

culture of the Air Force Academy does not tolerate sexual assault, perpetrators are punished, and victims are supported. The reputation of such a distinguished institution should not continue to be frayed by its failure to effectively address this one important issue.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITFIELD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 386.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3966, ROTC AND MILITARY RECRUITER EQUAL ACCESS TO CAMPUS ACT OF 2004

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 580 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 580

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order (except those arising under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3966) to amend title 10, United States Code, and the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve the ability of the Department of Defense to establish and maintain Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps units at institutions of higher education, to improve the ability of students to participate in Senior ROTC programs, and to ensure that institutions of higher education provide military recruiters entry to campuses and access to students that is at least equal in quality and scope to that provided to any other employer. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman

from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

On Thursday, March 25, 2004, the Committee on Rules announced that it may meet the week of March 29 to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 3966. The announcement further stated that any Member wishing to offer an amendment submit the amendment to the Committee on Rules by 1 p.m. on Monday, March 29, 2004. No amendments were submitted to the Committee on Rules for their consideration.

H.R. 3966 is based on a simple principle. Colleges and universities that accept Federal funding should also be willing to provide military recruiters the same access as other prospective employers to students in ROTC scholarship programs.

This legislation would improve the ability of the Department of Defense to establish and maintain ROTC detachments and ensure that military recruiters have access to college campuses and students.

Successful recruitment for our military relies heavily on the ability of these recruiters to have access to the students and the students to be able to have access to the recruiter easily.

This bill also requires an annual verification of colleges and universities who already support ROTC that they will continue to do so in the upcoming academic year.

The Department of Defense seeks nothing more than the opportunity to compete for students on an equal footing with other prospective employers. At no time since World War II has our Nation's freedom and security relied more upon our military than now as we engage in the global war on terrorism.

Our Nation's all-volunteer armed services have been called upon to serve, and they are performing their mission with the highest standards. The military's ability to perform at this standard can only be maintained with effective and uninhibited recruitment programs.

As many of my colleagues know, the Armed Forces face a constant challenge in recruiting top-quality personnel, and I believe that ROTC programs are ideally suited to meet those needs. To that end, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I would like to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we are considering this bill, surprise, surprise, under a closed rule. Once again, the Republican majority has decided that thoughtful debate and the ability for Members to

offer amendments is too much of a bother.

We learned that the underlying bill, H.R. 3966, was going to be on the floor at the end of last week when Members left Washington to return to their districts. Most Members did not arrive back in Washington until yesterday afternoon, which is exactly the time the Committee on Rules was meeting to report out this closed rule. So, once again, the majority has gone out of its way to stifle debate, prevent amendments, and rush legislation through the House before people know what hit them.

Mr. Speaker, one of these days, and I hope it is soon, this kind of heavy-handed use of power is going to backfire, especially when there is so much important work that is not being done.

At the end of the debate on this rule, I will urge a "no" vote on the previous question so that the House can consider the critical issue of unemployment insurance for the estimated 1.1 million jobless workers who will have exhausted their regular unemployment benefits without receiving additional aid. This is the largest number of exhausters in over 30 years, and this figure will only continue to grow when 80,000 more jobless workers exhaust their regular benefits and go without any additional aid each week.

As for the underlying bill, H.R. 3966, it is my view that it should be defeated. In 1995 and 1996, Congress passed legislation to deny Defense Department funding to colleges and universities that failed to give military recruiters access to their campus and students. Known as the Solomon Law, this legislation was passed to respond to efforts by several colleges and universities to protest the discriminatory policies of the Pentagon against gay men and women. Over time, the law was expanded to prohibit funding a university might receive from nearly every Federal agency.

□ 1500

H.R. 3966 would round out that list by expanding it to include the CIA and the National Nuclear Security Administration at the Department of Energy. The bill would also restate the Department of Transportation which was inadvertently deleted 2 years ago.

Now I am grateful that this law does not apply to student financial aid, but, unfortunately, it does apply to all other grants, including research grants.

Last November, a U.S. District Court in New Jersey upheld the constitutionality of the Solomon Law, but the court also determined that the Solomon Law does not give the Pentagon any basis for asserting, as it has in the regulations on implementing the Solomon Law, that universities and colleges must give military recruiters the same degree of access to campuses and students provided to other employers.

Ironically, Mr. Speaker, the Solomon Law is not about equal access at all

but about special access for the Pentagon. As the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network states, and I quote, "There is no lack of equal access for military recruiters and ROTCs on America's college campuses. Any access for an employer that fails to meet schools' nondiscrimination policies is special access. The Solomon Amendment is about giving the military a special right to discriminate in a way other employers may not."

So, Mr. Speaker, this House is being asked to use the blunt force of legislation to expand the Solomon Law to include equal treatment and scope for military recruiters who already have access to every campus and every student in the land.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the Pentagon sent a list to the Committee on Armed Services regarding a handful of colleges and universities that the Pentagon has predetermined do not provide them with equal treatment and quality of access to students. Now, let me emphasize, these are all colleges and universities that fully comply with the existing Solomon Law. They include several of our premier academic and research universities.

And who gets to make this determination, this judgment, as to whether a college or university is in compliance with this new law? The Secretary of Defense and the Pentagon. And who gets to determine and implement the punishment? That same Secretary of Defense and the Pentagon, with no independent or neutral arbiter and no genuine right to appeal. So in these cases the Pentagon serves as prosecutor, judge, jury, and appeals court. That is not how it is supposed to work in this country, Mr. Speaker.

Until I have a better understanding as to why these colleges and universities are on some predetermined watch list from the Pentagon that could strip them of all their Federal funding and research grants, I cannot support this expansion of the Solomon Law, a law which itself is grounded in discrimination.

Now, Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House, including myself, supports the ability of our Armed Forces to encourage the best educated and best minds of our Nation to consider the military as a career, especially in these perilous times. But, Mr. Speaker, the military already has that ability. It simply does not want to accept "yes" as an answer from 100 percent of our colleges and universities regarding access to campuses and students. What the Pentagon wants is 100 percent access on their terms and their terms alone.

It is true that the military has a problem with recruitment and retention, a serious situation when our troops are stretched so thin around the globe. As the resolution says, the Armed Forces face a constant challenge in recruiting top-quality personnel. But, Mr. Speaker, perhaps if

the Pentagon truly addressed the serious issues of discrimination against women and against gays and against minorities, more of these top-quality personnel would be willing to serve.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude my opening statement by asking: Are there not more urgent issues to consider before Congress adjourns for spring recess? The extension of unemployment benefits genuinely is an urgent issue, increasingly a life-and-death issue for many families, and it seems to me like a far more important issue for this House to consider before we recess on Friday than the bill that is before us this morning.

As I noted earlier, at the end of this debate I will be calling for a "no" vote on the previous question so that this House can take up the urgent issue of extending unemployment benefits to the 1.1 million needy Americans whose benefits have been exhausted.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to rise today to defend the thousands of people in the State of Washington who have no job and no unemployment benefits. Thousands more in our State face the same dire circumstances over the next 3 months.

The Washington State unemployment rate is the fourth worst in the United States. The United States Department of Agriculture Household Food Security Report ranks Washington as the fifth most hungry State in America. The National Law and Employment project says that at least half the people unemployed are putting off needed medical and dental treatment because they cannot pay for it. Half the personal bankruptcies in this country are the result of medical bills people cannot afford to pay.

Time and time again the Democrats have asked the Republicans to show a little compassion and extend a lifeline out to these people who are calling out for help. Republicans and the administration have a deaf ear. Again today we call on the Republicans and we urge the administration to stop pretending that economic recovery is at hand.

In the month of February, there were 21,000 jobs created in the United States. That is 400 for each State and not a single one in the private sector. All of them were government jobs. If you call that a recovery just around the corner, you have a different definition than I do. If that is recovery on the horizon, so the sun is setting on the hopes of average Americans.

No American should face alone at a time like this the problems of the unemployed. And we can change it. We

can change it. The money is there. We do not have to raise taxes or do anything. We can change it. No American should feel they have no place to turn and no one to turn to. We can change that, and no American should find the country's leaders listening but not hearing. We can change that today.

Today, we can take a real step toward economic recovery by extending unemployment benefits. America is only as strong as its will to defend its people at home against economic adversity. We need to speak out loud and clear in a voice of unshakable compassion, commitment and concern. Let us extend the unemployment benefits. We have been talking about this since December. Thousands of people have lost their jobs. They have quit looking. The numbers seem to be going down only because they have quit looking because there are three people looking for every job that is out there.

This bill is sort of directed at maybe we should keep them out there, keep them hungry, keep them desperate, and maybe they will go in the military. That is what this is about, perhaps.

The fact that we cannot deal with this issue suggests that the President, who talked about compassionate conservatism, has no idea what it is like to be without a job. If your dad can buy you a company or your father's friends can give you a baseball team, I suppose you really would not understand what it is like to be without a job.

I remember when my father was. He was an insurance man, lost his job, went out and was driving a cab. I used to go down and open the cab company at 5:30 in the morning with him. I know what it is like to see what that does to somebody and how desperately they look. But today they cannot find it. And the Republicans just sit there look at the ceiling and twiddle their thumbs.

Well, the workers in this country and the unemployed in this country are not going to twiddle their thumbs on November 2. They are going to compassionately give Mr. Bush a one-way ticket to Crawford, Texas.

Vote against this bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Right now, Oregon has 7.7 percent unemployment, the highest in the country. Since January, 2001, the State has lost over 50,000 jobs. These are hard-working men and women, not statistics. They are real people with real lives and families, and right now they are facing the prospect of not having enough money to put food on the table or enough money to pay for their medical bills if someone should get sick.

I have talked to people who are unemployed. They have sold their homes trying to live off the profit. They said, I do not know what is going to happen when this money runs out.

Unemployment benefits are supposed to be a safety net to get you from one job to the next job. They do not provide 100 percent of the person's previous salaries, but those benefits are absolutely vital for families to make ends meet. They are not out there not going to work because they want to. They are out there because they cannot find a job.

I talked to one gentleman, 52 years old, daughter in high school, and he talks about how bright his daughter is and that he would like to send her to college. He said, I cannot even pay for my mortgage. What am I going to do for my daughter?

Not only do these benefits provide a level of security for families, unemployment benefits are also stimulants for the economy. For every dollar we spend in unemployment benefits, we put \$1.73 back into the economy. That is good for business as well as people. These benefits are not used for luxury items. They are used to pay the rent, food, and utility bills.

The President talks about marriage promotion programs costing in the billions of dollars, but it is a scientific fact that poverty and homelessness directly increase the rate of divorce. Unemployment benefits, which keep families together and keep them temporarily off the streets until they find a new job, should be considered the best marriage promotion program of all, yet these benefits have been ignored by Congress and this administration.

Some have raised concerns that extending unemployment benefits would bankrupt the system. Guess what? We have \$18 billion sitting in the unemployment trust fund. That is more than enough to continue this program and extend the current benefits. These funds were paid into this unemployment compensation system for the purpose of helping dislocated workers during difficult economic times.

In short, there is not a legitimate argument towards not extending the unemployment benefits.

Again, people talk about stimulating economy. These benefits stimulate the economy. People say, well, we do not have enough money, yet we have \$18 billion sitting in that account for that purpose. People talk about promoting marriage and families. Preventing financial crisis is the number one way to keep families together.

Frankly, it is a no-brainer. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can extend unemployment benefits for the thousands of suffering Oregonians and Americans.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. COX).

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. I rise in strong support of H.R. 3966, and I want to commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) for his leadership and hard work on this issue. The rule that will bring this bill to the floor is, therefore, very important.

This bill is named the ROTC and Military Recruiter Equal Access to Campus Act of 2004, but it might just as well as be called the Harvard Act, because it squarely addresses the scandal of Harvard University and other schools' banishing ROTC and military recruiters from campus while turning around and cashing Uncle Sam's checks for billions of dollars each year from the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies that are fighting the global war on terror.

The attacks on America, on the World Trade Center, and on the Pentagon should serve as a wake-up call to schools such as Harvard which banished ROTC from campus 35 years ago.

□ 1515

As our Nation wages an aggressive campaign to stop global terrorism, President Kennedy's call to young people to ask what you can do for your country is more important than ever. America's Armed Forces are hunting down al Qaeda and other supporters of terrorism in Afghanistan, in Iraq, and on every continent around the globe. Never in recent history have Americans asked more of members of the Armed Forces, and never have we had a greater need for well-educated leaders in our military.

Today, successful recruitment of exceptional officers depends heavily on the Reserve Officers' Training Corps. This past year, for instance, 70 percent of the Army's newly commissioned officers came from ROTC. Through ROTC, students receive generous scholarship assistance in return for agreeing to serve their country following graduation. As chairman of the Select Committee on Homeland Security, I have been gratified and humbled to see how many of the best and brightest in America have been willing to enlist in the fight against terrorism both through ROTC and by choosing the armed services as a career upon their graduation. Yet I am very troubled that a number of America's most prestigious colleges and universities, including Harvard, Yale, Stanford and Columbia, continue to officially ban ROTC from campus. Many of these same schools deny students the opportunity to interview on-campus with military recruiters. These policies have been successful in discouraging young adults from choosing a career in the military.

The legislation before us today makes several important reforms to protect taxpayers, to protect students' freedom of choice and to protect our armed services from discrimination. The premise of the bill is a simple one: colleges that discriminate against the United States armed services should not receive United States taxpayer funds related to national defense and homeland security.

Specifically, H.R. 3966 makes three major reforms. First, it will stop the current abusive practice under which schools ban ROTC and military recruit-

ing, but then turn around and cash enormous checks from the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, and other Federal agencies fighting the war on terror. For example, the Homeland Security Act created several new science and technology research programs for which colleges and universities are eligible. This law will say that these funds should not go to schools that discriminate against ROTC or military recruiters.

Second, this legislation will require schools that accept national security and homeland security funds to certify that they do not discriminate against ROTC and that they do permit on-campus ROTC programs if requested by the Department of Defense. Current law, which already requires schools accepting defense funds to accommodate on-campus ROTC programs if requested by the Department of Defense, is not enforced against elite schools such as Harvard, Yale, Stanford, Columbia and others that have banned ROTC on campus. This bill will change that.

Third, this legislation will ensure that schools accepting national security and homeland security funding provide access to military recruiters that is "equal in quality and scope" to the access provided to other campus recruiters. At Harvard, even military recruiters who are themselves Harvard graduates are not permitted to meet students on campus like other employers. A Harvard grad that has stained himself in the view of the faculty by participating in the U.S. military cannot visit campus and cannot stuff mailboxes, even though virtually every other group and every other employer is permitted to do so.

On the Harvard campus in Memorial Church, the names of Harvard alums who died in service to this country are inscribed on the wall and there is this inscription by former Harvard President Lawrence Lowell:

"While a bright future beckoned, they freely gave their lives and fondest hopes for us and our allies, that we might learn from them courage in peace to spend our lives making a better world for others."

Today, as our Nation calls for able new leaders in the war on terror, will Harvard and our Nation's other elite universities step forward and live up to that legacy? It has been a long time since 1969 and Vietnam, John Kerry notwithstanding, when Harvard's faculty, of which I am a former member, banished ROTC. It has been 2½ short years since our Nation was attacked by terrorists who still make war on our Nation. It is time for universities that accept national security and homeland security funding to support and encourage, not undermine, this Nation's call to service. That is the message of H.R. 3966.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this important legislation and the rule that will bring it to the floor.

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

I would just simply say to the gentleman that Harvard does have an ROTC unit. One thing I suggested in my opening remarks, and I would suggest it again, is that probably the best way to kind of put this controversy to rest is for the military to deal with some of the discriminatory practices that currently exist. Some of these colleges have nondiscrimination policies that, quite frankly, conflict with some of the blatantly discriminatory policies that we now see happening in the Pentagon. I would simply say to the gentleman that maybe a way to resolve this, we can also deal with some of the underlying issues that continue to exist.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COX. It is true that there are a handful of brave students at Harvard that are ROTC scholars, and it is true that Harvard is happy to cash their scholarship checks; but Harvard refuses to permit the ROTC program on campus and, therefore, the students have to go down the road to MIT, which will accept them as the gentleman knows. As a result, the discrimination against Harvard students is very real. Furthermore, as the Wall Street Journal has outlined, not on their editorial page but in news articles, there is on campus a very hostile attitude toward students in uniform. That needs to be changed.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I appreciate the gentleman's answer. I would also say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, when we talk about the importance of people standing up to their responsibilities during this difficult time, I hope that there will be equal passion that will be brought to demanding that some of these Benedict Arnold companies that, quite frankly, take U.S. tax dollars and are engaged in contracts involving the reconstruction of Iraq and they do not pay U.S. taxes, I hope that there will be some accountability there.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I do not object to this rule; but I do strongly object to congressional inaction on an issue of daily importance to millions of Americans, that is, the extension of unemployment benefits for workers who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own. Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan said earlier this month, "I think considering the possibility of extending unemployment benefits is not a bad idea in times like this."

Congress allowed the temporary extended unemployment compensation program to expire at the end of last year despite a tremendous need for

these extended benefits. Many of us have been trying to extend the program ever since, but the Republican leadership in Congress has continually blocked those attempts. This obstructionism has occurred even though majorities in both the House and the Senate have voted to extend unemployment benefits. This obstructionism has gone on despite the fact that the average duration of unemployment has reached its highest level in over 20 years. This obstructionism continues even after we have heard our economy had a zero private sector growth in jobs last month. This obstructionism blocks action even as more than 1 million Americans have run out of unemployment benefits without finding work in just the last 3 months. And this obstructionism continues even after the Secretary of the Treasury indicated the President is finally willing to say he would sign an unemployment extension bill if it is sent to his desk.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. Congress needs to act to help the unemployed as it has during every other time when jobs were scarce. If the previous question is defeated on this rule, the next order of business before the House will be the consideration of an unemployment extension. More specifically, the House would debate a 6-month extension of the expired temporary extended unemployment compensation program. This extension would help nearly 3 million jobless workers pay their mortgages, put food on the table, and deal with these very difficult economic times.

I, therefore, strongly urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can provide the necessary assistance to those who are unemployed and cannot find employment.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I had not planned to come to the floor and debate this resolution. This resolution actually deals with the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve the ability of the Department of Defense to establish and maintain Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps units at institutions of higher learning. That is the subject of this particular measure. This is the rule, or the resolution, by which we consider that particular bill.

The other side of the aisle, unfortunately, is using this as an opportunity to bash our side of the aisle and also the administration. They are also using it as a vehicle to try to attach a nongermane amendment dealing with extension of unemployment benefits. It may well be necessary to do that, but let me say that I have heard some of the comments that have been made. I disagree with those comments. I come from the business sector. If we want to see jobs created and opportunities for people, we do not want to leave one option and that is extended unemploy-

ment benefits. I know the other side is well intended here. But if the other side is truly well intended, they need to take some time and look at pending legislation and proposals that would create jobs. Maybe some on the other side have not had enough familiarity with what a businessperson goes through today. Litigation, taxation, and government regulation are job suppressers in this economy. I challenge the other side, instead of offering a handout or an extended unemployment check, to offer a job and pass some of the legislation that is pending.

If you are going into business today, you take a great chance. I am glad I am out of the business world, because you are sued at every turn. If you want to see why jobs are going overseas, it is because of litigation. We do not even produce in this country anymore a ladder. There are no ladders produced in the United States because people would be sued to where they cannot afford to produce or manufacture in the United States, so they take those jobs and opportunity overseas.

If you are compassionate about people, do not give them just one option. They want a good-paying job, and they want to be able to compete in a global market. Try to go open a business, and I challenge Members of Congress to get back in business. Some of them should return to the private sector and see what it is like. I am so pleased that my wife and I, we are approaching April 15, that we do not have to fill out the mounds of forms and tax returns and comply with all the regulations. And health care, give some options in health care. Talk to a small businessperson. That is where jobs are in this country. Jobs are with small business in this country. They create more than all the big corporations. But you ask a small businessperson if he is going to expand jobs and he will say, it is very difficult. His taxes are high. In fact, taxes on business in the United States are the highest in almost any nation in the world. So would you go overseas, or would you create jobs here in the United States? You cannot afford to have health care.

I challenge the Members. Look at your pay stubs. There is \$2,700 going out for health care. That is our part of the equation. The total cost is \$9,000, \$10,000 a person. How would a small businessperson deal with that for health insurance for themselves or to create jobs? So here we have presented today, they are taking time from another piece of legislation, one option, a handout, a check which people may need, that is true, but they want a good-paying job.

□ 1530

So stop blocking legislation like Head Start that will give our young people some quality in a very expensive program to our neediest students who go on to become failures in our

schools and in our system. Stop blocking job-training programs and initiatives by the President, because everyone is not going to college, community colleges, where we need to train people for changing jobs in technology opportunities that we are missing and helping small business, not hurting small business to create jobs so we can have people working in the future. So I urge the passage of the rule.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I do want to talk about the pending legislation, so I do not have time to comment on all the odd things that the previous speaker talked about, but a couple must be mentioned.

This assertion that we in the minority are blocking legislation has to be one of the most bizarre misrepresentations of the actual situation I have ever heard. We have no control over the agenda. We are not blocking anything. I wish we could block some of the stuff that has happened.

But this challenge to us to stop blocking Head Start, I have looked all over. I could not find Head Start laying anywhere here. We have not hidden it under our chairs. We are not blocking Head Start.

Job training, stop blocking job training. Job training is not being held hostage in the Democratic cloakroom. All of the scheduling is up to the majority.

So this arm-waving about stop blocking things when the majority is entirely in control does not make a great deal of sense.

I, on the other hand, did appreciate the honesty of the gentleman when he sneeringly referred to unemployment compensation as a handout. He said, if people are in business, they understand that that is not the way to go.

I had thought Secretary Snow, the Secretary of Treasury appointed by the President, former head of CSX, had some business experience. I was pleased last week when he supported the extension of unemployment benefits. Yes, we should do more about job creation, but there are people who are not going to get those jobs over the next few months who have been on extended unemployment. The refusal to extend unemployment compensation, and it is not the administration we are criticizing here, it is the majority in this House, because they are the ones who will not do it, over the objection of us, the refusal to extend unemployment compensation causes real injury to working families. And then when the gentleman says that is just a handout, he literally adds insult to injury.

But now I want to talk about this pending legislation. It is not aimed at providing more people for the military. There is not an argument that they do not have enough people in the Officers Club. There is not an argument that there are not enough ROTCs around to service the military. That is not this legislation's purpose.

This legislation is to punish those institutions which have said, as a matter of principle, we do not want them recruiting on their campus unless everybody is eligible. We do not want them restricting on irrelevant grounds people because of their race or their religion or their gender or their sexual orientation.

As long as the military says that gay and lesbian people are not suitable to serve, although, as we have seen now, during wartime they stopped throwing people out quite as much because it turns out gay and lesbian military people, as we know, are quite capable of doing the job and when they are needed, they are kept on. But the purpose of this is to penalize those principled institutions that say we dislike this discrimination.

Indeed, this legislation helps restrict the number of people who join the military. We have a shortage of people who speak Arabic working for the United States in the military and elsewhere. About 1½ or 2 years ago, seven members of the military who were doing very well learning Arabic were kicked out because they were discovered to be gay or lesbian.

So with your policy of "don't ask, don't tell and, by God, don't translate" because somehow they will undermine the security of this country, you are restricting the entry into the military of qualified people. And this legislation does not expand the pool of people. It is in the service of a policy that unduly and unwisely and unnecessarily restricts the access, and it does it in a punitive way.

It could be changed. For example, it says, well, wait a minute, if we are going to take money for national security, then they cannot stand up for their principle of nondiscrimination. When did the Department of Transportation get involved there? I am all for public transportation. I had not thought it was a matter of national security.

This legislation also says, the gentleman from California alluded to, a situation where students at Harvard have to go to MIT, and he said that is inappropriate. On Page 6 of the bill, it says that if the Secretary of the Military Department refuses to allow an ROTC in a particular school, he can authorize or she can authorize those students to go elsewhere. Why is that compromise not good enough for the school? This bill calls for the use of a system the gentleman from California said was discriminatory.

I want to just repeat the main point, because no one really believes and the military has not said, oh, we are being so hindered by these recruitment restrictions that we cannot get enough people. This is to penalize those institutions that are just standing up particularly for the principle of nondiscrimination and particularly for the principle that qualified members of their university communities ought not to be discriminated against and

punishing them to reinforce an unfair policy hurts the military. It does not help it.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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, we are asking that the previous question be defeated and that we be allowed to bring up unemployment compensation to extend it; and here is the reason:

I am glad we are debating this because the gentleman from Florida, by his discussion, has exposed exactly what is the thinking of the majority in this House.

Last Friday, I met a fellow, 55, an electrician, working for more than 30 years. He told me he was going to take his retirement, his pension, from the Electrical Workers Union. He was going to do so even though he lost a level of benefits. And I said why?

He said, because I have only 2 weeks of unemployment compensation left and if I do not take early retirement, I am going to lose my house.

And you on the majority side call unemployment compensation a handout? It is part of the employment structure of this country because with employment sometimes comes unemployment.

And you say get a job? You in the majority, who have been in the majority in this city, in the Senate, and occupying the White House, under whose dominion three million jobs have been lost, tell this fellow, and there are hundreds of thousands of men and women like him, get a job? That is an insult to the working people of this country.

So we are bringing this up because you will not bring this bill up for a straight "yes" or "no" vote. If you brought it up, you know we would carry our position.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) has mentioned it was said by Mr. Snow, the Secretary, that the President would sign an extension when there are \$18, \$19 billion in funds set-aside for this purpose. We do not want a President to passively say he will sign it. We want some leadership from the President of the United States for the millions of people who are unemployed and the hundreds of thousands of people who exhaust their benefits every month. Defeat the previous question.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will urge a "no" vote on the previous question; and if the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule which will provide that, immediately after the House passes H.R. 3966, it will take up legislation to extend Federal unemployment benefits to the end of September of this year.

Mr. Speaker, last week during testimony before the House Committee on

Financial Services, the Secretary of the Treasury said the President would sign legislation to extend Federal unemployment if it reached his desk. The bill that I will attempt to make in order would give the President that opportunity. It is a simple extension of the current program through September 30, nothing more, nothing less. If the President is willing to sign this badly needed bill, then we should get it to him immediately; and if we defeat the previous question, we can get the process started right away.

From late December through the end of March, an estimated 1.1 million jobless workers will have exhausted their regular unemployment benefits without receiving additional aid. This is the largest number of exhaustees in over 30 years. This figure will continue to grow, with 80,000 more jobless workers exhausting their regular benefits and going without any additional aid each week. Despite this, the Republican leadership in this House refuses to extend this program.

Mr. Speaker, today's unemployment numbers are devastating. With no private sector jobs created last month and only 21,000 jobs created overall, all of them public sector or government jobs, unemployed Americans today are facing insurmountable odds. Today, 8.2 million Americans are unemployed, and 3 million private sector jobs have been lost since President Bush took office. On top of the millions of unemployed, there are 4.4 million people who are working part time, which is an increase of 33 percent since the beginning of this administration. The average length of unemployment hovers at the highest level in almost 20 years; and, worst of all, Mr. Speaker, there is no relief in sight. Yet this Congress cannot seem to find a will or the time to extend unemployment benefits to those workers who have exhausted their benefits but still cannot find work.

What are their families supposed to do, Mr. Speaker? Where will the money come from to pay the rent or the mortgage, to buy medicine, food, or gas for the car? Does this House simply not care about these families and their children?

Mr. Speaker, the extension of unemployment benefits is an urgent issue for many families; and it seems to me like a far more important issue for this House to consider than the bill that we are considering right at this point. Let me be very clear that a "no" vote on the previous question will not stop consideration of H.R. 3966. But a "no" vote will allow the House to vote on legislation to help provide some much-needed relief to our Nation's unemployed workers, many of whom have not had a paycheck for months. However, a "yes" vote on the previous question will prevent the House from passing this desperately needed extension of Federal unemployment benefits to our jobless workers.

Mr. Speaker, let us show the American people that we get it, that we un-

derstand what the real problems are facing the people of this country and that this House deliberates on issues that really matter, that make a difference to people's lives.

So vote "no" on the previous question and vote to extend unemployment benefits.

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

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

I would just like to note, Mr. Speaker, that Albania is a country that is a NATO aspirant and Albania's Prime Minister Fatos Nano is visiting Washington today.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT). 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.

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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 electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution.

These votes will be followed by 5-minute votes on House Resolution 558 and S. 2057 under suspension of the rules.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 202, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 98]

YEAS—223

Aderholt	Capito	Garrett (NJ)
Akin	Carter	Gerlach
Bachus	Castle	Gibbons
Baker	Chabot	Gilchrest
Balenger	Chocola	Gillmor
Barrett (SC)	Coble	Gingrey
Bartlett (MD)	Cole	Goode
Barton (TX)	Collins	Goodlatte
Bass	Cox	Goss
Beauprez	Crane	Granger
Bereuter	Crenshaw	Graves
Biggert	Cubin	Green (WI)
Bilirakis	Cunningham	Greenwood
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Jo Ann	Gutknecht
Blackburn	Davis, Tom	Hall
Blunt	Deal (GA)	Harris
Boehlert	DeLay	Hart
Boehner	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hastings (WA)
Bonilla	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hayes
Bonner	Doolittle	Hayworth
Bono	Dreier	Hefley
Boozman	Duncan	Hensarling
Bradley (NH)	Dunn	Herber
Brady (TX)	Ehlers	Hobson
Brown (SC)	Emerson	Hoekstra
Brown-Waite,	English	Hostettler
Ginny	Everett	Houghton
Burgess	Feeny	Hunter
Burns	Ferguson	Hyde
Burr	Flake	Isakson
Burton (IN)	Foley	Issa
Buyer	Forbes	Istook
Calvert	Fossella	Jenkins
Camp	Franks (AZ)	Johnson (CT)
Cannon	Frelinghuysen	Johnson (IL)
Cantor	Galgely	Johnson, Sam

Jones (NC)	Nunes	Shaw
Keller	Nussle	Shays
Kelly	Osborne	Sherwood
Kennedy (MN)	Ose	Shimkus
King (IA)	Otter	Shuster
King (NY)	Oxley	Simmons
Kingston	Paul	Simpson
Kirk	Pearce	Smith (MI)
Kline	Pence	Smith (NJ)
Knollenberg	Peterson (PA)	Smith (TX)
Kolbe	Petri	Souder
LaHood	Pickering	Stearns
Latham	Pitts	Sullivan
LaTourette	Platts	Sweeney
Leach	Pombo	Tancredo
Lewis (CA)	Porter	Taylor (NC)
Lewis (KY)	Portman	Terry
Linder	Pryce (OH)	Thomas
LoBiondo	Putnam	Thornberry
Lucas (OK)	Quinn	Tiahrt
Manzullo	Radanovich	Tiberi
McCotter	Ramstad	Toomey
McCrery	Regula	Turner (OH)
McHugh	Rehberg	Upton
McInnis	Renzi	Vitter
McKeon	Reynolds	Walden (OR)
Mica	Rogers (AL)	Walsh
Miller (FL)	Rogers (KY)	Wamp
Miller (MI)	Rogers (MI)	Weldon (FL)
Miller, Gary	Rohrabacher	Weldon (PA)
Moran (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen	Weller
Murphy	Royce	Whitfield
Musgrave	Ryan (WI)	Wicker
Myrick	Ryun (KS)	Wilson (NC)
Nethercutt	Saxton	Wilson (SC)
Neugebauer	Schrock	Wolf
Ney	Sensenbrenner	Young (AK)
Northup	Sessions	Young (FL)
Norwood	Shadegg	

NAYS—202

Abercrombie	Etheridge	Matsui
Ackerman	Evans	McCarthy (MO)
Alexander	Farr	McCarthy (NY)
Allen	Fattah	McCollum
Andrews	Filner	McDermott
Baca	Ford	McGovern
Baird	Frank (MA)	McIntyre
Baldwin	Frost	McNulty
Ballance	Gonzalez	Meehan
Becerra	Gordon	Meek (FL)
Bell	Green (TX)	Meeks (NY)
Berkley	Grijalva	Menendez
Berman	Gutierrez	Michaud
Berry	Harman	Millender-
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (FL)	McDonald
Bishop (NY)	Hill	Miller (NC)
Blumenauer	Hinchey	Miller, George
Boswell	Hinojosa	Mollohan
Boucher	Hoeffel	Moore
Boyd	Holden	Moran (VA)
Brady (PA)	Holt	Murtha
Brown (OH)	Honda	Nadler
Brown, Corrine	Hoolley (OR)	Napolitano
Capps	Hoyer	Neal (MA)
Capuano	Inslee	Oberstar
Cardin	Israel	Obey
Cardoza	Jackson (IL)	Olver
Carson (IN)	Jackson-Lee	Ortiz
Carson (OK)	(TX)	Owens
Case	Jefferson	Pallone
Chandler	John	Pascarell
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor
Clyburn	Kanjorski	Payne
Conyers	Kaptur	Pelosi
Cooper	Kennedy (RI)	Peterson (MN)
Costello	Kildee	Pomeroy
Cramer	Kilpatrick	Price (NC)
Crowley	Kind	Rahall
Cummings	Kleczka	Rangel
Davis (AL)	Kucinich	Reyes
Davis (CA)	Lampson	Rodriguez
Davis (FL)	Langevin	Ross
Davis (IL)	Lantos	Rothman
Davis (TN)	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
DeGette	Lee	Rush
Delahunt	Levin	Ryan (OH)
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Sabo
Deutsch	Lipinski	Sánchez, Linda
Dicks	Lofgren	T.
Dingell	Lowey	Sanchez, Loretta
Doggett	Lucas (KY)	Sanders
Dooley (CA)	Lynch	Sandlin
Doyle	Majette	Schakowsky
Edwards	Maloney	Schiff
Emanuel	Markey	Scott (GA)
Engel	Marshall	Scott (VA)
Eshoo	Matheson	Sherman

Skelton Taylor (MS) Waters
 Slaughter Thompson (CA) Watson
 Smith (WA) Thompson (MS) Watt
 Snyder Tierney Waxman
 Solis Towns Weiner
 Spratt Turner (TX) Wexler
 Stark Udall (CO) Woolsey
 Stenholm Udall (NM) Wu
 Strickland Van Hollen Wynn
 Stupak Velázquez
 Tauscher Viscolsky

NOT VOTING—8

Culberson Hulshof Tanner
 DeMint Jones (OH) Tauzin
 Gephardt Serrano

□ 1608

Mr. MURTHA and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT). 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 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on two motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: House Resolution 558 and S. 2057. These electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

Votes postponed on H.R. 3104 and H. Con. Res. 386 will be taken later today.

WELCOMING THE ACCESSION OF BULGARIA, ESTONIA, LATVIA, LITHUANIA, ROMANIA, SLOVAKIA AND SLOVENIA TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 558, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BE-REUTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 558, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 2, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]
 YEAS—422

Abercrombie Baldwin Berman
 Ackerman Ballance Berry
 Aderholt Ballenger Biggert
 Akin Barrett (SC) Bilirakis
 Alexander Barton (TX) Bishop (GA)
 Allen Bass Bishop (NY)
 Andrews Beaprez Bishop (UT)
 Baca Becerra Blackburn
 Bachus Bell Blumenauer
 Baird Bereuter Blunt
 Baker Berkley Boehlert

Boehner Franks (AZ) LoBiondo
 Bonilla Frelinghuysen Lofgren
 Bonner Frost Lowey
 Bono Gallegly Lucas (KY)
 Boozman Garrett (NJ) Lucas (OK)
 Boswell Gerlach Lynch
 Boucher Gibbons Majette
 Boyd Gilchrest Maloney
 Bradley (NH) Gillmor Manzullo
 Brady (PA) Gingrey Markey
 Brady (TX) Gonzalez Marshall
 Brown (OH) Goode Matheson
 Brown (SC) Goodlatte Matsui
 Brown, Corrine Gordon McCarthy (MO)
 Brown-Waite, Ginny Goss McCarthy (NY)
 Burgess Granger McCollum
 Burns Graves McCotter
 Burr Green (TX) McCrery
 Burton (IN) Green (WI) McDermott
 Buyer Greenwood McGovern
 Calvert Grijalva McHugh
 Camp Gutierrez McInnis
 Cannon Gutknecht McIntyre
 Cantor Hall McKeon
 Capito Harman McNulty
 Capps Harris Meehan
 Capuano Hart Meeks (FL)
 Cardin Hastings (FL) Meeks (NY)
 Cardoza Hastings (WA) Menendez
 Carson (IN) Hayes Mica
 Carson (OK) Hayworth Michaud
 Case Hefley Millender-
 Castle Hensarling McDonald
 Chabot Herger Miller (FL)
 Chandler Hill Miller (MI)
 Chocola Hinchey Miller (NC)
 Clay Hinojosa Miller, Gary
 Clyburn Hobson Miller, George
 Coble Hoeffel Mollohan
 Cole Hoekstra Moore
 Collins Holden Moran (KS)
 Conyers Holt Moran (VA)
 Cooper Honda Murphy
 Costello Hooley (OR) Murtha
 Cox Hostettler Musgrave
 Cramer Houghton Myrick
 Crane Hoyer Nadler
 Crenshaw Hunter Napolitano
 Crowley Hyde Neal (MA)
 Cubin Inslee Nethercutt
 Cummings Isakson Neugebauer
 Cunningham Israel Ney
 Davis (AL) Issa Northup
 Davis (CA) Istook Norwood
 Davis (FL) Jackson (IL) Nunes
 Davis (IL) Jackson-Lee Oberstar
 Davis (TN) Jefferson Obey
 Davis, Jo Ann Jenkins Olver
 Davis, Tom John Ortiz
 Deal (GA) Johnson (CT) Osborne
 DeFazio Johnson (IL) Ose
 DeGette Johnson, E. B. Otter
 Delahunt Johnson, Sam Owens
 DeLauro Jones (NC) Oxley
 DeLay Kanjorski Pallone
 Deutsch Kaptur Pascrell
 Diaz-Balart, L. Keller Pastor
 Diaz-Balart, M. Kelly Payne
 Dicks Kennedy (MN) Pearce
 Dingell Kennedy (RI) Pelosi
 Doggett Kildee Pence
 Dooley (CA) Kilpatrick Peterson (MN)
 Doolittle Kind Peterson (PA)
 Doyle King (IA) Petri
 Dreier King (NY) Pickering
 Duncan Kingston Pitts
 Dunn Kirk Platts
 Edwards Kleczka Pomo
 Ehlers Kline Pomeroy
 Emanuel Knollenberg Porter
 Emerson Kolbe Portman
 Engel Kucinich Price (NC)
 English LaHood Pryce (OH)
 Eshoo Lampson Putnam
 Etheridge Langevin Quinn
 Evans Lantos Radanovich
 Everett Larsen (WA) Rahall
 Farr Larson (CT) Ramstad
 Fattah Latham Rangel
 Feeney LaTourrette Regula
 Ferguson Leach Rehberg
 Filner Lee Renzi
 Flake Levin Reyes
 Foley Lewis (CA) Reynolds
 Forbes Lewis (GA) Rodriguez
 Ford Lewis (KY) Rogers (AL)
 Fossella Linder Rogers (KY)
 Frank (MA) Lipinski Rogers (MI)

Rohrabacher Simmons Towns
 Ros-Lehtinen Simpson Turner (OH)
 Ross Skelton Turner (TX)
 Rothman Slaughter Udall (CO)
 Roybal-Allard Smith (MI) Udall (NM)
 Royce Smith (NJ) Upton
 Ruppertsberger Smith (TX) Van Hollen
 Rush Smith (WA) Velázquez
 Ryan (OH) Snyder Visclosky
 Ryan (WI) Solis Vitter
 Ryun (KS) Souder Walden (OR)
 Sabo Spratt Walsh
 Sánchez, Linda Stark Wamp
 T. Stearns Waters
 Sánchez, Loretta Stenholm Watson
 Sanders Strickland Watt
 Sandlin Stupak Waxman
 Saxton Sullivan Weiner
 Schakowsky Sweeney Weldon (FL)
 Schiff Tancredo Weldon (PA)
 Schrock Tauscher Weller
 Scott (GA) Taylor (MS) Wexler
 Scott (VA) Taylor (NC) Whitfield
 Sensenbrenner Terry Wicker
 Sessions Thomas Wilson (NM)
 Shadegg Thompson (CA) Wilson (SC)
 Shaw Thompson (MS) Wolf
 Shays Thornberry Woolsey
 Sherman Tiahrt Wu
 Sherwood Tiberi Wynn
 Shimkus Tierney Young (AK)
 Shuster Toomey Young (FL)

NAYS—2

Bartlett (MD) Paul

NOT VOTING—9

Carter Gephardt Serrano
 Culberson Hulshof Tanner
 DeMint Jones (OH) Tauzin

□ 1618

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSING MEMBERS OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FOR CERTAIN TRANSPORTATION EXPENSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 2057.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2057, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 0, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]
 YEAS—423

Abercrombie Ballenger Bilirakis
 Ackerman Barrett (SC) Bishop (GA)
 Aderholt Bartlett (MD) Bishop (NY)
 Akin Barton (TX) Bishop (UT)
 Alexander Bass Blackburn
 Allen Beaprez Blumenauer
 Andrews Becerra Blunt
 Baca Bell Boehlert
 Bachus Bereuter Boehner
 Baird Berkley Bonilla
 Baker Berman Bonner
 Baldwin Berry Bono
 Ballance Biggert Boozman