

order to "purify" the ethnic's blood line, who forcibly conscript children to serve as child soldiers in their army, who plant land mines around the villages they attack so that returning villagers get maimed or killed, who pillage or plunder the resources of Burma so they can have huge weddings with millions of dollars of jewels around the necks of their daughters.

It is the SPDC generals, brutal dictators with their crimes against humanity and campaigns of ethnic cleansing who deserve to be stripped of power and placed under arrest for many years to come.

#### BUSH AND HOOVER PRESIDED OVER FALTERING ECONOMIES

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, for 7 years Americans have endured the failed economic policies of President Bush, policies that have favored the wealthiest few and the big corporations at the expense of the middle class and those aspiring to reach the middle class.

Last week for the fifth month in a row, we learned that the Bush economy had lost more jobs than it created. This unimpressive economic record is once again drawing comparisons to that of another Republican President, Herbert Hoover. President Bush has the worst job creation record since Herbert Hoover, who presided over the stock market crash and led our economy into the Great Depression.

And just like Herbert Hoover, President Bush refuses to take the necessary action and begin to turn this economy around and to help those who are suffering the most.

Madam Speaker, history is not going to be too kind to President Bush when it comes to his handling of our Nation's economy. But this week, he has the opportunity to work on that record by supporting our efforts to extend unemployment benefits to millions of our Nation's workers. And it is the right thing to do.

□ 1015

#### ANTI-DRILLING CROWD AND ETHICS

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, the anti-crude oil crowd has an ethical dilemma. You see, they don't want to drill for crude in Alaska, they don't want to drill offshore, especially off that sacred west coast. They don't want any refineries to produce that crude into products. They are just against all this nonsense. After all, they say, crude is the demon of the Earth.

However, they don't have a problem with using everything that comes from

crude, like gasoline that comes from crude off the Texas east coast, refined in American refineries. And it seems to me that the irrational non-drillers should lead by example, rather than being hypocritical by preaching damnation to crude oil, but using its by-products every day. So no more plastic water bottles, no using insecticides, no more fertilizer, medicine, candles, nylon, paint, makeup, perfume, computers or detergents. No more car rides or plane rides, and no more home heating oil come winter. After all, all of these things come from crude oil.

The radical don't-drill folks should literally walk the walk, instead of talking the big talk about how they are going to save us all from that demon crude oil, but sanctimoniously use its products every day.

And that's just the way it is.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5749, EMERGENCY EX- TENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COM- PENSATION ACT OF 2008

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1265 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1265

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5749) to provide for a program of emergency unemployment compensation. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 of rule XXI. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against the bill, as amended, are waived. 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 equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.R. 5749 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, for purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate purposes only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCURI. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

House Resolution 1265 provides for consideration of H.R. 5749, the Emergency Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2008. The rule provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Madam Speaker, our economy is in trouble, and hardworking Americans across the country are bearing the weight of it. Times are especially tough for middle-class families. The labor market continues to deteriorate, the price of gasoline and food continues to rise, the value of real estate continues to decline, and millions of American households are forced up to rack up more and more credit card debt just to make ends meet. And we are not talking about frivolous expenditures. Middle class families are racking up credit card debt to do things like paying their electric bills or buying school supplies for their children.

Madam Speaker, the American people deserve better. Since the beginning of this year, when the majority first began to push for an extension of the unemployment benefits, the national unemployment rate has surged to 5.5 percent, the largest 1-month increase in 20 years. Yesterday, 144 members of the minority made it clear that they don't think the situation is serious enough to warrant extending unemployment benefits for Americans struggling to make ends meet, so we are here again today.

To me, 8.5 million unemployed Americans is a very serious situation. To me, trying to fill up your car with gas at \$4 a gallon when you just lost your job is a very serious situation. And to me, when so-called free trade agreements are moving jobs across the border and no new quality jobs are being created, it is a very serious situation.

Madam Speaker, I believe government should lend a hand when its citizens are struggling, especially hardworking, middle-class families. But whether you agree with that or not, extending unemployment benefit is one of the most cost-effective, fast-acting ways to stimulate the economy.

Putting money directly into the pockets of struggling workers ensures that it will be spent quickly on daily necessities, boosting our economy and making it a little easier for folks to make ends meet. Every dollar spent on unemployment benefits generates \$1.64 in new economic demand. In my home State of New York, an extra 13 weeks of unemployment benefits would infuse \$600 million into the State economy.

For my constituents in upstate New York, a struggling economy and high unemployment has been a fact of life for a very long time now. My district hasn't reaped the so-called cyclical job

growth benefits from trade agreements. Oh, we lost our jobs all right, but we haven't seen the job creation yet. In fact, employees of businesses in my district have applied for trade adjustment assistance over 200 times since the program's inception, and of those applications, the Labor Department certified over half as a result of trade agreements. Unfortunately, as factories close, hard-working families have nowhere to go but to stand in line outside the local unemployment office. The American people deserve better, and that is why we are here today.

This bill would provide up to 13 weeks of extended unemployment benefits in every State to workers exhausting their regular benefits and provide an additional 13 weeks to States with higher unemployment levels.

Federal unemployment trust funds, which were created exactly for this type of situation and have more than enough reserves to cover the costs, will finance these benefits. This costs will not be deferred to our children to pay back, and the trust fund will do so in a structure very similar to the temporary extended unemployment compensation program established in response to the last recession in 2002, an emergency extension, I might add, which was passed by the previous Republican Congress in the same way we are doing today, when there were fewer long-term unemployed workers.

Madam Speaker, extending these benefits for struggling Americans is the right thing to do. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, it is an unfortunate spectacle to see the leaders of this Congress manipulate the extension of unemployment benefits into a partisan weapon and a diversion from their failure to do anything about the skyrocketing price of gasoline and diesel. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle want the American people to believe that Republicans are mean, uncaring and opposed to providing help to unemployed workers as they look for a job.

I am certain, Madam Speaker, that Democrat after Democrat will come to the House floor and attempt to paint this cartoon view of the world. But nothing, Madam Speaker, is further from the truth. It is Republicans who have been trying for weeks, months and years to overcome the near monolithic Democrat opposition to producing more American-made energy, which will increase the oil supply and

lower prices at the pump to keep our economy working. The high cost of gasoline is affecting families, workers and businesses in every town in this country, and this Democrat Congress does nothing.

Let me state for the record that Republicans not only believe in the importance and value of unemployment benefits and that we support extension of benefits in times of needs, but that it was a Republican Congress and President that last enacted unemployment benefit extensions in 2003, and I supported and voted for those extensions.

Yet the liberal leaders of this Congress decided to bring an unemployment benefit extension bill to the House floor that purposely undermines the bipartisan, responsible manner in which extensions have been enacted for the past 27 years, going all the way back to 1981. Democrat leaders decided to change the rules and to do it while blocking every single Representative, Republican or Democrat, from being able to come to the floor of the House and offer their suggestions for improving unemployment insurance or better directing benefits to those Americans or those communities in our country that are most in need.

As written in this bill, Madam Speaker, Democrats have mutated the requirements for receiving benefits so that an individual could work for just 2 weeks and then get an entire year's worth of unemployment benefits. Madam Speaker, giving 365 days worth of benefit checks for having worked just 14 days violates most Americans' sense of fairness. There is a big difference between providing a leg up and giving a handout, and I think this bill crosses that line.

This bill also gives an extra 13 weeks of unemployment benefits to States where the unemployment rate is incredibly low, below 3 percent. Instead of focusing benefit extensions to where it is needed, this bill gives it to places where it is not.

As I said, Democrats have chosen to mutate the way unemployment benefit extensions have been done for the past 27 years so that they can try to score political points. But Democrats have also decided it is okay to break the promises they made to the American people in just the last election.

One of the promises that Democrat leaders spoke about the loudest and most often was their commitment to what is known as PAYGO, or pay-as-you-go. Under the promise made by Democrat leaders, a new rule was written in the House at the start of this Congress to prevent any bill from passing that wasn't budget neutral, that didn't offset new spending with spending cuts or tax increases.

Madam Speaker, Democrats are not keeping that promise on this bill. On this bill, they are waiving PAYGO rules. They are now saying that the PAYGO rule they wrote and the promise they made to the American people

can be ignored whenever it is convenient or expedient.

Madam Speaker, my purpose in raising the issue of PAYGO rules being violated is not to use it as an argument against the extension of unemployment benefits, but to point out the broken promises and hypocrisy of the liberal leaders of this Congress. They claim it is okay to ignore PAYGO because American people pay unemployment insurance tax out of every paycheck, so it is the American people's own money that is paying for the bill.

Well, when it comes to income tax increases, that is the American people's money too. Yet it was just 2 days ago that the Democrat majority leader flat out declared that Americans will face billions of dollars of tax increases this year if expiring tax rates aren't offset by PAYGO rules.

Madam Speaker, the leaders of this House are using PAYGO to hold hostage tax relief legislation that would prevent 25 million Americans from having their taxes go up by an average of \$2,000 next April to pay the AMT tax.

□ 1030

They are holding an extension of the State sales tax deduction hostage under PAYGO rules by requiring taxes to be increased so that the residents of sales tax States, like my State, can be treated as fairly and equally as residents of income tax States. For the leaders of this Congress, PAYGO is an excuse to raise taxes by billions of dollars, but PAYGO can be ignored when they mutate long-standing unemployment benefits to allow someone who works just 2 weeks, just 2 weeks, to get an entire year's worth of benefits checks.

This extension of unemployment benefits is labeled as an emergency, as an emergency, because unemployment rose from 5 to 5.5 percent last month. It's stated that this is the largest 1-month increase in two decades and so Congress must now pass legislation. This 1-month increase of 10 percent is justification for urgent, immediate action that this House and the Senate must clear all other schedules and vote to pass this legislation without delay. That's what has been said.

Where is the same level of urgency and need for immediate action on gas prices? Gas prices have gone up over 10 percent in the last month. Americans aren't just paying the highest gas prices in the past two decades, they are paying the highest prices ever, ever, recorded in the history of this country? Almost every day the price of gasoline sets a new record.

Since Democrats took control of Congress the price of gasoline has gone up over 75 percent. At the pace that prices are climbing, it may only be a matter of time until they have doubled, doubled, while this liberal Congress does nothing.

I absolutely agree that losing one's job is a painful experience and that it deserves the attention of Congress. But

the pain of filling up your gas tank is felt by every American, whether they just lost their job or not. The pain of skyrocketing gas prices is hurting all Americans, all Americans, yet this liberal Congress does nothing to help increase the supply of gasoline to lower prices at the pump.

Time after time Democrats have blocked real solutions for more American-made energy by increasing oil and gas production and refining here, right here, in America. America has billions of barrels of oil reserves and trillions of cubic feet of natural gas, but Democrats insist on keeping it off limits. We are not allowed to make our own energy, and so the prices continue to climb.

How long will Speaker PELOSI and this liberal Congress refuse to act to increase supply and lower gas prices? How high do prices have to go before they stop blockading America from tapping its own resources? There were thousands of oil-drilling rigs in the Gulf of Mexico that weathered two back-to-back Category 5 hurricanes, Rita and Katrina, and not one single rig ruptured. America has the resources and safe technology to produce oil for years, but Democrats refuse to allow it.

Eighty-six percent of congressional Democrats have opposed more American-made energy, while 91 percent of Republicans have supported producing more energy right here in our own country. If this Congress is serious about addressing economic pain, then they need to get serious about gas prices and stop blocking real solutions.

For months Republicans have tried to force this House, and for months Democrats have refused to act. Meanwhile, the price of gas and diesel just goes up and up and up.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, I heard my friend from Washington twice refer to this Congress—at least twice, anyway—as a liberal Congress. I guess I would have to respond in that since when does helping people who lost their job have anything to do with being a liberal or conservative?

I think people, the American people, hear people in Congress cite statistics and studies as if the people they are referring to are not real. These people, a person who loses job, who has to support his family, doesn't care if the statistics say that his State has the lowest unemployment in America. He doesn't care. All he wants to know is that he has unemployment benefits so that he can support his family. That is what we are here to do today.

Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington, the chairman of the Family Support Subcommittee of the Ways and Means, Mr. McDERMOTT.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, the Bible says, "By their deeds, you shall know them." The Republicans do not want to help unemployed workers

in this country. It is as simple as that. If you go back to the debate in 1935 and come forward, the Republicans have always resisted the idea of unemployment benefits because the argument is that people will sit at home and wait for a check and that they will then not go out and look for work.

Now, it's clear that's not true and now, today, what they are hanging their hat on is some mythical worker out there who has worked 2 weeks and is going to get full benefits. That simply is misleading in the very plainest form.

Madam Speaker, I have a letter which I ask to enter into the RECORD from the Oregon Unemployment Department, signed by Tom Byerley.

STATE OF OREGON,  
EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENT,  
Salem, OR, June 11, 2008.

INDIVAR DUTTA-GUPTA,  
Professional Staff, House of Representatives,  
Committee on Ways and Means Sub-  
committee on Income Security and Family  
Support, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. DUTTA-GUPTA: In the deliberations by Congress relating to a proposal to extend unemployment insurance benefits, it has come to my attention that Oregon has been held up as an example as a state where a worker could work only three weeks during the base period upon which the claim was filed and qualify for 26 weeks of regular state benefits and an additional 13 weeks, or 26 depending on the unemployment rate, of benefits under the bill to extend claims. That is not true.

In Oregon a worker must have a minimum of \$1,000 in earnings for the entire base year. In addition, he must have total base year wages in an amount equal to or in excess of one and one half times the wages in the highest quarter. Oregon Revised Statute 657.150(2)(a)(A). With only three weeks of work, the only way this worker could qualify would be to work in two separate quarters. As an example, when an individual worked only three weeks in the base year, we'll place one week of work in one quarter and two in the subsequent quarter.

In this scenario, let's say the second quarter where the claimant worked two weeks would be the highest quarter since he worked two weeks and only one week in the prior quarter. In simplest terms, he earns \$333 for one week in the first quarter and \$667 for two weeks of work in the second quarter. That gives him the minimum required wage threshold of \$ 1,000 total earnings to qualify and gives him wages of one and one half times in the highest quarter in total base year wages.

This worker would qualify for \$108 per week for 3.08 weeks. \$108 for three weeks and the last payment would be \$9. This worker would not receive the full 26 weeks. Our law provides that if total base year wages are between \$1,000 and \$8,423.99, the maximum award will always be 1/3 of the total base year wages or in this case, \$333.

I cannot speculate how our law could be misconstrued to say that someone with the minimum wages to qualify for a claim would be able to claim the maximum award or 26 weeks. The information I have reviewed that I understand has been referenced in the "Highlights of State Unemployment Compensation Laws, January 2007" published by the National Foundation for Unemployment and Worker's Compensation (UWC) on pages 53 through 56 entitled "Qualifying Requirements" (copy attached) is accurate. In fact, we provide that data on an annual basis. To

read this to say you only have to work three weeks to qualify for a maximum claim of 26 weeks is simply reading something into our qualifying requirements that isn't there.

I hope this information is helpful. Please don't hesitate to contact me at (503) 947-1707 if you have any additional questions.

Sincerely,

TOM BYERLEY,  
UI Director.

This letter says, "In the deliberations by Congress relating to a proposal to extend unemployment insurance benefits, it has come to my attention that Oregon has been held up as an example as a State where a worker could work only 3 weeks during the base period and receive 26 weeks of benefits and an additional 13 weeks. That is not true."

He goes on to say, "I cannot speculate how our law could be misconstrued to say that someone with the minimum wages to qualify for a claim would be able to claim the maximum award" or benefit.

Now, what Members have to understand is the qualification for unemployment is decided by State legislatures. They make the decision. Many of them do not start the quarter that you are in. If you lost your job today, they would not count back to the 1st of April, they will not count to the first of the year, they would start counting last year in 2007.

So he gives an example, suppose somebody worked one week in September and two weeks in October, and they made \$1,000. They would be eligible in Oregon for a check of \$108 for three weeks and \$9 in the fourth week.

Now, if you want to hold up benefits for 1.5 million people in the United States for one lone Oregon duck who got \$108 for three weeks and \$9 in the fourth week, you go ahead. Your decision will be from the voters in your districts in this election.

This is a red herring. It has been.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. McDERMOTT. This was put into the law in 1981 when the workforce was entirely different. Women were not such a big part of the workforce, we did not have part-time jobs. When you have this provision in the law you are denying extended benefits to about 10 percent of the people who have exhausted their benefits. Because they did not work full time, they don't get anything, and these objections are simply a reflection of the Republicans, the fact they do not want to give unemployment benefits.

Vote for the rule. Vote for the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I certainly appreciate the gentleman yielding. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the rule, but I strongly support the underlying bill.

We are back here again today because this House, in my estimation, must act to give those who are struggling in our challenging economy the help that they need. Too many working families in my district, in my home State of Michigan are having serious difficulties finding work and making ends meet.

Not only have too many workers lost their jobs, but other factors have stymied their efforts to find work. Gas prices of over \$4 a gallon are making it increasingly difficult to travel longer distances to find work. The housing crisis, which is particularly acute in my home State of Michigan, has made it nearly impossible for families to sell their homes, which would allow them to move closer to areas where jobs could perhaps be found.

Some have argued that this bill would alter very long-standing Federal policy as a reason to vote against it and perhaps it does, but that is no comfort to those who cannot find work. They are not interested in Federal policy changes, they are interested in keeping their homes or feeding their families or having money to buy gas so that they can go out and find a job. I understand some of the concerns about granting this extension of benefits, but I believe strongly that those concerns are far outweighed by the needs of struggling American families.

I urge all of my colleagues to join together and to take this important step to provide a helping hand to fellow Americans in need.

Again, I oppose this rule, but I strongly support the underlying bill.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Madam Speaker, last Friday the Labor Department in our country reported that in May the unemployment rate rose to 5.5 percent from 5 percent and reported that unemployment continued to fall in construction, manufacturing, retail trade and temporary health services, while health care continued to add jobs. The half percentage point increase is the largest single increase in the unemployment rate in 22 years, with more than 861,000 jobs lost in May.

The unemployment insurance program provides benefits to those who become unemployed through no fault of their own and meet certain conditions. Our economy has also lost jobs for five consecutive months, and it's likely that more than 1.4 million workers have exhausted their unemployment benefits in the first 6 months of this year alone. The Congressional Budget Office estimate that had this legislation would provide additional benefits to 3.8 million unemployed workers, many of whom are at extreme financial risk.

Extending these benefits is one of the most cost-effective and fast-acting ways to stimulate our faltering economy because the money is spent quickly, according to the Congressional

Budget Office. Every \$1 spent on unemployment benefits generates \$1.64 in new economic demand.

Congress has extended unemployment benefits over several occasions over the last 50 years in response to economic weakness. This is another one of those times in which Congress must take immediate action to address this emergency on behalf of the people in our country.

I urge my colleagues to support this temporary, I repeat, temporary extension of unemployment benefits so we can provide much-needed relief to 3.8 million unemployed workers to assist them with rapidly rising food costs while they continue to struggle to find work in this rapidly slowing economy.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Republican Conference chairman, Mr. PUTNAM of Florida.

Mr. PUTNAM. I thank the gentleman for the time, and I appreciate the opportunity to debate this issue.

Madam Speaker, it is an unfortunate situation that we have to debate unemployment compensation because of the underlying economic weaknesses, particularly those that have been caused by high energy prices.

We have seen reports of plant closures because of high energy prices. High natural gas prices have put American manufacturers, American fertilizer makers, American petrochemical industries at a competitive disadvantage because it is not a global commodity, and we have failed as a Congress to put forward an energy policy that actually creates energy, which actually creates American jobs.

In addition to that, this particular rule waives PAYGO, one of the most prominently heralded reforms brought into the 110th Congress, the idea that you would pay-as-you-go. It is now a matter of sometimes paying as you go, every now and then paying when you go, when it's convenient paying as you go.

□ 1045

But be that as it may, it is important that we address not only the necessary relief for those who have lost their jobs, but to prevent people from losing their jobs in the first place. And the best way that this Congress can move forward on that is to put onto the floor of the House a comprehensive energy policy that actually produces energy, that puts American workers back to work, taking advantage of the tremendous potential in conservation and green jobs, but also in domestic production, exploring the resources that we have here and putting them to work for the American people, constructing nuclear power plants. There is a lot of talk from both sides of the aisle about the need to move into more innovative uses of mobile fuels, to move into the plug-in hybrid. Well, what are you going to plug it into?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. PUTNAM. I thank the gentleman.

So we have to invest not only in the next generation of mobile fuels to eliminate our dependence on foreign oil and gas, but also to construct the type of electrical infrastructure necessary to create a thriving economy, to put people to work so they don't have to rely on unemployment compensation and the whim of the Congress and the whim of the State legislatures about whether it is 13 weeks or 26 weeks. We ought to be focused on putting them back to work. That is what these American workers want, and we have an opportunity to do that.

We have put forward that proposal with the No More Excuses Energy Act, a comprehensive approach that puts people to work and eliminates our dependence on foreign energy from people who don't like us and creates a generational leap forward for energy security for North America.

I urge Members to defeat this rule. Let's start over and do it the right way.

Mr. ARCURI. If what the gentleman from Florida says is true, I guess any pay-as-you-go is better than the no-pay-as-you-go that we had in the last Congress.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. Madam Speaker, we are hearing a lot of concern about PAYGO. I have to tell you that when it comes to having credibility on this issue, as someone who is not a particularly partisan person, I always like to work on both sides of the aisle, I am a little upset that we are hearing this criticism about PAYGO from a group of folks who when they were in charge let the law expire.

It is a law that existed for 12 years. It helped move us from deficits to surpluses. It moved us on the glide path to where we wouldn't be burdening future generations with debt, and that law expired. The bottom line is that law as it was written would have allowed this unemployment compensation legislation to go through under emergency spending.

Now, the way that the law is written in this Congress, quite frankly, I think the law wasn't crafted properly because it should have allowed this to be emergency spending. That is why I, as a Blue Dog, am comfortable with this bill.

But let me assure you, actions speak louder than words. There are so many words that get thrown out on the floor of the House, but actions speak louder than words. And the actions are this: who cares about deficits, who thinks deficits matter? I am not sure that the other side of the aisle does, and their track record demonstrates that.

We've seen debt go up by \$3 trillion during the first 6 years of the Bush administration with a Republican Congress. Come on, we shouldn't be criticized about our good-faith efforts to try to encourage PAYGO and live within our means. If we have not been perfect on this side of the aisle, we have made the effort. And I have heard no response from the other side whenever we bring up a bill that is paid for to offer an alternative that is also paid for.

So if you really care about your future generations, which I do, I think of my two young sons, and I think about the debt burden that we are placing on them, I think that we have a moral obligation to do the right thing for future generations.

So please, let's tone down the rhetoric a little and let's acknowledge that if you really care about deficits, instead of just talking about it, do something about it.

This side of the aisle has attempted to do something about it in this Congress. They established a PAYGO rule. I am proud of the fact that the Democratic Caucus has done that, and we should all work together because it shouldn't be a partisan issue. If you care about deficits, whether you're Democrat or Republican, let's work together and let's secure the future for our children.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I will tell you that this debate is to me rather sad. I listened to my friend, Mr. McDERMOTT, with whom I have been very privileged to work for many years on trying to open up new markets for U.S. workers, to have access into those markets around the world. He represents the Seattle area, and we all know how important trade is. He and I have been privileged to try and pry open markets in Asia and Latin America and other parts of the world.

I just was downstairs and heard him on TV make some statement, and I would be happy to yield to him if I am incorrect in quoting him. He said Republicans don't care about those who are unemployed, those who are suffering and are victimized here. And I would be happy to yield. Is that what my friend said? I would say to my friend from Seattle, I would be happy to yield to him, that Republicans don't care about those who are unemployed?

Mr. McDERMOTT. Thank you for yielding.

If you read the history of the enactment of the 1935 Social Security Act, the last issue argued in the United States Congress was an amendment by the Republicans trying to take out un-

employment benefits because they said it weakened the will of people to search for work. It is a long, distinguished record.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me just say the 1935 Social Security Act is a debate that took place more than a couple of years ago.

Let's talk about what it is that we as Republicans have believed passionately in doing, and that is to ensure that people who are hurting the most are in fact able to benefit from unemployment benefits.

You know, we had an interesting debate in the Rules Committee last night. We just talked about the need for PAYGO compliance. Of course that was the sine qua non when we were debating the rules at the beginning of this Congress, the fact that we were going to make sure that everything was PAYGO compliant. Obviously this is not PAYGO compliant. Everyone has acknowledged that. The distinguished chair of the Rules Committee in a discussion with Mr. HASTINGS last night finally acknowledged that this is not PAYGO compliant, so completely contrary to what has been promised here time and time again.

But when it comes to actually ensuring that those who are truly in need are the beneficiaries of unemployment compensation, it seems to me we should go back not to 1935, but to 2002 because we had an extension of unemployment benefits that was put into place in 2002.

Madam Speaker, virtually every Democrat at that time supported the notion of saying there should be a minimum of 20 weeks of work, 20 weeks of work before someone could have the opportunity to see the unemployment benefits accrued to them.

What is it that this measure does? I will tell you, when I talk to my constituents about this, Madam Speaker, they are absolutely horrified. I just was downstairs 5 minutes ago talking to one of my constituents about it, and I explained what I am about to say here to our colleagues, and she could not believe it. Every member of her family with her, they were absolutely horrified when I said the following: under this plan, if someone works for only 2 weeks, they work only 2 weeks in their entire life, they are able to receive 52 weeks, one entire year of unemployment benefits. That's what it says, that's what this measure does.

In 2002 when we dealt with this issue, the Democrats decided there should be at least 20 weeks of work. And now when we have an unemployment rate, which as I acknowledged has gone up a half a percent, and it hasn't gone up to that level in 22 years, it is very unfortunate, it is still significantly lower than the unemployment rate we have seen in the past. And what are they saying, if someone has worked for only 2 weeks, they are able to see 52 weeks of benefits. That is just plain wrong.

I will tell you, whether you are a working American or an American

looking for a job, that is not right because perpetuating the welfare state is exactly what that does. It is not providing a cushion of benefits.

We also believe, Madam Speaker, that the opportunity to say, gosh, if someone is out there and they are working to find an employment opportunity and they do, we believe we should reward that by providing them a lump-sum benefit, a lump-sum benefit that has rewarded them for the fact that they have found a job. We know it is difficult. We are not saying that everyone is going to be able to, but that is the kind of thing that we want to do.

And what has happened here? Well, the new majority has said an absolute closed rule, no opportunity for us to offer that kind of amendment.

Let me get back to the issue that we have been talking about time and time again which is on the minds of the American people, Madam Speaker, and that is the issue of high gasoline prices and the energy costs that we face right now.

You think about people who are struggling and are looking to find a job and are out there, looking to improve their situation, I will tell you, one of the cruelest penalties of all on them happens to be high gasoline prices.

Last night I had one of our telephone town hall meetings, and I had the opportunity to have nearly 5,000 households from the area that I am privileged to represent from southern California on the phone, and we talked about the need to increase energy supply. I took a number of questions during the one-hour program and not one person, not one person, Democrat, Republican, Independent, we call people regardless of their political party, not one person opposed our efforts to try to increase supply, recognizing if we can increase the supply by responsibly and in an environmentally sound way, exploring in ANWR, by pursuing the cleanest, safest most cost-effective energy source known to man, that being nuclear energy, by working to increase our refinery capacity, by looking at the shale reserves in this country, and again in an environmentally sound way exploring them, deep water exploration off the coast, those are the things that we believe are necessary. And, Madam Speaker, not one of my participants on our conference call last night indicated opposition to that.

The American people get it. They know that for two decades plus we have unfortunately seen a majority of the new majority in this place stand there and prevent us from pursuing opportunities to increase the supply so that we can bring prices down.

Now I had the chance to talk with a number of experts on this issue, a number of our colleagues who represent States like Texas and Oklahoma, and one of the things that we hear time and time again is we need an immediate response.

I listened to my friend from Utah talk about action. Well, I wondered,

how are we going to be able to immediately bring gasoline prices down? Having spoken to a wide range of people, because of the fact that oil prices are based on futures, if we take any of those actions that I outlined, whether it is in an environmentally sound way pursuing ANWR, whether it is deep water exploration, whether it is looking at shale, whether it is nuclear energy, if we were to take any of those actions, we would, Madam Speaker, see an immediate reduction, an immediate reduction. Why, because there would be recognition in the marketplace that we are now vigorously pursuing an effort to increase our supply.

So those people who are unemployed, and that is what this issue is about, those people who are out there responsibly working hard to find a job, are being penalized by high gasoline prices, just as every other American is being penalized by it because of the increased cost of virtually everything.

That is why it is terribly unfair for us not to responsibly look at these creative proposals that are out there. We want to ensure that people who are hurting are able to benefit from the unemployment compensation that we provide.

So everyone on the other side can stand up and say the Republicans don't care about those who are facing difficulty economically; that is absolute baloney. We care. We want to make sure that there are opportunities there. We want to make sure that we open up new markets around the world for job creation and economic growth so that good jobs can be created right here.

Let's defeat this rule and let's come forward with a measure that can get the signature of the President, because we all know that this is going no place. The Statement of Administration Policy, which I will include for the RECORD, has made it very clear that the President wants us to put in job creation policies, and he wants to work to responsibly deal with unemployment compensation, and the attempt to embarrass us is not going to sell with the American people.

#### STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 5749—EMERGENCY EXTENDED

#### UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 2008

The Administration is deeply committed to continually fostering an environment where every American who wants a job has a job. The Administration believes the best way to help workers is to create an environment that encourages job creation and to promote effective job training. To accomplish these goals, the Administration urges Congress to create more opportunities for American exporters by passing the pending free trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea, make permanent the President's tax cuts that will expire over the next two years, and reform and reauthorize the Trade Adjustment Assistance program and the Workforce Investment Act. The Administration looks forward to continuing to work with Congress to enact these important measures. However, the Administration strongly opposes H.R. 5749. If H.R. 5749 were presented to the President, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

This legislation raises several concerns. First, although the unemployment rate has recently risen, it remains below the levels historically relied on to justify a federally financed extension of unemployment benefits. The last initiation of temporary extended benefits was in 2002 amidst the unprecedented events surrounding September 11, 2001. Other than that special case, extensions have generally been granted only when the unemployment rate was notably higher than it is today, at or above 7 percent.

Second, this bill would allow the payment of up to 13 extra weeks of benefits in every State, even though some of those States have unemployment rates as low as 2.6 percent. At present, a majority of States have unemployment rates at or below 5 percent, and it is fiscally irresponsible to provide extra benefits in States with low unemployment rates. In States with higher unemployment rates, the Federal-State extended benefits program already can provide up to 13 additional weeks of benefits to workers who have exhausted their regular unemployment insurance benefits. As many economists have noted, the counterproductive result of a broad extension of benefits would be that recipients may remain unemployed for slightly longer than they would have otherwise.

Third, this bill does not contain an important provision found in previous Federal extensions and the permanent Federal-State extended benefits law that assures the benefit extension is paid only to individuals who have demonstrated a serious attachment to the labor force. Since 1981, individuals must have 20 weeks of full-time employment to qualify for extended unemployment benefits. Under this bill, individuals who have worked as little as two weeks could qualify for up to 52 weeks of total unemployment benefits. This violates the longstanding requirement that extended benefits should be for Americans with meaningful work histories.

Fourth, for purposes of determining whether a State is considered a "high unemployment" State in which an extra 13 weeks of benefits is payable (for a total of 26 weeks of additional benefits), this proposal would use a total unemployment rate of 6 percent as the trigger for State eligibility. This is, historically, a relatively low number for justifying a full year or more of unemployment benefits.

As an alternative to these ill-targeted and costly measures, the Administration could support legislation that would offer a 13-week extension of Federally financed unemployment benefits to high-unemployment States alone.

Mr. ARCURI. The gentleman from California gives examples of working for 2 weeks and being eligible for 52 weeks. The fact of the matter is there is no record to indicate that is the case.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to a gentleman who can speak firsthand to that, the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Chairman RANGEL.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I think we are all proud that we are able to at least go back home and face the people who are going through this economic crisis. They are sitting around the table. They know America is not going to let them down. They know that they have hope and vision for the future. They know that they, and others, have had economic setbacks. Be-

cause as DAVID DREIER, my dear friend has said, they are in trouble now. They are not working and they are losing hope, but they are depending on everybody, Republicans and Democrats, to be there for them. At the end of the day they will look at each other and ask, What does it look like in the Congress?

□ 1100

Are they going to give us a little assistance, a little dignity, a little pride? Can we keep our kids in school? Can we pay the rent? Can we go into the supermarket and have a decent meal over the weekend? They're not going to let us down. No.

I don't know about you. I've been here 38 years. And the one thing that I always hear when I get back home is, "And how did you vote on that?"

I would suggest to you that you staple DAVID DREIER's statement to your newsletter so that they can interpret it with you and say, I didn't vote for you, but I didn't want to let you down. I didn't vote for you, but I did advocate a permanent extension of the President's tax cut. I didn't vote for you, because I really believe that if I give you some money, you're not going to get out there and try to get a job.

So you have to take this very carefully. But I hope that when you get home, you'll be able to say, you know, when they first started this, I didn't like the way the Democrats handled it. I didn't like the way they put it on the suspension calendar. I thought that perhaps we should, even though \$35 billion is there, I would have liked to have seen it handled different. And I expressed myself about it.

But at the end of the day, because I know so many people who know so many people that are not the least bit interested in the parliamentary procedure; they're going to ask the question, "How did you vote?" Be able to say I voted the right way.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 6½ minutes. The gentleman from New York has 15 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I will reserve my time so that we can equal the time out here.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. TANNER.

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

Mr. TANNER. Madam Speaker, I think I speak for a lot of us when we say that we welcome an intellectually honest debate on the issues that we are charged with confronting on behalf of the American people. And a discussion about the pros and cons of the provisions of the bill, I think, is in order. This is the place to do that.

When one talks about, though, ancillary matters, like whether or not this



violates PAYGO, that's why I come down here today.

Let me tell you something. Neither party is always right and neither party is always wrong. But we don't need to embarrass ourselves by trying to belittle those of us who are trying to pay the bills.

The fact is, during the first six years of this decade, the people who are criticizing the Blue Dogs and the Democratic Caucus for a PAYGO rule, sat here and helped this President borrow more money from foreign sources than all 42 before him combined. You don't have to believe that. That's not an argument. You can go to the U.S. Treasury Web site and look at it and see for yourself.

So if we want to talk about the relative merits of the legislation, we welcome that, and we want to talk about that. And we won't always vote alike. We won't always vote with the Democratic Caucus, some of us that are Democrats, because neither party's always right or always wrong.

But to come here and criticize us for somehow saying we're violating PAYGO; first of all, there's an unemployment tax that employers pay for this very purpose, and it will fill up the coffers again in time.

But don't come here with that, because I think that is not only demeaning and misleading, but embarrassing to some people.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. LEVIN.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Let me say to the gentleman from California who talked about our trying to embarrass the Republicans, we're not trying to embarrass you. You're embarrassing yourselves.

You come here when we're talking about 8 million unemployed, 1½ million who have exhausted their benefits, and soon it will be an additional 3 million, and you come here and talk about energy policy? You won't provide unemployment comp benefits so people can buy the gas to look for a job?

You talk about trade policy. Look, the jobless numbers came out this morning. Jobless claims jumped to the highest level since last March. Those claims rose to 384,000, an increase of 25,000 from the previous week, a much bigger gain than analysts had been expecting.

And you quote the administration policy. Mr. HASTINGS, under the administration policy, unemployed in Yakima would not be eligible for extended benefits because Washington, as a State, has less than 6 percent. How can you come here?

Go home, if I might be personal for just a minute. Go home and explain your position to people in Yakima, and those from Ohio, those from Pennsylvania, those from other States.

I conclude. Look, I'm from Michigan. I would benefit under the administration's narrow approach. I won't vote for it.

If you're jobless, you deserve the extended benefits, the million plus and the 3 million plus.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVIN. If I have the time.

Will you grant me a little time?

Mr. ARCURI. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

I want to remind my friend from Michigan that the last time that we passed an unemployment benefit extension in this Congress was in 2003. It passed on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. LEVIN. I understand that.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. And the opposition that the constituents in my area are concerned about is this 2-week window. That is where the issue is.

Mr. LEVIN. Taking back my time. The 2-week window, you talk about, 26 additional weeks, 52 weeks. You can't give a single example.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ARCURI. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LEVIN. And you raise a straw man and woman when we're talking about real men and women who have been laid off, who've been looking for a job, who can't find it. And you come here with these straw arguments.

You go home to Yakima. Others of you go back to Pennsylvania and other States, and talk to the hundreds of thousands of people looking for work and say to them, I voted "no."

That's unconscionable.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont, a member of the Rules Committee, Mr. WELCH.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I thank my friend and fellow member of the Rules Committee for yielding me 2 minutes.

Madam Speaker, this is really a very simple question, and it is whether we're going to extend unemployment benefits to American workers who are suffering the largest 1-month surge in increased unemployment in 22 years.

And we can bring in all kinds of other arguments about what our energy policy should be, what the compensation should be, what the formulation of the benefits should be. But the bottom line is that we have Americans who have worked, and through no fault of their own, but because of economic forces completely and utterly beyond their control, they've lost their jobs.

And when we have discussions about micromanaging how these go out, in

lump sums or weekly payments, and we're talking about trying to give an incentive, it is, in my view, Madam Chairman, very patronizing.

What is worse to an American than to lose his or her job?

Most Americans find their sense of satisfaction and self-worth in taking care of their family, in being providers, and by being a good, productive worker. All of us who've had the opportunity to have a good job know that there's nothing better than that. So there is a lot of built-in incentive for any American who's without a job to get a job.

But, in the meantime, \$300 a week, that's about what the average benefit is, is barely enough to keep gas in the car, keep your home heated, to put groceries on the table. We know it's not even close to adequate. So there is plenty of incentive.

And the question for us is not behavioral psycho dynamics. The question for us, as a Congress, is whether, when there is this largest spike in unemployment in 22 years, we're going to ignore it or we're going to respond. And we have the tool that was started in 1935 to respond, where workers and others put money into a fund that is to be used at times of stress.

Mr. ARCURI. May I inquire how much time is left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ARCURI. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule on H.R. 5749 to extend unemployment benefits to millions of American workers, including over 700,000 in my home State of California. And I'd like to speak about one of those real Americans that I am accountable to.

Just yesterday I spoke with a 51-year-old woman, whose name is Karen, from San Diego. After working for the past 10 years as a Consumer Service Specialist for a large telecom company, Karen was recently laid off from her job. And she's been actively looking for work but has been unable to find one because of the poor economy.

Unable to afford health insurance, the stress of being unemployed is beginning to take a toll on Karen's health. And it's also become harder and harder for her to pay her bills. She told me just looking for a job cost money because you've got to pay for the gas to drive to the interview. She can certainly relate to this discussion this morning.

To make matters worse, her unemployment benefits have just ended. She told me that she has worked hard her whole life and that she is not looking for a hand out, just her life back.

I think we can all agree Karen is one of those hardworking Americans we came to Washington to help.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 3

minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule and to note that Republicans support an extension of unemployment benefits for those who are suffering, those who need help.

I've enjoyed the debate of my friends on the other side of the aisle who point out, they try and blame the minority party for the delay in bringing this legislation to the floor. And I would note that the majority party controls the schedule, and the majority party can pass anything they want in the House. So I would note that the House Ways and Means Committee acted on the particular bill that we have before us 8 weeks ago. Eight weeks ago.

Now, some, my good friend from Michigan refers to this debate as being embarrassing. I think it's embarrassing in this legislative process that it's taken 8 weeks, this legislation, to come to the floor of the House to be debated, particularly when people in Michigan and Illinois have exhausted their benefits. And the Republicans in the House Ways and Means Committee voted for a proposal which could become law, which would have provided extended unemployment benefits for those workers in Michigan and Illinois who have exhausted their unemployment benefits. Eight weeks it's taken for this emergency legislation to come to the floor. Eight weeks.

I would note that a major concern many of us have in this legislation that's before us is that it takes a radical approach. It eliminates a 27-year policy that was supported by both Democrats and Republicans. The bill that is before us repeals a requirement that you work 20 weeks to get a full year's benefits.

In Michigan, under this legislation, you would work 1 week and be able to get 52 weeks of benefits. In my State of Illinois, you can work 2 weeks and get 52 weeks of benefits under this legislation.

Now, do taxpayers feel that that is fair?

We, as the minority party, the Republicans, we want to extend benefits, unemployment benefits to those who need help.

□ 1115

My district, my home State, we have unemployed workers who've exhausted their benefits. We want to ensure that their benefits are extended so that they can receive an additional 13- and 26-weeks' worth of benefits.

And we had a proposal in the Ways and Means Committee which would have accomplished that goal. All of the Republicans voted for it, and the President would sign it into law. But instead, we're seeing election year politics today. That's what this is all about. It's 8 weeks. Think about that. For 8 weeks. If you're a Michigan worker and you have been unemployed, you have exhausted your benefits, you have been waiting 8 weeks.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. You've been waiting 8 weeks because of election-year politics. This legislation could have been brought to the floor immediately, we could have had a bipartisan bill that had become law, but no. Our friends in the majority played election-year politics for 8 weeks.

We're finally bringing a bill to the floor that won't become law. Let's pass legislation that will become law. Let's help those who need help.

Mr. ARCURI. Just to correct the record, this was passed by the House, this bill, weeks ago and it has been blocked in the Senate. Just so it's clear that it has not waited for 8 weeks.

I would yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. To the Chair, to the gentleman from Illinois, in Michigan, you have to work two quarters to be eligible. The 1-week example is a straw man and woman example. Let's be faithful to the reality here.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, how much time again remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 3 minutes. The gentleman from New York has 6¾ minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I will reserve my time.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I want to remind my good friends that yesterday we were on the floor of the House and my good friends on the other side of the aisle, the Republican minority, blocked the passage of this emergency relief to so many Americans. And I rose yesterday and I asked the question, Who will be a Good Samaritan and stand with those who are in need?

Right now, soldiers on the front lines of Iraq and Afghanistan have family members who are unemployed and who have exhausted their benefits. What do we say to them? In Texas, we have a total of 160,000 Texans who have now either exhausted or will exhaust their unemployment benefits. They do so in an economy where they've lost their jobs through no fault of their own.

That's why we put this bill on the floor of the House because you could have gone to a job, worked for a week, and the business closed down because of varying economic crises created by this administration.

We've lost—324,000 jobs have disappeared over this period of time, 5 consecutive months. We've lost 300,000-

plus job. And the unemployment rose to the highest in the month of May.

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

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. The highest number of unemployment in 20 years in the month of May, and over the last 12 months, the number of unemployed workers have grown by 1.6 million, 200,000 more long-term jobless.

Who will be the Good Samaritan for the American people who have helped build this country? Who will tell the Iraqi soldiers and Afghanistan soldiers that the mother and father that is there longing for their return does not have a job and cannot pay for gasoline and rent and food? We have to stand today. Who will be the Good Samaritans?

This legislation is written the way it is to solve the problems of Americans. I will stand with them.

I ask you to support the underlying legislation and the rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

(Mr. AL GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, when you are born into poverty, you enjoy such delicacies as mayonnaise sandwiches without mayonnaise. When you're born into poverty, phrases like "but for the grace of God, there go I" have true meaning because you understand you have been there.

This bill will not fuel rockets to Mars. It will, however, put fuel in gas tanks right here on Earth. It will not put a man on the Moon, but it will put food on the table of somebody's home. But for the grace of God, there go I.

I will support the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 3 minutes. The gentleman from New York has 4¼ minutes.

Mr. ARCURI. I would yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS).

(Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, it's a pleasure today to come on the floor and talk about ways that this Congress and those of us who serve here can help those who are unfortunate to have lost a job.

I have watched the opposition on the other side attempt for the last couple of years to make illegal immigration their issue. I have watched with dismay as they continue to bring to this floor and blame Democrats in this Congress for the cost of gasoline at \$4 a



gallon. Back home we have a saying: that dog ain't gonna hunt in this Congress.

In fact, when you look at what they attempted to do on immigration, their Presidential candidate introduced an amnesty bill, and now their attempts on the floor are to block this Congress from even introducing legislation or passing legislation that would have been an energy package that would even attempt, that would attempt, to tell oil companies you have to pay your fair share of taxes.

So what they're now trying to do is block legislation that gives amnesty to big oil companies. Again, that's not going to work.

And now they come to the floor saying pay-as-you-go principles are not being followed with this bill that's been introduced, and I hope it passes today.

So as we look at this legislation, let's talk about pay-as-you-go. I used to be an employer. Today in Tennessee, if you employ someone, you pay between .15 percent, less than 1 percent, up to 10 percent as an employer of what each employee earns. They're paying as they go. At Forbus General Store, my friend Joe pays every paycheck every week so much percentage of what his employees earned into a Federal trust fund. He's paying as he goes. And when someone has to be laid off because jobs are not available, the economy turned sour, those individuals apply for and receive unemployment benefits.

We're paying as we go constantly. We have close to \$40 billion in the trust fund. Currently, this bill today scored with the CBO saves roughly \$10 billion cost over 10 years. This Congress has attempted to address the issues of oil prices and unemployment.

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

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee. It seems to me that as we listen to the other side, they're constantly trying to find some way that would be a head shot on issues for an election campaign. I tell you who's getting a head shot right now, folks who work at furniture factories in Tennessee and North Carolina, folks who work at auto industries. Their jobs are being lost. That's a head shot to them.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I would ask my friend from New York how many speakers he has.

Mr. ARCURI. I am prepared to close. We have no further speakers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I have 3 minutes left; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Madam Speaker, the idea here is to take care of those that have lost their jobs by extending unemployment bene-

fits. The idea is to get a bill to the President that he will sign. As the gentleman from Illinois said, this bill has been waiting now for 8 weeks before it has been brought to the floor, but the bill, in its present form, will not be signed because it has changed 27 years of bipartisan support on extending unemployment benefits.

So I think that we need to go back to the drawing board, if you will, and get a bill that we know that the President will sign. But more importantly, more importantly, we need to get our economy going again. And so it's time, in my mind, for the House to debate ideas for lowering gas prices to get the economy going again.

I'm going to ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that the House can consider H.R. 3089, the No More Excuses energy bill. By defeating the previous question, the House will still be able to act on the unemployment benefit extension bill, but the House will also be able to finally act on legislation that will create more American-made energy and jobs to increase the supply of gas by producing more gas and producing more gas here in our Nation. It will increase the supply and decrease the price at the pump. Skyrocketing prices need the attention of this Congress, and we've got to act.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the amendment and extraneous material inserted in the RECORD prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so this House can get serious about rising gas prices so we can start producing American-made gasoline.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, unemployment insurance can mean the difference between saving a home and failing to make a mortgage payment. It can mean the difference between purchasing needed medications and going without, and it can mean the difference between filling up the car to go out and look for another job and having to stay home. This legislation has the potential to help over 4 million unemployed Americans put food on their tables while quickly stimulating the economy.

The number of long-term unemployed Americans is higher now than when Congress last extended benefits in 2002. I am hopeful we can come together later today, Republicans and Democrats, to do the right thing and pass this rule and the underlying legislation. American workers and families can't wait any longer.

The idea is not getting the President a bill that he can sign. The idea is to do the right thing and for the President to sign that bill.

I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1265 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall, without intervention of any point of order, consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3089) to secure unrestricted reliable energy for American consumption and transmission. All points of order against the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources, the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) an amendment in the nature of a substitute if offered by Representative Rahall of West Virginia, which shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives*, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the *Floor Procedures Manual* published by the

Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam 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.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam 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, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1257; adopting House Resolution 1257, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1265; adopting House Resolution 1265, if ordered; and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 1553.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6063, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1257, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 183, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 405]  
YEAS—226

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allen  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Baca  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Billirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd (FL)  
Brady (PA)  
Brown, Corrine  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson  
Castor  
Cazayoux  
Chandler  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis, Lincoln  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Foster  
Frank (MA)  
Giffords  
Gilchrest  
Gillibrand  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hall (TX)  
Hare  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Herseth Sandlin  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hodes  
Holden  
Holt  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee (TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kirk  
Klein (FL)  
Kucinich  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Lobiondo  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowe  
Lynch  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum (MN)  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
McNulty  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Mitchell  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Mutha  
Nadler

NAYS—183

Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barrett (SD)  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Biggert  
Bliley  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehner

Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp (MI)  
Campbell (CA)  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Castle  
Chabot  
Childers  
Coble  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Crenshaw  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, David  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Donnelly  
Doolittle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Ehlers  
Emerson  
English (PA)  
Everett  
Fallin  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fossella  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Gingrey  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Graves  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Hill  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hunter  
Inglis (SC)  
Issa  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
Keller  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kline (MN)  
Knollenberg  
Kuhl (NY)  
LaHood  
Lamborn  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lucas  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul (TX)  
McCotter  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Murphy, Tim  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Paul  
Pearce  
Pence  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reynolds  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Roskam  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Sali  
Saxton  
Scalise  
Schmidt  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Souder  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Terry  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Turner  
Upton  
Walberg  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh (NY)  
Wamp  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield (KY)  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman (VA)  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—24

Boyda (KS)  
Braley (IA)  
Davis (AL)  
Flake  
Frelinghuysen  
Granger  
Higgins  
Honda  
Hulshof  
Kind  
Lewis (CA)  
Loebach  
McCrery  
Meek (FL)  
Mollohan  
Moran (KS)

□ 1150

Messrs. DONNELLY and SHAYS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. KIRK and JONES of North Carolina and Ms. HARMAN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

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

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 188, not voting 24, as follows:

Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boozman  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (SC)