

tax proposal this week—a very difficult vote. I really don't know how I'm going to vote.

On the one hand, I see the benefit of getting timely temporary and targeted relief to people, which helps the economy with unemployment compensation, unemployment compensation that is most needed for the people of the purple hearts of this Bush recession.

On the other hand, I see the money going to the upper 2 percent—the millionaires and billionaires—who will get \$700 billion over 10 years, which will put a deficit on our children and grandchildren for years to come—something we can't afford. When it comes time to affording it on reckoning day, it's going to hurt people getting Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, and that's something I can't see.

The estate tax will benefit 6,600 families, to the tune of \$25 billion, and I see that as wrong, too; but I understand the need to stimulate the economy and to get middle class tax cuts to the people earning less than \$250,000.

I ask my constituents to contact me at www.Cohen.house.gov. Let me know what you think.

□ 1020

VIRGINIA OBAMACARE RULING

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, earlier this week, a Federal judge in Virginia acted to defend the American people from an unconstitutional mandate to purchase health insurance. It really shouldn't be a surprise that a Federal judge recognized what many of us noted months ago: the Constitution does not give Congress and the President the right to force Americans to purchase a particular good or service.

Instead of finding ways to bring down the cost of insurance so that anybody can afford at least basic coverage, ObamaCare puts the Federal Government squarely in charge of the health care industry and then makes every American participate. The government defines what insurance is, what it does, what it covers and doesn't cover, and then forces you to buy it. Even with this unconstitutional mandate, health care costs will rise faster because of ObamaCare.

The next Congress will act to repeal this mandate and all the other bad ideas in ObamaCare because we, too, have a responsibility to protect the Constitution of the United States.

TAX CUT PROPOSAL

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I, along with many of my Democratic

colleagues, continue to fight for economic priorities for middle class Americans and for provisions that will create jobs and grow the economy. However, the tax proposal announced by the President calls for sharp differences in the policies and priorities of the Democratic and Republican parties.

For instance, the Democrats continue to fight to maintain tax cuts on incomes up to \$250,000 per couple and \$200,000 per individual, while Republicans continue to demand tax cuts for all incomes, including millionaires and billionaires.

The Democrats also strongly support the extension of unemployment benefits to help out-of-work Americans make it through the recession, while the Republicans are willing to hold the middle class and the unemployed hostage to benefit the wealthy.

The Democrats are championing the needs of low-income families by fighting to extend the child tax credit and the earned income tax credit. In addition, we are fighting to continue the college tuition tax credit to help students or working class families afford college.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support a tax cut proposal that will benefit our working class families and grow the economy.

EXTENDING THE TAX CUTS

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of extending tax cuts to American families and businesses.

This week, we have a choice. Congress can continue the campaign politics of the past year or Republicans and Democrats can set aside their talking points and get something done for the American people. I support the latter.

In my district, families are putting together their budgets and trying to make ends meet under difficult times. Small businesses are trying to make hiring decisions for next year. Family farmers are scared of losing their operations due to a looming bump in the estate tax, their inability to pass the farms on to their children.

In this struggling, fragile economic recovery, we cannot afford to let this happen. After months of partisan gridlock, it's time for Members of this House to listen to the American people and prevent their taxes from going up on January 1.

Delay is not an option. I call on the Congress to send the commonsense compromise, that is a compromise—that means by its very nature we have things that we like and things we dislike in the package—before us and send it to the President's desk, and then we must get serious about addressing and putting our Nation's fiscal house in order, which is job number one.

AIR FORCE TANKER

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

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, I rise to alert my colleagues to a very important job creation issue that resides potentially in the defense authorization bill that may come to the floor.

We have the opportunity to do something right for the American worker and the American taxpayer by insisting that in the competition for the new Air Force tanker that we take into consideration the illegal subsidies that have benefited so extraordinarily the Airbus competitor for the tanker contract. It is absolutely imperative that at this moment when we are struggling to create jobs in this country that we take into consideration in this competition the fact that our competitors in Europe have received over \$5 billion of illegal subsidies, and we have to insist the Pentagon take that into consideration.

For those that share my view, I hope you will join me in a letter to make sure that an amendment we passed will become part of the defense authorization bill. It is the only way to make sure that we keep these jobs in America and build a U.S. Air Force tanker.

EXTENDING THE TAX CUTS

(Ms. BERKLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BERKLEY. I rise to support the tax compromise that will be coming to the floor for a vote this week.

I represent the State that has the highest unemployment rate in the country. In my district, almost one in five people that I represent, 20 percent, are unemployed. The extension of those unemployment benefits is critical to the survival of thousands of the families that call Las Vegas home.

In addition to that, I represent a working class town. People think of Las Vegas as glitz and glitter, but it's glitzy and glittery because of all the working men and women that call Las Vegas home. I represent waiters and waitresses and busboys and Keno runners and cocktail waitresses and valet parkers and showgirls. They're all middle-income wage earners, and to extend that middle-income tax cut is critical to them.

The alternative minimum tax extension is important to 33,000 Las Vegans that will be ensnared by that alternative minimum tax if we don't pass it. The earned income tax credit, the marriage penalty tax credit, the child care tax credit, for the people I represent, so many of them single women with children and working, they need this child care tax credit.

Let's all vote for it.

SUPPORT DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL REPEAL

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, later today we're going to vote on Don't Ask, Don't Tell. This is a personal thing. I know a young gentleman who was in the Army, a graduate of West Point, extraordinary young African American. He's had two tours in Iraq, brought his company back safely from both tours without loss or injury to any member of his company.

But he also honored the commitment of the military not to lie and to be honest and straightforward. He was gay, and he was drummed out of the military. It is an enormous loss to America. I have no doubt that this gentleman would be a general and could probably rise to the highest ranks of the military.

We have to change the Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy. Later today, we'll have a chance to do that, and I'm sure that our colleagues, in recognition of the need of this Nation for well-qualified men and women in the military, will do away with this policy and set in place an opportunity for every American to serve this country, wherever and whatever their circumstances might be.

TAX CUT PROPOSAL DEFINES CONTRASTING PRIORITIES

(Ms. WATSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, the tax proposal announced by the President further defines the sharp differences in the policies and priorities of Democrats and Republicans.

Democrats are fighting for the needs of the middle class and for provisions that creates jobs and expands economic opportunities. Republicans are demanding tax breaks for the wealthy.

Democrats continue to fight to maintain tax cuts on income up to \$250,000. Republicans continue to demand tax cuts on all incomes.

Democrats made a priority of extending unemployment benefits to help out-of-work Americans make it through the recession. Republicans were willing to hold the middle class and the unemployed hostage to benefit the wealthy.

Democrats will continue to fight for the economic priorities of middle class Americans, to create jobs, and to grow the economy. These are the principles that define the contrast between the Republicans and Democrats.

□ 1030

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE) laid before the House the fol-

lowing communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 15, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*The Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on December 15, 2010 at 9:40 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 4005.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

APPROVING PURCHASES OF LITTORAL COMBAT SHIPS

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6494) to amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 to improve the Littoral Combat Ship program of the Navy, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6494

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

SECTION 1. LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP PROGRAM.

(a) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—Subsection (a) of section 121 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2211) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “ten Littoral Combat Ships and 15 Littoral Combat Ship ship control and weapon systems” and inserting “20 Littoral Combat Ships, including any ship control and weapon systems the Secretary determines necessary for such ships.”; and

(B) by striking “a contract” and inserting “one or more contracts”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “liability to” and inserting “liability of”.

(b) TECHNICAL DATA PACKAGE.—Subsection (b)(2)(A) of such section is amended by striking “a second shipyard, as soon as practicable” and inserting “another shipyard to build a design specification for that Littoral Combat Ship”.

(c) LIMITATION OF COSTS.—Subsection (c)(1) of such section is amended by striking “awarded to a contractor selected as part of a procurement” and inserting “under a contract”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. AKIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, the Littoral Combat Ship Program started off as a very good idea. It was to be a single purpose, low-cost war ship that would help our Navy get to the stated goal of at least three Chiefs of Naval Operations of getting back to a 313-ship Navy.

With that said, the program has had, admittedly, a number of problems. First of which was, we were going to build it to commercial specifications. That was a mistake that Congress later corrected because this is a warship. It needed to be built to warship recommendations. You don't build disposable ships unless you want to have disposable crews, and our Nation will never settle for disposable crews.

Madam Speaker, having solved that problem, we found that the two vendors took a ship that was supposed to stand for LCS, Littoral Combat Ship, and it came late, costly, and subject to protest. And only because of the great work, in my opinion, of Under Secretary of Defense Sean Stackley of devising a strategy about a year ago that, in effect, read the riot act to both vendors and told them they were going to do a number of things.

No. 1 in order to submit their package to Congress, their proposal, they were going to submit with that a technical data package which meant that our Nation that has paid to develop these ships would have the specifications to those ships so that if either vendor continued to underperform, we could then go out and seek additional vendors to build this ship if we felt like our Nation was not getting the ship we deserved at the price we need to pay. Under Secretary Stackley came back with a proposal that said we would give to one vendor a contract for 10 ships and then take that technical data package, put it out on the street and give a second vendor a contract for five, a winner-take-all strategy between a monohull ship and a trihull ship and gave the vendors about 8 months to come up with a price.

Madam Speaker, one of the few pleasant surprises of this Congress was that both vendors came back with remarkably good prices when given that all-or-nothing proposal. And I want to compliment, give credit where it's due to Under Secretary Stackley. I also want to give credit where it's due to the Seapower Subcommittee, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN), and the other gentleman from Missouri, Chairman SKELTON, for allowing us to work with Under Secretary Stackley to get this program back under control.