

WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 249 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 249

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported on the legislative day of May 22, 2003, providing for consideration or disposition of the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

(Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 249 waives clause (6)(a) of rule XIII requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Committee on Rules.

The rule applies the waiver to a special rule reported on the legislative day of May 22, 2003, providing for consideration or disposition of the bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201 of the concurrent resolution, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

This rule is the starting block to allow the House to consider legislation that will infuse our economy with job-creating tax relief, investment incentives, and overall economic growth. The House initially passed the Jobs and Growth Reconciliation Tax Act earlier this month, and with today's action we can demonstrate our continued commitment to spurring economic expansion and providing stability to American workers, businesses and families.

Our economy needs a healthy dose of meaningful relief. This Congress has once before exhibited the leadership and sense of purpose needed to create jobs and protect workers. If we delay, we put American jobs and the strength of our economy at risk.

As we prepare to consider legislation extending unemployment compensation, I can think of no better com-

plimentary action for Congress to adopt than legislation to boost employment levels, lower the tax burden, and grow the economy. It is imperative that we move forward at once. Thus, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this rule so we can proceed with a debate on this very important legislation.

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

□ 1345

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

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, it is often said if you repeat a lie often enough, people begin to believe it. Our record \$350 billion deficit, the Republican Congress tells us that does not matter. The fact that this Republican administration has asked us not once, but twice, to raise the debt limit to record levels, ignore that, and maybe it will go away. The promise that all Members made to protect Social Security and Medicare funds in a lockbox, that does not seem to matter either, Mr. Speaker.

This is not government. This is a complete abdication of fiscal responsibility.

In 1995 the now majority leader, TOM DELAY, said, "By the year 2002, we can have a Federal Government with a balanced budget or we could continue down the present path towards total fiscal catastrophe."

It is now abundantly clear that the Republicans have lost their way and have decided that the path of fiscal catastrophe is not such a bad path after all. That begs the question, Mr. Speaker, what are the priorities of the Republican Party that makes tripping down the path to fiscal catastrophe such a great idea in 2003 when it was so bad an idea in 1995?

Well, we know the Republicans' top priority is to give millionaires a dividend tax cut. Where does that money come from? Well, the Republican budget conference report cuts veterans' Medicare and burial benefits by \$6.2 billion. So if you are a millionaire and you have got a lot of dividend and capital gains income, the Republicans take care of you. If you are a veteran, this Republican Congress wants you to remember this Memorial Day as the one when your benefits were cut. And for what, Mr. Speaker? One of the most gimmick-laden tax cuts this Congress has ever considered. While the dividend and capital gains taxes last until 2008, the marriage penalty relief and child tax credits disappear at the end of 2004.

So while the millionaires enjoy their rate break for the rest of the decade, working families are left with uncertainty.

In 2001 the Republicans told us that their tax cut would create jobs. Instead, the Bush administration has presided over one of the worst job losses in American history; 2.7 million jobs have

been lost. A dividend tax package is not going to help these people get jobs. It is simply welfare for millionaires.

Mr. Speaker, Warren Buffett has made a lot of money. Mr. Buffett would, in fact, be one of the greatest recipients of the Republican tax plan. He wrote an op-ed in The Washington Post this week calling the dividend tax plan "voodoo economics."

Alan Greenspan said, "There is no question that as deficits go up, contrary to what some have said, it does effect long-term interest rates. It does have a negative impact on the economy."

These are two of America's leading economic minds, Mr. Speaker. And they know that financing this tax cut which benefits only the wealthy few with borrowed money is wrong. It is wrong, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we believe it is important to move this legislation forward to grow our economy, to create jobs, help people who do not have jobs find jobs; and we strongly support it and strongly support this rule.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I received my symbol for this Congress just the other day. It is an official stamp from the White House, and they are passing them out. You will all get one in the mail I am pretty sure, and it says: "Official rubber stamp. I approve of everything George Bush does. Member of Congress."

All you have to do is sign your name on there. That is what this Congress is about, rubber stamping the President's proposals. Bring it out here. No debate. Do not let us offer amendments. Do not take any time. Just get out the rubber stamp and put it down there and just roll it on in. You have now joined the rubber stamp Congress.

This party is running a one-party government. They want no input from the Democrats whatsoever. They are a rubber stamp for the President. They are willing to give away all their prerogatives on the war. They said to the President, whenever you think it is time to go to war, go ahead. So they have rubber-stamped whatever he wanted to do. On the tax cut, just give it to him. It will work. On unemployment benefits, well, they stalled and stalled; and he said, look, we are getting bad numbers on those polls. We better do something about employment. So in about an hour we are going to come out here and rubber-stamp again his unemployment bill that the Democrats have been pushing for 4 months. But when the President says it, everybody on the other side jumps up and says, Where is my rubber

stamp? God, I got to get over to the floor and cast my vote for whatever he wants.

Whether he wants to repeal all of the environmental issues related to the military, give the military an open season on doing anything they want. They are killing whales and porpoises in Washington, they are doing all the rest, but over here on the other side, we do not want to have any debate on that. We are rubber-stamping whatever the President wants. I welcome everybody to the rubber stamp club. I hope you got yours. Do not forget to bring them to the floor when you vote.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, it would be my greatest desire that we would have a full debate on the question of the next step for our economy and walk out of this Chamber with the mark of the Congress in the bipartisan way.

Two days ago, Warren Buffett wrote an op-ed, and I believe everyone knows the portfolio of Warren Buffett is still very strong, one of the richest men in the Nation. And he argued vigorously with the approach this Congress was taking. Clearly, he said, the tax plan now moving through the Congress is not a gift for him. It is an outright bonus. It is Christmas every day, and it is for everyone in his predicament and condition: \$40 billion-plus in assets. But he compared his status, Mr. Speaker, with the status of the secretary or receptionist working in his office or even the cleaning woman working in his office.

He said, under this effort, this tax cut program, he would be paying or being given a gift and he would be paying one-tenth of the amount of monies required by the receptionist and the cleaning woman.

What that says to me, Mr. Speaker, we are going up the wrong road. There is a dead end at the end of the road and the dead end are the millions of unemployed who are not getting an extended unemployment package of 26 weeks because we have got to give a tax cut to the rich. We are going up a dead end, Mr. Speaker, because the program that is now being fostered upon us does not create jobs.

If we took the Democratic plan, Mr. Speaker, and we invested a million dollars in transportation infrastructure, you would get 13 jobs. If you did it in health care, you would get 26 jobs. Mr. Speaker, if you use the plan that the President has put forward, you take a million dollars and you get two jobs.

Now, I know that there is a difficulty in math in this great body because we are willing to go forward on \$550 billion, which I understand is a compromise on \$350 billion; but it does not

invest back into America to create jobs, and the plan as proposed by the Republicans takes \$1 million to create two jobs. And I can take \$1 million and put it in transportation and create 15 jobs, and in health care and create 28 jobs and on down the line. And then I could provide 26 weeks of unemployment for those whose benefits are being cut off.

I know the American people are focused as we honor the dead this coming weekend, and I will join them in cherishing those who fight for our freedom. But it is time for America to wake up. You are going to be hungry after 13 weeks. You need to stand up and fight for 26 weeks. That is what I believe we should be doing today.

Putting up this marshal rule does not allow us to collaborate and to work together. Let us work through tomorrow, let us work through Saturday, let us work through Sunday. Let us leave this place with a tax bill that really invests in America. Let us leave this place with 26 weeks of unemployment insurance for the single mothers and dads who are going to be facing eviction because they do not have the benefit.

Let us churn the economy by ensuring that those people who are without work who are looking for work because there are no jobs, still have the benefits to pay their mortgage and their rent and to buy the food.

Mr. Speaker, we are forcing this down the throats of the Members of Congress. I know we are better than this. This is not a good rule. We need to deliberate and work for a better economy for America because our economy is in shambles. I ask my colleagues to work together and vote against this.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to suggest a caution flag as we rush towards this free lunch-approach to governmental fiscal policy. We cannot have a world-class military and defense, world-class health care, education, cities, and culture, and suggest that no one has to pay for it. And we talk about tax cuts today as if they are going to stimulate the economy tomorrow with some type of selective amnesia, because it was right here on this floor just 2 years ago that we passed the largest tax cut supposedly in the history of the country. And it did not stimulate our economy.

Let us just take a look for a minute at where we are.

□ 1400

We have moved from hundreds of billions of dollars of surpluses to now having hundreds of billions of dollars of deficits. We had millions of Americans who were working who are now unemployed; and, even today, the unemployment registration rate in our country has increased again. Consumer confidence is down. Housing starts are down. And every single indicator, in

terms of economic health in our country, is troubling.

We have heard from the Chair of the Federal Reserve Board, Alan Greenspan, suggesting that this tax cut is very problematic in both the short term and the long term. He cautions the Congress that our combination of both spending and tax cuts risks the fiscal health of this Nation. And the Republican majority, I am sure, wants to say, well, we just need to get spending under control, as if the country should forget that they are in the majority, that they control spending both in the House and in the Senate, and they control the signature from the executive at the White House.

For so many years now we have been insisting on spending more on defense, we have been insisting on investing in a whole range of exotic weapons systems, and then we come to the floor and the majority offers us more and more tax cuts. The fiscal health of our country is in jeopardy. Future generations will have to pay. We should say to Americans, why do we not be mature, pay the bills as we go, rather than run the country into further deficit?

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this is a martial law rule, and that is appropriate because there are those in this House and in this country that think the role of all the representatives here is to march in a martial fashion behind the leadership of the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

So it is appropriate they bring this rule out today, a gag rule, to gag those of us that do not share the views of the majority leader, who might have an amendment or an alternative way to address the problems that American families face. They deny us that right. They have assured there will be no substitutes considered on this floor. It is their way or the highway. It is a martial America that they are supporting and appropriate they bring this rule up to do it.

Their ideas are so narrow and so extreme that they cannot stand to have them debated and voted upon, not so much worrying about the Democrats but worrying that some members of their own party could not be held in line against solid alternatives to do something for the millions of Americans that lack jobs in this Bush economy; to do something about the millions of Americans who lack insurance in this Bush economy; to do something about the children who are denied the opportunity to fulfill their full potential because of teacher freezes, because there are textbooks that will not be renewed in Texas.

Meanwhile, the President tells us that he has to break his promise on the "Leave No Child Behind" Act. He has come up with a mere \$9 billion, that is billion with a "B," billion dollars. He breaks his promise in the short period

of time that he advanced a bipartisan proposal for education that we all came behind. Now he will break his promise and not fulfill the promise he made to the American people. Though we do not have the money for our children to get access to new textbooks, we do not have enough money for that, we do have enough money for more tax breaks for those at the top of the economic ladder.

The budget deficit puts a hole in the pocket of every American every day of their lives. It threatens the very foundation of our culture. We must seize and act upon this historic opportunity to solve this, the most pressing issue facing the country.

Those are not my words, though I find them rather eloquent. They are the words of Treasury Secretary John Snow in 1995 but forgotten by him now that he has a new job in the administration. No "Snow job" can hide this administration's Mt. Everest of debt. Mr. Snow got a new job and a new viewpoint at the same time millions of Americans were losing their jobs in this sorry economy.

A few weeks ago, the President announced a tax cut of the size that will be imposed on America tonight and said that it was just a "little bitty" tax cut. Well, Mr. Snow is coming the same week and asking us to raise the debt ceiling by billions of dollars. Is that a "little bitty" increase? No, they practically need an extension ladder over there at the Treasury Department because they cannot get the debt ceiling raised fast enough before they are back having to go up a little higher and raise it some more.

Of course, they turn to us and say, "it is the people's money, give it back to them. It is their taxes." Well, it is the people's debt, too, and they are going to have a whole lot more of it. And not billions, but trillions, with a "T," trillions of dollars in additional debt if this lame economic policy, this sorry tax break, one after another writeoff for the rich, is imposed on the children and the grandchildren of America.

This is a borrow and spend Republican Party, and that is why they have to have martial rules because they cannot permit Congress to consider alternative proposals. They cannot have full and fair debate. They need everybody to line up in a line and stand to borrow more from the people of this country. A "no" vote is a vote for fiscal responsibility that ensures our children will not be burdened by today's excesses.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) for yielding me this time, and I rise in opposition to this martial rule, which essentially restricts debate. It does not permit the Democratic economic program to even be debated today.

Why not? What is the opposition afraid of? They have the votes on their

side. Why not even allow us to talk about our program?

Here is why. I remember back to that old saying, if you fool me once, shame on you. If you fool me twice, shame on me. But if you fool me thrice, well, my gosh, it is just a sad and deadly shame.

If we think back to 1981, when Vice President DICK CHENEY was then a Member of this House and head of the Republican Policy Group, he was involved in the Republican tax program enacted back in 1981. We had the worst job washout in American history. I was elected in 1983. It took us 15 years to balance this budget and to bring employment up, with the election of Bill Clinton and 8 years of economic growth inside this economy. And it was not easy.

When this administration took over, they blew \$1.3 billion in the first year and a half. Fifteen years of work flew out the window. Then with their tax bill that they passed back in 2001, what have we gotten in terms of employment? None. We have got the biggest job loss since World War II, over 3 million more jobs lost in this country. We have three people in this economy looking for every single job that is being created, and most of those jobs do not pay a living wage and they do not have health benefits.

So, fool me once, fool me twice, and now we have the third version that they are bringing up. This bill, what will it do? It is going to create more unemployment. It is no different than what was done back in 1981, no different than what was done back in 2001. Strike one, strike two, strike three. They ought to be out.

If we take a look at our country, we might ask ourselves the question: With 150,000 of our men and women, of our troops, now deployed in Afghanistan and Iraq, is it not amazing that what we do here at home under the Republican plan is reward the Wall Street brokers who just stole your 401(k) money? There is not a single American family that has not been affected. So we say to them, take more of our money. Take more of our money. The interesting thing about the Republican bill is that not a dime that is given to them has to be invested in the USA. We are going to have more job washout to China, to Mexico, and every single American community and worker knows what I am talking about.

So the Democratic plan provides a million jobs this year alone. It invests in the United States. It gives families security. It does not borrow against the Social Security trust funds, which is how they are covering their growing deficits, and it enacts responsible economic programs. That is what the Democratic bill does. It creates jobs this year, it does not add a penny to the deficit, and it preserves Social Security and Medicare, our Democratic legacy.

Fool me once, not me. Fool me twice, not me. Fool me thrice? How about you?

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We are seeing a very clear difference in philosophy and opinion on the floor of the House today between the parties. It was said before by one of our friends on the other side of the aisle that when we cut taxes, when we reduce the burden of taxation on the American people, that that is an imposition. That was the word. We impose this. Congress, it was said, will impose a tax cut on the American people.

We believe that when we relieve the tax burden on the American people, that that is not an imposition on the American people. We believe it is their money in the first place, and we are relieving the tax burden on the American people. We are imposing less taxes from Washington.

So it is an interesting difference of opinion, and I think it is a fundamental difference of opinion. I think the American people are seeing it today. What we believe is that we should return as much as we can of the people's money to the people, and that they are best suited and know best how to spend their own money. So it is a fundamental difference.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Yes, there is a difference between the two parties here. The other side would impose billions of dollars of debt on my 6-year-old granddaughter and my 3-year-old granddaughter and my 2-month-old granddaughter. I do not believe we should be doing that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Bush recession continues, and this job killer bill ensures that it will continue to continue. It imposes additional deficits on our budget and additional debt on the American people. It imposes higher interest rates on the American people. It will impose upon our teachers and our firefighters layoffs at a time when we need more jobs in the economy, because it virtually ensures that we will provide only very limited and inadequate aid to our States and cities that are falling on hard times right now.

If we look at the details, we become aware that this bill, whatever the arguments that were made in favor of it, is nothing more than an effort to hand as much cash as possible to the Bush class. We are told that it is going to help investments, but when we look at the details, we discover otherwise. Three details: It is temporary, it provides aid to children with huge trust funds, and it provides equal encouragement to invest in foreign corporations as domestic corporations.

At least that is what I am told orally about a bill that, in theory, has not been written yet but in fact is out in the press now.

What about it being temporary? The idea was that we were not just going to give a windfall to people who had already invested in stocks but that we were going to encourage people to invest more. Well, wait a minute. Municipal bonds are a nice investment for tax-free income. But who would buy a municipal bond today if 5 years from now all the income was going to be subject to tax? Nobody is going to invest in stocks long term because of a short-term window in which the dividends are tax free. Sure, if they already own the stock, they will enjoy not paying taxes.

Second, I am told that these same benefits are available to investments in foreign corporations. So if you invest in the Chinese people's low-wage corporation, you pay no American tax at the corporate level, of course, and no American tax at the domestic level, or a very low tax.

Finally, if you transfer half a million bucks worth of Rolls Royce stock to your 14-year-old daughter, in a couple of years she will be eligible to receive the dividends on that stock virtually tax free and then go out and buy a Rolls Royce with the dividend income. This is the Rolls Royce Investment Act, or I like to call it the Rolls Royce for Buffy Act.

□ 1415

The Bush recession continues, and this bill is carefully crafted to make sure it continues.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of talk, and my colleagues on my side of the aisle have suggested that we are traveling down a course we traveled before from 2 years ago when we were promised that a tax bill would create millions of new jobs and new opportunities for people. In fact, it did not.

Some will say there are reasons for that. The President will say, as he has said in speech after speech, that this country was attacked. We were. Our Nation responded with great resolve, determination, courage and charity; and our military has responded with unprecedented swiftness and effectiveness. Yet we in Congress have failed the American people, and the President has, in large part, as well. Instead of tailoring and adjusting a plan to conform to the realities of the day, we continue to offer the same rhetoric and the same plan that we offered when things were good, when things were bad, when things were really bad, and now at a time when things are compounded.

Some of my colleagues have come to the floor to detail the challenges that their States face. My colleague on the other side of the aisle, whom I have great respect for, the gentleman from

Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART), comes from a State which is running a big deficit. The President's brother is the Governor of that State. My Governor is faced with a \$500 million shortfall. Things are so bad in some States that they are releasing prisoners early to help meet or to close budget shortfalls. Something is wrong here in Congress and wrong with us in government when we pretend that these issues are either not ours to confront or not of our making, or somehow our ideas are the only and best ideas.

We could probably come up with a number of ways to stimulate the economy, a number of tax cuts to stimulate the economy. I have heard some say this dividend tax is unfair. The Tax Code is polluted with areas that unfair; inequities litter it. We should prioritize if we are going to clean up and undo some of the unfairness of the Tax Code.

It would seem to me the best thing we can do is to help our States. The President reluctantly agreed to include a \$20 billion package. I applaud him on that front. If anything, we should provide more for the States. Not only do we help governors avoid doing the two worse things during an economic downturn, which are to cut services and/or raise taxes, we also help them create more jobs because as you cut State programs, more and more people are laid off.

Those of us from rural areas understand the importance of rural hospitals and rural health care. When you close hospitals, not only do you compromise care, you cause a decline in the job market in those areas as well. I can only say to my friends, and there are those who have come to the floor and have talked about marching orders and even rubber-stamping, and there is great truth and great humor in a lot of the things that they have said. It is my hope that my friends on the other side of the aisle will pay some attention to what we are saying. We understand that they have the votes to ram things down and do what they choose to do. But remember, all of us represent people and all of us have to go home and explain to our Governors, to our mayors, and, more importantly, to our bosses whom we call constituents why we have not done more to assist cities and States, and for that matter the private sector, in creating more and more jobs.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have been hearing some interesting arguments today. I thought it was very interesting that one of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle said that by virtue of the fact that the tax cut is set to expire, or parts of it at the end of the year 2008, that that will diminish the incentive for people to invest in the stock market and have the stock market thus increase and contribute to economic growth.

But what was failed to be pointed out is that the opponents of the tax cut have so diligently fought the tax cut that they were able to reduce the amount of the tax cut for the American people, the reduction of taxes for the American people; and thus that portion will expire previously before we would have wanted it to have expired. I do not think it is logical to be able to say I am going to fight the tax cut. You reduce it, and then they say since it expires sooner than it was meant to, then its effectiveness is to be questioned. Wait a minute, do you want the tax cut or do you not want the tax cut?

In a sense I thought that was somewhat incoherent, that argument; but of course there is a right to make any argument in this wonderful body.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. FORD. If my reading is correct, and I have not been a part of any of the meetings, it appeared to me that one of the reasons that the tax cut was reduced from \$726 billion to \$550 billion to \$350 billion was because there was disagreement in the gentleman's own party between the two bodies, between the House and Senate.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. That is correct.

Mr. FORD. So we bear some of the responsibility, but some on the other side of the aisle also bear some of the responsibility.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Yes, there is no doubt about that. But what I was pointing to was that the argument was made that the incentive to invest in the stock market is reduced by virtue of the fact that that tax cut, that tax incentive, is sunsetted.

What I am saying is it is people who oppose the tax cut, from whatever party, and the argument was made against the effectiveness of the tax cut with regard to the dividends part by my distinguished colleague who is a Democrat. I was pointing out that I think it is inconsistent to want to have it both ways and then to say it sunsets, so it is not effective. I thought there was an inconsistency there, and some incoherence.

Mr. FORD. Fair enough.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. But the gentleman is right, there are Republicans in the other body that are responsible for reducing the effectiveness of what we are talking about. But what we strongly believe and what we want to do, and we are doing it to the best of our ability, is to reduce the tax burden on the American people.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) pointed out previously that the debt burden may be increased. We want to reduce the debt burden by incentivizing economic growth which will not only create jobs now, but also lessen the debt burden in the future.

That is what I was pointing out with regard to the point on the effectiveness of the dividend part. If you are against the tax cut, but then say it sunsets, so it is not effective, I thought that was an incoherent argument.

Mr. FORD. If the gentleman would continue to yield, with regard to the efforts the Congress made on behalf of the airline industry right after September 11 and not long ago in the war supplemental, which I thought was the right thing to do and I support it, does it not make sense also, because part of the argument on this side, and I think from some in the other body, to provide greater resources to States that are having to lay nurses and teachers off? And I could go on with our rhetoric, and the other side has rhetoric; but the reality is State governments are forced to make some bad decisions largely because the Governors cannot borrow money, and we can. I am just curious, the \$20 billion that was added on the Senate side, is that something that the other side would be supportive of? That was not included in the House bill.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I am not sure if it is. What we are doing with this rule is making possible for us to have that debate today, and obviously the people who have been involved in the negotiations will explain the details of what they ultimately end up with. We are trying to have that debate today, and that is why we have this rule.

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

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

The reasoning on the other side is very curious. I do recall in 2001 when they were promoting the first tax cut, the reason they gave for the tax cut was, oh, we have a surplus. Now we have this surplus, we need a tax cut so we can give that money back. Now we are in 2003 and we have a deficit, so we have to have a tax cut. Which one was it? It cannot be both. It cannot be we had a surplus, so we should have a tax cut; we have a deficit, so we should have a tax cut.

I find their logic very curious. Everyone would like a tax cut. The American public obviously would like to pay less in taxes; and certainly we could have made the argument for a tax cut in 2001, perhaps not as large as they did, but we certainly could have made a valid argument: we are running a surplus; we do not need all of this money. Some of us felt like the tax cut was so large it was going to plunge us into a deficit, and that is what has happened.

But it is hard to make the argument that now we are in a deficit, let us drive this country deeper into a deficit.

Mr. Speaker, if the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule. My amendment will allow the House to consider H.R. 2046, introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the Democratic Rebuilding America Through Job Creation plan.

I guess I can understand why the Republicans are rushing through what they are claiming is a conference process to come up with a so-called economic growth bill. Every hour the American people have to see what the Republicans are up to, the less they will like it. It is a proposal that hurts American families, it hurts the American economy, and just digs the deficit hole deeper.

In stark contrast to the conference agreement we will soon see here on the floor, the Democratic plan helps all Americans, not just the rich; and it helps the economy immediately. It provides middle-class tax cuts to stimulate demand; it gives tax incentives to all businesses, especially small businesses and U.S. manufacturing businesses; and unlike the Republican proposal, it is fiscally responsible.

Yes, if I were a Republican, I might not want to have to explain a vote against the Democratic Rebuilding America Through Job Creation plan. But guess what, that is not a good enough reason to deny Members a chance to debate and vote on this measure. It is a terrible disservice to the American people if we let our fear of criticism prevent a vote on this very effective and responsible plan.

Let me make it very clear that a "no" vote on the previous question will not stop consideration of the conference agreement. A "no" vote will allow the House to consider the Democratic job creation plan as a separate bill. However, a "yes" vote on the previous question will prevent the House from taking up this responsible alternative. Make no mistake, this vote is the only opportunity the House will have to consider the Rangel plan. I urge a "no" vote on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed in the RECORD immediately before the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we believe it is very important to be able to get to this debate. We need to pass this rule, and then we will debate this matter further. It is obviously a fundamental matter. We believe that we need to do everything that we can to incentivize economic growth and job creation. That is why we are bringing this matter to the floor today.

The material previously referred to by Mr. FROST is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES. 249 WAVING
2/3 CONSIDERATION FOR CONFERENCE REPORT
ON H. RES. 2

At the end of the resolution add the following new section:

"SEC. . Immediately after disposition of the resolution 249, it shall be in order with-

out intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2046) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to rebuild America through job creation. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except:

(1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Chairman and ranking Minority Member of the Committee on the Ways and Means; and

(2) on motion to recommit with or without instructions."

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on adoption of the resolution.

This will be a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 202, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 211]

YEAS—221

Aderholt	Cubin	Hensarling
Akin	Culberson	Herger
Bachus	Davis, Jo Ann	Hobson
Baker	Davis, Tom	Hoekstra
Ballenger	Deal (GA)	Hostettler
Barrett (SC)	DeLay	Houghton
Bartlett (MD)	DeMint	Hulshof
Barton (TX)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hunter
Bass	Diaz-Balart, M.	Isakson
Beauprez	Doolittle	Issa
Bereuter	Dreier	Istook
Biggert	Duncan	Janklow
Bilirakis	Dunn	Jenkins
Bishop (UT)	Ehlers	Johnson (CT)
Blackburn	Emerson	Johnson (IL)
Blunt	English	Johnson, Sam
Boehlert	Everett	Jones (NC)
Boehner	Feeney	Keller
Bonner	Ferguson	Kelly
Bono	Flake	Kennedy (MN)
Boozman	Fletcher	King (IA)
Bradley (NH)	Forbes	King (NY)
Brady (TX)	Fossella	Kingston
Brown (SC)	Franks (AZ)	Kirk
Brown-Waite,	Frelinghuysen	Kline
Ginny	Galleghy	Knollenberg
Burgess	Garrett (NJ)	Kolbe
Burns	Gerlach	LaHood
Burr	Gibbons	Latham
Burton (IN)	Gilchrest	LaTourette
Buyer	Gillmor	Leach
Calvert	Gingrey	Lewis (CA)
Camp	Goode	Lewis (KY)
Cannon	Goodlatte	Linder
Cantor	Goss	LoBiondo
Capito	Granger	Lucas (OK)
Carter	Graves	Manzullo
Castle	Green (WI)	Marshall
Chabot	Greenwood	McCotter
Chocola	Gutknecht	McCreery
Coble	Harris	McHugh
Cole	Hart	McInnis
Collins	Hastings (WA)	McKeon
Cox	Hayes	Mica
Crane	Hayworth	Miller (FL)
Crenshaw	Hefley	Miller (MI)

Miller, Gary
 Moran (KS)
 Murphy
 Musgrave
 Myrick
 Nethercutt
 Ney
 Northup
 Norwood
 Nunes
 Nussle
 Osborne
 Ose
 Otter
 Paul
 Pearce
 Pence
 Peterson (PA)
 Petri
 Pickering
 Pitts
 Platts
 Pomo
 Porter
 Portman
 Pryce (OH)
 Putnam
 Radanovich

NAYS—202

Abercrombie
 Ackerman
 Alexander
 Allen
 Andrews
 Baca
 Baird
 Baldwin
 Ballance
 Becerra
 Bell
 Berkley
 Berman
 Berry
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Blumenauer
 Boswell
 Boucher
 Boyd
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (OH)
 Brown, Corrine
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardin
 Cardoza
 Carson (IN)
 Carson (OK)
 Case
 Clay
 Clyburn
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costello
 Cramer
 Crowley
 Cummings
 Davis (AL)
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (FL)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (TN)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Deutsch
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Dooley (CA)
 Doyle
 Edwards
 Emanuel
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Etheridge
 Evans
 Fattah
 Filner
 Ford
 Frank (MA)
 Frost
 Gonzalez
 Gordon
 Green (TX)
 Grijalva

Gutierrez
 Hall
 Harman
 Hastings (FL)
 Hill
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hoeffel
 Holden
 Holt
 Honda
 Hookey (OR)
 Hoyer
 Inslee
 Israel
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 Jefferson
 John
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones (OH)
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick
 Kind
 Kleczka
 Kucinich
 Lampson
 Langevin
 Lantos
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lee
 Levin
 Lipinski
 Lofgren
 Lowey
 Lucas (KY)
 Lynch
 Majette
 Maloney
 Markey
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (MO)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McIntyre
 McNulty
 Meehan
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Menendez
 Michaud
 Millender
 Farr
 McDonald
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, George
 Mollohan
 Moore
 Moran (VA)
 Murtha
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal (MA)

Souder
 Stearns
 Sullivan
 Sweeney
 Taucredo
 Tauzin
 Teyler (NC)
 Terry
 Thomas
 Thornberry
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Toomey
 Turner (OH)
 Upton
 Vitter
 Walden (OR)
 Walsh
 Wamp
 Weldon (PA)
 Weller
 Whitfield
 Wicker
 Wilson (NM)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wolf
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)

Bonilla
 Combust
 Cunningham
 Foley

NOT VOTING—11
 Gephardt
 Hyde
 Kennedy (RI)
 Lewis (GA)
 Oxley
 Quinn
 Weldon (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1448

Mr. GUTIERREZ changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 202, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 212]

AYES—218

Aderholt
 Akin
 Bachus
 Baker
 Ballenger
 Barrett (SC)
 Bartlett (MD)
 Barton (TX)
 Bass
 Beauprez
 Bereuter
 Biggart
 Bishop (UT)
 Blackburn
 Blunt
 Boehlert
 Boehner
 Bonner
 Bono
 Boozman
 Bradley (NH)
 Brady (TX)
 Brown (SC)
 Burgess
 Burns
 Burr
 Burton (IN)
 Buyer
 Calvert
 Cannon
 Cantor
 Capito
 Carter
 Castle
 Chabot
 Chocola
 Coble
 Cole
 Collins
 Cox
 Crane
 Crenshaw
 Cubin
 Culberson
 Davis, Jo Ann
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeLay
 DeMint
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Doolittle
 Dreier
 Duncan
 Dunn

Ehlers
 Emerson
 English
 Everett
 Feeney
 Ferguson
 Flake
 Fletcher
 Forbes
 Fossella
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gallegly
 Garrett (NJ)
 Gerlach
 Gibbons
 Gilchrest
 Gillmor
 Gingrey
 Goode
 Goodlatte
 Goss
 Granger
 Graves
 Green (WI)
 Greenwood
 Gutknecht
 Harris
 Hart
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayes
 Hayworth
 Hefley
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Hobson
 Hoekstra
 Hostettler
 Houghton
 Hulshof
 Isakson
 Issa
 Istook
 Janklow
 Jenkins
 Johnson (CT)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones (NC)
 Keller
 Kelly
 Kennedy (MN)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kirk

Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Royce
 Ryan (WI)
 Ryun (KS)
 Saxton
 Schrock
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shaw
 Shays
 Sherwood
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simmons

Simpson
 Smith (MI)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Souder
 Stearns
 Sullivan
 Sweeney
 Tancredo
 Tauzin
 Taylor (NC)
 Terry
 Thomas
 Thornberry
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Toomey

NOES—202

Abercrombie
 Ackerman
 Alexander
 Allen
 Andrews
 Baca
 Baird
 Baldwin
 Ballance
 Becerra
 Bell
 Berkley
 Berman
 Berry
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Blumenauer
 Boswell
 Boucher
 Boyd
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (OH)
 Brown, Corrine
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardin
 Cardoza
 Carson (IN)
 Carson (OK)
 Case
 Clay
 Clyburn
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costello
 Cramer
 Crowley
 Cummings
 Davis (AL)
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (FL)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (TN)
 DeFazio
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Deutsch
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Dooley (CA)
 Doyle
 Edwards
 Emanuel
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Etheridge
 Evans
 Farr
 Fattah
 Filner
 Ford
 Frank (MA)
 Frost
 Gonzalez
 Gordon
 Green (TX)
 Grijalva
 Gutierrez

Hall
 Harman
 Hastings (FL)
 Hill
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hoeffel
 Holden
 Holt
 Honda
 Hoolley (OR)
 Hoyer
 Inslee
 Israel
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 Jefferson
 John
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones (OH)
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Kennedy (RI)
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick
 Kind
 Kleczka
 Kucinich
 Lampson
 Langevin
 Lantos
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lee
 Levin
 Lipinski
 Lofgren
 Lowey
 Lucas (KY)
 Lynch
 Majette
 Maloney
 Markey
 Marshall
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (MO)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McIntyre
 McNulty
 Meehan
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Menendez
 Michaud
 Millender
 McDonald
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, George
 Mollohan
 Moore
 Moran (VA)
 Murtha
 Napolitano
 Neal (MA)

NOT VOTING—14

Billirakis
 Bonilla
 Brown-Waite,
 Ginny
 Combust

Cunningham
 DeGette
 Foley
 Gephardt
 Hunter

Turner (OH)
 Upton
 Vitter
 Walden (OR)
 Walsh
 Wamp
 Weldon (FL)
 Weldon (PA)
 Weller
 Whitfield
 Wicker
 Wilson (NM)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wolf
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)

Oberstar
 Obey
 Olver
 Ortiz
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Peterson (MN)
 Pomeroy
 Price (NC)
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Reyes
 Rodriguez
 Ross
 Rothman
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sabo
 Sanchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sanders
 Sandlin
 Sandlin
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Scott (GA)
 Scott (VA)
 Serrano
 Sherman
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Solis
 Spratt
 Stark
 Markey
 Stenholm
 Strickland
 Stupak
 Tanner
 Tauscher
 Taylor (MS)
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Towns
 Turner (TX)
 Udall (CO)
 Udall (NM)
 Van Hollen
 Velazquez
 Vislosky
 Waters
 Watson
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Wexler
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Wynn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised they

have less than 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1455

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 212, I was attending the burial of a leading veteran from my district at Arlington National Cemetery. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2185, UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AMENDMENTS OF 2003

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 248 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 248

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2185) to extend the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 248 is a closed rule, providing for the consideration of H.R. 2185, an extension of the Federal Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Program. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate, evenly divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The rule also provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions. This is a fair rule and one that will expedite the debate of this important extension so that we can provide needed economic security to the unemployed.

H.R. 2185 will provide for a 13-week extension of benefits for the unemployed. This legislation once again pro-

vides a total of 26 weeks of benefits to those in designated "high unemployment" States.

The extension of benefits under the Federal Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Program is set to have expired at the end of this month. I am pleased to bring this rule to the floor as this House responds to those who are without work. With passage of this bill, we ensure there is no break in essential benefits to families across the country.

H.R. 2185 provides over \$7 billion in extended Federal unemployment benefits in addition to the \$16 billion that this Congress has previously approved for both State and Federal unemployment. With the original legislation in March of 2002 and the first extension in January of this year, Congress has succeeded in assuring those families in need will have the funds precisely to put food on the table and pay for child care so that they can focus on becoming employed once again. In fact, this extension will help 2.5 million people in addition to the 5 million that have been helped through previous extensions.

I would like to highlight the previous work by this body to not only provide Federal unemployment benefits but also \$8 billion to the individual States for use in their individual unemployment programs.

□ 1500

I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman THOMAS) for his leadership and the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) for sponsoring this important legislation. H.R. 2185 is important legislation, important to the continued economic health of families in all of the 50 States.

Mr. Speaker, hopefully this should be a bipartisan effort to provide benefits to the unemployed, and this rule allows this Chamber to consider it and consider it today. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. Once again, the Republican leadership is turning its back on working Americans. Last night, President Bush told over 7,500 wealthy Republican donors that this is a strong and compassionate country.

Mr. Speaker, this economy is anything but strong, and this leadership is anything but compassionate. I am sure the people in that crowd, the crowd that raised \$22 million for the Republican Party, cheered and clapped their hands every time somebody mentioned the Republican tax bill, or, as some have called it, the "No Millionaire Left Behind Bill." But what about the rest of the country? What about the people struggling to find work? They do not have as much to cheer about.

Let us look at the facts: over 2.7 million jobs have been lost since President Bush took office in 2001; long-term unemployment is at a 30-year high; the average length of unemployment is the highest since 1984; the economy has lost 500,000 jobs in the last 3 months; there are currently three unemployed workers competing for every available job.

Mr. Speaker, people are out of work, and they need help. The Republican leadership's solution is to be dragged, kicking and screaming, into doing the absolute minimum. Their proposal will continue to leave over 1 million unemployed workers in the cold.

We have seen this rerun before. The Republican leadership voluntarily let unemployment insurance expire last December, forcing millions of Americans to worry about how they would provide for their families during and after the holidays. Two weeks later they proposed a plan that denied 1 million people unemployment insurance.

That is compassionate? These unemployed Americans are not deadbeats. They are our neighbors, friends, and relatives. They do not want a handout, they want a job, but they need help while they search for a job.

It is well established that unemployment insurance provides a better stimulus than dividend tax cuts. In fact, we will see a \$1.73 return for every dollar invested in unemployed Americans. As an investment tool, expanding unemployment insurance is good policy, but it is also the morally right thing to do. Unemployment insurance is a safety net for American workers who lose their jobs through no fault of their own, and we have a moral responsibility to not let these workers down.

Now, before this current economic crisis, no Congress had ever extended unemployment insurance without including workers who already exhausted their Federal unemployment. But for the second time this year, the Republican leadership lets these workers down by cutting out the unemployed who have already exhausted their coverage.

This leadership should be ashamed of themselves for this disingenuous and insufficient bill. But they are not.

The unemployed deserve better until the job market improves, and the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means has a bill to do just that. His bill would provide unemployment insurance for workers who are currently unemployed and are exhausting their coverage, and I support that plan.

But the Republican leadership has once again tossed aside the democratic process by denying the House the right to debate and vote on the proposed substitute offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL). At the end of this debate, I will move the previous question; and if defeated, I will offer an amendment to make the Rangel substitute in order.

The only reason I can think of to deny the Rangel substitute is that the