

would deprive America of the fruits of our labors and the investments that we made in these young people through our public education system.

I call upon the House and the Senate to immediately move to pass the DREAM Act and help make these young people proper Americans.

TSA MUST EXPLORE OTHER SCREENING ALTERNATIVES

(Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, our country continues fighting a deadly and determined terrorist enemy. Agencies such as Homeland Security and the TSA work hard to keep us safe and protect us. Still, American citizens are concerned with the newly implemented security measures that are both revealing and personal.

Concerned passengers and even TSA workers feel violated, confused, and uncomfortable. No one is sure what to expect. The American public rightfully wants answers from questions like what is the training, accountability, and selection process for the TSA? Two, what can we learn from other countries' security measures? Three, can we prevent body scan photos from public release? Four, how do we identify who is actually a risk? And isn't there another, more accurate way to do this, rather than treating everyone as a suspect?

People do not have confidence in the Federal Government's ability to protect their privacy, and TSA must explore other screening alternatives because national security and the liberty it aims to protect both matter.

TAX CUT FOR 98 PERCENT OF TAXPAYERS

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for fairness, for equality, and to simply stand up for what is right. I support a tax cut for our Nation's working families and middle income community. In my district, that includes 98 percent of taxpayers, over 342,000 individuals. What I do not support, and what our Nation simply cannot afford, is a tax cut for millionaires and billionaires.

In fact, Republicans are holding hostage the extension of unemployment benefits at the expense of tax cuts. Six thousand eight hundred individuals in my district make over \$250,000 a year. Conversely, 6,400 individuals in my district will lose their unemployment benefits at the end of this month. The choice—6,800 billionaires and millionaires, or 6,400 hardworking families that will not be able to pay their bills, put food on their table, or heat their

homes on a cold winter's night. I stand with the middle income and working families of my district.

And what happens to the local economy? If we do not extend unemployment benefits, my district alone could see the loss of tens of millions of dollars in economic benefits, including small business losses each and every month.

Mr. Speaker, the moral and economic choice is clear. I stand with our working families and our middle income community.

□ 1030

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF MOTHER TERESA'S BIRTH

(Mr. FORTENBERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on August 26, 2010, the world began the year-long celebration of the centenary of the birth of Mother Teresa, the Blessed Teresa of Calcutta. Mother Teresa's enduring legacy of humility and sacrifice has been heralded across cultures and in many languages throughout the world. And just earlier this year, the United States Postal Service created this stamp in commemoration of Mother Teresa's life's work.

Mother Teresa worked among the poor in conditions that would weaken the hardest. Yet she stood with strength before presidents, kings, and queens. She saved lives and gave countless thousands hope, hope for the leper, hope for the expectant mother who had been abandoned by family and community, hope for the orphaned child who only wanted a helping heart and a home, hope for the indigent poor who sought a meal and belonging.

The United States Congress honored Mother Teresa with a U.S. Congressional Gold Medal in 1997. And as we commemorate the 100th anniversary of her birth, I urge my colleagues to join me in again uplifting Mother Teresa's life's work, especially during this time when the world is yearning for meaning.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4853, MIDDLE CLASS TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2010, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1745 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1745

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4853) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend

the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time through the legislative day of December 3, 2010, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). The gentlewoman from Maine is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I am pleased to yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). All time yielded during consideration of this rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1745 provides a closed rule for consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 4853. The rule makes in order a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 4853 with the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying the resolution. The rule provides 1 hour of debate on the motion equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the motion except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. The rule provides that the Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. Finally, the rule allows the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules through the legislative day of December 3, 2010. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the minority leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity to do the right thing and put

American workers ahead of millionaires and billionaires. This should be our priority and shouldn't be a tough choice to make. Today we can focus on economic growth to help those who are suffering from this recession and to provide permanent, equitable tax relief for the middle class.

These should not be controversial positions. They aren't and they shouldn't be. The economic growth that all Americans can share in ought to be a top priority for every elected official, and lowering the tax burden for working families shouldn't be any kind of a partisan fight.

After the last administration and the previous Congress spent billions of dollars starting two foreign wars and bailing out the big banks that ran roughshod over our economy, isn't it only fair that we do more to help out those who are struggling to find work and to make ends meet? Today we are simply voting on whether or not to protect the middle class and to make sure working families do not suffer needlessly as winter approaches. Nothing more, nothing less.

This is not political showmanship or a partisan game. We are doing the work the American people asked us to do. We are not voting on whether or not to extend tax cuts for the wealthy. We are only voting on extending tax cuts for the middle class, and this is something I sincerely believe we should all agree on.

One of the biggest pieces of misinformation about ending tax cuts for the wealthy is that it would hurt small businesses, which is simply not true. The bill we are talking about today extends tax cuts for incomes up to \$250,000. That covers 97 percent of all small businesses in the United States. And let's be clear about another thing: For all small businesses, the cuts continue for their first \$250,000 of profit.

If we really want to help small businesses, let's offer real direct benefits. Let's help them access funding to grow, offer larger tax deductions for purchasing equipment or create incentives to hire more workers.

I am glad many business owners in my State, the State of Maine, have been able to see through this misinformation. Jim Wellehan, who owns one of the largest shoe store chains in the State, has recently come out against tax cuts for the wealthy because they offer no benefit to his business or his employees. He recently said it makes no sense from any perspective to preserve the tax cuts for the wealthiest people in this country. It will just increase the wealth gap and create more of a social and economic problem.

Jim hits on a critical point. Over the last 30 years, the wealthiest have gotten richer and richer compared to everyone else. In 1980 the average income of the country's top .01 percent of earners was 180 times that of the bottom 90 percent. Today that number is 1,000 times. Meanwhile taxes for the rich

have gone down dramatically. So as the wealthiest take a larger and larger piece of the pie, they have given less and less back to the public infrastructure, to our communities, and to the people who helped create that prosperity.

The truth about tax breaks for the ultra rich is that they are very, very expensive. Cutting taxes for those making over \$250,000 will add \$700 billion to the deficit in the next 10 years alone. That's about the cost of the entire stimulus bill, and most economists agree it would do very little to stimulate the economy.

In January of this year, the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office analyzed 11 policy proposals and ranked them by how effective they would be in fueling economic recovery.

Number one on that list was extending benefits for the unemployed because those dollars go immediately into local economies and spur more spending. If only that was the bill we were voting on today.

What was number 11? Number 11 on that list was extending tax cuts for the wealthy. The benefit of those dollars going to the rich was marginal, because that money would be mostly saved, not spent. That's just not right.

I hope all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me today in supporting this commonsense bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1040

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I first want to express my appreciation to my very good friend and Rules Committee colleague, the gentlewoman from North Haven, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as I listen to the very thoughtful statement of my friend and Rules Committee colleague, I'm reminded of—and as I looked at news reports this morning, I guess I should say—as I listen to her statement and then look at the reports that we have this morning, I'm reminded of the 1992 Presidential campaign. And I would like to point to two very famous quotes from that 1992 Presidential campaign.

First, in the general election you will recall that Bill Clinton, George Herbert Walker Bush and Ross Perot all ran against each other. I know the Speaker pro tempore understands very well, coming from Texas, that that was a fascinating campaign 18 years ago. And there was a very famous Vice-Presidential debate. And in that debate, the great, highly decorated Admiral James Stockdale, who I was happy before his passing to have as a good friend, famously began the debate by saying, Who am I, and why am I here?

Now, Mr. Speaker, we already have reports this morning that the negotiators have come together and decided

there will be probably a 2-year extension of the effort to ensure that we don't increase taxes on any Americans over the next 2 years. And in light of that, we are now resorting to a little more than a political ploy saying, well, we've all come together and agreed that we don't want increased taxes on middle income Americans, and so what we should do is let's vote for this and agree on it when, in fact, we're arguing that we should not increase taxes on any Americans.

Now to my second quote from the 1992 Presidential campaign. Senator Paul Tsongas, whose widow, Niki, serves very well here in the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, said very famously, and I quoted him, and she corrected the quote when I told her that I quoted him widely, I quoted him as follows: Senator Tsongas in the 1992 Presidential campaign when he was challenging Bill Clinton in the primary said, The problem with my Democratic Party is that they love employees but they hate employers. And Mrs. Tsongas reminded me that he apparently said, You can't love employees without loving employers. Well, either way, it's very clear that when you look at where we are, it gets back to that famous Lincoln line: you can't lift up the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. And so all we're saying is that as we look at the challenges that we're facing today, focusing on job creation and economic growth is something that we should do.

And I believe that every Democrat and every Republican in this institution clearly wants to see our economy get back on track. They want to see us grow. They want to see us emerge. No one wants to see the United States of America diminished to the level that was predicted by Dave Cote, a member of the debt commission, the head of Honeywell, who in his statement yesterday said that at the rate we are going, the United States of America will become, in fact, a second-rate Nation. No one, no Democrat or Republican, wants that to happen. And so why don't we use empirical evidence that will prove that we can take a course that will get this economy back on track.

Now, my friend says that we have a cost of \$700 billion. If we fail to increase taxes on those small businesses and those who are upper income wage earners, a \$700 billion cost is what is claimed. In fact, if you talk to economist after economist, as I have, that is, in fact, not the case. Just yesterday a very prominent economist met with a number of Members of this body pointing to the fact that if you do, if you do, Mr. Speaker, actually keep those taxes low, we will actually see an increase in the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury.

And I point to that again, as I have time and again here. I believe we should be utilizing the bipartisan—the bipartisan model, put forward first by a great Democratic President. We will

mark the 50th anniversary of John F. Kennedy's inaugural address. He was elected 50 years ago. On January 20, there is going to be a great celebration here in this Capitol marking the 50th anniversary of the great inaugural speech, which many of us have been quoting since we were children, of John F. Kennedy.

And we should be utilizing the model put forward by Ronald Reagan, who on February 6 of next year will mark his 100th birthday. And that economic model is one which says that making sure that we reduce marginal tax rates will actually grow the economy and create an increase in the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we look at where we are today, you have economists from even on the left who will say—even Keynesian economists—that the notion in a down economy—and we all know we have a 9½ percent unemployment rate and we heard the sad news about housing sales that came out this morning—we all know that in a down economy, even the Keynesian economists will say that increasing taxes is a prescription for failure. It actually undermines the potential for economic growth.

Now, we had quite a meeting in the Rules Committee last night, Mr. Speaker, when we brought this measure up, and the distinguished ranking member soon-to-be chairman of the Trade Subcommittee, the gentleman from Houston, Mr. BRADY, referred to what was going on here as political theater. I said that I believe that to be very generous. This is sleight of hand, a political ploy. There are all kinds of pejoratives that can be used to describe the process that we have here.

We have a closed rule, as my friend said, and I argued that I'm for an open rule, which is what I'm often arguing for, and we hope to be able to have that in the 112th Congress as often as possible, but I argued for a modified closed rule, a modified closed rule for consideration of this measure.

Now, what would that mean, Mr. Speaker? If we were to have a modified closed rule, it would mean that we would simply allow this House to have a vote, which is under the present structure before us going to be denied, a vote that has been requested by 31 Democrats and all Republicans. And, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we could, in fact, have a strong bipartisan vote in this House to extend, to ensure that we don't increase taxes on any Americans at this time. And this rule would allow that.

I offered an amendment that would simply say, okay, let's just provide the ranking member, Mr. CAMP, of the Ways and Means Committee, a chance to offer one substitute which would basically mean we are not going to increase taxes on small businesses, and we are not going to increase taxes on any Americans. I offered that amendment, and on a party-line vote it was rejected.

It was fascinating, Mr. Speaker, to hear the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, my very good friend, SANDY LEVIN, say that making sure we don't increase taxes on middle income Americans is something we can all agree on. And, yes, Mr. Speaker, we can agree on that. But I think it is very evident that this House could, with a majority vote, ensure that we don't increase taxes on any Americans during these very troubling, difficult economic times.

So I would argue that I think it's very important for us, as an institution, to realize that it's really a joke that has been put before us, tragically, during a time when the American people are hurting. I have an unemployment rate in part of the area I'm privileged to represent in Southern California, Mr. Speaker, that is in excess of 15 percent. We have a statewide unemployment rate in the largest State of the Union, the largest, most important State of the Union, the State of California, we have a 12½ percent unemployment rate. People are hurting. And so to do anything other than ensure that we don't increase taxes on the people who are struggling to create jobs for our fellow Americans is something that we have a responsibility to do.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule and allow us to let the House work its will and have what I am totally convinced would be a strong, strong vote in favor of ensuring that we don't increase taxes on any Americans.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1050

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, before I yield time to one of my colleagues, I want to answer a couple of things that my good colleague from California mentioned. Soon his party will be in power, and I am confident he will be the chair of the Rules Committee and the Rules Committee will be very open perhaps at that time to have more open rules and to change the process. So I look forward to, as a sophomore Member, learning how a different process will be conducted by the other side of the aisle.

I do want to remind him that during 12 years when his party was in control, there was never a tax bill that came to the floor which allowed for amendments. I don't know if that process will change in the future. It certainly wasn't that way in the past.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentlelady yield on that point?

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I will tell you about the 12 years we were in the majority, we did often provide substitutes. So all we are asking for, as I said, all I asked for on this measure is not an open rule, a modified closed rule, which would have provided simply one bite at the apple, one alternative, which is out of

respect to the Democrats in this House who would very much like to have a chance to vote to ensure that we don't increase taxes on any American.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Thank you for making that point. I think it is slightly different from the other point of saying that tax bills never were allowed to be amended in the last 12 years. But I look forward to modified open rules or open rules or whatever process we will be working with in the future. That isn't what we have before us today.

I do want to comment that while you were kind of referring to this as political theater, I also recall that you asked for 3 hours of debate on this; and if it is truly political theater, that would be tying up a lot of the people's time to have us conduct this debate for 3 hours if, in fact, you do not consider it serious debate. I mean, in my opinion, you and I just have a strong disagreement. Our two parties and many of our Members disagree on where the appropriate place to have tax cuts is.

We are putting this bill on the floor today because we believe it is important to extend tax cuts for the middle class, that that has the greatest benefit to our economy. And as the OMB and other studies have shown us, tax cuts for the wealthiest to the country just do not stimulate the economy. The money does not go where we think it needs to go to create more jobs, and it is not a good expenditure of \$700 billion, which is what this will cost us over the next decade in a time when we are clamoring to find ways to reduce the deficit.

So I find it unfathomable that there would be any objection to taking a vote on what is clearly the most agreed upon part of our tax cuts here and then allowing for other debate on the rest of the package. So for me, this is a logical way to bring this to the floor. I am pleased that we have this opportunity here.

I am a little frustrated every time I hear this tried to be portrayed as the real argument is only about small businesses. You know, 2 percent of the small businesses in our country are the ones that will be affected by this.

I disagree with your statement that Democrats love employees and dislike employers. Many of us on this side of the aisle are employers. I am an employer. I have a small business, and I actually feel pretty good about myself.

Mr. DREIER. If the gentlelady will yield, I was simply quoting the late Senator Paul Tsongas. It wasn't my quote. I was simply quoting Senator Tsongas.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I do appreciate that, and I am glad to know that dear Senator Tsongas' wife has corrected you on the appropriate way to use that quote. But either way, it was something that you brought to the floor to make the point that somehow you think this bill is put forward so that Democrats can show their disapproval of employers. And I can speak

personally that I work closely with employers in my district. I am an employer and think there are employers who will benefit under this as well. That is why I quoted, in my own remarks, Jim Wellehan who owns a chain of shoe stores in our State who said: I am not in favor of a bill that would give tax cuts to the wealthy because it doesn't do anything to help my employees or my business. And that, in fact, is what he is concerned about. You know, employers need customers, which are those employees, and that is why we consider it so critical to make sure that we do something to benefit those people who will be purchasing.

Just one other comment that I had in my notes here today from a small business owner in Lincoln, Nebraska. People talk about the \$250,000 without talking about that as net profit. Here is how he described it: A lot of people don't understand how small business works. We reinvest in our business. We try to minimize the amount of taxable income we have. I went out and bought an \$80,000 piece of equipment. I did it so I could reduce my taxes. The only people I can think of who could honestly call themselves small businesses that this would affect would be stock brokers and lawyers.

That is what Rick Poore, owner of a Lincoln, Nebraska, clothing firm who employs 30 people thinks about this.

Well, if in fact the 2 percent we are trying to help today are stock brokers and lawyers, I don't think the American public is clamoring for them to have another tax break, and I think people aren't explaining and displaying an understanding of how business works. This is about net profit for small businesses, which even reduces further the number of businesses who will be affected by this.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO).

Ms. HIRONO. I thank the gentlewoman from Maine for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of the rule and the bill we are voting on today, the Middle Class Tax Relief Act. This bill will help millions of Americans who are trying to make ends meet by providing them with sorely needed tax relief. The Middle Class Tax Relief Act permanently extends the tax cuts for middle class taxpayers so that individuals who make less than \$200,000 a year, under \$250,000 for joint filers, will get the tax relief they need. This legislation would help about 323,000 lower- and middle-income families in my congressional district alone.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have made it clear that they won't vote for this bill because it doesn't meet their highest priority—continuing the status quo of providing tax breaks for the wealthiest 2 percent of Americans. On the one hand, they claim to be concerned about reducing the \$13.8 trillion national debt, opposing an extension of unemployment ben-

efits for the nearly 2 million Americans who desperately need the assistance, including more than 4,000 in Hawaii. Not only is this reprehensible, it is bad math. A recent Labor Department report shows for every dollar spent on unemployment insurance, \$2 are reinvested into the economy.

On the other hand, continuing tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires, the richest 2 percent of Americans, would add a whopping \$700 billion to our deficit over 10 years. These tax breaks would not trickle-down to create more jobs or help our economic recovery. In fact, they would add to our deficit. And, by the way, these richest taxpayers will also get the benefit of this tax relief in this bill for their first \$200,000 of income. Why should this group of taxpayers then get an additional benefit that 98 percent of Americans will not.

Mr. Speaker, this is about fairness. We need to fight for working families and let the tax breaks for the wealthy expire so that they can start to pay their fair share of taxes. Today's vote on this bill will let the American people, the 98 percent who don't make \$200,000 a year, including 323,000 families in Hawaii, know who is on their side fighting for them.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would say to both of my colleagues who are both good friends of mine that as I listen to the arguments that have been put forward, the standard old class warfare, us versus them, rich versus poor, is an argument that has failed for years and years and years. I think all we need to do is look at the November 2 election. There was a rejection of this divisive tone which we regularly hear around here: the haves and the have-nots.

The fact of the matter is any Member of this House who votes in favor of the measure that is going to be before us is voting for a tax increase. They are voting in favor of increasing taxes on American investors and small businesses in this country. There is all kinds of dispute about this: how many are small businesses, 2 percent. We have evidence that it is substantially higher than that. But if there are any small businesses that are out there trying to create jobs and this policy of increasing taxes undermines them and inhibits their ability to say to a person in this country who is seeking a job opportunity that they can't have it because of this burden that is being inflicted, this is clearly wrong.

Now, again, on the notion of this \$700 billion, this \$700 billion, the cost, and we are exacerbating the deficit, that is preposterous. If we can get people with a 9.4 percent unemployment rate, 9.6 percent, as I said, in my State, 12.5 percent unemployment rate, if we can get people from the unemployment rolls onto the working rolls, that in and of itself is evidence that we will increase

the flow of revenue to the Federal treasury.

□ 1100

Why? We'll diminish the cost of unemployment benefits, and we will have people who are working as productive members of society who are paying taxes. So this \$700 billion figure is a ridiculous one.

Mr. Speaker, I will say again: Any Member of this House who votes in favor of the measure that is before us is going to be voting to increase taxes on working Americans, and it is just plain wrong.

Let me just close again by saying that, when I used the term "political theater," I was quoting the very thoughtful ranking member of the Trade Subcommittee of Ways and Means, Mr. BRADY, who came before us in the Rules Committee and said, This is political theater.

Why? There are reports today that the negotiators from the White House and both Houses of Congress have come to an agreement that we are going to ensure that we don't increase taxes on any Americans for at least 2 years. Those are the reports that we have that have come out. So we are here on the House floor, denying this institution an opportunity to vote on a proposal like that.

We in the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, simply said, Gosh, since 31 Democrats have signed a letter saying they believe it would be a mistake to increase taxes on any Americans, the House should have a chance to vote on that.

I offered that proposal upstairs last night in the Rules Committee. A party-line vote.

The Democrats said, Oh, no. We're not going to allow what would clearly be a majority of this House, I believe, if we were to actually have a vote, to work its will. We are going to resort to legerdemain and not allow a motion to recommit.

This bill before us, Mr. Speaker, happens to be the airport and airway bill. It's basically the FAA bill. They did that to deny even an opportunity for a motion to recommit. Now, I know that's all inside baseball stuff, but it's inside baseball stuff that led the American people to cast the votes that they did on November 2, because it was a year ago last June when this "read the bill" measure came forward, when we had the 300-page amendment dropped in our laps at 3 o'clock in the morning in the Rules Committee, and we didn't have a chance to read it. So the American people started looking at what takes place in this institution, and on November 2, they rejected it.

Well, with what we are doing here today, it is obviously an indication that this majority that is now in charge is tone deaf. They don't understand the message that the American people sent, because they have spent time looking here at what is going on, and that is why we have focused on increasing transparency, disclosure, and accountability.

So, as they have done that, they've said, Don't do the kinds of things that you are contemplating doing right now.

The bottom line is, by resorting to legerdemain, we are going to end up increasing taxes on working Americans.

I say, in closing, Mr. Speaker, that any Member of this House who votes in favor of this measure is voting to increase taxes on the men and women in this country who are out there saving, investing, and working to create jobs for our fellow Americans, and it is just plain wrong. So I urge a "no" vote on the previous question and a "no" vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I thank the gentleman from California for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, before I close, I would just say again that I think we have a difference of opinion on the semantics here.

You want to argue that, if we don't continue tax cuts/tax breaks for the wealthiest people in this country that we are increasing taxes. I would say it is time we let those tax breaks end, those tax breaks that went on for too long and that did nothing, in my opinion, to stimulate the economy.

I also just want to add my own comment.

You know, there is a lot of interpretation about November 2. The voters cast their votes. Things changed dramatically. Many of us who have been in politics over time know that sometimes you're in the majority, sometimes you're in the minority; sometimes your ideas come out on top, and sometimes they don't.

But I have to say personally, in interpreting my own district, voters heard me say every day that I pledge to continue the tax breaks for the middle class but that I will not vote to extend them for the wealthiest in this country. I debated my opponent, and it was written about in the newspaper. There were endless interviews when I made it very clear as to what my point of view was and why I thought it was important. I come from a State where small business rules, where I am a small business owner, and where I said to people, You know, this isn't a small business issue; this is about helping the wealthiest people in this country.

I just have to say, when I go back and look at the November 2 election, oddly enough, I'm still here, and I intend to be here on January 5 and to be sworn in again. Somehow, the voters in my district said, Go for it. We don't want to see any more tax breaks for the wealthy. We, in fact, only want to see tax cuts for the middle class.

So I am interpreting November 2 to mean we are doing the right thing on the floor today. We are putting forward the one measure that allows us to make sure we can separate the tax cuts for the wealthiest from the tax cuts for the middle class. That is what we are doing here today.

Let me just close, Mr. Speaker.

Ten years ago, Congress passed a package of tax cuts with the lion's share of the benefits going to the wealthiest of the wealthy. The stated intent was to grow and secure our economy. Today, millions of families across this country are struggling. They are worried about finding work. They are barely covering their monthly expenses.

I have to ask my colleagues: Do your constituents feel more economically secure than they did 10 years ago?

Since these cuts took place, we have gone from a balanced Federal budget to troubling deficits. We have seen the middle class weaken, and we have experienced the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression. The billions we have given in handouts to the super rich have been major contributors to all of those realities.

Today, we have a historic opportunity to support the middle class, to show real Americans that we as Members of Congress are hearing their frustrations and their anger. We can stand up today and say that we are going to help the vast majority of Americans, that we care deeply about the economic security of the middle class and that, for once, Congress is going to act in the best interest of the middle class.

I strongly stand behind H.R. 4853, extending the tax cuts for middle class families and businesses who make up to \$250,000. They need a break, and we should be doing even more for them. It is simply outrageous to suggest that we should hold these tax cuts hostage in order to continue a failed policy that has weakened our economy, has placed a bigger burden on working families and has only been effective in making the rich richer. I urge all of my colleagues to support middle class Americans and to vote for the underlying bill.

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

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. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 1745, if ordered, and suspending the rules with regard to House Resolution 1638, House Resolution 1598, and House Resolution 1576, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 186, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 596]

YEAS—224

Ackerman	Hare	Ortiz
Andrews	Harman	Owens
Arcuri	Heinrich	Pallone
Baca	Herseht Sandlin	Pascarell
Baird	Higgins	Pastor (AZ)
Baldwin	Hill	Payne
Barrow	Himes	Perlmutter
Becerra	Hinchey	Perriello
Berkley	Hinojosa	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Hirono	Pingree (ME)
Bishop (NY)	Hodes	Polis (CO)
Blumenauer	Holden	Pomeroy
Bocchieri	Holt	Price (NC)
Boswell	Honda	Quigley
Boyd	Hoyer	Rahall
Brady (PA)	Inslee	Rangel
Braley (IA)	Israel	Reyes
Brown, Corrine	Jackson (IL)	Richardson
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Rodriguez
Capps	(TX)	Rothman (NJ)
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Carnahan	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Carney	Kagen	Rush
Carson (IN)	Kanjorski	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Salazar
Chandler	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Chu	Kildee	T.
Clarke	Kilpatrick (MI)	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Kilroy	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kind	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Schauer
Cohen	Kissell	Schiff
Connolly (VA)	Klein (FL)	Schwartz
Conyers	Kosmas	Scott (GA)
Costello	Kucinich	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Langevin	Serrano
Critz	Larsen (WA)	Sestak
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Shea-Porter
Cuellar	Lee (CA)	Sherman
Cummings	Levin	Shuler
Dahlkemper	Lipinski	Sires
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Skelton
Davis (IL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Slaughter
Davis (TN)	Lowey	Smith (WA)
DeGette	Luján	Snyder
DeLauro	Lynch	Space
Deutch	Maffei	Speier
Dicks	Maloney	Spratt
Dingell	Markey (CO)	Stark
Doggett	Markey (MA)	Stupak
Donnelly (IN)	Marshall	Sutton
Doyle	Matsui	Tanner
Driehaus	McCarthy (NY)	Teague
Edwards (MD)	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Edwards (TX)	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Ellison	McGovern	Tierney
Ellsworth	McMahon	Titus
Engel	McNerney	Tonko
Eshoo	Meeks (NY)	Towns
Etheridge	Melancon	Tsongas
Farr	Michaud	Van Hollen
Fattah	Miller (NC)	Velázquez
Filner	Miller, George	Visclosky
Foster	Mollohan	Walz
Frank (MA)	Moore (KS)	Wasserman
Fudge	Moore (WI)	Schultz
Garamendi	Moran (VA)	Waters
Giffords	Murphy (CT)	Watson
Gonzalez	Murphy (NY)	Watt
Gordon (TN)	Murphy, Patrick	Weiner
Green, Al	Nadler (NY)	Welch
Green, Gene	Napolitano	Wilson (OH)
Grijalva	Neal (MA)	Woolsey
Gutierrez	Nye	Wu
Hall (NY)	Obey	Yarmuth
Halvorson	Oliver	

NAYS—186

Aderholt	Bono Mack	Cassidy
Adler (NJ)	Boozman	Castle
Akin	Boren	Chaffetz
Altmire	Boustany	Childers
Austria	Brady (TX)	Coble
Bachus	Bright	Coffman (CO)
Bartlett	Broun (GA)	Cole
Barton (TX)	Brown (SC)	Conaway
Bean	Buchanan	Cooper
Berry	Burgess	Costa
Biggert	Burton (IN)	Crenshaw
Bilbray	Calvert	Culberson
Billirakis	Camp	Davis (AL)
Bishop (UT)	Campbell	Davis (KY)
Blackburn	Cantor	Dent
Blunt	Cao	Diaz-Balart, L.
Boehner	Capito	Diaz-Balart, M.
Bonner	Carter	Djou

Dreier	LaTourette	Rehberg	Bishop (GA)	Hinojosa	Pascrell	Harper	McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (MI)
Duncan	Latta	Reichert	Bishop (NY)	Hirono	Pastor (AZ)	Hastings (WA)	McCaul	Rohrabacher
Ehlers	Lee (NY)	Roe (TN)	Blumenauer	Hodes	Payne	Heller	McClintock	Rooney
Emerson	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (AL)	Boccieri	Holden	Pelosi	Hensarling	McCotter	Ros-Lehtinen
Flake	Linder	Rogers (KY)	Boswell	Holt	Perlmutter	Herger	McHenry	Roskam
Fleming	LoBiondo	Rogers (MI)	Brady (PA)	Honda	Pingree (ME)	Herseth Sandlin	McIntyre	Ross
Forbes	Lucas	Rohrabacher	Braley (IA)	Hoyer	Polis (CO)	Himes	McKeon	Royce
Fortenberry	Luetkemeyer	Rooney	Brown, Corrine	Inslee	Price (NC)	Hoekstra	Mica	Ryan (WI)
Fox	Lummis	Ros-Lehtinen	Butterfield	Israel	Quigley	Hunter	Miller (FL)	Scalise
Franks (AZ)	Lungren, Daniel	Roskam	Capps	Jackson (IL)	Rahall	Inglis	Miller (MI)	Shallise
Frelinghuysen	E.	Ross	Capuano	Jackson Lee	Rangel	Issa	Miller, Gary	Schock
Gallegly	Mack	Sessions	Carnahan	(TX)	Reyes	Jenkins	Minnick	Sensenbrenner
Garrett (NJ)	Manzullo	Royce	Carney	Johnson (GA)	Richardson	Johnson (IL)	Mitchell	Sessions
Gerlach	Matheson	Ryan (WI)	Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Rodriguez	Johnson, Sam	Moran (KS)	Shimkus
Gingrey (GA)	McCarthy (CA)	Scalise	Castor (FL)	Kagen	Rothman (NJ)	Jones	Moran (VA)	Shuler
Gohmert	McCaul	Schmidt	Childers	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard	Jordan (OH)	Murphy, Tim	Shuster
Goodlatte	McClintock	Schock	Chu	Kaptur	Ruppersberger	King (IA)	Myrick	Simpson
Granger	McCotter	Sensenbrenner	Clarke	Kennedy	Rush	King (NY)	Neugebauer	Smith (NE)
Graves (GA)	McHenry	Sessions	Kildee	Kildee	Ryan (OH)	Kingston	Nunes	Smith (NJ)
Graves (MO)	McIntyre	Shimkus	Kilpatrick (MI)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Salazar	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Olson	Smith (TX)
Griffith	McKeon	Shuster	Kilroy	Kilroy	Sánchez, Linda	Kline (MN)	Paul	Space
Guthrie	Mica	Simpson	Kind	Kind	T.	Lamborn	Paulsen	Stearns
Hall (TX)	Miller (FL)	Smith (NE)	Kissell	Kissell	Sanchez, Loretta	Lance	Pence	Stutzman
Harper	Miller (MI)	Smith (NJ)	Klein (FL)	Klein (FL)	Sarbanes	Latham	Perriello	Sullivan
Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary	Smith (TX)	Kosmas	Kosmas	Schakowsky	LaTourette	Peters	Terry
Heller	Minnick	Stearns	Kratovil	Kratovil	Schauer	Latta	Peterson	Thompson (PA)
Hensarling	Mitchell	Stutzman	Kucinich	Kucinich	Schiff	Lee (NY)	Petri	Thornberry
Herger	Moran (KS)	Sullivan	Langevin	Langevin	Schwartz	Lewis (CA)	Pitts	Tiaht
Hoekstra	Murphy, Tim	Terry	Larsen (WA)	Larsen (WA)	Scott (GA)	Linder	Platts	Tiberi
Hunter	Myrick	Thompson (PA)	Larson (CT)	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)	Lipinski	Poe (TX)	Turner
Inglis	Neugebauer	Thornberry	Lee (CA)	Lee (CA)	Serrano	LoBiondo	Pomeroy	Upton
Issa	Nunes	Tiaht	Levin	Levin	Sestak	Lucas	Posey	Walden
Jenkins	Olson	Tiberi	Loeb sack	Loeb sack	Shea-Porter	Luetkemeyer	Price (GA)	Wamp
Johnson (IL)	Paul	Turner	Lummi	Lummi	Sherman	Radanovich	Radanovich	Westmoreland
Johnson, Sam	Paulsen	Upton	Dicks	Dicks	Sires	Reed	Reed	Whitfield
Jones	Pence	Walden	Dingell	Dingell	Skelton	E.	Rehberg	Wilson (SC)
Jordan (OH)	Peterson	Wamp	Doggett	Doggett	Slaughter	Mack	Reichert	Wittman
King (IA)	Petri	Westmoreland	Donnelly (IN)	Donnelly (IN)	Smith (WA)	Manzullo	Roe (TN)	Wolf
King (NY)	Pitts	Whitfield	Doyle	Doyle	Snyder	Marshall	Rogers (AL)	Young (AK)
Kingston	Platts	Wilson (SC)	Driehaus	Driehaus	Speier	Matheson	Rogers (KY)	Young (FL)
Kline (MN)	Poe (TX)	Wittman	Edwards (MD)	Edwards (MD)	Spratt			
Kratovil	Posey	Wolf	Edwards (TX)	Edwards (TX)	Stark			
Lamborn	Price (GA)	Young (AK)	Ellison	Ellison	Stupak			
Lance	Radanovich	Young (FL)	Engel	Engel	Sutton			
Latham	Reed		Eshoo	Eshoo	Tanner			

NOT VOTING—23

Alexander
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Berman
Boucher
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buyer
Cardoza

□ 1144

Messrs. TERRY, GRAVES of Missouri, SCALISE and GOODLATTE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 596 on Motion on Ordering the Previous Question—H.R. 1745, I was unavoidably detained because of a transportation delay. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PAS-
TOR of Arizona). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 213, nays 203, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 597]

YEAS—213

Ackerman
Andrews
Arcuri

Baca
Baldwin
Barrow

Becerra
Berkley
Berman

Meek (FL)
Oberstar
Putnam
Schneider
Shadegg
Taylor
Waxman

NAYS—203

Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Bachus
Baird
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berry
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)

Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Crenshaw
Culberson
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (KY)

Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Djou
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)

NOT VOTING—18

Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Boucher
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buyer
Cardoza

DeFazio
Delahunt
Fallin
Hastings (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Marchant

McMorris
Rodgers
Owens
Putnam
Schradler
Shadegg
Taylor

Announcement by the Speaker Pro Tempore

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1155

Messrs. BOYD, POSEY, and COSTELLO changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL GEAR UP DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution (H. Res. 1638) supporting the goals and ideals of National GEAR UP Day.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

The question was taken.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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