

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1588, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 1588, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, cross-references, and the table of contents, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1588, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the resolution (S. Con. Res. 46) "Concurrent resolution to correct the enrollment of H.R. 1298."

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AMENDMENTS OF 2003

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 248, I call up the bill (H.R. 2185) to extend the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of H.R. 2185 is as follows:

H.R. 2185

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 "Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 2003".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF THE TEMPORARY EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 2002.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 208 of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 30), as amended by Public Law 108-1 (117 Stat. 3), is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by striking "before June 1" and inserting "on or before December 31";

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by striking "May 31, 2003" and inserting "December 31, 2003";

(3) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) in the heading, by striking "MAY 31, 2003" and inserting "DECEMBER 31, 2003"; and

(B) by striking "May 31, 2003" and inserting "December 31, 2003"; and

(4) in subsection (b)(3), by striking "August 30, 2003" and inserting "March 31, 2004".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 248, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN).

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

Mr. Speaker, today we consider H.R. 2185 to extend unemployment benefits for millions of displaced workers. I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor today. This bill will extend the current unemployment insurance program until December 2003 with a phase-out until March 2004.

My legislation will allow dislocated workers to receive 13 weeks of benefits in all States and an additional 13 weeks for workers who live in States with high unemployment rates such as Alaska, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Washington. The bill will help approximately 2.4 million displaced workers nationwide.

In my home State of Washington, the unemployment rate has again increased from 7.1 percent to 7.3 percent, making it the third highest unemployment rate in the Nation. Mass layoffs continue to have an adverse impact on our State's economy, especially in the aerospace industry. I represent more than 25,000 Boeing workers, many of whom have already lost their jobs.

As we work on a jobs and growth package to provide an immediate boost to our economy, we must also give displaced workers the peace of mind in knowing that they have a little time to find a job. So what does H.R. 2185 do? It achieves the following: it extends unemployment benefits until December 31, 2003, with a phase-out until March 31, 2004; it extends unemployment benefits for 13 weeks in all States for displaced workers; it extends unemployment benefits for an additional 13 weeks for a total of 26 weeks in high unemployment States.

This bill will cost \$6.5 billion over 10 years, and it will help about 2.4 million workers nationwide. I think it is important that people realize that the Congress has done a lot to help unemployed workers. We feel this is the time to continue generosity and to help some of these folks who are trying to get jobs.

The existing unemployment extension expires at the end of this month with a phase-out until August. Congress has now extended unemployment benefits three different times: first in March 2002, 13 weeks for all States and 26 weeks for high unemployment States; secondly, in January 2003, 13

weeks for all States and 26 weeks for high unemployment States; and, lastly, in April 2003 an additional 26 weeks for airline and related industry workers.

We are extending the safety net for workers struggling to find a job while stimulating our economic growth by reducing taxes for individuals and encouraging business expansion. By extending unemployment benefits for an additional 13 weeks in all States, we can help the 2.4 million workers, and in my State, 60,000 workers, who need this kind of help.

Our unemployment system has worked well for many years, and it serves people during economic downturns. We are constantly reviewing the unemployment program to ensure that it helps those who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own. It is a temporary program, and now is the time to extend these benefits in a temporary way to help those folks who need to be helped.

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to control the time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me assure the House that on the Democratic side of the aisle, we are pleased that we have legislation before us that extends the Federal unemployment compensation for an additional 7 months. We think that is the right way to move. However, we are extremely disappointed that the legislation does not include any additional help for those who have already exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits.

We are very disappointed that over a million people who currently are unemployed, who cannot find employment, will not be able to get any benefits under this legislation. Few States will be able to go beyond the 13 weeks of additional Federal unemployment insurance benefits because of the trigger mechanism. We believe that the legislation before us should include 26 weeks of unemployment insurance benefits for all those workers who exhaust their State unemployment insurance funds.

Let me point out that in prior recessions we have done exactly that. The gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) points out what we have done, but it falls far short of what we did in the recession in the early 1990s. Despite the fact that this recession is much deeper than the prior recession, we have lost 2.7 million jobs, twice as many jobs as in the early 1990s, and 70 percent more people have exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits in this recession than in the recession in the early 1990s. In the early 1990s, we extended benefits for 27 months. Yet in

this recession, we have only extended benefits for 15 months. In the prior recession, we extended Federal unemployment benefits initially for 26 weeks, then reduced it to 20 weeks; yet the legislation before us maintains only 13 weeks of benefits for those who are unemployed.

We have accumulated \$21 billion in the Federal unemployment trust funds just for this purpose. The legislation before us is scored at about \$6.5 billion. If we would extend the benefits to all of those who have exhausted benefits and provide 26 weeks of Federal unemployment insurance, it would cost perhaps another \$3.5 billion, so \$10 billion, about half the money that is in the fund exactly for this purpose.

Lastly, let me point out that providing unemployment insurance benefits for those who are unemployed and cannot find employment through no fault of their own would be the best way to stimulate our economy. A little later this evening we will be talking about a tax bill, supposedly to create jobs. If we really want to help our economy, let us give the money to those people who have to spend it because they have no other source of income.

The rule before us denies the opportunity of Members to offer amendments. That is regrettable. We should have had that opportunity. Speaking for my side of the aisle, the Democrats will use every opportunity we can to try to correct this legislation to deal with the 1 million people who are being left out by the underlying bill.

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

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH), a very valuable member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I must say having been in western Pennsylvania, when you have been reading the headlines, looking at the economic statistics, things are indeed bleak out there. We are in a recession even if many within the Washington beltway do not fully recognize it, and that is why I rise today to applaud the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Washington, and the House leadership for recognizing the needs of the unemployed in this recession.

While we work, apparently in the face of partisan opposition, to enact a balanced and robust economic growth package, we also need to provide immediate help for these displaced workers. These are people who would rather have a job; but in lieu of a job during an economic slowdown, they need these benefits. Today's legislation will maintain a safety net for our Nation's displaced workers by providing up to 26 weeks of benefits for those who exhaust their State benefits. This type of measure is absolutely critical to move now so we make sure that no families fall between the cracks.

However, as we do it, I think we also need to recognize as a House that maybe the time has come to reassess parts of the safety net, look for ways of extending it, and that is why I have introduced the Safety Net Extension Act, a bill that would not only extend temporary assistance for the unemployed, but also enact some permanent reforms to the unemployment system. It would provide relief for those workers who are paying taxes on their unemployment benefits, many of whom are in my district. My bill would look to also reauthorization trade adjustment assistance, and I view this package as being of a piece.

Tonight we have an opportunity to move forward and extend the unemployment benefits for workers who have been laid off, making sure that they do not fall between the cracks. But in the long haul, I would hope that we in the House would come together on a bipartisan basis and look for ways of enriching those benefits and at the same time pass a real stimulus package that will get the economy back on a growth path.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) that under the bill, 78,000 people from Pennsylvania will be denied any additional benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning 1 million Americans will arise and have no jobs. They will go to the front doorstep and pick up the newspaper and look at the want ads.

□ 1945

The want ads will be filled with solicitations for jobs if you are a nuclear engineer or if you are ready to work for minimum wage with no benefits. And then they will go to their mailbox and even though they have no job, they will still have their mortgage bill and their car insurance bill and their utility bill and all the other expenses they need to support their families. And they will go out for their daily trek to try to find work and they will find that for every 3½ people in America looking for a job, there is one job. It is a measure of decency and equity how we treat these 1 million Americans.

Before we adjourn for the recess in the wee small hours of the morning, the majority will no doubt pass significant relief for the owners of the companies that laid off these million people. How tragic it is that we will not even get the opportunity to address the real needs of the 1 million Americans who will wake up tomorrow with no job, no prospects and no unemployment benefits. Let us measure the decency of this House and the capacity for compassion in this country by extending unem-

ployment benefits for all the people of the country who need them, not simply those covered by this bill. Of course we will support this bill to help those who are helped, but it is a tragedy that we are leaving behind 1 million Americans who need work.

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

I want to remind the gentleman from New Jersey that, under this bill, 124,250 of his constituents will receive unemployment coverage.

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

Ms. DUNN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. Also in this bill, 51,000 of my constituents will not receive the extension, either.

Ms. DUNN. Because they have already received Federal benefits in the past.

Mr. ANDREWS. If the gentleman will yield, and they have exhausted those benefits and have no benefits now.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), a very trusted and good member of our committee.

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

Mr. WELLER. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2185. It is simple legislation that helps people, a simple, straightforward 7-month extension of the current Federal Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation program. It is going to benefit 2.5 million unemployed, many in Illinois and many in the district that I represent.

I would note that 2.5 million unemployed workers will receive extra help through this extension on top of the 5 million workers who have already received Federal extended benefits in 2002-2003. For those who measure their compassion by how much money you spend, I would note that this proposal before us provides about \$7 billion in additional extended unemployment benefits on top of the \$16 billion that we provided the States earlier this year.

This is important legislation. My State in Illinois has 6.6 percent unemployment. My district, my home county, has 12.8 percent unemployment. The manufacturing sector in the district that I represent is hurting. Many of those laid off are employed or used to be employed in the manufacturing sector. This legislation extending unemployment benefits combined with the economic growth and jobs plan that we will be adopting, which deserves bipartisan support, would be a boost for the manufacturing sector as well as the economy in my State of Illinois.

I urge support of this 7-month extension of unemployment benefits. I urge support for the jobs and growth plan later on this evening.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me just point out to my friend from Illinois that 53,000 of his constituents will

not be able to get benefits because of being excluded from this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this bill tonight, while a welcome step, will leave by the end of the year 2 million Americans without the safety net that they have contributed to when they were employed as far as the unemployment compensation tax, as a part of benefits.

1.4 million Federal workers have already exhausted their State and Federal benefits. 685,000 workers will exhaust their benefits and be left stranded under this bill, 58,000 in my home State of Florida.

There is a simple reason for this. This Congress is refusing to do what Democrats and Republicans came to do in the early 1990s during the recession and that is to add an additional 13 weeks of coverage after 13 weeks have expired from the Federal Government on top of 26 weeks of the State. There is no defense on the other side of the aisle as to why we should not repeat what Democrats and Republicans did in the 1990s to preserve the safety net.

Who is being affected out there tonight by this? There are more than three unemployed workers looking for every job opening in the country today. 341,000 people lost their jobs in April. The unemployment rate is 6 percent. There are 8.8 million people out of work right now. One out of every five unemployed workers have been out for 6 months right now. The unemployment compensation trust fund today has \$20 billion in it that is designed to be used exactly for the benefits the Republicans are refusing to provide tonight to these people who are looking for work.

And who are these people? The average unemployed worker has been looking on 29 different occasions trying to find a job, 29 potential job openings. People over 45 on the average have applied for 42 different jobs without success. Two-thirds of unemployed workers have had to cut back on basic necessities for their families. One in four unemployed workers have lost their home. Six in ten unemployed workers have spent almost all their savings.

Is this what you want to be proud of tonight? Is this what we are not capable of addressing tonight? Let us pass this bill but only after we adopt the benefits that were provided in the 1990s.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), a former Governor and current valued Member.

Mr. CASTLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in strong support of H.R. 2185, the Unemployment Compensation Amendments. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this important measure, and I thank Chairman THOMAS and the House leadership for bringing this to the floor.

Sadly, we have watched many Americans become unemployed and struggle

to find work in today's economy. Today, Congress is taking a much-needed step in extending unemployment compensation for our Nation's workers. Figures show the U.S. unemployment rate is at 6 percent, and nearly 9 million people are unemployed. This legislation provides a safety net for men and women who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own.

We must assist workers during these times of hardship so they can successfully make the transition back to the workforce. The legislation before us helps accomplish this goal and coupled with existing job training and networking programs we can return Americans to the workforce. I urge my colleagues to join together in supporting this important legislation.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Thank God, Mr. Speaker. They finally woke up and decided that we needed to extend unemployment benefits. But they fell short. In fact, they have let so many people fall off the cliff, I wonder, where is the safety net?

In Ohio, as a result of the proposal for unemployment benefits that is being presented, 36,500 people will not get unemployment benefits. Right now in Ohio, since this President took office, 167,000 people have lost their job. In the city of Cleveland, 57,000 people have lost their job.

If you do not believe me about unemployment, let me go to somebody that everybody thinks is really great and ought to be heard. Let me tell you what Mr. Greenspan said about unemployment. He says:

"Unemployment insurance is essentially restrictive because it's been our perception that we don't want to create incentives for people not to take jobs. But when you're in a period of job weakness, where it is not a choice on the part of people whether they're employed or unemployed, then obviously you want to be temporarily generous."

We ought to be temporarily generous. "And I think that's what we have done in the past and it has worked well."

He goes on to say this:

"I do, however, argue that we must be careful about creating permanent, temporary extensions, if I might put it that way. And I was suggesting to your colleagues that should you be going forward in an extension that it is far more important to have a short extension and if necessary just repeat it later." But I think this is important. "And I think that because it is stringent in normal periods, that one should recognize that people who lose jobs not because they did anything and can't find new ones, you have a different form of problem, which means that you

have to allow the unemployment system to be much broader and, indeed, that's what we need to do."

So I say, pay no attention to me, listen to Mr. Greenspan where he says, but when you get into a period where jobs are failing, the arguments that people are worried about incentives should not apply.

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

I think, to put the comments of Mr. Greenspan in context, because he made them at the meeting of the Joint Economic Committee yesterday, where I was present, he said:

"I have always been of the opinion, and stated before this committee previously, that our unemployment insurance system seems to work rather well. It is not overly generous, which would induce the type of increased levels of structural unemployment which we see in other countries which have these types of things, these types of structures. But unemployment insurance is essentially restrictive because it's been our perception that we don't want to create incentives for people not to take jobs. But when you're in a period of job weakness where it is not a choice on the part of the people whether they're unemployed or unemployed, then obviously you want to be temporarily generous."

And he says, "If you go forward with additional extensions, I would be careful to keep the extensions relatively short and renew them again if necessary."

That is exactly what we are doing.

He says, "Because we're not quite clear at this stage what the path of short-term economic activity is. A number of major economic forecasters have forecasts for the third quarter, which is just about in front of us, of 4 percent growth at an annual rate. And that is a relatively long list."

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO).

Mr. LOBIONDO. I thank the gentlewoman from Washington for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of H.R. 2185 which will provide an additional 13 weeks of unemployment benefits to workers whose State jobless benefits will expire at the end of this month. I believe that we need to make sure that unemployed workers can continue to look for work with a degree of security that they can pay their bills. This legislation is the right way to accomplish this goal. I supported an extension of unemployment benefits in January and at that time signaled my belief that we should extend benefits throughout all of 2003 to give the economy time to recover and Congress a chance to pass a strong jobs and growth package. Tonight, we will pass that package, and we will also make unemployed workers eligible for unemployment benefits through the end of the year.

I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the

chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means; I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. QUINN), a colleague whom I have worked with closely to help working men and women; and I would like for all of my colleagues to think about, as we prepare to go back to our districts to answer to the folks that we represent next week, that we think about people in the real world, people who are around that kitchen table who know that they have a problem on their hands. This gives us an opportunity to say that we have listened, we have recognized the problem, and we are willing to do something about it. People will argue maybe that this is not perfect, but it is a good step that everyone should support, and we should look for additional ways to help working men and women get through these troubled times.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me point out to my friend from New Jersey that 51,000 people in his State are not going to get benefits because of leaving out the extra weeks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, welcome back to the rubber-stamp Congress. This bill is a statement by the President of the United States that he does not care about 1 million people. He sent the message to his junta here, and they run a bill out last night, drop it in, never had one single hearing on it, will not give us a chance to amend it.

If you gave us an amendment to cover those 1 million people, it would pass. The people on your side would be afraid to go home, having given the stiff arm to people who are off benefits. But we have to rubber-stamp everything George Bush does. "I approve of everything George Bush does. I will leave a million people off the unemployment rolls deliberately." Deliberately. It is not an accident. It is not as though it just happened to us.

I got this from the White House. I suppose everyone else has theirs. You are going to use that again tonight on another bill, the tax bill. I have figured out what the President is thinking. He figured out, "Well, I'm leaving a million people off and then I'm going to give this huge tax cut and I'm going to create a million jobs. And all those people who have been left out, they're going to have a job."

□ 2000

Of course they are going to have to wait until tax time next year or sometime. I do not know when all that is going to start.

This is nonsense. You did absolutely the minimum you could do and keep a straight face and put out your press release that you did something for unemployment. How you could deliberately construct one when you have 70 percent more people running out of bene-

fits now than Bush, Sr., did 10 years ago.

At least he said 27 weeks. He was expansive. His son is about as tightfisted as we are ever going to see towards working people. Not to the military. Not to nuclear defense and all that kind of stuff, but to working people he is just saying, hey, folks, I am sorry you do not qualify or your State did not trigger but tell the kids to kind of suck it up. Pull their belt a little bit tighter because the rubber stamp Congress of George Bush is out here tonight. They are waiting at home to see what you do.

If you had been out of work and you cannot pay your rent and you cannot buy for your kids and you are one of those million, you say to your kids, I am sorry but the President does not care. He has got \$20 billion in a fund down there, but he will not give us anything.

How is that going to look in the next election? You ought to be thinking about that. I guarantee that before we leave here you will be back here extending these benefits again.

Your idea that people are staying at home from work to live off these fancy benefits is simply nonsense. Nobody who has lost a job stays at home when there is a job available. There are not enough jobs.

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

Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with the gentleman from Washington in that anybody who cannot find a job wants to, which is why we are going to pass tonight the Jobs and Growth Reconciliation Tax Act of 2003.

I do want to also remind the gentleman from Washington that the Congress has been watching over the concerns of States like Washington that have been the recipient of many unemployed people, and we have not done nothing. The debate tonight makes it sound like the Federal Government has done nothing.

In the State of Washington specifically, we have followed up 30 weeks of State benefits that the residents of our State are eligible for with 26 weeks of federally funded benefits that we passed in March, 2002, and extended again another 26 weeks in January of 2003, and then we matched the State for 9 total weeks of Federal- and State-funded benefits. We added on 7 weeks of State benefits for aerospace and timber workers who are in training programs. If we total that all up, it comes to 65 weeks for all dislocated workers, 98 weeks for aerospace workers and 72 weeks for timber workers.

I think the extension that we are going to do today, which for the State of Washington would provide 60,000 new people with unemployment benefits, is the right thing to do. With luck, if we play our cards right and the economy responds in the way we hope it will, we will not need to extend unemployment benefits, but if we need to, we will be there and do it, as Alan Greenspan says, on a temporary basis.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from the State of Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) who talks from experience since he is from the State with the highest unemployment.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, we are proud of a lot of things in the great State of Oregon. Having the highest unemployment rate at 8 percent is not among them.

It is astounding to me to hear some of the Members on the other side of the aisle talk about unemployment insurance being a great economic producer. You are the people who have taken the jobs away from the people in Wallowa County: unemployment rate, 15.1 percent. It is your policies, yes, it is your policies who took away the jobs in Crook County: unemployment rate, 11.5 percent; Grant County, 14 percent.

I will tell you the policies. Did you vote for the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 the day before yesterday? Did you? Did you? Did you? No. Maybe you voted for it. Did you?

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, what was the unemployment rate there 5 years ago or 6 years ago?

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, worse. Worse. It has been double-digit rates. I am happy to show the numbers. I will get them.

Some of these counties were approaching 20 percent unemployment because they are surrounded by Federal forests. Yes, it is hard to believe. Yes, you can laugh. Folks in Wallowa County are not laughing. We have been on 65 weeks of unemployment, 65 weeks, the highest unemployment in the country. If we want to create jobs in rural America, and that is what I represent, 72,000 square miles. My colleagues know my district. It is all of eastern Oregon. These are hard-working people. They are Republicans and Democrats. It is not a partisan thing to be unemployed. They want real jobs.

I am going to vote to extend this. You bet I am. This district, and I have only represented it for 4 years, did not enjoy the roaring 1990s of the major metropolitan areas. We are a resource-based district. Agriculture and timber. Our forests burn. Our watersheds are destroyed. Trees rot because they cannot go in and cut down the dead trees after a fire. We are trying to change that. I want healthy watersheds. I want healthy forests. They are America's forests. And I want these men and women back to work.

So I plead with my colleagues as we extend unemployment, which we must, and I have supported it every time, including the aerospace extension, to extend the benefits, but I plead with my colleagues, these people want jobs. Help us change the policies. When they voted no this week on healthy forests, they voted to take away their jobs again. Please work with us. It is more than just a safety net.

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

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman makes a good point, and he says work with us. The gentleman recalls that you would not allow us amendments to that bill so that many Democrats would have felt very comfortable voting for that bill. So you did not work with us.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Reclaiming, first, I am not on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HOYER. I understand that. I did not mean the gentleman personally.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Second, let me suggest that the gentleman's side was given an opportunity to craft a bill to create a majority vote on this floor. The gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), whom I have worked with on other issues and will again, put forward a proposal of their free will in writing. They were given that opportunity. Many of you voted for that. I think it is insufficient. It did not prevail. It did not achieve a majority.

But it goes beyond healthy forests. The rules and the regulations and the laws, I remember when George McGovern left this body and opened a bed and breakfast. He wrote a column, and he said, "I wish I had done this before I served in the Congress, because I had no idea what these rules and regulations and laws do to small business."

I have been in small business 16 years. The bill we are going to vote on tonight to increase the ability to expense and deduct will produce jobs because companies will have the ability to invest in equipment they need. Somebody has to make that equipment, and they will. So let us get America back to work, and let us extend benefits as we need to extend them, and I will continue to vote to do that as I am going to do tonight.

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

Let me just point out to my friend from Oregon that the Bush Administration has the worst job record of any administration since World War II, losing 69,000 jobs, whereas the Clinton Administration has the best, creating over half a million jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), Democratic whip.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the job losses occurred in my district under the Clinton Administration. I would suggest that and I bet I could prove that. The gentleman's numbers are about States in total, not looking at rural communities like the ones I represent.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, there is no doubt, however,

that George W. Bush has the worst job creation or, better put, the worst job loss record of any President. I would tell the gentleman from Oregon I do not recall his statement, but I recall the statements of many of his colleagues that stood on this floor in 2001 and said, if we vote for this \$1 trillion package, we are going to create jobs, the economy is going to boom, and, guess what, we can do it within the framework of this \$5.6 trillion surplus which is now, of course, as the gentleman knows well, a \$2.7 trillion deficit, an \$8 trillion turnaround which is going to dampen the economy of Oregon and our entire country.

Mr. Speaker, what a difference a week makes. I ask the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) to listen to this.

Last week, my colleagues may recall, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), House majority leader, last week said in on this floor in regard to the much-needed extension of unemployment insurance benefits, what they bring here under great pressure from Democrats, and that is the only reason it is here, and I am going to vote for it, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) said this:

"I think it is a stretch to say that we are at a crisis point, that we have to move quickly and not deliberatively on this issue."

I am sure the people in eastern Oregon thought we had better move quickly, and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) agrees with that. Our Republicans friends finally have recognized that last week's noncrisis, which is what their leader said, is this week's emergency for millions of American families; and I share the gentleman from Oregon's (Mr. WALDEN) view on the need of those unemployed.

The Republicans have finally peeked out from under their tax-cut blinders just long enough to see the harsh reality on Main Street America today, that our Nation has the highest unemployment rate in 9 years, that there are nearly 9 million unemployed Americans, that our economy has lost 2.7 million private sector jobs since President Bush was inaugurated, and that 4 million jobless Americans will have their temporary unemployment benefits completely cut off on May 31 unless this Congress acts immediately.

We asked that they act last week. We asked that they act the week before that. They have not done so. But their political analysts have told them, do not go home without at least positively affecting some of these people. Even as they prepare to shower the most affluent citizens in America with enormous budget-busting, debt-exploding tax cuts, the self-proclaimed compassionate conservatives demonstrate again that they only have so much compassion in their hearts, two-thirds to be exact tonight, because 1 million people are going to be left on the cutting room floor.

This GOP bill is most notable for its half measures. It will provide only 13

weeks of additional benefits to workers who have exhausted their State benefits, rather than 26 weeks that we sought. And for the 1 million unemployed Americans who have already exhausted both their State and Federal unemployment benefits, this bill would provide zero; nada; nothing; sorry, we cannot help.

I challenge my Republican colleagues to go home and tell the jobless constituents in eastern Oregon or anyplace else who have exhausted their State and Federal benefits that they refuse to extend them when they have the opportunity tonight now. Do it. Do the right thing.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the amount of time that remains for both sides, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) has 12 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) has 13¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) for yielding me this time.

I say to the gentleman from Oregon here, I think there is a fundamental difference in the philosophy of these two parties, and it is highlighted once again this evening. We care about the entire American family. What we mean by community is a place where nobody is to be abandoned and nobody is to be left behind.

But let me give my colleagues a quote to follow up on what the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) said, where the majority leader offered another callous comment about the unemployed. But let me offer a comment from another prominent member of the Republican leadership as he said, as he often is, worked up about this or that, hey, this is not a welfare program.

Talk about callousness? Talk about indifference? We are going to vote in the wee hours of this morning to give a massive tax cut to people who, to their everlasting credit, have not even asked for it. Those are members of the American family. It has sent shudders through Wall Street what they are about to do. And every one of the Members on this side of the aisle will march in, head down, and do what they are told once again.

There are millions of Americans who are struggling today, millions of them. And I want to vote to help the people in Oregon. They deserve it, just like the people on the East Coast. Do my colleagues know what we call that in our democracy? The national principle. We come to the assistance of parts of this country who need it.

Let me give the Members some economic facts, and they are pretty bleak. U.S. unemployment, a 9-year high. It was 4.1 percent when the President

took office. Now it is 6 percent. The number of discouraged workers, and I suspect a lot of them live in the gentleman from Oregon's congressional district, who are not even looking for a job any longer are at a 20-year high, 2.3 million jobs lost since 2001. One point seven million jobs have been lost since the \$1.3 trillion 2001 tax cuts took effect.

Do we have in this institution amnesia? We were told this was a jobs bill last year, and I am telling the Members watch, 2 o'clock in the morning, head down, they will all vote for it again. And do the Members know what? Not one of them even asked a question. That is the embarrassing part about it. Seventy-three thousand jobs lost per month.

Mr. Speaker, vote for the Democratic alternative on the motion to recommit. Give those people in Oregon an opportunity. Call them members of the American family.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I looked up and I heard these figures come out that this many people are going to be left out of this bill. I looked up at who is supporting it and where the figures are coming from. It is called the Center on Budget Priorities, an extreme far-left-wing organization that is supported by Democrat Socialists of America, lodged a progressive caucus on its website, supports increased taxes, increased social spending, bigger wasteful government, supports union over small business, and I could go on. So I think the numbers are a little bit misfit.

In the year 2000, this country was going through a recession. The tax relief that was passed according to Alan Greenspan and the economists who testified before the committees said that the tax relief shallowed that recession. It was growing at about 4.5 percent, which is slow, but it was increasing. And then we had 9/11. New York City alone, \$200 billion in reconstruction and construction.

□ 2015

That does not include \$83 billion in lost revenue and the jobs that went with it. In all of your districts, think about the hotel business, the tourism. Hotels in San Diego were at 10 percent occupancy. Tourism went down. The airlines got hurt. Look what happened to the stock market. Then we had Enron; then we had WorldCom.

We produced 58 bills that the other body did not pass to stimulate the economy. That was under Democratic leadership in the other body. Some of those bills restored confidence for people that lost thousands, in some cases millions, of dollars in their retirement accounts, and that would have helped stimulate the economy as well. But that was held up.

Mr. Speaker, it was said that this is the worst jobs President there ever

was. Let me remind Members of some of the facts.

First of all, on the 1993 tax bill, the Democrats will say that no Republican voted for it. Let me tell you why. The same issues that Democrats demagogue on every single day, veterans, Democrats cut COLAs in 1993. You cut the COLAs for our military; that was on food stamps. You increased the tax on Social Security, and in that bill every dime was taken out of the Social Security trust fund.

Guess what? You even had a gas tax that went into the general fund. We changed that when we took the majority and put it into a transportation fund. That is where we came up with ISTEA for infrastructure control. We did away with your 1993 highest tax increase in the history of the United States. Then I remember the lady in the red dress and the gentleman from Missouri said we need middle-class tax cuts. Well, you increased the tax on the middle-class.

We decreased those taxes. And not a single Clinton budget, not even the Blue Dog budget, which had some very good points in it during that time frame, ever passed the House, ever. Not a Clinton budget passed.

Republicans brought the Clinton budget to the House floor to force the Democrats to vote on it, it was so bad. Do you know how many Democrats voted for it? Three, the same amount that voted for the First Lady's health care package.

When you say that President Clinton was responsible for the surplus, it just ain't so.

Now, let us get down to the issue that is before us that people left out. I have been here for 12 years; and this year is the worst partisan attack, from our side as well, and a lot of it in reaction.

I will bet every single Member here, except for those in leadership, would rather sit down and work together, and we can; and we can help the people with this bill, instead of the partisan attacks.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me tell my friend from California that if he checks with the Department of Labor he will find that 150,000 people in his State are not going to be covered under this bill who are unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

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

Well, it is about time the Republican leadership does something about the unemployed and something for the unemployed; but what they offer is too little, too late, and it does not cover those who have used up their benefits but are still not working.

I would like to remind the gentlewoman from Washington State that unemployed workers cannot find jobs when there are not any. I would like to

respond to the gentleman from Oregon, referring to "our policies," meaning the Democrats. Our policies, indeed. When Bill Clinton was our President, our economy was strong. Not like today, when just 3 weeks ago the Labor Department reported that new applications for unemployment insurance hit 455,000 for the week ending April 19, and that number does not even count families who have exhausted their benefits and are not working.

Just listen to one of my constituents. He says, "I have a master's degree and I have not been able to find work. I also deal with a chronic illness. I find myself applying for food stamps and soon will be unable to pay any bills. I am not sure I will have a roof over my head very soon. A lot of people are having a very difficult time. Please, Congresswoman, try to make unemployment extensions a top priority."

That is why I support the Rangel bill, H.R. 1652, the Unemployment Benefits Extension Act, which would provide 26 weeks of extended benefits through November 2003. This bill will provide real benefits to all of those workers who are in between jobs, not only those who are newly unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation, and I urge the Republican leadership to take up H.R. 1652 so that we can have real unemployment relief.

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

Mr. Speaker, some of these speakers on the other side have talked about folks who have been covered in the past by Federal unemployment insurance, but they do not make that point. They make it sound as though they never have been covered.

I think it is important to reiterate that the Congress in March of 2002 extended to folks 13 weeks of Federal unemployment and 26 weeks for high unemployment States; extended it once again in January 2003, 13 weeks for all States and 26 weeks for high unemployment States; extended it again in April 2003, an additional 26 weeks for airline and related industry workers; and that many States also have provided for unemployment benefits.

Some States have additional benefits to help those who have exhausted their Federal benefits. For example, States have the option to provide 13 weeks of extended benefits at a 50/50 State and Federal cost share. This is after the 26 weeks of State and 13/13 weeks of Federal benefits, where we matched the States.

Additional Federal funds have been given to States to provide for unemployment benefits in any way they wish. They are done under the Reid Act. In March 2002, Congress allocated \$8 billion to States under the Reid Act. States have the flexibility to use this money to pay for an additional unemployment benefit if they choose to do so. At this time States still have \$6 billion of unused funds under the Reid Act. Congress also provided, as I said

before, targeted additional benefits to airline and related industry sectors.

So I think it is very, very misleading to make it sound like this is the first time we have thought of people who are unemployed. We have kept very close watch over these folks, because we feel their pain and we want to make sure they are provided with the help they need to go out and get jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the high-unemployment State of Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I find this debate interesting, because we are debating a bill we all, or most all, are going to be supporting, so it is kind of like this is a good bill, we are going to vote for it, but we want it better or want it differently.

It is a good bill. It is a good bill for my State; 75,359 people have benefited. We are going to help 37,450 more, for a total of 112,809. In terms of dollars spent, we have provided \$259,231,629. We are going to add \$142 million, for \$401 million. This is an effort to reach out.

My colleague from Buffalo, New York, has helped push this, along with the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) and others. We listened to our Democratic colleagues who said we need to move forward with the bill. It seems to me they should be taking credit for some of what we are doing.

Now, I support this legislation because I think it is important to our workers who are out of work; but I also support our tax cut, because I think that is ultimately how we are going to benefit these folks who need a job.

We are going to increase the child tax credit to \$1,000, and then phase it out for the wealthy. It only is going for the families that need it. If you have three kids, you get to subtract \$3,000 from the bottom line of your taxes. If you are married, you are not going to be paying a penalty anymore.

But my colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted against this. We are going to reduce the marginal rates to help working families. We are going to treat dividends like capital gains, and also reduce the capital gains rate.

We are going to get this economy moving again, frankly, with or without the support of our Democratic colleagues. We are going to provide the unemployment compensation we need, we are going to provide the tax cuts that we need, and we are going to get this economy moving again.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me say to my friend from Connecticut that the suggestion we are making to cover those who are unemployed costs less than 1 percent of the tax bill we are taking up later.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BELL).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about the need for follow-through and

about what got us to this point. For many weeks now, those of us here on the Democratic side of the aisle have been talking about jobs, the need for an economic stimulus plan that would lead to true job creation, the need to extend unemployment benefits for those who simply cannot find work in this lousy economy.

□ 2030

If Members come from a place like Houston, Texas, like I do, in a State that is facing 6.7 percent unemployment, the highest unemployment we have seen in 10 years, and a city like Houston, where more than 2,000 people are losing their jobs each and every month, we realize that people are desperate and that they need a helping hand. But for weeks what we continued to hear from the other side of the aisle was, no, that there would be no further extensions.

Well, now that has suddenly changed; and we welcome that change. I know that there will be a lot of chest thumping on the other side of the aisle tonight, that they have now passed an unemployment benefit extension, and many of us will join with them in that vote.

The problem is follow-through. Because if you are going to finally be brought kicking and screaming to the realization that people need a helping hand, then at least be willing to give them the hand that they need, not a plan that leaves 1 million unemployed people out in the cold, but provides for another 13-week extension for those individuals; not just another 13-week extension for the others, but a 26-week extension that would provide a real window of opportunity for those individuals to find work.

If they are finally going to listen to us and recognize the need to extend unemployment insurance benefits, then they should have been willing to follow through and accept our proposal. I am glad they were willing to go part of the way, but given the economic situation we face in this country, they should have been willing to go the rest of the way.

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I thank my colleagues from the Committee on Ways and Means for allowing me to speak.

I rise in support of the effort to give out-of-work Americans more time to find a job before their benefits run out. In December of 2000, my hometown of Houston had one of the lowest unemployment rates in the Nation, 3.5 percent. The national average then was 4.2. Today we have unemployment of 6.7 percent in Houston. That is almost double what it was in December of 2000. Texas has lost 112,000 jobs since January of 2001. The country as a whole has lost over 2.5 million jobs since then.

Texans want to work, earn a living, and make homes for their families, but no one can survive for long on an unemployment check. People do not lose their jobs just to collect the unemployment check. It is almost laughable. It is only making the best of a terrible situation.

One hundred thirty-three thousand Texans are likely to run out of their regular unemployment without finding new work. We need to help these workers, and I am glad we are doing so today. But many will be left out, even as we act today. By the end of this month, there will be an estimated 69,000 Texans who have run out of their extended benefits and remain unemployed in this slow economy, even if we act today. Another 39,000 Texas workers will run out of benefits this summer. None of these numbers take into account the underemployed and the long-term unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, while I commend the leadership of both parties in bringing this legislation to the floor today, we need to realize it is only a Band-Aid. Texans and American workers need an extension of unemployment benefits, but they would rather have a job. But workers see Congress exporting good jobs and building up a massive Federal debt that slows down the economy and will have to be paid for by our children.

I urge support of the legislation, but it is a half a loaf, at best.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD).

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I am pleased that the House has taken up the extension of the unemployment benefits tonight. The unemployment in my congressional district is a glaring 30 percent in the Millinocket and East Millinocket labor market area, 13 percent in the Calais labor market area, 12 percent in the Jonesport labor market area, and the list goes on and on. Mill after mill are either shutting machines down or closing their doors completely.

As far as the Statewide unemployment, it is in the single digits. But as far as the northern part of the State, as I mentioned, it is over 30 percent in some of the labor market areas. It is not as if you could drive an hour away or so to go to where there is low unemployment. You have to drive about 6 hours away.

The aid we deliver tonight is desperately needed, but, Mr. Speaker, we can do so much more. We should be voting on a bill like H.R. 1652, the Rangel bill, of which I am a cosponsor. The bill would extend benefits by 26 weeks and give an additional 13 weeks for unemployed workers who have exhausted their benefits.

This would help the 2,700 workers in Maine who have exhausted their benefits and who would be left behind, because this bill would not consider them tonight. These are people who are left stranded by the economic downturn,

jobless through no fault of their own, and are desperately looking for work but cannot find the work.

For those who do not know, I have worked in a mill, paper mill, over 30 years in northern Maine. I know what it is like to lose your job. These neighbors, they are neighbors of mine, they are family, and they are friends. They do not want a handout, but, with no other recourse, they do need a helping hand.

Until we get this economy moving again and providing new jobs, instead of the 2 million jobs that we have lost over the couple of years, they will need this help desperately. But we can do much better for my constituents and people across this country, so I urge that we amend this bill to increase the unemployment compensation.

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN).

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this administration should be referred to as the administration of hard knocks. It is simply amazing that George W. Bush, who has been in office for only 2 years after being selected by the Supreme Court, has led this country into one of the worst economic downturns in our Nation's history; 2 years, selected by the Supreme Court, and he has led this country into one of the worst economic downturns in the Nation's history. We have lost over 2 million jobs in the last 2 years and as many as 500,000 jobs in the last 3 months alone.

The only answer the Republicans have to our economic problems is tax cuts, tax cuts, and more tax cuts. This is supposed to be the People's House, not a House that just represents the country club buddies of the Republican Party.

On this weekend before Memorial Day we have an unemployment package before the House, and once again the Republican Party is playing politics with the American people. They again block the Democratic proposal, which would have given workers an additional 13 weeks to find a job in these difficult markets.

Watch out, Republicans. They can fool some of the people some of the time, but they cannot fool all of the people all of the time. The 1 million people left out in the cold are paying attention and will remember them on Election Day.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the very valued member of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from New York (Mr. QUINN).

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Washington for yielding time to me. I also want to thank the gentlewoman for her work on this unemployment extension.

Many times I find myself at odds with the Republican Party, my party, when it comes to unemployment bene-

fits for the working families across this country. But tonight we are not trying to fool any of the people any of the time. Tonight we are being very straightforward. Tonight what we are trying to do is to make sure that the working men and women and families of this country understand that the Republican Party understands their needs.

I am happy to support this bill tonight, as I think most Members on both sides of the aisle will. I want to thank our leadership of the Republican Party for taking this up and allowing many of us who feel that we need to have a voice for working families in the country make that voice heard.

I want to make certain that our Members understand that it is an opportunity for us to help working families. I am proud to say that we are going to do that very straightforwardly in a very clean bill, unattached to anything else, up or down, yes or no.

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

Mr. Speaker, we would give the gentleman a chance to help the 103,000 people who are currently not covered by the bill in New York.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, in Illinois we have unemployment now of 6.7 percent; 17,000 workers have lost their job in the last 6 months; 2.5 million Americans have lost their jobs in the last 2 years; and 2 million of those jobs are manufacturing jobs.

One gentleman brought up the statistics and said that the statistics, and we are talking about the 1 million people who are left out, they were put out by the Center for Budget Priorities. In fact, the Department of Labor also recognized that 1 million people would not be covered by this unemployment insurance.

The fact is, I believe people on both sides are going to support this because people on both sides believe that people are hurt and need support. But this is an it'sy-bitsy unemployment insurance program, when we can cover another 1 million people. That is how some people refer to the \$350 billion tax cut. In my view, this is an it'sy-bitsy unemployment tax cut.

We can do more because we are able to do more. We should not make that choice, that if you are unemployed you cannot get unemployment insurance. I believe that is the value we want to put in place. Although a number of us will support this, we can do better than the economic plan envisioned here.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON), from one of those high unemployment States.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Committee on Ways and Means and the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) for her leadership on this issue.

I come from western Pennsylvania, which has been struggling with high

unemployment. We have had many plant closings, a very difficult time. I believe this committee and this Congress has been meeting these issues head on and appropriately.

Why do we have the high unemployment? I hear today we are laying blame. If we are laying blame, I mention where I think the blame lies. September 11 shook the economy of this country. Why did we have 9/11? We had two embassies blown up. What did we do about the terror? Nothing. We had a barracks blown up, and several hundred of the Marines killed. What did we do about the terror? Nothing. We had the side of a ship blown up. What did we do about that terror? Nothing. We had an attempt to blow up the towers in New York before 9/11. What did we do? Blow up a baby milk factory.

We have an energy issue in this country that the last administration ignored. Every time we have had energy spikes in this country, our economy has gone down. Because we do not have adequate energy supply in this country, and when we do not have ample supply of all energies, we have spikes in prices.

We have been unwilling to have an energy policy. We have moved to all-natural gas for power generation. This very day we have gas prices that are going to hurt this economy in the year ahead because they are the highest they have ever been, and our storage is the lowest.

Yes, a lack of fighting terror years ago in the last administration, lack of an energy policy in the last administration, is the reason. Unemployment does not happen in a year. Those things happen over years of not taking care of business.

I just wanted to share my thoughts of where the blame ought to be.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) is recognized for 45 seconds.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, as I said at the beginning of this debate, we welcome the opportunity of having an unemployment compensation bill on the floor. It is important that we enact legislation tonight that will help those people who are unemployed.

I can assure Members the Democrats want to join in that effort. We will offer an opportunity under the Rules so we can extend those benefits to all the people that are being trapped that are entitled to unemployment through their employment paying into the fund, so we do not leave 1 million people behind.

We would urge Members to support our motion, which will allow the 7-month extension for those who have exhausted the State benefits and also include those who have exhausted their 13 weeks.

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

I would like to do a comparison between the bill that we are talking

about on the floor tonight and the bill that the Democrats have often brought up as being a better bill.

The Democrat plan is not targeted. It guarantees 26 weeks of benefits, regardless of local economic conditions in a State. Our bill is targeted. It provides immediately 13 weeks of Federal assistance to those who need it now, and it targets additional benefits to States that have high unemployment rates.

The Democrat plan is too long in duration. That plan would extend the program through October, 2004. We might be out of this recession by October of 2004. Our goal is to create jobs. We are enacting tax relief for all Americans that will give our economy an immediate boost and create new jobs.

Our bill continues the unemployment benefits through December, 2003, with a phase-out through March, 2004. That means Congress can come back, as we have consistently done in the past, and review the economic conditions at that time and decide if we need to extend unemployment benefits.

□ 2045

Also, in the growth bill, in addition to these unemployment extension benefits, we will provide \$20 billion of Federal assistance to States in the jobs and growth package. This is a good solid unemployment package. It should pass.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2185, the "Unemployed Compensation Amendments of 2003." I am proud to be an original sponsor of a measure so important to my home State of Connecticut.

Despite the fact that this Congress has passed several extensions for unemployment benefits, there are still millions of displaced workers who, of no fault of their own, are unable to find employment. This Congress—led by my colleague JENNIFER DUNN—recognizes this and has put forth a bill that will once again provide a lift to those who are still feeling the impact of September 11 on the economy.

Nowhere is this bill more important than in my home State of Connecticut. Unemployment benefit claims in Connecticut are up 7 percent from this month last year.

Thousands of Connecticut's working men and women need more assistance. For these reasons, it is imperative for Congress to act now and extend the unemployment insurance program to help those who are still looking for jobs.

H.R. 2185 will go a long way toward helping Connecticut's economy recover and ensure our workers economic security as they seek to rejoin the workforce.

On behalf of those more than 112,000 working men and women in Connecticut who will benefit from an unemployment extension, I ask that all Members of Congress support this bill.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, Oregon's highest unemployment rate in the Nation gives me more than 139,800 reasons to be concerned. This extension is one of the most important things we can do to help people in my State. It is ironic that the bill to extend these benefits is being debated on the same day as we are poised to pass a massive tax cut. The contrast between the economic effect of the

two pieces of legislation and the people they benefit are stark. Each new dollar in the unemployment benefits program quickly boosts the economy by \$1.73, while the cut in dividend taxes enriches the economy by only 9 cents per dollar. Republican leadership priorities are made clear when it takes an extraordinary effort to extend \$6.5 billion in benefits for those struggling to find work, while approving \$350 billion—sure to be a trillion dollars if the authors of the tax cut have their way—in tax cuts that, in large part, benefit the wealthiest and worsen our ever spiraling national deficit.

After fighting for this extension for months I'm pleased we will pass this legislation before benefits expire this weekend, but it is once again, too little too late. What about the thousands of Oregonians who have had their benefits lapse? They will not be eligible for any benefits under this legislation. The Democratic substitute, which will not be allowed under the restrictive rule for debate today, would have assisted these workers. Our amendment would also have helped states improve coverage of low-wage earners and part-time workers, who pay unemployment taxes but often fail to qualify for benefits upon losing their jobs. Unfortunately, we will not even be able to debate this proposal today, instead forced to vote for half a solution. I hope we can reach the point where the House appreciates that unemployment benefits are too critical to be political cannon fodder. Unemployed Oregonians struggling to provide for their families deserve better.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 2185, the Unemployment Compensation Amendment of 2003, but I must also highlight that this bill is an inadequate response to the plight of those without jobs.

Although the economic policies of the Bush administration and the Republican Congress have led to the loss of 2.7 million jobs, my Republican colleagues continue to do the absolute minimum to help those out-of-work Americans. H.R. 2185 reauthorizes 13 weeks of emergency benefits for individuals who have exhausted their regular unemployment benefits, but it ignores many others who are unemployed.

This legislation does not help the 1.1 million Americans who have already exhausted their emergency unemployment benefits and still cannot find work. With three unemployed workers for every job opening in America, the prospect of these long term unemployed workers finding a job are gloomy at best. They need help, but they're left out in the cold under this bill.

Another inadequacy of H.R. 2185 is that it only provides 13 weeks of additional emergency unemployment benefits after beneficiaries have exhausted their 26 weeks of regular unemployment benefits. A 13-week emergency unemployment benefit extension is simply inadequate because the number of workers who have been unemployed for more than 6 months has more than tripled over the last three years—up from 596,000 in April 2000 to 1.9 million in April 2003.

Finally, the Republican legislation fails to modernize the Unemployment Insurance program and adjust the definition of a high unemployment State, so that beneficiaries in States marred in deep recessions can access an additional 7 weeks of emergency unemployment benefits. Those 7 weeks of emergency unem-

ployment benefits would be in addition to the current 13 weeks those unemployed workers can receive under current law. Because of the Republican bill's failure to change this definition, only 5 to 6 States qualify as high unemployment States and some funds designated for emergency benefits to high unemployment States are currently sitting unused in a federal trust fund.

If the Republicans really wanted to help hard-working average Americans, they could have begun by passing the Democratic alternative plan. Our plan really helps those who are without jobs. The Democratic plan adds 26 weeks of emergency unemployment benefits for individuals who exhaust their regular unemployment benefits and provides an additional 13 weeks for those workers who have already exhausted their emergency unemployment benefits. In addition, the Democratic plan modernizes the Unemployment Insurance program by lowering the rate of unemployment a state must have before it is designated a high unemployment State. This change would allow unemployed workers in 15 States get the additional 7 weeks of emergency unemployment benefits.

I will support this legislation today because it does help many unemployed Americans. But, Congress needs to do more to help all unemployed Americans survive this recession.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from Washington Ms. DUNN for her work on this vital legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2185. I applaud the efforts of Chairman THOMAS and Majority Whip BLUNT for making good on their commitment to address this issue and ensure that unemployed Americans will be able to get through the Memorial Day holiday without having to worry about their benefits expiring on May 31.

H.R. 2185 would extend the Federal unemployment compensation program through the end of this year—relieving Congress of having to continue to revisit this issue while the economy begins to rebound.

This extension will provide relief for about 2.5 million unemployed workers.

It allows for 13 weeks of federally funded benefits—as well as an additional 13 weeks for residents of high unemployment States.

This relief will be a tremendous boost to Americans still actively seeking employment.

Again, I thank my colleagues for their hard work on this issue.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, since January 2001, 2.7 million people have been put out of work and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are doing nothing to change it. H.R. 2185 is an unemployment package that will not help our Nation's economy or our Nation's unemployed.

In just the last 3 months, nearly one half million people have lost their jobs. Our unemployment rate is at an astounding 6 percent. That is the highest unemployment rate we have experienced in 10 years. And in response to this, all the Republicans can do is extend unemployment benefits for merely 13 weeks. 13 weeks. This is intolerable.

We need legislation that is going to stimulate growth and create jobs. We need to invest in research and technology to try to get this economy moving. We need to find realistic solutions that help the working and unemployed people of this Nation—not merely the wealthiest 5 percent.

We need to help the people that have been out of work for more than 6 months or more because this job market simply has nothing to offer. By the end of this month, it is estimated that well over 1 million people will have exhausted both State and Federal unemployment benefits without finding jobs.

As Democrats, we want to start passing legislation that creates jobs. We want to make sure that the unemployed have benefits. We want to make sure that people can feed their families and clothe their children. But the Republicans simply will not let us do it. Under our plan, we would strengthen unemployment benefits offering a permanent solution not merely temporary aid. Research shows that each dollar dedicated to strengthening unemployment benefits would boost the economy by one dollar and seventy-three cents. But the Republicans have closed their door on this plan and will never let it reach the House floor. This is a tragedy.

I am tired of temporary solutions. We need to fix this problem and make sure that the hard working people of this Nation get the help that they need.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2185, Extend Temporary Unemployment Benefits Act. This bill guarantees at least 13 weeks of unemployment benefits for jobless workers who are about to exhaust their original 26 weeks of benefits. Extending unemployment insurance is not only compassionate; it makes good economic sense because it stimulates the economy. For every dollar of unemployment insurance given to individuals, \$1.73 is generated in the economy, the greatest of any spending initiative or tax cut.

Over the past 2½ years, more than 2.6 million Americans have lost their jobs, and the total number of unemployed, 8.8 million, is the highest in a decade. In New York State, we have seen 175,000 people lose their jobs over this same period of time. Without this extension, many of these workers would lose their insurance in the next few months.

Today's legislation is a step in the right direction. While it helps those who have not exhausted their benefits, it is my hope we continue to find ways to help those whose benefits have completely expired and are facing difficult times. Families need real help, not empty promises.

I look forward to President Bush signing this legislation into law.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2185, the "Unemployment Compensation Amendments." I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this important measure and I thank Chairman THOMAS and the House leadership for bringing this to the floor.

Sadly, we have watched many Americans become unemployed and struggle to find work in today's economy. Today, Congress is taking a much needed step in extending unemployment compensation for our Nation's workers. Figures show the U.S. unemployment rate is at 6 percent and nearly 9 million people are unemployed. This legislation provides a safety net for men and women who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own.

We must assist workers during these times of hardship so they can successfully make the transition back to the workforce. The legislation before us helps accomplish this goal and coupled with existing job training and net-

working programs we can return Americans to the workforce. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2185, legislation that will allow unemployed workers to receive 13 weeks of additional Federal unemployment benefits. This legislation also provides an additional 13 weeks for workers who live in States with high unemployment rates. Congress previously passed an extension of benefits in December, and I urge my colleagues to once again support this important legislation.

Approximately 300,000 unemployed workers will exhaust their benefits each month without this extension. While I think we all agree that unemployment compensation should be a temporary benefit, I do not believe that our economy is currently strong enough to phase out the extension we passed in December. With the unemployment rate at 6 percent and an estimated 2 million unemployed workers predicted to exhaust their benefits between June and November, families need this benefit to simply make ends meet and keep their homes.

Many of my own constituents in central Illinois, despite their hard work and persistence, cannot find suitable work. In Illinois, over 100,000 unemployed workers are likely to exhaust their benefits over the next 6 months. This legislation will help to sustain these families until they can once again become self-sufficient. Additionally, it will provide even more benefits to unemployed workers in States in a worse position than Illinois, such as Washington and Oregon.

It is important that we pass this legislation today and avoid a possible disruption in benefits. While Congress is doing its part to ensure that our economy improves, we should not ignore those who are struggling. Once again, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, today I come before you to talk about how much unemployed Americans across the country will be affected when the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002, TEUC, runs out at the end of this month. We all know how severely the current economic downturn has impacted not only our districts, but our States overall. In my own State of California, the unemployment rate was 6.7 percent in 2002, while the Nation's unemployment rate for the same time period was 5.8 percent. California had 1.2 million unemployed residents in 2002, leaving it tied for 46th place with the worst unemployment ranking among the 50 States and the District of Columbia. As of March 2003, the State's unemployment rate had risen to 6.8 percent, which remains higher than the national average of 5.8 percent.

With our country's ongoing economic uncertainty, it is incumbent upon us to provide all methods of support to citizens who are searching for work nationwide.

With upward of 2.7 million private sector jobs lost during the past 2 years in contrast to 1.3 million private sector jobs disappearing in the early 1990s, we must clearly provide all available resources to unemployed Americans.

If we do not act quickly, some 80,000 Americans who are out of work will be unable to receive extended unemployment benefits each week unless we act and extend the current Temporary Extended Unemployment Com-

pensation Program. If we delay further action, as of June 1 up to 2 million unemployed workers could be denied extended benefits over the next 6 months. This is on top of the 1 million out-of-work Americans who have already exhausted their Federal extended benefits.

Given that our economy was declared to be in recession as of March 2001, and with the additional decline caused by the events of September 11, more people are losing their jobs, and experience difficulty finding other work in order to sustain their families and themselves. We are facing new, unprecedented economic challenges, and the assistance we offer to those who are unemployed must meet their needs. An extended benefits program was made available to the unemployed for 27 months during the recession of the early 1990s, and unemployed workers received from 20 to 26 weeks' worth of benefits. Now, the extended benefits program is scheduled to expire after only 15 months, and it offers only 13 weeks of benefits in a select number of States. We spent \$28.5 billion to help unemployed workers a decade ago, as opposed to spending \$16 billion on extended benefits for the unemployed today.

The statistics we face regarding unemployment today are grim. The Department of Labor's Job Openings and Labor Turnover report indicates that there are now more than three unemployed workers for every job opening. Many individuals and families rely solely on unemployment benefits to support themselves. With the average length of unemployment now stretching out to 19.6 weeks, we are facing a 20-year high in terms of the numbers of Americans who are seeking employment. At this time, the percentage of people who have exhausted their standard unemployment benefits stands at 43 percent over the past several months, which is a record high. Compounding that fact, the number of long-term unemployed individuals out of work for more than 6 months has tripled over the last 3 years from 596,000 in 2000 to 1.9 million as of last month.

We are facing sobering statistics in a difficult economic climate, and tough choices must be made. As we move forward in making decisions, let us be mindful of the women, men and children who are in greatest need at this time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). All time for debate has expired.

The bill is considered read for amendment.

Pursuant to House Resolution 248, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. CARDIN

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CARDIN. Yes, in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CARDIN moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2185, to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions that the Committee report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 3. ENTITLEMENT TO ADDITIONAL WEEKS OF TEMPORARY EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.

(a) WEEKS OF TEUC AMOUNTS.—Paragraph (1) of section 203(b) of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 28) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount established in an account under subsection (a) shall be equal to 26 times the individual’s weekly benefit amount for the benefit year.”.

(b) WEEKS OF TEUC-X AMOUNTS.—Section 203(c)(1) of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 28) is amended by striking “an amount equal to the amount originally established in such account (as determined under subsection (b)(1))” and inserting “7 times the individual’s weekly benefit amount for the benefit year”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section—

(1) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002; but

(2) shall apply only with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of enactment this Act.

Mr. CARDIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated during the debate on the bill, the bill before us does extend unemployment insurance benefits for 7 months. I agree with the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) that a 7-month extension of the unemployment insurance benefits at this time is the appropriate length of time for us to extend unemployment insurance benefits.

We hope that during this period of time our economy will rebound; and if not, then we will have to revisit it again, but the length of time is the right period, and we have no objection to that.

Our objection is that we are not covering all the people who need to be helped. As I pointed out, in the recession in the 1990s when the loss of employment was less severe than the loss of employment in this recession, with the number of people who exhausted their Federal unemployment insurance benefits was less than under the current recession, we extended benefits for 26 weeks. We have the money in the unemployment insurance trust fund in order to do this. We have the money in the account, \$21 billion. This will add a little over \$3 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chair-

man just filed the conference report on the Growth Tax Bill that I assume we will be taking up later this evening. That conference report will incur \$350 billion of additional outlays. The amendment I have before you is less than 1 percent, less than 1 percent of the conference report on the tax bill. It affects 1 million people; 1 million people are affected by this motion. The adoption of this motion to recommit will not delay this bill 1 minute. We will still vote on it and pass it tonight. It is our opportunity to speak to what is the right policy, the right policy for those people who are unemployed; the right policy for what we have done in previous recessions; the right policy to help our economy, because we know these people need the money and will spend the money.

It is the right policy. I urge my colleagues to take advantage of this opportunity so that we cannot only take care of the 2 million people who are estimated to exhaust their State unemployment insurance benefits during the next 6 to 7 months, but we can help the 1 million people who are looking for jobs and cannot find jobs.

We have heard from these people in our communities. For every three people that are seeking a job, there is only one job available in the community, through no fault of their own. The least we can do is try to help them, and we can tonight by your vote on this motion to recommit. I urge my colleagues to support the motion.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to compliment the gentlemen from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN). He has written a motion to recommit that is real.

We have seen many, many of these motions to recommit, and I am forced to point out the language that prefaces the specifics is not really genuine because they use the word “promptly” which kills the bill; and therefore, anything that they say they want simply is not so. And I rise to compliment him because in my usual examining of motions to recommit, he has got “forthwith.” That is real. That means if we decide to do this, it comes back immediately and the bill is changed. That is usually what the motion to recommit is about.

That is one of the reasons that Republicans, when we became the majority, decided to make sure that the minority would always have, would always have the right to recommit, not at the pleasure of the majority as was the case when we were in the minority, but guaranteed so that they could offer their alternative; and what we have seen all too often is a political stunt.

This is not a political stunt because it is clear with the language “forth-

with” that they would like to have what this motion to recommit does. The gentleman said that we will soon be considering a growth plan, and I appreciate his use of that term because we hope that is exactly what it does. Of course, it is kind of a piker in terms of growth compared to what is offered in the motion to recommit.

It turns out that under the Democrat’s plan, although it is not quite perpetual motion it comes darn close, someone can work for 20 weeks and then they can get 26 weeks of regular State unemployment. Then they can get another 26 weeks of temporary extended that will be provided to every State under the motion. Seven additional weeks in a high-unemployment State and then 13 additional permanents. That is 72 weeks. That is 17 months for 20 weeks’ work.

If this motion to recommit passes, the growth plan that we will soon be considering, notwithstanding the fact that there may be a job, will create a real temptation for many people to take a look at this growth plan for unemployment that the Democrats offer and say 20 weeks of work for 17 months of unemployment is a really, really good deal.

We believe that we have to have a structure that deals with the underlying problem. We believe the bill that we have presented does. It is possible to create a structure which is, in fact, virtually self-defeating. I believe this motion to recommit comes awfully close. And I would ask my colleagues to oppose the motion to recommit. Vote for the underlying bill. Move that bill off the floor so that prior to this break everyone knows we wanted to make sure that we had a continuous, uninterrupted opportunity so that those who are seeking employment can have assistance to do so.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

This is a 15-minute vote to be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 205, nays 222, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 222]

YEAS—205

Abercrombie	Allen	Baird
Ackerman	Andrews	Baldwin
Alexander	Baca	Ballance

Becerra	Hoefel	Olver	Hefley	Miller (MI)	Schrock	Barton (TX)	Evans	LaTourette
Bell	Holden	Ortiz	Hensarling	Miller, Gary	Sensenbrenner	Bass	Everett	Leach
Berkley	Holt	Owens	Herger	Moran (KS)	Sessions	Beauprez	Farr	Lee
Berry	Honda	Pallone	Hobson	Murphy	Shadegg	Becerra	Fattah	Levin
Bishop (GA)	Hooley (OR)	Pascarell	Hoekstra	Musgrave	Shaw	Bell	Ferguson	Lewis (GA)
Bishop (NY)	Hoyer	Pastor	Hostettler	Myrick	Shays	Bereuter	Filner	Lewis (KY)
Blumenauer	Inslee	Payne	Houghton	Nethercutt	Sherwood	Berkley	Fletcher	Linder
Boswell	Israel	Pelosi	Hulshof	Ney	Shimkus	Berman	Foley	Lipinski
Boucher	Jackson (IL)	Peterson (MN)	Hunter	Northup	Shuster	Berry	Forbes	LoBiondo
Boyd	Jackson-Lee	Pomeroy	Hyde	Norwood	Simmons	Biggert	Ford	Lofgren
Brady (PA)	(TX)	Price (NC)	Isakson	Nunes	Simpson	Billirakis	Fossella	Lowe
Brown (OH)	Jefferson	Rahall	Issa	Nussle	Smith (MI)	Bishop (GA)	Frank (MA)	Lucas (KY)
Brown, Corrine	John	Rangel	Istook	Osborne	Smith (NJ)	Bishop (NY)	Frelinghuysen	Lucas (OK)
Capps	Johnson, E. B.	Reyes	Janklow	Ose	Smith (TX)	Bishop (UT)	Frost	Lynch
Capuano	Jones (OH)	Rodriguez	Jenkins	Otter	Souder	Blackburn	Gajetty	Majette
Cardin	Kanjorski	Ross	Johnson (CT)	Oxley	Stearns	Blumenauer	Gerlach	Maloney
Cardoza	Kaptur	Rothman	Johnson (IL)	Paul	Sullivan	Blunt	Gibbons	Manzullo
Carson (IN)	Kennedy (RI)	Roybal-Allard	Johnson, Sam	Pearce	Sweeney	Boehlert	Gilchrest	Markey
Carson (OK)	Kildee	Ruppersberger	Keller	Pence	Tancredo	Boehner	Gillmor	Marshall
Case	Kilpatrick	Rush	Kelly	Peterson (PA)	Tauzin	Bonner	Gingrey	Matheson
Clay	Kind	Ryan (OH)	Kennedy (MN)	Petri	Taylor (NC)	Bono	Gonzalez	Matsui
Clyburn	Kleczka	Sabo	King (IA)	Pickering	Terry	Boozman	Goode	McCarthy (MO)
Conyers	Kucinich	Sanchez, Linda	King (NY)	Pitts	Thomas	Boswell	Goodlatte	McCarthy (NY)
Cooper	Lampson	T.	Kingston	Platts	Thornberry	Boucher	Gordon	McCollum
Costello	Langevin	Sanchez, Loretta	Kirk	Pombo	Tiahrt	Boyd	Goss	McCotter
Cramer	Lantos	Sanders	Kline	Porter	Tiberi	Bradley (NH)	Granger	McCrery
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Sandlin	Knollenberg	Portman	Toomey	Brady (PA)	Graves	McDermott
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky	Kolbe	Pryce (OH)	Turner (OH)	Brady (TX)	Green (TX)	McGovern
Davis (AL)	Lee	Schiff	LaHood	Putnam	Upton	Brown (OH)	Green (WI)	McHugh
Davis (CA)	Levin	Scott (GA)	Latham	Quinn	Vitter	Brown (SC)	Greenwood	McInnis
Davis (FL)	Lewis (GA)	Scott (VA)	Radanovich	Regula	Walsh	Brown, Corrine	Grijalva	McIntyre
Davis (IL)	Lipinski	Serrano	Ramstad	Rehberg	Wamp	Brown-Waite,	Gutierrez	McKeon
Davis (TN)	Lofgren	Sherman	Regula	Renzi	Weldon (FL)	Ginny	Gutknecht	McNulty
DeFazio	Lowe	Skelton	Rehberg	Reynolds	Weldon (PA)	Burns	Hall	Meehan
DeGette	Lucas (KY)	Slaughter	Renzi	Rogers (AL)	Weller	Burr	Harman	Meek (FL)
Delahunt	Lynch	Smith (WA)	LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)	Whitfield	Burton (IN)	Harris	Meeks (NY)
DeLauro	Majette	Snyder	Lucas (OK)	Rogers (MI)	Wicker	Buyer	Hart	Menendez
Deutsch	Maloney	Solis	Manzullo	Rohrabacher	Wilson (NM)	Calvert	Hastings (FL)	Mica
Dicks	Markey	Spratt	McCotter	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson (SC)	Camp	Hastings (WA)	Michaud
Dingell	Marshall	Stark	McCrery	Royce	Wolf	Cannon	Hayes	Millender-
Doggett	Matheson	Stenholm	McHugh	McInnis	Young (AK)	Cantor	Hayworth	McDonald
Dooley (CA)	Matsui	Strickland	McKeon	Ryan (WI)	Young (FL)	Capito	Heller	Miller (MI)
Doyle	McCarthy (MO)	Stupak	Mica	Ryun (KS)		Capps	Herger	Miller (NC)
Edwards	McCarthy (NY)	Tanner	Miller (FL)	Saxton		Capuano	Hill	Miller, Gary
Emanuel	McCollum	Tauscher				Cardin	Hinchey	Miller, George
Emanuel	McDermott	Taylor (MS)				Cardoza	Hinojosa	Mollohan
Engel	McGovern	Thompson (CA)				Carson (IN)	Moore	
Eshoo	McIntyre	Thompson (MS)				Carson (OK)	Hoefel	Moran (KS)
Etheridge	McNulty	Tierney				Carter	Hoekstra	Moran (VA)
Evans	Meehan	Towns				Case	Holden	Murphy
Farr	Meek (FL)	Turner (TX)				Castle	Holt	Murtha
Fattah	Meeks (NY)	Udall (CO)				Chabot	Honda	Myrick
Filner	Menendez	Udall (NM)				Chocola	Hoolley (OR)	Nadler
Ford	Michaud	Van Hollen				Clay	Houghton	Napolitano
Frank (MA)	Millender-	Velazquez				Clyburn	Hoyer	Neal (MA)
Frost	McDonald	Visclosky				Coble	Hulshof	Nethercutt
Gonzalez	Miller (NC)	Waters				Cole	Hunter	Ney
Goode	Miller, George	Watson				Collins	Hyde	Northup
Gordon	Mollohan	Watt				Conyers	Inslee	Norwood
Green (TX)	Moore	Waxman				Cooper	Isakson	Nunes
Grijalva	Moran (VA)	Weiner				Costello	Israel	Nussle
Gutierrez	Murtha	Wexler				Cox	Issa	Oberstar
Hall	Nadler	Woolsey				Cramer	Istook	Obeys
Harman	Napolitano	Wu				Crenshaw	Jackson (IL)	Olver
Hastings (FL)	Neal (MA)	Wynn				Crowley	Jackson-Lee	Ortiz
Hill	Oberstar					Cummings	(TX)	Osborne
Hinchey	Obeys					Cunningham	Janklow	Ose
Hinojosa						Davis (AL)	Jefferson	Otter
						Davis (CA)	Jenkins	Owens
						Davis (FL)	John	Oxley
						Davis (IL)	Johnson (CT)	Pallone
						Davis (TN)	Johnson (IL)	Pascarell
						Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor
						Davis, Tom	Jones (NC)	Payne
						Deal (GA)	Jones (OH)	Pearce
						DeFazio	Kanjorski	Pelosi
						DeGette	Kaptur	Pence
						Delahunt	Keller	Peterson (MN)
						DeLauro	Kelly	Peterson (PA)
						DeLay	Kennedy (MN)	Petri
						DeMint	Kennedy (RI)	Pickering
						Deutsch	Kildee	Pitts
						Diaz-Balart, L.	Kilpatrick	Platts
						Diaz-Balart, M.	Kind	Pombo
						Dicks	King (NY)	Pomeroy
						Dingell	Kingston	Porter
						Doggett	Kirk	Portman
						Dooley (CA)	Kleczka	Price (NC)
						Doyle	Kline	Pryce (OH)
						Dreier	Knollenberg	Putnam
						Duncan	Kolbe	Quinn
						Dunn	Kucinich	Radanovich
						Edwards	LaHood	Rahall
						Ehlers	Lampson	Ramstad
						Emanuel	Langevin	Rangel
						Engel	Lantos	Regula
						English	Larsen (WA)	Rehberg
						Eshoo	Larson (CT)	Renzi
						Etheridge	Latham	Reyes

NOT VOTING—7

Jones (NC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The **SPEAKER pro tempore** (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) (during the vote). There are two minutes remaining to vote.

□ 2113

Messrs. **BEAUPREZ**, **HEFLEY**, **MCINNIS**, and **SMITH** of Michigan changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. **BAIRD** changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. **QUINN**. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 409, noes 19, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 223]

AYES—409

Aderholt	Buyer	English	Abercrombie	Allen	Baker
Akin	Calvert	Everett	Ackerman	Andrews	Baldwin
Bachus	Camp	Feeney	Baca	Balla	Ballance
Baker	Cannon	Ferguson	Akin	Bachus	Ballenger
Ballenger	Cantor	Flake	Alexander	Baird	Barrett (SC)
Barrett (SC)	Capito	Fletcher			
Bartlett (MD)	Carter	Foley			
Barton (TX)	Castle	Forbes			
Bass	Chabot	Fossella			
Beauprez	Chocola	Franks (AZ)			
Bereuter	Coble	Frelinghuysen			
Biggert	Cole	Gallely			
Billirakis	Collins	Garrett (NJ)			
Bishop (UT)	Cox	Gerlach			
Blackburn	Crane	Gibbons			
Blunt	Crenshaw	Gilchrest			
Boehlert	Cubin	Gillmor			
Boehner	Culberson	Gingrey			
Bonner	Cunningham	Goodlatte			
Bono	Davis, Jo Ann	Goss			
Boozman	Davis, Tom	Granger			
Bradley (NH)	Deal (GA)	Graves			
Brady (TX)	DeLay	Green (WI)			
Brown (SC)	DeMint	Greenwood			
Brown-Waite,	Diaz-Balart, L.	Gutknecht			
Ginny	Diaz-Balart, M.	Harris			
Burgess	Dreier	Hart			
Burns	Duncan	Hastings (WA)			
Burr	Dunn	Hayes			
Burton (IN)	Ehlers	Hayworth			

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

NOES—19

Bartlett (MD)	Franks (AZ)	Musgrave
Burgess	Garrett (NJ)	Paul
Crane	Hensarling	Shadegg
Cubin	Hostettler	Smith (MI)
Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Tancredo
Feeney	King (IA)	
Flake	Miller (FL)	

NOT VOTING—6

Bonilla	Doolittle	Gephardt
Combest	Emerson	Lewis (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 2120

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOBS AND GROWTH TAX RELIEF RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2003

Mr. THOMAS (during consideration of H.R. 2185) submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2), to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 108-126)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2), to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the “Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003”.

(b) *AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.*—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; references; table of contents.

TITLE I—ACCELERATION OF CERTAIN PREVIOUSLY ENACTED TAX REDUCTIONS

Sec. 101. Acceleration of increase in child tax credit.

Sec. 102. Acceleration of 15-percent individual income tax rate bracket expansion for married taxpayers filing joint returns.

Sec. 103. Acceleration of increase in standard deduction for married taxpayers filing joint returns.

Sec. 104. Acceleration of 10-percent individual income tax rate bracket expansion.

Sec. 105. Acceleration of reduction in individual income tax rates.

Sec. 106. Minimum tax relief to individuals.

Sec. 107. Application of EGTRRA sunset to this title.

TITLE II—GROWTH INCENTIVES FOR BUSINESS

Sec. 201. Increase and extension of bonus depreciation.

Sec. 202. Increased expensing for small business.

TITLE III—REDUCTION IN TAXES ON DIVIDENDS AND CAPITAL GAINS

Sec. 301. Reduction in capital gains rates for individuals; repeal of 5-year holding period requirement.

Sec. 302. Dividends of individuals taxed at capital gain rates.

Sec. 303. Sunset of title.

TITLE IV—TEMPORARY STATE FISCAL RELIEF

Sec. 401. Temporary State fiscal relief.

TITLE V—CORPORATE ESTIMATED TAX PAYMENTS FOR 2003

Sec. 501. Time for payment of corporate estimated taxes.

TITLE I—ACCELERATION OF CERTAIN PREVIOUSLY ENACTED TAX REDUCTIONS

SEC. 101. ACCELERATION OF INCREASE IN CHILD TAX CREDIT.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The item relating to calendar years 2001 through 2004 in the table contained in paragraph (2) of section 24(a) (relating to per child amount) is amended to read as follows:

“2003 or 2004 \$1,000”.

(b) *ADVANCE PAYMENT OF PORTION OF INCREASED CREDIT IN 2003.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Subchapter B of chapter 65 (relating to abatements, credits, and refunds) is amended by inserting after section 6428 the following new section:

“SEC. 6429. ADVANCE PAYMENT OF PORTION OF INCREASED CHILD CREDIT FOR 2003.

“(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Each taxpayer who was allowed a credit under section 24 on the return for the taxpayer’s first taxable year beginning in 2002 shall be treated as having made a payment against the tax imposed by chapter 1 for such taxable year in an amount equal to the child tax credit refund amount (if any) for such taxable year.

“(b) *CHILD TAX CREDIT REFUND AMOUNT.*—For purposes of this section, the child tax credit

refund amount is the amount by which the aggregate credits allowed under part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 for such first taxable year would have been increased if—

“(1) the per child amount under section 24(a)(2) for such year were \$1,000,

“(2) only qualifying children (as defined in section 24(c)) of the taxpayer for such year who had not attained age 17 as of December 31, 2003, were taken into account, and

“(3) section 24(d)(1)(B)(ii) did not apply.

“(c) *TIMING OF PAYMENTS.*—In the case of any overpayment attributable to this section, the Secretary shall, subject to the provisions of this title, refund or credit such overpayment as rapidly as possible and, to the extent practicable, before October 1, 2003. No refund or credit shall be made or allowed under this section after December 31, 2003.

“(d) *COORDINATION WITH CHILD TAX CREDIT.*—

“(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The amount of credit which would (but for this subsection and section 26) be allowed under section 24 for the taxpayer’s first taxable year beginning in 2003 shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the payments made to the taxpayer under this section. Any failure to so reduce the credit shall be treated as arising out of a mathematical or clerical error and assessed according to section 6213(b)(1).

“(2) *JOINT RETURNS.*—In the case of a payment under this section with respect to a joint return, half of such payment shall be treated as having been made to each individual filing such return.

“(e) *NO INTEREST.*—No interest shall be allowed on any overpayment attributable to this section.”.

(2) *CLERICAL AMENDMENT.*—The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 65 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 6429. Advance payment of portion of increased child credit for 2003.”.

(c) *EFFECTIVE DATES.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2002.

(2) *SUBSECTION (b).*—The amendments made by subsection (b) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 102. ACCELERATION OF 15-PERCENT INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RATE BRACKET EXPANSION FOR MARRIED TAXPAYERS FILING JOINT RETURNS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The table contained in subparagraph (B) of section 1(f)(8) (relating to applicable percentage) is amended by inserting before the item relating to 2005 the following new item:

“2003 and 2004 200”.

(b) *CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.*—

(1) Section 1(f)(8)(A) is amended by striking “2004” and inserting “2002”.

(2) Section 302(c) of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 is amended by striking “2004” and inserting “2002”.

(c) *EFFECTIVE DATE.*—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2002.

SEC. 103. ACCELERATION OF INCREASE IN STANDARD DEDUCTION FOR MARRIED TAXPAYERS FILING JOINT RETURNS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The table contained in paragraph (7) of section 63(c) (relating to applicable percentage) is amended by inserting before the item relating to 2005 the following new item:

“2003 and 2004 200”.

(b) *CONFORMING AMENDMENT.*—Section 301(d) of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 is amended by striking “2004” and inserting “2002”.

(c) *EFFECTIVE DATE.*—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2002.