

Herse	th Sandlin	McCotter	Ruppersberger	Moran (KS)	Rush	Wamp
Higgins	McDermott	Ryan (OH)	Ryan (OH)	Ortiz	Tiahrt	Westmoreland
Hill	McGovern	Ryan (WI)	Salazar			
Himes	McHenry	Salazar	Sánchez, Linda			
Hinche	McIntyre	T.	Sanchez, Loretta			
Hinojosa	McKeon		Sarbanes			
Hirono	McMahon		Scallise			
Hodes	McMorris		Schakowsky			
Holden	Rodgers		Schauer			
Holt	McNerney		Schiff			
Honda	Meeks (NY)		Schmidt			
Hoyer	Melancon		Schock			
Hunter	Mica		Schrader			
Inglis	Michaud		Schwartz			
Inslee	Miller (FL)		Scott (GA)			
Israel	Miller (MI)		Scott (VA)			
Issa	Miller (NC)		Sensenbrenner			
Jackson (IL)	Miller, Gary		Serrano			
Jackson Lee	Miller, George		Sessions			
(TX)	Minnick		Sestak			
Jenkins	Mitchell		Shea-Porter			
Johnson, E. B.	Mollohan		Sherman			
Johnson, Sam	Moore (KS)		Shimkus			
Jones	Moore (WI)		Shuler			
Jordan (OH)	Moran (VA)		Shuster			
Kagen	Murphy (CT)		Simpson			
Kanjorski	Murphy (NY)		Sires			
Kaptur	Murphy, Patrick		Skelton			
Kennedy	Murphy, Tim		Slaughter			
Kildee	Myrick		Smith (NE)			
Kilpatrick (MI)	Nadler (NY)		Smith (NJ)			
Kilroy	Napolitano		Smith (TX)			
Kind	Neal (MA)		Smith (WA)			
King (IA)	Neugebauer		Snyder			
Kingston	Nunes		Space			
Kirk	Oberstar		Speier			
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Obe		Spratt			
Kissell	Olson		Stark			
Klein (FL)	Oliver		Stearns			
Kline (MN)	Owens		Stupak			
Kosmas	Pallone		Sullivan			
Kratovil	Pascarell		Sutton			
Kucinich	Pastor (AZ)		Tanner			
Lamborn	Paul		Taylor			
Lance	Paulsen		Teague			
Langevin	Payne		Terry			
Larsen (WA)	Pence		Thompson (CA)			
Larson (CT)	Perlmutter		Thompson (MS)			
Latham	Perriello		Thompson (PA)			
LaTourette	Peters		Thornberry			
Latta	Peterson		Tiberi			
Lee (CA)	Petri		Tierney			
Lee (NY)	Pingree (ME)		Titus			
Levin	Pitts		Tonko			
Lewis (CA)	Platts		Towns			
Lewis (GA)	Polis (CO)		Tosgas			
Lipinski	Pomeroy		Turner			
LoBiondo	Posey		Upton			
Loeback	Price (GA)		Van Hollen			
Lofgren, Zoe	Price (NC)		Velázquez			
Lowey	Putnam		Viscosky			
Lucas	Quigley		Walden			
Luetkemeyer	Radanovich		Walz			
Luján	Rahall		Wasserman			
Lummis	Rangel		Schultz			
Lungren, Daniel	Rehberg		Waters			
E.	Reichert		Watson			
Lynch	Reyes		Watt			
Maffei	Richardson		Waxman			
Maloney	Rodriguez		Weiner			
Manzullo	Roe (TN)		Whitfield			
Marchant	Rogers (AL)		Wilson (OH)			
Markey (CO)	Rogers (KY)		Wilson (SC)			
Markey (MA)	Rogers (MI)		Wittman			
Marshall	Rohrabacher		Wolf			
Matheson	Rooney		Woolsey			
Matsui	Ros-Lehtinen		Wu			
McCarthy (CA)	Roskam		Yarmuth			
McCarthy (NY)	Ross		Young (AK)			
McCauley	Rothman (NJ)		Young (FL)			
McClintock	Roybal-Allard					
McCollum	Royce					

NAYS—14

Altmire	Ehlers	Linder
Berry	Flake	Nye
Burgess	Gohmert	Poe (TX)
Carter	Graves (GA)	Shadegg
Chaffetz	Johnson (IL)	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

DeFazio	Welch
---------	-------

NOT VOTING—20

Bachus	Cleaver	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (GA)	Davis (AL)	King (NY)
Boehner	Fallin	Mack
Butterfield	Forbes	Meek (FL)
Capuano	Hoekstra	

□ 1425

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) 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.

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1537 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1537

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of July 23, 2010, providing for consideration or disposition of a measure addressing unemployment compensation.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time through the legislative day of July 23, 2010, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1537.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1537 waives the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII, requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Rules Committee.

□ 1430

This would allow for the same-day consideration of any resolution reported through the legislative day of July 23, 2010, relating to consideration or disposition of a measure addressing unemployment compensation.

Finally, the resolution allows the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules through the legislative day of July 23, 2010. The Speaker, or her designee, shall consult with the minority leader, or his designee, on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

These are not unusual procedures, as some of my colleagues on the other side are wont to argue. I want to point out that in the 109th Congress the Republican majority reported at least 21 rules that allowed for same-day consideration. In fact, five of those rules waived this requirement against any rule reported from the committee. This rule is for a specific bill.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4213, the Restoration of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 2010, ensures that absolutely essential funds continue to reach the millions of American citizens struggling to find a job, keep their homes, and provide for their families. This legislation is unconscionably overdue, with unemployment benefits having expired on June 1 of this year.

While I'm pleased to point out that this legislation is retroactive to that date, nevertheless, millions of Americans who desperately needed our support were left hanging by an egregious obstructionism that prevented this legislation from moving forward.

This Congress, and I include both the House and the Senate, has a responsibility to act in the best interest of the American people and to ensure that, in this time of extreme economic hardship, Americans can rely on essential government services to help them through the hard times. Unemployment insurance is one of those services, part of a range of urgently needed activities that are necessary to rebuild our economy and recover from the recession. There is no excuse for delay.

That only two Republican Senators saw fit to vote to ensure that 2.5 million Americans could claim lapsed benefits demonstrates a complete lack of concern for struggling Americans. The fact is that for every open job there are five applicants, leaving the vast majority out of work. Unemployment insurance is not a luxury; it is a necessity. Why Members of this Congress are able to vote in favor of massive tax cuts for the wealthy one day and against unemployment insurance for hardworking Americans the next day is beyond me.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I kind of like would rather that we not have to do a same-day rule. What we should be doing is a 6-weeks-ago rule so we can go back in time and relieve some of the great anxiety and financial hardship endured by millions of Americans while they waited for this Congress to act.

Over the past few days and weeks, much of the debate about the emergency measure has revolved around its cost. While I don't dismiss these concerns, bringing our economy back from the brink of disaster doesn't come cheap, and we have a responsibility to

support Americans during this most painful and difficult time.

In fact, I would argue that Democrats and Republicans have a significant difference of opinion when it comes to what it means to be fiscally responsible. Seemingly, my Republican colleagues think that being fiscally responsible means that when our economy is prospering, and it has prospered in the past and will again, when it's prospering, you will have free rein to cut taxes for the wealthiest and the well to do among us and spend with abandon, as they did when we were prospering. But when their irresponsible fiscal policies come back to bite them, well, then it's too expensive to invest in our economy, to provide for those who can't provide for themselves, or to spend what is necessary to jumpstart the economy.

Republicans say they aren't opposed to spending these funds on unemployment insurance; they just want to cut the same amount from other programs. Well, I'll tell you what they can cut. How about not doing any further tax cuts for wealthy people? How about cutting missiles to nowhere? How about cutting some of this Pentagon money and war in this world? How about cutting huge tax subsidies for offshore oil drilling? How about cutting out people taking their money and running to tax havens away from America and not fulfilling their responsibilities?

Mr. Speaker, I don't see Republicans offering to cut those things. Instead, I see them blocking essential legislation with vague platitudes about the need for cuts. They see nothing wrong with leaving the people who are most suffering the effects of their misguided economic views out in the cold. The Republicans' track record has proved them to be nothing but fair-weather deficit hawks.

Democrats, on the other hand, see things a bit differently. We, too, believe that balancing the budget is vital for our long-term prosperity. And I've been here and others, as well as the sitting Speaker, have been here when we did just that, balance the budget. But it can't be done on the backs of struggling Americans. In order to grow this economy, we need to invest in the American people. The Federal Government has a responsibility to help our communities meet their needs and ensure that anyone who wants to find work for a decent wage can do so.

Our economy is already showing considerable signs of recovery, but a jobless recovery is unacceptable. Make no mistake, job creation is the number one priority for Democrats. That is why we're working hard to find ways to create jobs and grow our economy again. But, in the meantime, we cannot simply let millions of Americans fall into financial ruin, lose their homes, be unable to pay their rent, and jeopardize their futures and the futures of their families and children.

Unemployment insurance can make the difference between whether fami-

lies can afford to put food on the table or pay rent while they devote themselves to finding new employment or to get by, just get by, until the economy improves and jobs are more forthcoming.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule, Mr. Speaker, so that this much-needed, much-overdue legislation can be considered in a timely manner. The American people are waiting. And waiting 1 more minute, not 30 minutes on the U.S. Senate, or 30 hours as they are taking now, waiting 1 more minute is 1 minute too long.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida for yielding time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

You know, he mentioned that we have no problem on one day voting for tax decreases and then the next day voting against unemployment benefits. Unfortunately, our colleagues across the aisle haven't given us an opportunity to vote for tax decreases in this session of Congress. Would that we'd had that opportunity, we certainly would have, because the money that the hardworking people of this country earn belongs to them. It doesn't belong to the government. That's what our colleagues across the aisle think. They want to control everything in this country, including all of the money that the good citizens of this country work hard to earn.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to this same-day rule on unemployment insurance.

When the White House economic advisors released their report back in January 2009, they concluded that if we just borrowed \$1 trillion, the stimulus would stop the unemployment rate from increasing beyond 8 percent. Here we are with a 9.5 percent unemployment rate, the largest deficit in our history, and the national debt at almost \$14 trillion. The response of the liberal Democrat leadership is to add \$30 billion more to the deficit by not offsetting another extension of Federal unemployment benefits.

The American people want real economic growth and private job creation. If job creation is the number one priority for the Democrats, I'd hate to see what the number two priority is, given the dismal numbers that they've created, particularly in the last 18 months.

During consideration of H.R. 5618, the Democrats' \$34 billion unpaid for Restoration of Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act, before the July 4 recess, Democrats opposed the Republican motion to recommit, which would have paid for the extension.

Specifically, the Republican motion to recommit would have used \$34 billion in unspent stimulus funds to cover the cost of extending expired unemployment benefits through November 30. This was a fiscally responsible motion which recognized that the American people want Washington to stop

spending money we don't have. Adding insurmountable amounts of spending to our soaring deficit helps no one.

□ 1440

Painting Republicans as being unfeeling and uncaring about those who have lost their jobs is inappropriate. We are very concerned with those people, and we want to do everything that we can to help them. But putting us more and more into debt and increasing the deficit is not going to do that. And our colleagues across the aisle should have learned that by now with their very, very bad policies.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, just to answer my distinguished colleague from North Carolina very briefly, when she began her remarks by indicating that we haven't given them an opportunity to vote on tax cuts, my last look at the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act gave 95 percent of Americans a tax cut. I would be interested to know how many Republicans supported that measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, as was correctly pointed out, Republicans had ample opportunity to vote for tax cuts for Americans. As was amply pointed out just a moment ago, 95 percent of the American people got a tax cut under the Recovery Act, and 0 percent of the Republican Caucus voted in favor of it. So there again, when average Americans get a chance for a tax cut, no. When rich folks get a chance for a tax cut, absolutely.

By the way, those tax cuts don't have to be set off. During the Bush administration, well over \$700 billion worth of tax cuts were not set off at all. And now we're just asking for a little bit of money for average working Americans who have worked for a benefit, Mr. Speaker, to get a little bit of help when they really, really need it. No, we're not asking for a set-off for unemployment insurance benefits because it's an emergency.

It's an emergency for that mom trying to get some cereal to put it on the table for her kids. It's an emergency for that dad who's trying to pay rent so they don't get thrown out. It's an emergency for that family who is facing foreclosure because they cannot pay their mortgage because they have been out of work. It's an emergency. It is appropriate not to have to set it off because those are the rules that we have been living by in this body for years and years and years. Now, because of partisanship, Republicans don't want to go by those rules, they want to make political hay and delay, delay people's help when their help should be coming.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is 2.5 million Americans have to wait another day because Senate Republicans have to make a political point. That is a

shame. That is too bad. If the caucus opposite, if the Senate Republicans really have a heart for the American people, they will prove it by stopping their unsympathetic and relentless delay of unemployment insurance benefits.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, when asked on July 4th are we headed in the right direction, Vice President BIDEN answered, "The economic initiatives that we took, they're working. They're working." Vice President BIDEN's repeatedly touted the failed stimulus package, and has recently coined what he calls "the summer of recovery." Yet when asked about concerns that the stimulus is not working he acknowledges that unemployment remains, "unacceptably high."

You know, if we are in a summer of recovery, we can't quite understand why we continue to have high unemployment in this country. When asked by ABC's This Week host Jake Tapper in an interview aired Sunday if the administration "is getting enough credit" for the Wall Street bill, the health care bill, and the economic recovery act in light of polls showing the majority of Americans believe the country is on the wrong track, Mr. BIDEN said, "The vast majority of the American people and a lot of people really involved don't even know what's inside the packages." On the contrary, for the first time in a long time the American people are taking a very strong interest in what Congress is doing, reading the bills and voicing their opinions.

Eighteen months after President Obama's \$862 billion so-called stimulus, which really cost \$1.2 trillion if you include the \$347 billion that the Congressional Budget Office estimates for interest payments on the borrowed money, as my colleagues said across the aisle, there are still five job seekers for every job opening, and we have a 9.5 percent unemployment rate. I appreciate my colleague from Florida helping me make that point that we still have a problem despite the fact that there have been so many policies passed here and so much money spent. We have a 9.5 percent unemployment rate.

Instead of facing reality, we are hearing that everything is going great. That is, everything except that which they might be able to somehow blame on the previous administration. Ignoring that virtually all of the jobs they are touting are government jobs, this misleading statistic doesn't represent net job growth, thereby omitting all the jobs lost since the liberals seized complete control of Washington.

Doesn't it really seem discordant to be promoting unemployment benefits when Democrats are touting this as the summer of recovery? If the Democrats' stimulus were so successful, why do we need to increase our debt by \$30 billion more for additional Federal unemployment benefits? Rather than acknowledge their stimulus plan failed and the American people were sold a bill of

goods, the President and his administration continue to propose new government programs that increase the deficit. This is wrong. The American people know it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, my good friend and colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, extending help to the unemployed is the right thing to do. It's the decent thing to do. We should have done it a long time ago. My colleagues on the Republican side have frustrated attempt after attempt after attempt after attempt to extend these benefits to people, most of whom have lost their jobs through no fault of their own.

My friends on the other side of the aisle say, well, we can't afford to do it, that we need to pay for this, even though they are emergency benefits. Well, why don't we pay for the Bush tax cuts, which added hundreds of billions of dollars to our debt? Why don't we pay for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, all funded through borrowed money? Why is nation building in Afghanistan more important than our own people? Why is giving Donald Trump another tax cut that is unpaid for, that adds to our deficit, more important than helping those who are unemployed?

I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle, What are you thinking? Why don't you care? Whose side are you on? I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to leave the Beltway every once in a while and go back and talk to your own constituents, and you will see that people are struggling, that there are people who are suffering because of this economy.

This is a difficult economy that is slowly but surely beginning to recover. It is a difficult economy that President Obama inherited from George W. Bush. We are trying to dig ourselves out of this mess that my Republican friends have created. It's going to take time. I remind my friends on the other side of the aisle that when George Bush was President we were losing an average of nearly 750,000 jobs per month in the last 3 months of the administration.

□ 1450

Twenty-two consecutive months of job losses, that's what they gave us.

When they talk about the deficit, I remind them that President Bill Clinton left George W. Bush a record surplus that they squandered on tax cuts for the rich and two wars that were unpaid for.

And, you know, the reason why we talk about President Bush's record is because the head of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee, Pete Sessions, when asked what the Republican plan was, he said, We need

to go back to the exact same agenda: the exact same agenda that produced these record deficits, the exact same agenda that put millions of people in this country out of work. Now, I've heard a lot of scary things in this Chamber, but I've got to tell you, that is the scariest thing I've ever heard.

I don't want to go backwards. I don't want to go back to the time where we were losing hundreds of thousands of jobs per month. President Obama to his credit and the Democratic Congress here are trying to fix the mess that they created, and we are now beginning to see job increases in this country. Not as much as we want, but we're moving in the right direction.

But in the meantime, we cannot turn our backs on those who are unemployed. So I say to my Republican friends in the United States Senate, stop your obstructionism. Stop playing politics with unemployment benefits and move out of the way and allow this bill to move forward so we can vote on it here on the House floor.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I know our colleagues again continue to want to rewrite history, but it's just not something we're going to let you do.

Our economy was doing great until you all took over the Congress in January of 2007. You keep blaming what happened in the last few months of President Bush's Presidency on President Bush. But you were in control of Congress. You've been in control. And you have to take the responsibility for what happened. The job losses came on your watch.

We had a \$200 billion deficit when you took over the Congress, and you have caused the deficit to go up. It is Democrat policies which have created the problems, not the Republican policies.

On Monday, President Obama took to the Rose Garden to criticize Republicans for insisting that new government spending to extend the Federal unemployment insurance program be paid for by cutting government spending elsewhere. Ironically, in another speech in the Rose Garden last November, President Obama took the opposite position, touting his signing an extension that was "fully paid for." And this is his quote: I would also like to announce I just signed into law a bill that will help grow our economy, save and create new jobs, and provide relief to struggling families and businesses. Now it's important to note that the bill I sign will not add to our deficit. It is fully paid for and so it is fiscally responsible.

Those remarks were made by President Obama on November 6, 2009. So he was for paying for spending before he was against it.

On June 28, Speaker PELOSI made statements indicating the best way to

create new jobs is to hand out more unemployment checks. This is her quote: This is one of the biggest stimuluses to our economy. Economists will tell you this money is spent quickly. It injects demand into the economy and it is job-creating. It creates jobs faster than almost any other initiative that you can name.

This is news to a lot of economists.

I wanted to share also a portion of a Wall Street Journal article from Tuesday entitled, "Stimulating Unemployment." This is the quote: "Only last week, Vice President Joe Biden was hailing the stimulus for saving and creating three million jobs. This week the White House says we need even more stimulus in the form of jobless checks to make up for the jobs his original spending stimulus didn't create."

The one possibility the President and congressional Democrats won't entertain is that their own spending and taxing and regulating and labor union favoritism have become the main hindrances to job creation. Since February 2009, the jobless rate has climbed to 9.5 percent from 8.1 percent, and private industry has shed two million jobs. The overall economy has been expanding for at least a year, but employers still don't seem confident enough to add new workers. The economists who sold us the stimulus say it's a mystery. But maybe employers are afraid to hire because they don't know what costs government will impose on them next.

In the immediate policy case, Democrats are going so far as to subsidize more unemployment. If you subsidize something, you get more of it. So if you pay people not to work, they often decide not to work or at least to delay looking or decline a less-than-perfect job offer holding out for something that may or may not materialize.

The economic consensus which includes Obama administration economists in their previous lives couldn't be clearer on this. In a 1990 study for the National Bureau for Economic Research, labor economist Lawrence Katz found that the results indicate that a 1-week increase in potential benefit duration increases the average duration of the unemployment spells of unemployment insurance recipients by 0.16 to 20 weeks, 16 to 20 weeks.

A March 2010 economic report by Michael Farrell of JP Morgan Chase examined several studies and concluded that lengthened availability of jobless benefits has raised the unemployment rate by 1.5 percent points.

A 2006 NBER study by Raj Chetty of U.C. Berkeley on a related subject begins: It is well known that unemployment benefits raise unemployment durations.

President Obama has said that this is a misguided notion and that attitude reflects a lack of faith in the American people. Yet Democrats have consistently passed legislation which takes away the choices and freedoms of the American people. That is the true reflection of a lack of faith in the American people.

And with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to a good friend of mine at this time, the distinguished gentleman from Memphis, Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. I want to thank Congressman HASTINGS for the opportunity to speak on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important issue to the American economy and the American public. My friend from North Carolina suggests that economists don't think this is a good thing. Well, Mark Zandi, who's the chief economist at Moody's, who was one of President Bush's economists and supporters, says, "No form of the fiscal stimulus has proved more effective during the past 2 years than energy UI benefits, providing a bang for the buck of \$1.61," for every dollar put in.

Paul Krugman, Nobel Prize-winning economist—that's not a bad little opportunity prize to win—"One main reason there aren't enough jobs right now is weak consumer demand. Helping the unemployed, by putting money in the pockets of people who badly need it, helps support consumer spending. That's why the Congressional Budget Office rates aid to the unemployed as a highly cost-effective form of economic stimulus."

Timely, targeted, and temporary are the three keys to stimulus spending; and unemployment compensation goes to people who are the Purple Hearts of this economic recession, an economic recession caused by George W. Bush.

My friend from North Carolina says we're forgetting history. I'll tell you about history. Under Bill Clinton, we had a budget surplus. Under George Bush with a misguided war built on lies and tax breaks to the wealthiest people in the country, we built up budget deficits, which we have had to increase because of the need to get out of this worst economic recession since Herbert Hoover—George Bush's ideological father—put us into the Depression some 80 years earlier.

No more American, independent, private-spending person than Warren Buffet has said that unemployment compensation should be passed. It helps the economy and it's just the right thing to do. This is the right thing to do for the economy, for the people who've gotten the Purple Hearts of this economic downturn, and for our country. And I urge everybody to use their brains and their hearts and to support this proposition.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I will just point out again to our colleagues across the aisle that the reason we had a surplus when Bill Clinton was President was because Republicans were in charge of the Congress, and the reason we had a deficit the last 2 years of the Bush administration is because Democrats were in charge of the Congress.

We'll continue to remind you of that.

I now would like to yield such time as he may consume to my distin-

guished colleague from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Grandfather Community for the great job that she's doing managing this rule, and I even recognize my friend from Fort Lauderdale is doing a reasonably decent job of managing the rule from his side.

□ 1500

You know, the focus of this institution is right now on what it is that the American people want us to focus on, jobs. Everybody here, Democrat and Republican alike, is talking about getting our economy back on track, creating job opportunities. The problem is that the policies that are emanating from this institution are tried and failed policies of the past.

I listened to my friend from Tennessee just a moment ago talk about the Great Depression. Well, Mr. Speaker it's very obvious that the policies of tax-and-spend that were pursued during the Great Depression exacerbated the Great Depression. In fact, very famously in testimony delivered before the House Ways and Means Committee in the fall of 1939, the Treasury Secretary, Henry Morgenthau of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, had these words to say. He said, We've tried spending money. We've spent more than we've ever spent before. Now, after 8 years of this Roosevelt administration, we have unemployment that is just as high today as it was when we started and an enormous debt to boot.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the Treasury Secretary of John F. Kennedy, Secretary Douglas Dillon, who pursued a pro-growth economic policy, you would not find him critical of President John F. Kennedy's economic policy. If you look at Treasury Secretary James Baker, who had been an opponent of Ronald Reagan's vision of putting into place pro-growth economic policies during the 1980s or, actually, when he was running his friend George H.W. Bush's campaign, he called it voodoo economics. But if you talk to Jim Baker today, he is a huge proponent of those policies, having seen the empirical evidence of their success.

So as we look at Secretary Douglas Dillon, as we look at Secretary James Baker, and look at Secretary Henry Morgenthau, it's very clear what it is that works. And so that's why, while Democrats and Republicans alike, Mr. Speaker, talk enthusiastically about getting the economy back on track, getting jobs created—because we all know how the American people are suffering. In part of the area I represent, Mr. Speaker, I have a 14.4 percent unemployment rate. It was just announced this week. My Statewide unemployment rate in California, a State with nearly 40 million people, the largest State in the Union, the greatest

and most important State in the Union I should add as well, has tragically an unemployment rate of 12.3 percent.

We all know that with the policies that we've gone through in the last 18 months, we were promised that if we pass the trillion-dollar stimulus bill we would not see the unemployment rate exceed 8 percent. We were told at this point following implementation of the stimulus bill that the unemployment rate would be at 7.4 percent. Well, as I said, in my State it's 12.3 percent, the largest State in the Union. Nationwide we all know, very sadly, it is 9.5 percent.

So clearly everybody's talking about the need to create jobs and get our economy back on track, but the policies have been the tried and failed policies of the past.

I had an interesting conversation 2 years ago with one of the leaders in Latin America who had been the President of his country in the 1980s. He was President for 5 years, and during that period of time, he pursued an extraordinarily statist, big government, high tax, regulatory vision for his country, and they had serious problems. He became President again and governed like Ronald Reagan governed. He focused on reducing the size and scope and reach of government. He reduced taxes to stimulate economic growth. He put into place an effort to reduce the regulatory burden, and he said to me in this meeting 2 years ago that the worst 5 years in the modern history of his country had been when he was President from 1985 to 1990. And he asked rhetorically, how can you in the United States of America contemplate moving in the direction that the rest of the world has learned to have failed?

I was just talking to the son of Ronald Reagan a few minutes ago, Michael Reagan, on the phone. He told me that he was just in France, and we all know that we have not used France as our economic model for the future. But Mike Reagan was telling me that he was there, and people are scratching their heads wondering why it is that we would be pursuing in the United States of America, the greatest Nation the world has ever known, a policy that has led to an 84 percent increase in the last 18 months in nondefense discretionary spending.

So, Mr. Speaker, we're here under a martial law rule, and since it's part of my job as a member of the Rules Committee to focus on procedure, I want to congratulate my friends in the majority for establishing martial law rule only for the issue at hand here and not providing blanket consideration of martial law rule.

I will say as I said in the Rules Committee last night, we have since mid-to late May every single week extended suspension authority through the rest of the week. Last week, we took a little break from that and we didn't do it, but this week again in this rule we have blanket extension of suspension authority. I know those are very inside

baseball things, but they are indicative of an arrogance that we have seen from the majority that is really undermining the deliberative process the American people deserve and desperately seek for this institution.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to join with my friend from Grandfather Community, North Carolina, in urging my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule in hopes that we can come together with a very decent and bipartisan approach following the John F. Kennedy-Ronald Reagan model to make sure that we get our economy back on track.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased at this time to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), who is a good friend of mine.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. It must, Mr. Speaker, be a luxury to have the ability to think about the great sweep of economic history since the 1930s, and I enjoyed very much the remarks of my friend from California, but we're here to talk today about 2.5 million Americans who don't have that luxury. These are people who have been out of work for a very long time, and as the first of the month rolls around very soon and there's no rent payment or no mortgage payment in their checking account, as they find it difficult or impossible to pay their utility bills, their health care bills, and they're slipping away, these are the Americans that we're here to talk about this afternoon, 2.5 million Americans.

The extension of unemployment benefits should have been done a very long time ago. There should not have been this wait to extend the benefits. Some people said that we should delay the benefits because people aren't looking hard enough for a job who are on unemployment. I would challenge those who make that assertion to go walk in the shoes of someone on unemployment a little while and see just how difficult it is to find a job.

The problem in America today is not that people aren't looking hard enough for work. It is that frankly not enough jobs are being created. We can all agree to that. How to fix that problem is a subject of debate in this country and on this floor.

But as we have that debate, isn't it the right and good and decent and necessary thing to do to look after the interests of those 2.5 million Americans, and should it not have been done a while ago? Now, why wasn't it? There are Members who in good faith in the other body argued that the bill should not even be voted on, not even be taken up, until there was money set aside to pay for the cost of the extension of the unemployment benefits. That was their argument. Sounds like a fairly plausible argument until you look a little bit beneath the surface and understand these are many of the same Members of the other body who are calling for a

permanent extension of tax reductions to the wealthiest Americans.

Let me explain what that means. These are people who are saying in the days of a person who owns an office building and a person who was laid off from a job cleaning the office building, that the following rules ought to apply.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I will yield additional time.

I just want to share with you as a segue of what you're saying, these are remarks from Senator KYL on the other side:

On extending President Bush's tax cut, despite the cost, his quote, "You should never have to offset cost of a deliberate decision to reduce tax rates on Americans."

□ 1510

These are the people that are holding up unemployment.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ANDREWS. I think my friend would say this: that that philosophy says that the person who got laid off from her job cleaning the office building at night can't get unemployment benefits unless we find a way to pay for it, but the guy who owns the office building, who would get a half million dollar a year tax break, should get that tax break whether or not there is money to offset that expenditure.

Now, I just don't understand that. I don't understand a philosophy that says that you have to offset and pay for help to a person who cleans office buildings, but by no means do you have to offset a tax break for a person who owns the building.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ANDREWS. If you have that philosophy, shouldn't it, at the very least, have been put up for a vote? Wasn't it wrong for people in the other body to deter that from even coming up for a vote?

They have gotten beyond that hump. Too little, too late in many ways, and we have an opportunity today to do our duty, put that issue squarely on the floor. Our colleagues on both sides should vote "yes" and let this House have its say and work its will so that we can address the very real needs of 2.5 million of our fellow citizens.

I urge Members to vote "yes."

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would point out to my colleagues across the aisle, Mr. Speaker, that Democrats are totally in control of Congress. They have been since January of 2007. In the House, the number is 255-178. There are two vacancies. In the Senate, it's 59-41, so the Democrats are clearly in charge,

but they continue to blame Republicans who are very much in the minority. The American people are seeing through that, Mr. Speaker. They understand who has the responsibility. And I think, what the quote from Mr. KYL is saying is that the money belongs to the citizens of this country.

I thank my colleague from Florida for bringing it up. It proves the point. Our friends on the other side of the aisle think that all the money in this country belongs to the government and that it's up to the Members of Congress to decide who is going to get that money. They joined in with President Obama in believing that they should spread around the wealth, take from some and give to others. I think we have heard that philosophy before, but that isn't what the American people believe. They believe that they worked hard for their money; they should keep it.

And I would also say to my colleague across the aisle, is it right and decent to saddle the American people with debt that is going to haunt us for many, many generations? Children not yet born are going to be given this debt while our friends across the aisle fund their pet projects and take from those that they wish to take from and spend where they want to.

There wouldn't need to have been any kind of wait because, again, you are in the majority. You could do this.

I want to say again, Republicans are very sympathetic to those who have lost their jobs, but the problems came when our colleagues across the aisle began irresponsible spending when they took over the Congress, adding rules and regulations. We know what drives jobs away. It's increased government spending and it's increased rules and regulations.

I think that we have to point out the liberal Democrat agenda has failed. Our friends across the aisle need to go back to the drawing board and come back to the American people with real solutions to their real problems.

We are in touch with those folks. I go home every weekend and I talk to the people in my district and they tell me they are very concerned about the future of this country. I can't tell you, Mr. Speaker, how many people tell me every weekend, I am frightened to death for the future of this country based on what is happening in Washington these days.

This isn't the time to dither and blame the Republican minority for the disappointing collapse of governments we have seen since the liberal majority seized control of Congress in 2007.

As I said, my colleague from Florida said earlier that job creation is the number one priority for Democrats. Well, obviously, they are missing the mark. Their spending programs have destroyed, not created, jobs.

Albert Einstein is credited with saying the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results. Well, our

colleagues keep doing the same thing over and over again and expect different results. They are not going to get different results as long as they have these irresponsible policies.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from not very far from here, Maryland, DONNA EDWARDS.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, look, at 3 o'clock this afternoon, 2,742,660 Americans were denied an extension of their unemployment benefits. It's just that simple. And I have heard the arguments on the other side, but when a liberal goes in to buy bread, nobody says that's liberal bread. When a conservative goes in to buy cereal, nobody says that's conservative cereal. When Republicans go in to pay their rent, nobody says that's Republican rent. When Democrats go in to pay that electric bill, nobody says that it's a Democratic electric bill.

Yet here on this floor, we have heard time and time again about liberals and conservatives and Republicans and Democrats. And when Americans are unemployed, it really doesn't matter what any of those labels are because they are trying to feed their families. They are trying to take care of their responsibilities. They have paid in, in many cases, for years and years and years, into an unemployment compensation insurance fund, and now that it's time to draw on it, our Republican colleagues want to deny them the opportunity to get what is justly theirs.

Now, our Republican colleagues a number of times, first in March of 2010 this year, 85 percent of them voted "no" for extending unemployment benefits. April 15, 93 percent of them voted "no" for extending unemployment benefits. On the 20th of July, we don't know. Are we going to again vote not to extend unemployment benefits to those who have run out of employment benefits, those who are not employed, to those who work hard every day going out there searching for jobs?

So the Republicans want to extend tax benefits for the wealthiest of Americans, billions and billions of dollars, but they don't want to extend unemployment benefits for people who have done everything that we have asked them to and they can't find a job. Republicans don't want to create jobs. They don't want to give unemployment benefits.

I have to ask. I mean, I just think that at home people are saying, What in the world is going on here? It's time to stop it. It's time to extend unemployment benefits, and it's time for Republicans to stop playing games, because this is about jobs.

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

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

In response to my good friend from California, firstly, I would argue with

you that California is not necessarily the greatest State in the Union. We happen to have 50 great States and six wonderful territories in this great country of ours. But coming from Florida, I find that rivalry worthwhile. We will match him any day.

This Congress, when he speaks in terms of the measure that we are proceeding on, from the standpoint of process, this Congress alone provided suspension authority on a day other than Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday, has allowed for passage of the Iran sanctions conference report, a paid-for doc fix, the Small Business Micro-lending Expansion Act, the Medicare Premium Fairness Act, and a resolution recognizing Israel's right to defend itself against attacks from Gaza, sponsored by the Speaker along with Representatives BOEHNER and CANTOR.

□ 1520

This same-day authority has allowed for passage of several bills that have already become law, including a bill authorizing the Oil Liability Trust Fund for the Deepwater Horizon oil spill, legislation expanding the Small Business Loan Guarantee program, legislation for the Temporary Extensions Act and the Worker, Homeownership, and Business Assistance Act. All of these bills passed with overwhelming support from the House.

This same process has not only benefited majority Members, it benefited Republican Members as well. Representatives LUETKEMEYER, GINGREY, TIBERI, CALVERT, REICHERT, PLATTS, FALLIN, SCHOCK, FORTENBERRY, CARTER, and LEE have all benefited from this provision by having their legislation adopted under suspension of the rules in spite of what day of the week it was. So much for that. Back to the point dealing with unemployment.

People think that this stuff is done in a vacuum sometimes. Well, Senate Republicans have repeatedly obstructed job creation legislation that extended critical unemployment insurance benefits to help Americans who lost their job through no fault of their own make ends meet as they look for their next job opportunity.

The Republican obstruction is unprecedented. Since 1959, Congress has never allowed unemployment benefits to expire when unemployment is more than 7.2 percent. There are a considerable number of economists—Alan Blinder, Ralph Martire and, then more important, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities—who say that for every \$1 spent on unemployment it creates \$1.90. So, really, the best stimulus for this economy suggests, as the economists do, that it is stimulated much more by spending on unemployment than we would tax cuts.

I want to say one final thing on tax cuts. I have two personal friends that are fortunate enough in this country to be billionaires. They earned their money the hard way; they earned their money during good and bad times, and

none of us hold any truck with either of those billionaires. I know two other billionaires personally, and not one of them before has ever said that they favored tax cuts—just to talk about some of the American people—they manage regardless.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon, a good friend of mine, Mr. DEFAZIO.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I was in my office and heard this debate, which was sort of a departure from reality on the Republican side of the aisle. They say we should blame the victims of the Wall Street-led crash in America. These people are lazy; they don't want to work. Why, if we just cut off their unemployment benefits, maybe they will go out and find a job. The jobs don't exist. They were destroyed by greed on Wall Street, by the reckless Republican policies of deregulation at any cost, of tax cuts for the wealthiest among us because trickle down would help the working people of America and put them back to work. Crazy.

I have 60,000 Oregonians, a State with over 10 percent unemployment, hard hit who will benefit from this bill. Now, they would say that's a special interest or an earmark to help 60,000 Oregonians who have exhausted their unemployment benefits. Let me just talk about one who I met in the unemployment office. Shame on you on that side of the aisle. Shame on you.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will address their remarks to the Chair, not to other Members in the second person.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Shame on those who would not extend unemployment benefits, whoever they might be—I think they're on that side of the aisle.

Now, this gentleman, hardworking construction worker, older guy, fifties, 30 years never been unemployed, 30 years. He lost his job. Kind of a tough market for an older construction worker. He was in the unemployment office, initially pretty hostile; and afterwards he came over and he apologized and he said, I know you're not responsible for this. I know it was the Bush administration, and their policies put us in this mess, but I'm desperate, I'm desperate because my wife is really sick. And I can get extended health care benefits under COBRA for 900 bucks a month because I had a pretty good plan, but my unemployment is only about 1,200 bucks a month—Easy Street, the Republicans talk about, these people are living on Easy Street with \$1,200 a month. \$900 a month for health insurance for a desperately ill wife. How does he pay the mortgage? How does he feed the kids?

Now, come on, let's get real here. You don't want to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy. You didn't pay for a \$1 trillion war in Iraq that we didn't need, but now we've got to pay for the emergency unemployment benefits. Humbug.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will note that the gentleman from Florida has 2 minutes remaining and the gentlewoman from North Carolina has 7½ minutes remaining.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this same-day rule, reject the liberal agenda that continues to distract from private sector job creation and getting our economy back on its feet.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, he fought his way all the way over here, and even though I have but 2 minutes, I would like to share 1 of my minutes with Mr. LANGEVIN.

I would inquire of my good friend from North Carolina if she would be so kind as to yield 30 seconds to Mr. LANGEVIN as well.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my time.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would be more than happy to yield 30 seconds to Mr. LANGEVIN.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank both the gentleman and the gentlelady for yielding time on this very important issue. I am very grateful.

I do rise in strong support of this rule for consideration of H.R. 4213, the Restoration of Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act. This very important bill provides a critical boost for more than 2.5 million Americans across the Nation, including 6,000 Rhode Islanders right now who are struggling to find employment. Not only that, but for every \$1 spent on unemployment benefits, \$1.90 is put back into the economy. These benefits are crucial for working families as they search for new opportunities in a very tight job market.

In my home State of Rhode Island, we have the country's fourth highest unemployment rate at over 12 percent. Through recovery funds, we have recently implemented Jobs Now Rhode Island, a job training program that in the past 2 months has successfully put more than 300 Rhode Islanders back to work. I recently met with some of these workers at Capco Steel. A couple had been out of work for a few months, while for others this was their first job in a few years. This visit reminded me that as Members of Congress we have the obligation not only to help create jobs, but also to give hardworking Americans another chance to continue their job search and provide for their families.

I encourage my colleagues to pass this bill and help those who are most vulnerable right now during these trying times. We are going to get through this tough economy, but we have to help people with their immediate needs, and unemployment extension does that.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we stand ready to provide

those struggling to find work this small reprieve; and Democrats in Congress are also committed to putting forth the necessary effort to create jobs, spur economic growth, and put our country once again on the road to prosperity.

□ 1530

But, in the meantime, we have a responsibility to ensure that those most profoundly affected by these difficult times are able to stay afloat—to feed their families, to keep their homes, and to continue to search for new jobs. We must not play political football with unemployment insurance. It is simply too fundamental to the livelihoods of millions of Americans. Our economy is starting to turn around, and the American people cannot afford to wait another second, let alone 30 hours for the United States Senate to act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I was hearing my friend across the aisle. He was yelling about things not being paid for when, actually, what happened was, in my first 2 years here, in 2005 and 2006, our friends across the aisle pointed out to voters, These guys are running a \$100 billion, \$200 billion budget, so elect us, put us in the majority, and we will stop the insane deficit spending. We will make sure every bill is paid for.

So the voters took them up on that. They gave our friends across the aisle, Mr. Speaker, the majority, and said, Okay, you guys say you won't deficit spend like the Republicans had started doing.

The Republicans balanced the budget in the late 1990s, but they got away from it and got giddy when President Bush got elected. So, in January 2007, it was the Democrats' job to do what they had promised the voters they would do. That promise has not been kept.

PAYGO was passed as a rule, but then that promise was not kept. I voted for PAYGO previously but not this last time because I found out it was a joke, that it was not intended to do what it said because, every time a bill comes along that they want to pass, they just do a rule that goes around it. There was no sense in that. This could be easily paid for.

For all of those people whose eyes we look into who have lost their jobs—we see them at job fairs, and we see them around, looking for jobs—we've got to tell them that we have all of these little pet projects that we don't want to give up the money for. So, therefore, you're going to stay out of work because we're not going to let the private sector have the capital they need to create jobs.

Yes, we're going to provide the unemployment benefits. That would be fine. But don't force other people not to

have jobs because we don't create the capital by stopping the insane deficit spending. You hurt people. Yes, you help people by giving them unemployment benefits further, but you hurt people because they can't go get jobs because the jobs can't be created because we won't give up the little pet projects.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of this emergency legislation that will restore the safety net to millions of American families. Those families have been desperately waiting for this relief since June. Their faith in us had been tested, but today, I am pleased to say we can extend them the help that they need.

My colleagues have heard me speak of the legendary mayor of Boston, James Michael Curley. A truly gifted orator.

Curley spoke with great empathy about the forgotten man, those individuals who for whatever reason have found themselves outside of the mainstream of economic life. He also would suggest that, in simplicity, that the great ally of civilization was a full stomach. And we need to be reminded of that with the grim economic statistics that America is currently witnessing.

Now, also another very pertinent reminder here that I think that we all ought to recall: in October of 2008, in record time this House voted to come to the aid of Wall Street. It didn't take us long, with the Troubled Asset Relief Program, to keep standing many of those institutions that helped create the problem that we find ourselves currently in.

Is that relevant today? There are millions of people across this country who have simply found themselves without work. What does that do to an individual who has spent a career, and after 30 years finds the job is gone? And we treat them as though they are simply a statistic after perhaps they served us in an honorable manner in Vietnam, or currently in Iraq, or Afghanistan, or other theaters around the world?

America's about building community, Mr. Speaker. America's about a place where nobody's to be abandoned and nobody's to be left behind. The great bounty of God's work has been to ensure that most people in America have shelter and food. This opportunity to extend unemployment benefits for the American people ought to meet this moment.

I urge adoption.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question on the same-day rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. 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, this 15-minute vote on House Resolution 1537

will be followed by 5-minute votes on suspending the rules with regard to H.R. 5566 and House Resolution 1411, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 185, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 458]

YEAS—233

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bocchieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene

Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Hereth Sandlin
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey

Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schradner
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Djou
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger

Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitschell
Murphy, Tim
Myrick

Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Teague
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Capuano
Clarke
Fallin
Hoekstra
King (NY)

Lee (CA)
Mack
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Moran (KS)

□ 1602

Messrs. MANZULLO, TIBERI, CULBERSON, BAIRD, MINNICK, and Ms. MARKEY of Colorado changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. LOEB SACK changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PREVENTION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE IN ANIMAL CRUSH VIDEOS ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DRIEHAUS). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5566) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit interstate commerce in animal crush videos, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

NAYS—185

Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann

Bachus
Baird
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggart

Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner