AT WEST POINT ON ITS BICENTEN- NIAL ANNIVERSARY

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 32) congratulating the United States Military Academy at West Point on its bicentennial anniversary, and commending its outstanding contributions to the Nation.

The Clerk read as follows:

S.J. RES. 32

Whereas establishing a military academy to teach the technical arts of war was a desire of many of our founding fathers, particularly George Washington;

Whereas Congress passed legislation on March 16, 1802, to establish such a military academy to be located at West Point, New York, a site that Washington called the key to the continent because of its strategic importance during the Revolution;