

differences, I would like to remind our colleagues that this bill was entirely acceptable to all of the Democratic and Republicans on the Oversight Committee prior to this bill reaching the floor.

H.R. 1722 received full consideration by the Federal Workforce Subcommittee that I chair. It was referred unanimously by the subcommittee to the full Oversight Committee. And during the full committee consideration, I am proud to say that Republican amendments were offered and they were accepted and the legislation was then advanced to the House without a single objection by any Republican member. And I am proud of that fact. That is bipartisanship. My friends on the other side of the aisle, good Republicans, had every opportunity to attempt to add additional provisions in the committee, where they would have received full consideration rather than the 5 minutes of hurried debate prior to the vote on the Republican motion to recommit.

But today I'm pleased that we have the opportunity to consider the excellent, comprehensive, bipartisan compromise we were able to negotiate with the Senate. And I would also like to add that all the House and Senate committee staff, majority and minority, met following Senate passage to discuss possible alternatives that would be acceptable.

This has been a bipartisan process. This is something I think we can agree on. I would not want the perfect to be the enemy of the good in this case. I think we have a good bill here. I think there's been good input from both sides of the aisle here, and it shows in the end product.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, as a representative of a district with a large number of Federal employees, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1722, The Telework Improvements Act. I want to thank Chairmen TOWNS and LYNCH and Representative SARBANES for their leadership in crafting this important bipartisan bill.

The Telework Improvements Act makes administrative, fiscal and environmental sense. If passed, the measure will save money for the American taxpayers, make government operations more efficient, and put the Federal Government on equal footing with many private sector employers and State governments which allow their employees to perform many of their duties and responsibilities from home or at another work site.

Passing this bill will help attract more workers to government service. There is an effort under way to encourage more young people to work for the Federal Government to offset the growing number of older employees who are retiring. Offering prospective employees the option to telework increases the possibility that those employees with families will join the Federal workforce.

Passing this bill is smart fiscal policy. According to the Office of Personnel Management, during the blizzard that hit Washington, DC last winter, the government lost tens of millions of dollars worth of productivity for each day it remained closed. This number

might have been far larger had some Federal workers not had the opportunity to work from home. The bill will also reduce costs for taxpayers by lowering absenteeism.

Passing this bill makes environmental sense. Increasing teleworking opportunities for employees of the country's largest employer means fewer cars on the roads and lower carbon emissions. According to the Telework Exchange, if 20 percent of Americans teleworked, we could eliminate 67 million metric tons of greenhouse gas emissions annually and reduce Persian Gulf oil imports by 40 percent.

Madam Speaker, passing The Telework Improvements Act will save money for the taxpayer, help ease pressure on the environment and make the government run more efficiently. The bill is also PAYGO compliant.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting the bill and I urge its immediate passage.

Mr. LYNCH. I ask all Members to vote in favor of H.R. 1722, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of this motion is postponed.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ISSA. At the end of debate, isn't it appropriate to call for the vote prior to postponing for the yeas and nays? I heard no request for it. Are we postponing further debate, even though debate has concluded, rather than a House vote and then postponing a recorded vote?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Time for debate has expired. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the motion has been postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

#### EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION CONTINUATION ACT

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6419) to amend the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 to provide for the further extension of emergency unemployment benefits, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6419

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Unemployment Compensation Continuation Act".

#### SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROVISIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Section 4007 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(A) by striking "November 30, 2010" each place it appears and inserting "February 28, 2011";

(B) in the heading for paragraph (2) of subsection (b), by striking "NOVEMBER 30, 2010" and inserting "FEBRUARY 28, 2011"; and

(C) in subsection (b)(3), by striking "April 30, 2011" and inserting "July 31, 2011".

(2) Section 2005 of the Assistance for Unemployed Workers and Struggling Families Act, as contained in Public Law 111-5 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note), is amended—

(A) by striking "December 1, 2010" each place it appears and inserting "March 1, 2011"; and

(B) in subsection (c), by striking "May 1, 2011" and inserting "August 1, 2011".

(3) Section 5 of the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-449; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by striking "April 30, 2011" and inserting "July 31, 2011".

(b) FUNDING.—Section 4004(e)(1) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking "and" at the end; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (F) the following:

"(G) the amendments made by section 2(a)(1) of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Continuation Act; and".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-205; 124 Stat. 2236).

#### SEC. 3. OPTION FOR STATES TO TEMPORARILY MODIFY CERTAIN "ON" AND "OFF" INDICATORS RELATING TO EXTENDED BENEFITS.

(a) INDICATORS BASED ON RATE OF INSURED UNEMPLOYMENT.—Section 203(d) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by inserting before the last sentence the following: "Effective with respect to compensation for weeks of unemployment beginning after the date of enactment of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Continuation Act (or, if later, the date established pursuant to State law), and ending on or before March 1, 2011, the State may by law provide that the determination of whether there has been a State 'on' or 'off' indicator beginning or ending any extended benefit period shall be made under this subsection as if paragraph (1)(A) had been amended by striking 'the preceding two calendar years' and inserting 'the preceding three calendar years'; except that, notwithstanding any such provision of State law, any week for which there would otherwise be a State 'on' indicator shall continue to be such a week and shall not be determined to be a week for which there is a State 'off' indicator.".

(b) INDICATORS BASED ON RATE OF TOTAL UNEMPLOYMENT.—Section 203(f) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) Effective with respect to compensation for weeks of unemployment beginning after the date of enactment of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Continuation Act (or, if later, the date established pursuant to State law), and ending on or before March 1, 2011, the State may by law provide that the determination of whether there has been a State ‘on’ or ‘off’ indicator beginning or ending any extended benefit period shall be made under this subsection as if paragraph (1)(A)(ii) had been amended—

“(A) by striking ‘either (or both)’ and inserting ‘any (or all)’; and

“(B) by striking ‘the preceding 2 calendar years’ and inserting ‘the preceding 3 calendar years’.

Notwithstanding any provision of a State law described in this paragraph, any week for which there would otherwise be a State ‘on’ indicator shall continue to be such a week and shall not be determined to be a week for which there is a State ‘off’ indicator.”.

#### SEC. 4. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

#### SEC. 5. EMERGENCY DESIGNATIONS.

This Act—

(1) is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4(g) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-139; 2 U.S.C. 933(g));

(2) in the House of Representatives, is designated as an emergency for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles; and

(3) in the Senate, is designated as an emergency requirement and necessary to meet emergency needs pursuant to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Madam Speaker, this is called an emergency bill because it is an emergency. For millions of people, this is an emergency. Unemployment benefits are going to run out in a few days. Therefore, it is an emergency for the United States of America. And let me just indicate what is at stake here.

Through January 1 of next year, close to 2 million people will not any longer be eligible for benefits. And then, a month later, the amount almost doubles. This is an emergency.

Last night, I was in my office at 9:30 and a person called from Atlanta, Georgia, to thank me and to thank Mr. McDERMOTT and to thank our party for bringing up this extension.

I don't know what more any of us want. I don't see how we can go home for Thanksgiving when, as a result of failure of benefits, hundreds of thou-

sands of people may not have a turkey on their table because they can't afford it and the next week may not have the moneys they need to meet their daily needs.

This should be a bipartisan effort. This is a totally human effort. This is totally an urgent effort. These are people laid off, people who have been looking for work, people who cannot find work. For every job, at least five people are looking for employment for that job. I don't know what other evidence needs to be brought here. It can be stated very briefly and directly.

If the 2 million people who are going to lose their benefits looking for work were brought here so we could see them, would anyone vote “no”? Would anyone vote “no”? Do we need the 2 million here? Can we put ourselves in their homes, in their shoes, in their places with their families, with their children.

This is an emergency. This House must act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1250

Mr. BOUSTANY. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, well, as Yogi Berra said, This bill is like *deja vu* all over again—and not in a good way.

The bill before us today is the ninth extension of unemployment benefits since mid-2008. Benefits recently stretched up to 99 weeks, or almost 2 years, in most States. With the exception of just one bill last November, every one of those extensions was not paid for. That's a total of \$135 billion added to our \$14 trillion debt.

Meanwhile, our Democrat colleagues swore their policies would create jobs—but they haven't. Instead of paychecks, millions of Americans were left with only an unemployment check. In February 2009, the President signed the Democrats' trillion dollar stimulus plan. At that time, Democrats promised that the plan would create 3.7 million jobs and lower the unemployment rate to 7 percent by now. None of that happened.

Instead, over 2 million more private sector jobs were lost, and unemployment spiked to 10 percent while the debt has grown by almost \$3 trillion. A total of 48 out of 50 States have lost jobs since the Democrats' stimulus bill passed. Yet here we are again—extending unemployment benefits because the Democrats' trillion dollar stimulus failed to create the millions of jobs they promised it would. Even more sadly, instead of doing this responsibly, this bill will simply add another \$12 billion to our current mountain of debt.

We can do better than this. We certainly can do better than this.

Both Republicans and Democrats support helping the long-term unemployed. The chairman of the committee expressed a great deal of empathy in his opening statement. We share that empathy. Every one of our congress-

sional offices has dealt with families dealing with this tragedy of unemployment, but Republicans and even some Democrats want to responsibly pay for these benefits. In fact, there are sufficient unspent stimulus funds to do just that, to cover the \$12 billion cost of the bill before us. This is not a new Republican idea or a new idea. This is something we have discussed before, but the other side insists on bringing this forward, unpaid for.

The chairman of the Senate Finance Committee has proposed cutting stimulus to pay for certain measures. Last June, the Democrat leader himself, Mr. HOYER, admitted there was spending fatigue across the country, and “if we have dollars not yet expended in the Recovery Act,” they should be “applied to” new spending like this. That would be far better than adding to the unchecked growth in spending and debt that has already cost us an estimated 1 million jobs.

The fact is we can both provide this help and pay for it by cutting less effective stimulus spending. That's what we should be debating today, not a bill called up under special rules that permit no amendments and no chance to offer ways to pay for this. Even if this were to pass, the sad thing is that there are no plans in the Senate for a vote on this bill any time soon. So the fact of the matter is this bill is going nowhere.

The American people know it isn't right to add these costs to our already overdrawn national credit card. We all want to help those in need, but the American people also know that someone has to pay when government spends money, and it shouldn't be our children and our grandchildren. The American people sent us here to do a job. We should pay for this spending today. We can pay for this spending today, and there is no reason why we couldn't bring a bill forward with a way to do this, with a way to pay for it.

So I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject this bill today. Instead, let's work together to quickly pass a bill to extend Federal unemployment benefits while finding a responsible way to pay for it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I say to the gentleman from Louisiana that the people of this country who are looking for work don't want empathy; they want the unemployment insurance that they worked for, and you're standing in the way. Don't send them empathy. Send them what they worked for.

I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my time be controlled by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), the author of this bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, may I ask what the division of minutes is at the moment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 16½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Louisiana has 15½ minutes remaining.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 6419, which will extend current unemployment insurance benefits through February of next year and will provide much needed help to unemployed Americans during the holiday season.

From the beginning of the unemployment insurance program 75 years ago, we have never cut off benefits for out-of-work Americans when the unemployment rates have been this high. Without this extension, temporary Federal extended benefits will shut down shortly after Thanksgiving, the 27th, denying benefits to 2 million of our fellow citizens over the holiday season. It is unthinkable to me that we can allow these benefits to lapse during the holiday season and before the economic recovery is on solid ground.

Despite the severity of the Republican economic collapse, which started under Mr. Bush, there have been 10 straight months of private sector growth under this Democratically controlled Congress and administration. Despite the huge accomplishment of digging the American economy out of the Republican economic ditch, too many Americans remain unemployed. There is still only one available job for every five unemployed Americans. To make matters worse, the press is now carrying reports that employers around the country are refusing to hire the unemployed.

They're saying to the unemployed, We want to hire somebody who has a job to come over and fill our job because we know you were laid off because you weren't a good employee, and that's why they let you go. We don't want to hire people who aren't worth anything.

That's the message that's going out in this country now to the unemployed. Many of those people are middle class people who have worked very hard, and through no fault of their own, their industries have collapsed—banking, housing—as a direct result of what the Bush administration did—or didn't do, really, which is to have regulated Wall Street.

Unfortunately, the Republicans have already made it clear that, instead of helping the middle class, one of their top priorities is to give millionaires and billionaires a huge \$700 billion break. Now, the same people who are saying this should be paid for will be out on this floor sometime in the next couple of weeks, saying, We don't have to pay for a tax break. Why, that'll pump jobs into the world. All we have to do is cut taxes everywhere and give \$700 billion to people who make more than \$500,000 a year—that's okay—but

an unemployment check for somebody to keep bread on the table and keep a mortgage paid is not okay.

We can't not fund that. This is an emergency.

People who talk like that on the floor of this House have never been unemployed or have never known anybody who has been unemployed. You would not talk that way about unemployed people if you knew them.

Now, this should give every middle class American a lot to think about with the results of this last election. This is your first chance to observe what you can expect in the next 2 years. The minority leader in the other body said, My number one priority is to prevent Barack Obama from having a second term. Not public policy. Not jobs for people. Not health care for people—but political gain.

□ 1300

And that's what this is all about. The experts agree—two out of every three people who get unemployment benefits are in the middle class. We're not talking about people who weren't trying or weren't working or weren't doing their part as Americans.

While the Republicans were bankrupting the country to help the rich with one hand, giving tax breaks all over the place, the Republicans were using the other hand to push the unemployed middle class of America out of their homes and never dealt with the foreclosure issue to prevent them from having food on their tables and to keep their children from being properly clothed.

On the campaign trail Republicans called the unemployed "lazy." Boy, you haven't met an unemployed person or you would never say that a second time to them. And they said that unemployment benefits "spoil" out of work Americans. They get lazy and they just sit around the house and wait for their unemployment check. Those checks aren't that big in the first place, and secondly, people don't like to be unemployed in this country. People look for work, and they are looking for work and they are now being told you've been unemployed for 2 years, we're not interested in hiring you. We want somebody who's got a job over here. That was on NPR just yesterday. So it isn't made up. That's what's going on.

Some Republicans even question the constitutionality of the Unemployment Insurance Program. The health and welfare of the American people is unconstitutional, according to some people.

Fortunately, the American people don't feel the same way. A recent poll showed that 86 percent of Americans believe the unemployed really want to work. That's what the people think. That's not the political rhetoric of people running for election. That's what the people really think.

The election is over now, and Americans have said we want both parties to

work together to get things done and do it by listening to the American people. Americans don't want to push American families whose breadwinners lost their jobs through no fault of their own into poverty during the holidays.

I think we should end these debates and extend benefits longer and allow benefits to be scaled back as the economy improves. The reason we've had all these votes out here is because the Senate is unable to do anything. We've tried to extend this for extended periods of time, and over in the Senate, they say, well, let's extend it for a month, let's see if we can starve them for a month, and then we'll go in. They let this program lapse for 3 months over there, and you're telling me that we're going to work together. Well, I think we ought to work together.

This is a short-term extension in an effort to see if our Republican colleagues will support any kind of help for the unemployed. I am told by the other side that there's no plan in the Senate to take up this bill. Well, they're waiting to see if we can get it out of here. If you don't help, maybe it won't get out of here, but the message to 4 million Americans will be the Republican Party doesn't care whether you have a Christmas or a way to fund your mortgage or a way to put food on the table for the first three months of the next year. I hope my Republican colleagues will join the American people in supporting this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, I just regret to say that we're hearing oversimplifications and many generalizations from the other side.

Look, this is not one of those you either pass it or you don't types of issues here. We could pay for this, and the sad thing is all I'm hearing on the other side is a great deal of cynicism. But furthermore, look, the American people have spoken about this, and they are saying we've got to get a handle on national debt if we're going to get the economy going again and create jobs because the American people want paychecks. They want good-paying jobs. They want an end to this uncertainty.

We have information from the MacArthur Foundation, a very respected organization. They released a poll showing that over 70 percent of voters in this month's election say it is very important to reduce the national debt. Overwhelmingly, voters want us to reduce the debt by cutting spending, but instead of doing this fiscally responsible thing and actually paying for this new spending, which we could very easily do, the bill before us today does exactly the opposite. It adds \$12 billion to our Nation's debt in a program that's already added \$135 billion to the national debt. The sad thing is, Madam Speaker, we could extend these unemployment benefits, and we could pay for them.

Look, the bill reflects I think a very cynical political maneuver by the Democratic leadership because they

know that the Senate has no plans to pass this unpaid-for bill. We've been down this path before, and in fact, the liberal Huffington Post has broken the code on really what's going on here. There was a recent headline, *Jobless Benefits About to Lapse as Senate Democrats Mull Strategy*. That was a headline on Tuesday. And, *No Plans in Senate For a Vote on Unemployment Benefits* read the headline yesterday. To quote Senator REED from Rhode Island, a Democratic leader on this legislation: "At this point it's not been scheduled. I can't point to a specific time it will come up for a vote this week."

The American people are tired of the cynicism. They want answers. And the sad thing is there's a simple answer on this one, unlike many of the other problems our country is facing which are more complex. We could extend unemployment benefits and we could pay for it, but our friends on the other side of the aisle currently control the House, they control the Senate, they control the White House, and they can't even get their act together to do this, especially when there are Republicans who would be willing to do this extension if it were paid for. The simple answer is "yes" there is a way to pay for it. It's staring us right in the face, and yet our friends across the aisle refuse to see this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I yield myself 30 additional seconds.

My friend on the other side clearly understands, I'm sure, the legislative process. We put a bill over to the Senate. They can make a change. If they want to pay for it, they can pay for it. They are safe, they're comfortable, because they know you're going to stop the bill or try to stop the bill. They know that the House Republicans are determined that they're not going to let this bill through here. So they say, all right, we can say we don't have any way to do anything with it. My belief is that we put a bill over there, they will pass a bill.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I believe that the American people want to work. Those who are unemployed want a job. Those who are out of work want employment benefits. I don't think that there is any excuse that can be given. There is no reason that one can conjure up that would say to a person who's unemployed, out of work, has no food, can't pay their mortgage, can't enjoy the holidays, that there is a reason, especially since they have worked, that they can't have benefits to get them through this situation on an emergency basis.

I am amazed, I am dumbfounded, I can't believe that I'm hearing what I'm hearing, that somehow or another the Democrats, in a technical sense, are keeping individuals from getting unemployment benefits. I would hope

that we could change our minds, change our position, and know that when we do this for the least of these, then we're doing the work that we ought to be doing.

Let's pass this measure. Provide benefits to the unemployed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will take this opportunity to remind all Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, I want to remind our friends on the other side that in the past when they did bring the bill up on suspension, it failed, and yet when you did on one occasion bring it up on regular order, it did pass.

We all have to work hard to listen to the will of the American people. Yesterday, Speaker PELOSI herself said, "Our consensus is that we go out there listening to the American people. It's about jobs. It's about reducing the deficit."

Yet today, here we are again being asked to increase the deficit by another \$12 billion. That's another \$160 in debt for every family of four in the United States, just for 3 months of benefits under one program, all on top of the \$2.8 trillion in debt we have racked up since President Obama took office, a 44 percent increase.

□ 1310

The question, Madam Speaker, is, Is the Speaker really listening to the American people? Because what we heard earlier this month is that people want us to provide help to those in need but not add to the mountain of debt that we are currently leaving to our children and grandchildren.

The sad thing—again, I repeat—the sad thing, we could have achieved both goals today. The Congressional Budget Office has informed us there is enough unspent stimulus spending that we can cut to cover the additional spending in this bill. It's just unconscionable that the other side has not heard the American people about the concerns about unfettered debt passed on to our children and grandchildren.

Again, Mr. HOYER this past summer suggested we do just that. In June he said, "If we have dollars not yet expended in the Recovery Act," that they should be "applied to" new spending like this. In July, 59 Democrats signed a letter saying: "Extending critical, economic investments is no more important than paying for them. America is facing a debt crisis that is threatening to undermine our economic and national security. We can no longer afford to exacerbate the problem because the decisions about how to pay for what we spend are getting harder."

This one is fairly easy. We have a way to pay for it, and yet the majority chose to bring this to the floor unpaid for, and without an opportunity to even offer an amendment.

So I ask our colleagues on the other side, Are you listening to the American

people? Madam Speaker, are they even listening to each other? And do they agree with the Speaker that it's about debt? All we're hearing are mixed signals. If so, join us in voting down this unpaid-for bill and begin working together on a new bill, which we could do very quickly, that does right by the unemployed as well as our children and our grandchildren. That's what the American people expect of us today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, could you tell us how much time we have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Louisiana has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the Joint Economic Committee, which I chair, released a report today that finds that if Congress fails to extend the Federal unemployment insurance benefits program, the unintended consequences could be extremely serious. Serious not just for the 2 million Americans who would see their benefits expire in December, but extremely serious for the larger economy as well.

Prematurely ending the program would drain our economy of some \$80 billion in purchasing power, just as our fragile economy is beginning to recover. This would result in the loss of over 1 million jobs over the next year. Even now, there are five Americans looking for work for every job opening in the land; and more than 40 percent of those unemployed have been out of work for 27 weeks or more, including over 159,000 in New York State, with some 95,000 in my home of New York City. Choosing to vote against an extension, and thus add a million Americans to the ranks of the unemployed, cannot possibly be considered as a wise economic policy choice.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office ranks the stimulative effects of unemployment benefits as one of the most effective policies to increase growth and employment that they have studied, and the President's Council of Economic Advisers estimates that every dollar spent on unemployment insurance benefits increases the gross domestic product by \$1.60. Economists predict that without extended benefits, the economy will suffer, consumer spending will fall by 0.5 percent, and economic growth will be reduced by almost 0.5 percent.

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. MALONEY. The facts and the numbers in the new JEC report make it clear that extending this program benefits those who need our help most, benefits the larger economy, and thus benefits us all.

I urge a "yes" vote on this bill.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Again I say, there was a way to pay for this. We have to be frank with the American people on this. Jobless benefits have cost so far \$319 billion, and yet unemployment is still at 9.6 percent; and we've seen really nothing coming from the other side who has controlled the majority in the House, controlled the majority in the Senate, controlled the White House. We've seen nothing to help small businesses get going again to hire. We've seen nothing to promote competitiveness in the U.S. economy. Their answer is to continue to extend unemployment benefits unpaid for.

Now there's agreement. We're not disagreeing about extending the unemployment benefits at this time. We're saying, let's do it in a responsible way and pay for it.

It wasn't always this way. This is the ninth attempt to extend this program. And when Democrats passed their only paid-for unemployment insurance extender bill in November of 2009—the only one that was paid for—the Obama administration hailed that "fiscally responsible approach to expanding unemployment benefits," adding that "fiscal responsibility is central to the medium-term recovery of the economy and the creation of jobs."

That was from the administration's statement of policy about the Democrats' one paid-for UI extension bill, which was H.R. 4548. There were 156 Republicans who supported that November 2009 bill.

By the administration's own logic, the Democrats' latest fiscally irresponsible bill, H.R. 6419, which increases the deficit by an estimated \$12 billion, undermines the medium-term recovery of the economy and the creation of jobs. The sad thing, Madam Speaker, is this: we could extend unemployment benefits and pay for it. This is not a hard one. There are harder decisions coming with the debt that our country is facing and economic uncertainty. Republicans are ready to move forward and get this country going again and restore American competitiveness, but I see our friends on the other side of the aisle are up to their old ways.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I have found that the other side is very adroit at finding some reason not to do anything to help the middle class. Now, there is plenty of evidence to suggest that the people in this country are not interested in cutting off food and housing and medical coverage for people who are unemployed in this country. And to use these arguments about, Oh, we're going to get the money from the stimulus money, I defy anybody on this floor at this moment to stand up and tell me where that stimulus money is and what the impact would be if you cut it because that money was allocated to various agen-

cies, some to pay salaries for schoolteachers, some to pay salaries for policemen and firemen and local governments, some to pay the States for Medicaid.

All this money is out there. Maybe some of it hasn't yet been spent, but it's allocated. Some of it is for construction projects. I suppose, just like that Governor in New Jersey who thinks it's really politically smart to stop a public works project under the Hudson River because then he can use that money to pave potholes in New Jersey, and he puts the construction workers out of work all over the place.

□ 1320

Those infrastructure projects, you can't spend all the money on the first day. It does take a little while to build it, and you pay it out as you build it. Now, you know that. Republicans are just being deceptive. They think because it still is there in the Treasury, it can be used for something else. Well, it might have been committed for something else.

But not my Republican friends. This emergency that these 4½ million people have over here who have no benefits coming by the end of March, "You folks understand that you shouldn't worry about this. I mean, the Speaker will explain it to you that you just have to wait until we can find where that money is in the budget."

This is an emergency for people who have no check coming.

We would all like this thing to be all over. There isn't anybody on this floor, Republican or Democrat, who wouldn't like the mess that was created by the Bush administration to be over with. It isn't.

And the problem is, a guy in my district said, you know, JIM, I can tell you what the problem with America is, and your Republican side has a bad dose of this. He said, It's the belief in the microwave. If they have a problem, they come down to the refrigerator. They open the refrigerator, pull something out, close the refrigerator, open the microwave, throw it in, hit two buttons and wait 30 seconds and they've got lunch. They think everything can be solved like that.

It took a long time for Mr. Bush to create the mess that we are now dealing with, and it isn't going to be over in 30 seconds like the microwave dinner is.

And the fact is that you've got people who contradict you directly. The real budget—no one's going to ever accuse me of being a big budget warrior or a deficit warrior. I'm no deficit hawk. But Bob Bixby, President of the Concord Coalition, that organization dedicated to eliminating Federal budget deficits said, and I quote: "As a deficit hawk, I wouldn't worry about extending unemployment benefits. It is not going to add to the long-term structural deficit, and it does address a serious need. I just feel like unemployment benefits wandered into the wrong

street corner at the wrong time, and now they're getting mugged."

He's absolutely right. For us to pick on the unemployment benefits as the problem for this deficit, wait till we have the debate on taxes on this floor and I hear people whining and whining around here about people making more than half a million dollars and we've got to give them a tax cut.

I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 6419.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this important legislation to extend unemployment benefits through February 2011.

We must continue to help families who are struggling to make ends meet. While we are continuing to see encouraging signs of economic recovery, the unemployment rate remains too high. If we do not extend emergency unemployment benefits, approximately two million Americans—including 14,600 Marylanders—will lose those benefits by the end of February.

Many Americans remain out of work through no fault of their own. Ending emergency unemployment assistance will not only be devastating for these individuals and their families, but it will also hurt the economy as a whole by undermining consumer confidence and demand. If individuals are unable to put food on the table and keep a roof over their heads, the entire economy could slip back into recession. In fact, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office recently found that because unemployment benefits increase consumer demand and spending, previous extensions of unemployment insurance benefits increased both employment and job retention more than what it would have been otherwise in 2009.

The President and Congress have been working together to bring our economy back from the brink. However, there is much more work to do to create jobs and help put Americans back to work.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this much-needed legislation.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I strongly support the extension of unemployment compensation. Indeed, there is no issue more important to our Nation right now than job creation. At a time when over 11 percent of Florida residents are desperately searching for employment and struggling to survive, it is simply mind blowing that we are not extending these benefits.

Never before has America turned its back on millions of American families as they struggled to make ends meet with this high level of unemployment. Yet the same Republicans, who want to increase our deficit by extending massive tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans, were willing to leave average Americans to fend for themselves and vote against this bill.

Certainly, extending unemployment benefits is not only good for the unemployed; it is also one of the best and fastest ways to stimulate the economy. According to the Economic Policy Institute, unemployment benefits were responsible for creating more than 1 million jobs since the recession started, and adding almost 2 percent to the gross domestic product.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, it is with strong conviction that I urge my colleagues to support this short-term extension of

critical unemployment benefits for our citizens. As our Nation and my state continue to struggle out of this recession, this bill will provide vital assistance to almost 400,000 Illinoisans as we enter December. Failure to extend unemployment will directly affect approximately two million Americans, including 125,000 citizens from Illinois. If policymakers vote to block this critical lifeline, these 125,000 Illinoisans living in a state with a 10.8 percent unemployment rate will experience incredible hardship. Their time in unemployment has been difficult, trying to find work when the jobs are few and far between, trying to cover food, housing, and transportation for the families on an average of \$290 a week, which typically replaces only half of the average family's expenses.

A government is supposed to help its people in times of need. Failure to extend these benefits would be the first time since the unemployment program's inception that Congress allowed such critical aid to lapse when unemployment remained high for extended periods of time. It is not only these families who will suffer, it is our businesses. The retail sector has been hard hit by this recession. Cutting unemployment benefits for two million people will take a tremendous toll on these businesses as well.

In addition to this short-term extension, I strongly support determining ways to help those who remain unemployed beyond the 99 weeks currently covered. Long-term unemployment is an unfortunate reality for Chicago and for my constituents. Further, we should extend the TANF Emergency funds as well. This program directly helped over 26,000 individuals and close to 5,000 employers in Illinois by creating subsidized jobs program, a much-needed boost to the economy in the midst of the worst recession in decades. This program put \$9 million dollars into the pockets of hard working Illinoisans until Congress allowed it to lapse at the end of September.

Passing this bill today tells our citizens that we are working for them. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote for its passage.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of extending emergency unemployment. This legislation, of which I am a proud cosponsor, is a common sense, non-controversial measure that will help American families.

The unemployment situation in our country is a national emergency. Over the past two years, millions of jobs have been lost as a result of the worst recession in 70 years, caused by Wall Street excesses and an unregulated housing market. Millions of Americans are unemployed today—but through no fault of their own. Our neighbors, our friends, and our families are the ones who agonize as the economy slowly recovers. We cannot afford to abandon the unemployed members of the American workforce, and I won't stand by silently and allow these lifelines to expire.

Unemployment benefits help millions of unemployed Americans help meet the basic needs of rent, food, and transportation while they search for jobs. Any family receiving unemployment insurance would tell you that these benefits do not provide for a luxurious lifestyle without financial worries. These same families would tell you that without these benefits, they will lose their home, lose their car, and lose the ability to feed their children. If the Federal Government does not assist these out-of-work Americans with emergency unem-

ployment compensation, then they will fall to the next level of the social safety net, requiring public housing assistance, seeking medical care in hospital emergency room, or turning to food shelves to put dinner on the table.

We have seen the proof that these benefits significantly stimulate economic growth while making the difference in the lives of struggling Americans. Economists from both sides of the aisle agree that unemployment benefits go directly into the economy, stimulating the kind of activity that creates jobs. And we have never before let federal emergency unemployment expire while the unemployment rate is anywhere close to this high.

I challenge my Republican colleagues who say this legislation is unaffordable to come to the floor right now and tell me how they can pay to give the richest 2 percent of Americans \$700 billion while holding this lifeline hostage. Every single vote against this extension is a vote to impoverish more American families. Every single vote against this legislation is a vote against economic growth. Every single vote against this bill is a vote against the middle class.

Our economy will recover. But until our economic growth is fully restored, I simply refuse to abandon America's families during their time of greatest need.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 6419, the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Continuation Act.

Madam Speaker, 14.8 million Americans are unemployed. A majority of them are workers that endure historic long-term unemployment. Economist Heidi Shierholz of the Economic Policy Institute (EPI) estimated that at the current pace of job growth, it would take twenty years for the country to return to its pre-recession rate of unemployment. The American people cannot afford to wait another 20 years for the country to fully recover from the longest recession it has experienced in seventy years.

Some argue that passing unemployment benefits will add to the deficit and therefore should be opposed. Research tells us otherwise. EPI estimates that the effect of the \$65 billion spent on extending benefits through 2011 is actually "one of the most efficient things that can be done to create new jobs" and will increase the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) by "an estimated \$104.7 billion." This increase in the GDP will translate into approximately a half-million jobs.

Madam Speaker, it would be a disgrace for Congress to adjourn for the Thanksgiving break without giving those who need our assistance the help they deserve. This is not a hand out. This is our responsibility.

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the extension of emergency Unemployment Insurance (UI) benefits for the millions of American workers who are unable to find work. If the incoming majority is committed to extending tax cuts to increase the wealth of millionaires, I certainly hope they are equally committed to helping Americans who have lost their jobs to stay in their homes and put food on their tables over the holidays.

UI benefits are a lifeline for millions of Americans. Allowing these benefits to expire at the end of the month would mean that two million people will lose their income, including over 450,000 in my State of California. These are people who want to work, but when there

are five applicants for every new job, the odds are against them. For these individuals, the recession has most definitely not ended.

People call my office every day worried about what will happen to them when they lose their unemployment benefits. As we approach the holiday season, we should not tell these individuals that their country will no longer support them in the midst of the worst economy since the Great Depression. We have never cut off support when the unemployment rate was this high. We must not begin now. Unemployment benefits kept 3.3 million Americans out of poverty in 2009, including almost 1 million children. UI benefits created two dollars of economic activity for every dollar spent in 2009. Extending benefits protects families and stimulates the growth of our economy.

Congress has a responsibility to protect families struggling to find work. H.R. 6419 is a chance for us to fulfill that responsibility. I urge all of my colleagues to side with American workers and support this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Continuation Act which would extend emergency unemployment compensation and other benefits through February 2011. Our government has always provided federal unemployment benefits during economic downturns until the job market has rebounded. If Congress does not act, over two million unemployed workers will lose their benefits this holiday season.

Today, unemployment levels are unacceptably high. In my home State of Michigan it is over 12 percent. In the past election, voters overwhelmingly cited the economy and job market as their highest concerns. It is highly ironic then that Republicans made electoral gains even though they have blocked multiple attempts to extend the unemployment benefits and many other job creating bills. Furthermore, Republicans oppose today's measure while providing unwavering support for permanent extension of Bush tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires. Republicans are willing to give a helping hand to the rich while ignoring the taxpaying American worker. It should be clear to everyone where the Republican Party stands and who they will be willing to fight for.

Madam Speaker, with power comes responsibility. The Republicans won the election and now they have a responsibility to govern, instead of simply saying "no" over and over again. We simply cannot adjourn for Thanksgiving, a holiday that symbolizes gratitude and appreciation, while turning our back to our neighbors in need. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come together in a show of compassion for our fellow citizens during this season of giving and support today's legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6419, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BOUSTANY. 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 and the



Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

# TELEWORK ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, proceedings will resume on the motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1722) to improve teleworking in executive agencies by developing a telework program that allows employees to telework at least 20 percent of the hours worked in every 2 administrative workweeks, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1721, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on concurring in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1722 will be followed by 5-minute votes on suspending the rules with regard to H.R. 6419, S. 3774, H. Con. Res. 329, and H. Res. 1677.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 254, nays 152, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 578]

YEAS—254

Ackerman	Castor (FL)	Driehaus
Adler (NJ)	Chandler	Edwards (MD)
Altmire	Childers	Edwards (TX)
Andrews	Chu	Ellison
Arcuri	Clarke	Ellsworth
Baca	Clay	Engel
Baird	Cleaver	Eshoo
Baldwin	Clyburn	Etheridge
Barrow	Cohen	Farr
Bean	Connolly (VA)	Fattah
Becerra	Conyers	Filner
Berkley	Cooper	Forbes
Berman	Costa	Fortenberry
Bilbray	Costello	Foster
Bishop (GA)	Courtney	Frank (MA)
Bishop (NY)	Critz	Fudge
Blumenauer	Crowley	Giffords
Bocciari	Cuellar	Gonzalez
Boren	Cummings	Gordon (TN)
Boswell	Dahlkemper	Grayson
Boucher	Davis (AL)	Green, Al
Boyd	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Brady (PA)	Davis (IL)	Grijalva
Braley (IA)	Davis (TN)	Guierez
Bright	DeFazio	Hall (NY)
Buchanan	DeGette	Halvorson
Butterfield	DeLauro	Hare
Cao	Dent	Harman
Capito	Deutch	Hastings (FL)
Capps	Dicks	Heinrich
Capuano	Dingell	Herseth Sandlin
Cardoza	Djou	Higgins
Carnahan	Doggett	Hill
Carney	Donnelly (IN)	Himes
Carson (IN)	Doyle	Hinchey

Hinojosa	McGovern	Sanchez, Loretta
Hirono	McIntyre	Sarbanes
Hodes	McNerney	Schakowsky
Holt	Meek (FL)	Schauer
Honda	Meeks (NY)	Schiff
Hoyer	Melancon	Schrader
Inslee	Michaud	Schwartz
Israel	Miller (NC)	Scott (GA)
Jackson (IL)	Miller, George	Scott (VA)
Jackson Lee	Minnick	Serrano
(TX)	Mitchell	Sestak
Johnson (GA)	Molohan	Shea-Porter
Johnson, E. B.	Moore (KS)	Sherman
Jones	Moore (WI)	Shuler
Kagen	Murphy (CT)	Sires
Kanjorski	Murphy (NY)	Skelton
Kaptur	Nadler (NY)	Slaughter
Kildee	Napolitano	Smith (WA)
Kilpatrick (MI)	Neal (MA)	Snyder
Kilroy	Nye	Speier
Kind	Obey	Spratt
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Oliver	Stark
Kissell	Ortiz	Stupak
Klein (FL)	Owens	Sutton
Kosmas	Pallone	Tanner
Kratovil	Pascarella	Taylor
Kucinich	Pastor (AZ)	Teague
Langevin	Payne	Thompson (CA)
Larsen (WA)	Perlmutter	Thompson (MS)
Larson (CT)	Perriello	Tierney
LaTourette	Peters	Titus
Lee (CA)	Peterson	Tonko
Levin	Pingree (ME)	Towns
Lewis (GA)	Polis (CO)	Tsongas
Lipinski	Pomeroy	Van Hollen
Loebuck	Quigley	Velázquez
Lofgren, Zoe	Rahall	Visclosky
Lowey	Rangel	Walz
Lujan	Reichert	Wasserman
Lynch	Reyes	Schultz
Maffei	Richardson	Waters
Maloney	Rodriguez	Watt
Markey (CO)	Ross	Waxman
Markey (MA)	Rothman (NJ)	Weiner
Marshall	Roybal-Allard	Welch
Matheson	Ruppersberger	Wilson (OH)
Matsui	Rush	Wittman
McCarthy (NY)	Ryan (OH)	Wolf
McCollum	Salazar	Woolsey
McCotter	Sanchez, Linda	Yarmuth
McDermott	T.	

NAYS—152

Aderholt	Gingrey (GA)	McKeon
Akin	Gohmert	McMorris
Alexander	Goodlatte	Rodgers
Austria	Granger	Mica
Bachmann	Graves (GA)	Miller (FL)
Bachus	Graves (MO)	Miller (MI)
Bartlett	Griffith	Miller, Gary
Barton (TX)	Guthrie	Murphy, Tim
Berry	Hall (TX)	Myrick
Biggart	Harper	Neugebauer
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Nunes
Blackburn	Heller	Olson
Blunt	Hensarling	Paul
Boehner	Herger	Paulsen
Bonner	Hoekstra	Pence
Bono Mack	Holden	Petri
Boustany	Hunter	Pitts
Brady (TX)	Inglis	Platts
Burgess	Issa	Poe (TX)
Burton (IN)	Jenkins	Posey
Buyer	Johnson (IL)	Price (GA)
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Putnam
Camp	Jordan (OH)	Rehberg
Campbell	King (IA)	Roe (TN)
Cantor	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Carter	Kingston	Rogers (KY)
Cassidy	Kline (MN)	Rogers (MI)
Castle	Lamborn	Rohrabacher
Chaffetz	Lance	Rooney
Coffman (CO)	Latham	Ros-Lehtinen
Cole	Latta	Roskam
Conaway	Lee (NY)	Royce
Crenshaw	Lewis (CA)	Ryan (WI)
Culberson	LoBiondo	Scalise
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lucas	Schmidt
Diaz-Balart, M.	Luetkemeyer	Schock
Dreier	Lummis	Sensenbrenner
Ehlers	Lungren, Daniel	Sessions
Emerson	E.	Shadegg
Flake	Mack	Shimkus
Fleming	Manzullo	Shuster
Fox	Manchant	Simpson
Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (NE)
Frelinghuysen	McCauley	Smith (NJ)
Garrett (NJ)	McClintock	Smith (TX)
Gerlach	McHenry	Stearns

Stutzman	Tiberi	Wilson (SC)
Sullivan	Turner	Wu
Terry	Upton	Young (AK)
Thompson (PA)	Walden	Young (FL)
Thornberry	Wamp	
Tiahrt	Whitfield	

NOT VOTING—27

Barrett (SC)	Delahunt	Moran (VA)
Bilirakis	Duncan	Murphy, Patrick
Boozman	Fallin	Oberstar
Broun (GA)	Galleghy	Price (NC)
Brown (SC)	Garamendi	Radanovich
Brown, Corrine	Kennedy	Space
Brown-Waite,	Kirk	Watson
Ginny	Linder	Westmoreland
Coble	McMahon	
Davis (KY)	Moran (KS)	

□ 1352

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. CAPITO changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 578, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

# EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION CONTINUATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6419) to amend the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 to provide for the further extension of emergency unemployment benefits, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 258, nays 154, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 579]

YEAS—258

Ackerman	Carney	Dent
Adler (NJ)	Carson (IN)	Deutch
Altmire	Castle	Diaz-Balart, L.
Andrews	Castor (FL)	Diaz-Balart, M.
Arcuri	Chandler	Dicks
Baca	Childers	Dingell
Baird	Chu	Doggett
Baldwin	Clarke	Donnelly (IN)
Barrow	Clay	Doyle
Bean	Cleaver	Driehaus
Becerra	Clyburn	Edwards (MD)
Berkley	Cohen	Edwards (TX)
Berman	Connolly (VA)	Ehlers
Bilbray	Conyers	Ellison
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Ellsworth
Bishop (NY)	Costello	Engel
Blumenauer	Courtney	Eshoo
Bocciari	Critz	Etheridge
Boren	Crowley	Farr
Boswell	Cuellar	Fattah
Boucher	Cummings	Filner
Brady (PA)	Dahlkemper	Foster
Braley (IA)	Davis (AL)	Frank (MA)
Butterfield	Davis (CA)	Fudge
Capps	Davis (IL)	Garamendi
Capuano	DeFazio	Gerlach
Cardoza	DeGette	Giffords
Carnahan	DeLauro	Gonzalez