

I ask my Democrats to please continue to extend the unemployment benefits to help out Americans to make it through this recession, and I plead with my Republican colleagues to not hold the middle class and unemployment hostage any longer.

I also recommend that we help the 155 million middle class Americans at a cost of \$214 billion, and I plead with my colleagues to join us in assisting to help because only 4.8 million of the country's wealthiest, at a cost of \$133 billion, is what we are trying to make a decision on.

Please join me and look out for the working people of this country, and let the billionaires continue to pay the bills.

□ 1020

HONORING THE SERVICE AND SACRIFICE OF CORPORAL CHAD STAFFORD WADE

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of America's bravest, Corporal Chad Stafford Wade of Bentonville, Arkansas, who valiantly sacrificed his life in support of combat missions in Afghanistan. Corporal Wade was a devoted family man and friend who was known to make those around him laugh. He shared his zest for life through the small things he did that put a smile on the faces of those who loved him, demonstrating his love of music, singing his favorite country songs, and enjoying the outdoors.

Corporal Wade taught others the importance of service, joining the Marine Corps in October of 2007. He was a member of the 2nd Battalion, 1st Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force based in Camp Pendleton, California, and served in combat missions in Iraq and Afghanistan.

My prayers and the prayers of Arkansans are with Corporal Wade's family, including his wife, Katie, his mom, Tami, and his dad Terence. I humbly offer my thanks to Corporal Wade, a true American hero, for his selfless service to the security and well-being of all Americans, and I ask my colleagues to keep his family in our thoughts and prayers during this very difficult time.

WHERE IS ROBIN HOOD WHEN YOU NEED HIM?

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

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, where is Robin Hood when you need him? I rise today to express my profound sadness about the tax bill that was passed by the Senate and set to pass in this House that benefits the

wealthiest of Americans at the expense of putting billions of dollars of debt onto the backs of our children and grandchildren. Where is Robin Hood?

It's not just about the estate tax for 6,600 families or the tax cuts for the 2 percenters. This is so irresponsible. It contradicts everything, as Democrats, that we have been fighting for for generations. And for those who charge that it's purity or sanctimony, make no mistake, this is about our value as Democrats. It's about the prospect of creating hope and opportunity for our children and grandchildren, and we're not doing it here. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say that it's time for us to do what's in the interest of working families in this country and not to continue to sacrifice for the very few.

FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the American people are hurting. We all know that. In my State of California, we have a statewide unemployment rate of 12.5 percent; and in part of the area I am privileged to represent, we have a 15.5 percent unemployment rate. There are steps that we should have taken that we still can take that will help deal with the joblessness problem about which we are all concerned.

I believe that the President has been right on target in talking about the need to open up new markets around the world as we seek to create good manufacturing jobs right here in the United States of America. We can do that if we move as expeditiously as possible to pass not only the Korea Free Trade Agreement, which the President has talked about and he believes is very important, which will be the single-largest bilateral free trade agreement in the history of the world, but also at the same time within this hemisphere, we need to pass the Panama and Colombia Free Trade Agreements. Jobs can be created for Caterpillar workers, for John Deere workers, for Whirlpool workers right here in this country if we can open up the markets within this hemisphere. Union and nonunion jobs will be created. We need to move now.

THE DEFICIT

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

Mr. LYNCH. Later on today, Mr. Speaker, we will address this bill which would award a tax cut for the richest 2 percent of Americans, and it's important that we understand the context in which this bill is being addressed. In this current year, the government has taken in \$2.4 trillion in revenue, but we have spent \$3.7 trillion. And so we have a deficit of \$1.3 trillion. If this bill

passes, it will add almost \$1 trillion to our national debt.

At current rates, by the year 2040, the interest on the debt will be double the amount that we spend on defense, education, transportation, agriculture, housing, the space program, science, and research and development. We can't keep kicking the can down the road and not address our national debt. We're running out of road, we're running out of time, and the American people deserve a better deal.

COSTLY AND UNNECESSARY SECOND F-35 ENGINE

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because, despite opposition from the Secretary of Defense, the President, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps, the Senate spending package still includes \$450 million for a second engine for the F-35. Americans across the country are tightening their belts, 15 million are unemployed, and many of those with jobs have not seen raises in years. But the Federal Government seems to think that it is exempt from this shared cost-cutting.

Despite the recession and ballooning debt, we continue to fund wasteful projects like the second engine, which our own military has asserted they neither need or want. Sadly, the second engine is just the tip of the defense spending iceberg, the lowest of the low-hanging fruit. According to a recent report by the Sustainable Defense Task Force, hundreds of billions could be cut from our defense budget without harming national security. There can be no sacred cows. Cost-cutting has to include defense, and it should start with what Secretary Gates has called the "costly and unnecessary" second F-35 engine.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4853, TAX RELIEF, UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE REAUTHORIZATION, AND JOB CREATION ACT OF 2010

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1766 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES 1766

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to debate in the House the topics addressed by the motions specified in sections 2 and 3 of this resolution for three hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their designees.

SEC. 2. After debate pursuant to the first section 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 to the House amendment to 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 to the House amendment to the Senate amendment with the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 3. If the motion described in section 2 of this resolution fails of adoption, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on a motion that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment, on which the Chair shall immediately put the question.

SEC. 4. Until completion of proceedings enabled by the first three sections of this resolution—

(a) the Chair may decline to entertain any intervening motion, resolution, question, or notice;

(b) the Chair may postpone such proceedings to such time as may be designated by the Speaker; and

(c) each amendment and motion considered pursuant to this resolution shall be considered as read.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order against H. Res. 1766 because the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. The resolution contains a waiver of all points of order against consideration of the bill, which includes a waiver of section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act, which causes the violation of 426(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentleman has met the threshold burden under the rule, and the gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from New York each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

□ 1030

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this tax package that the House will consider shortly. While there may not be unfunded mandates per se in the bill, this will impose a burden on States and local governments and everyone else here. And particularly it will add a huge burden to our kids and our grandkids, because we are borrowing hundreds of billions of dollars that will go directly to the deficit and directly to our \$14 trillion national debt.

On November 2, I think we got a pretty good message from the taxpayers. They wanted us to stop running deficits and to start paying down the debt.

Yet before we even get to the new year, just weeks away from the election, here we are, adding hundreds of billions of dollars to the deficit and to the debt. This compromise shows that Washington just doesn't get it yet. We simply didn't get the message we were supposed to on November 2.

I do support the extension of the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts that were enacted, and we also have to find a remedy for the death tax. But we've got to do it in a different way than this. Congress can take swift action to ensure that taxes don't go up, but we shouldn't be adding the other items that we're doing here. It's taken on the seasonal theme again, of course. It's become a Christmas tree. I'll explain a few of the items in it. But it just notes, more than anything, that we haven't gotten the message, that we're just going about things the same way we always have.

Let me just take one provision here, ethanol. We've been subsidizing ethanol now for nearly 30 years. It's about a \$6 billion a year subsidy. They have the tripartite, the ethanol industry. We mandate its use. We impose tariffs to imports to make sure we can compete, and then we subsidize as well. And we're going to continue to do all those things here for an industry that should be mature at this time, but it's continuing to get subsidies. How in the world that belongs as part of this tax package I'll leave for the voters to decide. But it just shows that we haven't changed. When are we going to wake up to the fact that we can't continue to do business like this anymore?

With regard to ethanol, one of the former backers was former Vice President Al Gore. He said the other day: One of the reasons I made this mistake—this mistake being supporting the subsidizing of ethanol—is that I paid particular attention to the farmers in my home State of Tennessee, and I had a certain fondness for the farmers in the State of Iowa because I was about to run for President.

Now, that's a pretty candid admission. And the reason we have ethanol subsidies is that all Presidential campaigns begin in Iowa. But that's no reason to saddle the rest of the country with this kind of burden. And also the negative impacts on the environment are huge and growing from ethanol, yet we continue to do it just to buy a couple of votes to get this tax bill over the top.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I must say that I understand the point of the gentleman. I think spending this kind of money, over \$700 billion over 10 years for 6,600 families in the United States, is a foolish expenditure. I do agree that what we want to do is get the deficit down, and believe me, that does not do it.

Technically, though, this point of order is about whether or not to con-

sider the rule and, ultimately, the underlying measure. And, in reality, it's about trying to block the measure. I believe that that's an abdication of our responsibility. We have to have the opportunity to debate, and without an opportunity for an up-or-down vote on the legislation, we are failing our responsibility. I think that is wrong.

I hope my colleagues will vote "yes" so we can consider the legislation on its merits and vote accordingly and not stop it on a procedural motion.

I have the right to close, but in the end, I will urge my colleagues to vote "yes" to consider the rule.

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

Mr. FLAKE. I appreciate the comments of the gentlelady. She brings up that this is a technicality, that we're just speaking here on a point of order when we should be speaking on the bill and that we should debate this bill on the merits. I would like to. That's why I actually submitted an amendment to the gentlelady's committee, to the Rules Committee, to debate the ethanol provision; yet it wasn't included. We weren't allowed to debate that. And so if we're not allowed to debate that then under the rule, then we have to debate it some other time.

I would love to hear an explanation from the Rules Committee as to why this wasn't included and why only amendments that may make Members feel good about voting on but have no possibility of delaying this package were even considered.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLAKE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

I would say to my friend that he is absolutely right in pointing to the fact that we had a more than 2-hour hearing in the Rules Committee. The die was already cast. The decision had already been made that the only thing that would be made in order was an opportunity to increase the death tax, that burden on the intergenerational transfer that we believe is important to keep our economy growing. And the amendment that my friend offered, and my California colleague, Mr. HERGER, offered a similar amendment to deal with this notion of ethanol subsidies, which are just plain wrong, and I'm troubled at the fact that this rule does not allow us a chance to address those issues.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman.

Just continuing on the ethanol theme, Robert Bryce of the Manhattan Institute said recently: "Between 1999 and 2009, while U.S. ethanol production increased sevenfold to more than 700,000 barrels a day, U.S. oil imports actually increased by more than 800,000 barrels per day. Furthermore, and perhaps more surprising, during the same period, U.S. oil exports—yes, exports—more than doubled to more than 2 million barrels per day."

"Data from the Energy Information Administration show that oil imports closely track U.S. oil consumption. Over the past decade, as domestic oil demand grew, imports increased. When consumption fell, imports dropped. Ramped-up ethanol production levels simply had no apparent effect on oil imports or consumption."

We have every level of the administration, anybody who analyzes this says that this is a boondoggle; and yet it reappears here, a \$6 billion item, not insubstantial, not small. But it appears here in this tax package simply to get it over the line. That simply can't happen anymore if we're going to get control on this debt and deficit.

Let me talk about one other provision of the tax bill. All of us talk about the burden that the payroll tax has, and it is big. And it's tough for taxpayers to pay the payroll tax. I would like to lower it. I think everybody would like to lower it. But the payroll tax is dedicated specifically for Social Security. It goes into the Social Security trust fund.

Under this legislation, we'll have a 2 percent reduction in the payroll tax on the employee side. That will net somebody like me or any Member of Congress here about \$2,000 a year. What does it do for the deficit? It will balloon the deficit by \$120 billion a year. One year from now, because it's only a 1-year reduction, we'll be faced with this same problem.

What do we do as Republicans? We always say we're not going to raise taxes on anybody, no matter how temporary the tax. We'll be forced politically, with the situation, where do we increase this tax? Do we let it go? If we let it continue, that's another \$120 billion hole in the deficit and in the Social Security trust fund. Why are we doing that?

If we do have payroll tax deductions, we may well want to, but at least let's have commensurate benefit cuts on the other side. Let's address benefits on the other side. If we're not going to lower them, then we shouldn't lower this.

This is simply irresponsible for us to take a bill like this and assume that it's not going to have an impact on the deficit and not going to have an impact on the debt.

Where are we now? Just a few weeks ago, every one of us, I tell you, every one of us running for office said to the voters, we're going to get control of the debt and the deficit. All of us said that. And yet our first actions here, before we even go into the next Congress, is to put a bill on the floor that's going to balloon the debt and deficit. How can we do that? We can't. We shouldn't. That's why I am raising this point of order.

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

□ 1040

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. May I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FLAKE. Again, this is a package that we simply cannot afford. We cannot go on as if the deficit and the debt don't matter. Not only that they don't matter, but we expand them considerably. We can continue the tax cuts for every American. We can do that without these extra things in the bill. Let's wait until January. Let's wait until we have a new Congress, and let's do a different deal than this. This is not a deal that is good for the taxpayer; it is not a deal that is good for this institution.

We have said that we will change and that we got the message. This is evidence that we haven't.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments this morning. I urge him to vote "no" on this bill if he plans to do that, and I think he will find a great deal of company. But I want to urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this motion to consider so we may debate and vote on this piece of legislation today.

It is not perfect by any means. I rarely see a piece of perfect legislation. But remember that what we are doing here is concurring in a Senate bill, which limited the fact of how many changes that we would be able to make.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on House Resolution 1766.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 1766 provides for consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 4853, the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act.

The rule provides 3 hours of debate and 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 the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 4853 with the amendment printed in the Rules Committee report. If

that motion fails, the rule causes to be pending a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 4853.

Finally, until completion of all proceedings, the Chair may decline to entertain any intervening motion, resolution, question, or notice; the Chair may postpone proceedings to a time designated by the Speaker; and each amendment and motion shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan agreement on a framework for extending middle class tax cuts and extending unemployment relief is certainly not perfect. In fact, I don't like it much at all.

In the lead-up to the debate here this morning, a lot of my constituents have encouraged me to oppose it. They know it is an unwarranted handout for millionaires and billionaires at a time when we are still fighting two wars with countless pressing needs here at home and a deficit that would push us further into the red by this giveaway.

A typical sentiment was reflected in a call from Ken, a Niagara Falls resident, who phoned my office to insist it was wrong-headed for Democrats, who control the House, the Senate, and White House, to agree to extend the Bush tax cuts for the wealthy. His words were: "Barack Obama is still the President of the United States, not MITCH MCCONNELL, and MCCONNELL should not get to dictate tax policy." To that, I say, I hear you. But, nonetheless, today here we are.

There are some good things in this bill. Certainly extending unemployment relief for struggling American workers who may have been laid off and simply need assistance to help them buy groceries and necessities until they find a new job is important.

During the last 2 years, this Congress has voted to cut taxes for working parents and small businesses at least eight times, and lower tuition costs for college students. We have provided the best opportunities for growth and prosperity.

But losing \$25 billion in revenue to provide a tax shelter to 6,600 families who will qualify for this new estate tax handout is just wrong, it is disgraceful, and it is damaging to the entire economic future of this country.

In the aftermath of this negotiation, the President was accused of quitting in the first round, giving away the store, punting on first down, and other things that I don't want to go into here. But while this agreement is flawed, there are parts of it, as I said, that will benefit the American people.

Failure to send the bill to the President's desk for his signature would result in tax hikes on millions of middle class families across our country and loss of unemployment insurance for those who are hardest hit by this recession.

More importantly, I think it might risk slowing the economic recovery. However, I think it is very important

for me to make this point: we have lived with these tax cuts for 10 years. It is certainly no secret to any American or anybody else in the world that our unemployment condition is perfectly awful. And to try to pretend to the American people that once we pass this great tax cut for the rich that jobs are suddenly going to rain on us makes us feel like Alice in Wonderland, able to believe 10 impossible things before breakfast. I am just not one of them. It will not make that kind of difference. It simply, once again, makes the rich richer. But that was the price we had to pay for helping the middle class and the unemployed.

I note that many of these tax cuts, as we know, were created 10 years ago. And what have they brought? Nothing but a deep-lasting recession. But what I also want to comment on here is the impossibility of this Congress to let these tax cuts expire, which would in itself decrease the deficit by 50 percent in 2 years, says to me that these will never expire. And I want to put that in connection with what we have done to the payroll tax.

I consider this one of the greatest threats to Social Security and its future. If anybody here believes, if anyone can stand up and believe that we are going to be able to reinstate that payroll tax on employers and employees, they only need to look at what is happening here today, that after 10 years of experience, which brought us no jobs, we are expanding tax cuts which will, again, bring us no jobs.

If this agreement doesn't become law, I know that the tax rates on the middle class will go up. They are going to end up paying more money, and I hate that, because God knows all the benefits in the last 10 years have gone to the wealthy.

I dread seeing my America, the one I grew up in and I love, where I don't believe that the American Dream is available for children anymore. I am not going to cry about it, but I know that now that the rich are richer and the poor are poorer, the poor children don't think about that much anymore. They think about trying to get an education, if they can, or trying to live another year.

So we have to take this bill up today. No question about it. And I feel very sad about it. But I will tell you that it has been our experience that these are the prices that we have to pay when we negotiate with our partners on the other side. They believe in trickle-down with all their heart: make everybody richer at the top, all those great folks, even those with great inherited wealth, as my colleague Mr. MCGOVERN said, who may never have worked a day in their life, and suddenly jobs are going to be produced. Please, America, please don't believe that. That is not what we are doing here today. We are not doing anything to benefit this economy here today.

That logic of driving up long-term deficits and putting the government in

the red more than it is, to hand out money for a tiny fraction of taxpayers, is that really a sensible thing for America to be doing today? I think not. But we know that the other side in the coming years will pursue even more tax breaks for the wealthiest and the wealthiest estates. All of those tangible outcomes are directed toward millionaires and billionaires. As long as I am serving in Congress, I will resist this with every fiber of my being because I don't think it does anything for our economy while adding to the deficit.

In the end, I am here to encourage my colleagues to support this rule so that we may have this 3-hour debate, which will give people plenty of time on both sides to express their opinion. It is a fair process. All the Members will be able to express their views.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1050

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by expressing my appreciation to my very good friend from Rochester, New York, the distinguished chair of the Committee on Rules, Ms. SLAUGHTER, 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, let me begin in the spirit of the season and say that I would like to associate myself with some of the remarks that were offered by the distinguished chair of the Committee on Rules, and express appreciation to Ms. SLAUGHTER for her very, very interesting and thoughtful approach to this issue.

I associate myself with the remarks she made when she said she doesn't like this measure. I associate myself with her in that in saying I don't like this measure that is before us, Mr. Speaker. But I like even less the idea of our imposing a tax increase on every single American who pays their income taxes. I believe that that would have a deleterious effect to the goal that we as Democrats and Republicans alike share.

What is the message that we have gotten over and over and over again and the message that was sent this past November 2? It was create jobs, focus on economic growth, make sure that we can do everything that we possibly can to look at those Americans who are hurting today, and make sure that they have an opportunity to get onto the first rung of the economic ladder. That is the driving message. Obviously, a very important part of that is going to be to reduce the size and scope and reach of the Federal Government, which has undermined the ability for job creation and economic growth to take place.

Now, when I say I don't like this measure that is before us, I don't like the fact, and many of my Republican colleagues have raised this—Mr. FLAKE

just raised concerns about the ethanol subsidies. I don't like the fact that we have unemployment benefits that are extended without being paid for. I don't like a number of the provisions here.

But we are in the midst of a very fragile economic recovery at this juncture, and I will tell you, mark my words, Mr. Speaker, beginning in January we are going to focus on cutting spending. I have just come from a meeting with a number of my colleagues, and we are determined to focus on that. That is why it is imperative that today we recognize that the issue that is before us is going to actually be helpful in our quest to deal with job creation and economic growth.

I congratulate President Obama for working in a bipartisan way to address this issue. In fact, I said in the last campaign that one of my priorities was to work to make President Obama a better President. I believe the fact that he has moved towards recognizing that a pro-growth economic policy has direct ties to the level of taxation imposed on working Americans and job creators is a positive sign, and I believe that moves him in the direction of being a better President.

I also have been encouraged by the fact that he wants to create jobs by opening up new markets around the world. I gave a 1-minute speech this morning talking about the importance of the key U.S.-Korea free trade agreement the President supports and I hope will send to us very soon. It will be the largest bilateral free trade agreement in the history of the world, when you look at the size of our economies. That is something that the President is supporting and I believe we will be able to work on in a bipartisan way.

So, Mr. Speaker, the notion of seeing President Obama shifting to the John F. Kennedy vision and the Ronald Reagan vision on economic growth is a very encouraging indicator to me and many of our colleagues, and should be for the American people as well.

Now, again I will say that Ms. SLAUGHTER is absolutely right; we don't like this measure. But the idea of increasing taxes is something that is anathema to the vision of economic growth and job creation. And it is not just conservative economists who say that, it is not just the supply-siders, of which I consider myself to be one.

Keynesian economists, Mr. Speaker, Keynesian economists, those who subscribe to the view of John Maynard Keynes, who lived until 1950, recognizing and focusing on the issue of spending, those who subscribe to the Keynesian view recognize that increasing taxes on anyone when you are dealing with slow economic growth is a prescription for exacerbating, exacerbating, the problems that you are trying to address.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in the midst of bipartisan discussions over the past several days with a number of my colleagues on the recognition that we have to say that Democrats should recognize that spending cuts need to take

place and Republicans need to recognize that tax increases need to take place. It is an interesting discussion, and many argue that that is sort of the give-and-take we have.

But I think it is important as we look at this issue to harken back on history. Next month I will begin my fourth decade here, and I will say that there was a study done in my first decade, during the 1980s, by two professors from Ohio University, Professors Vedder and Gallaway. Their study looked at the impact of tax increases in the quest to try to reduce spending and the size and scope of government and deal with the problem that Democrats and Republicans alike regularly decry, that being the expansion of government.

Well, their study was known as the \$1.58 Study. What it showed, Mr. Speaker, was that every time there was \$1 in taxes increased, the Federal Government increased spending by \$1.58. Now, I remember one of the first measures that I voted against was known as the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982, and in that measure they said there would be \$3 in spending cuts for every \$1 in taxes increased.

Mr. Speaker, as we are here today just days before Christmas, going back to 1982 we got the \$98.5 billion tax increase included in that, but we are still waiting for those \$3 in spending cuts. The Vedder-Gallaway study made it very, very clear, looking on many occasions, the 1990 increase and other studies done since then have shown for every \$1 in taxes increased, spending has increased from \$1.05 to \$1.81, and this is outlined in a piece that was done by Professor Vedder and Stephen Moore in *The Wall Street Journal* this week.

So our notion of saying that increasing taxes is going to deal with the deficit problem is again a specious argument.

Now, many argue that the tax that exists on job creators, those at the upper end, will create a great drain on the Federal Treasury. But if we are going to focus again on job creation and economic growth, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced, based on the vision put forth by Professor Arthur Laffer and many others, that the economic growth that will follow keeping those rates low on job creators will actually increase the flow of revenues to the Federal treasury, and keeping those top rates low, capital gains and dividend rates low, will spur the growth that will create jobs, and many people who today are not working and are in fact receiving unemployment benefits will have opportunity, and they will be joining the productive side of the economy and generating that flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury that we obviously desperately need.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have been asking us to do this for a long period of time. My colleagues have had an opportunity to do it for a long period of time. Unfortunately,

here we are just 2 weeks, just 2 weeks before the end of the year, and 2 weeks before the largest income tax rate increase that we have seen in many a year is scheduled to take place.

So while there is much to criticize about this measure, and I could easily vote against it, I believe that the right vote for us to cast is a vote which will ensure that we continue down the road towards job creation and economic growth and allowing the American people to keep more of what they've earned.

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

□ 1100

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, a member of the Rules Committee, Mr. McGOVERN.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the chairwoman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule but in reluctant opposition to the underlying legislation.

Let me begin by saying that I know there are a lot of goods things in this bill. The bill extends tax relief for middle class families. It extends unemployment insurance for Americans who, through no fault of their own, find themselves out of work in this difficult economy. The bill also extends several important tax relief measures that were included in last year's recovery package, including the parity for transit benefits, which is a measure that I have worked on here in the House.

I understand and appreciate the situation in which President Obama found himself. He was faced with the United States Senate that demands a supermajority of 60 votes to order pizza, let alone enact significant legislation. Over the past 2 years, our Republican colleagues in the Senate have blown by the previous records for filibusters. They have made it clear that their overriding political strategy is to say "no" to whatever President Obama proposes, no matter how worthy or popular. And that's unfortunate, but that's the reality we face. And it is unbelievably cynical.

But I believe that the provisions in this bill that give away billions and billions and billions of dollars to the wealthiest Americans are unnecessary, unproductive, and irresponsible. Unnecessary, because over the past few years, while millions of middle class families struggled to pay their mortgages and put food on the table, the wealthiest few in America have done very well. The fat cats on Wall Street are riding high once again with multi-million-dollar bonuses and golden parachutes. Unproductive, because study after study have shown that one of the least effective ways to stimulate the economy is to put more money into the pockets of the rich. The wealthiest few are more likely to save that money rather than invest it in our economy. CBO has found that of all the things we

could do to stimulate the economy, tax breaks for the rich people in this country have the worst record of encouraging economic growth. And irresponsible, because this bill will add billions and billions of dollars onto our Nation's debt. None of these tax cuts are paid for.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. McGOVERN. We just came through a campaign in which everybody talked about the need for deficit reduction. The bipartisan Bowles-Simpson commission made it clear that we are on an unsustainable course. When they presented their report, everybody in this town nodded gravely and said this is important work. Yet here we are, less than a month later, making the problem worse.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the underlying legislation as written. I know we will have an opportunity to improve this bill by supporting an amendment to pare back some of the estate tax cuts for the wealthiest estates in America. I urge my colleagues to support that amendment.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better than this. We must do better than this. Future generations are counting on us.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to my very hardworking Rules Committee colleague, the gentlewoman from Grandfather Community, North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. I thank my distinguished colleague from California (Mr. DREIER) for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I first want to make it clear I am opposed to allowing tax increases to go into effect on January 1. However, I am also opposed to this rule and the underlying bill.

It's very interesting to hear our colleagues on the other side of the aisle arguing against the tax bill before us today because of their concerns that we're adding to the deficit. We didn't hear those arguments when they were voting for the trillion-dollar stimulus and all the other trillions they have voted for in the past 4 years. In fact, their stories and those of the President have changed dramatically over the past few days. Mr. Speaker, I would like to put into the RECORD an article in *American Thinker*, December 14, "Tax Cuts Clearly Explained." The article does a really good job of explaining the flip-flops on the side of the Democrats.

I want to quote a couple of sentences from it. It says, "The Republican position was to keep tax rates where they are now and where they've been since 2003. Democrats fought to keep the Bush tax rates only for those making less than \$250,000 in a year. That is curious, since they've been saying for about 10 years that the 'Bush tax cuts' went only to the wealthiest Americans. Democrats are arguing to keep something they said never existed." So we

find our friends again on the other side of the aisle flip-flopping on this issue.

I'd also like to add a couple of more comments from this article. "As a matter of record, the final Bush tax rates passed Congress in mid 2003, shortly after Republicans retook the Senate. From August 2003 to December 2007, over 8 million net new jobs were created and real GDP grew almost 3 percent per year. At the same time, Federal revenues increased by 2.3 percent of GDP, \$785 billion, putting revenues above the average level of 1960 to 2000, the 40 years before Bush. Unemployment fell to 4.4 percent and the deficit fell to 1.2 percent of GDP. Such was the catastrophe of 4 years of Bush's tax rates and Republican-written Federal budgets.

"You will hear that this or that group, the top 2 percent of those who inherit dad's farm, et cetera, does not 'deserve' to have its taxes kept at the current rate. There are only two alternatives for where that money goes: the family that earned it or the government. If the family doesn't 'deserve' it, does the government?"

It appears from all the comments that our colleagues have made that they believe that the money that the hardworking Americans earn belongs to the government. As a member of the Rules Committee, I have seen up close how the ruling Democrats have violated every promise they made to run an open Congress but have shut out the opportunity to offer amendments.

We should vote down this rule and allow any amendments to be offered.

[From American Thinker, Dec. 14, 2010]

TAX CUTS CLEARLY EXPLAINED

(By Randall Hoven)

If you go to the White House website, right at the top is a bar you can click on to see "Tax Cuts Clearly Explained." If you click, you see a video of one of President Obama's economic advisors using a whiteboard to explain that Republicans are bad, that Obama is above politics, and that if Obama gets his way, jobs and growth and goodness will spring forth.

The video starts out simply enough. Republicans want to extend the Bush tax rates for everyone; Obama wants to leave out the top 2% of income earners. It was all about the Bush tax rates and for how long, and to whom, to extend them.

But then the video starts talking about a host of things unrelated to those tax rates. The economist even lists them on his whiteboard.

Unemployment insurance,
Earned income tax credit,
American opportunity tax credit,
Child tax credit,
Payroll tax,
Investment incentives.

The "clear" explanation is that since the current tax rates for the top 2% would be extended another couple years, this list of unrelated "targeted and temporary" tax cuts must be added to the package to somehow offset them. The concern was that extending current tax rates for the top 2% would increase the deficit too much. So politicians compromised in a way that would increase the deficit more than either party's initial proposal. (King of like the way they compromised on TARP in 2008. Remember "sweeteners"?)

Since Congress got into the compromise act, tax credits for ethanol, alternative fuels, and who knows what else have also been added.

In the spirit of clarity, what follows is my attempt to explain tax cuts.

The Republican position was to keep tax rates where they are now and where they've been since 2003.

1. Democrats fought to keep the Bush tax rates only for those making less than \$250,000 in a year. That is curious, since they've been saying for about ten years that the "Bush tax cuts" went only to the wealthiest Americans. Democrats are arguing to keep something they said never existed.

2. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the entire package, as currently proposed in the Senate, would add \$858 billion to the 2011-2020 deficit. Without it, the 2011-2020 deficit would be \$6,246 B. So this package theoretically increases the ten-year deficit by 14%.

3. Of that \$858 B, about \$544 B comes from keeping current tax rates; the rest comes from the new goodies unrelated to the Bush rates. So because Democrats said some part of that \$544 B adds too much to the deficit, they added another \$314 B to the deficit. That is how compromise and "the middle way" work in Washington.

4. The CBO calculates future revenues under the assumption that tax rates have zero effect on the behavior of investors, consumers, employers, etc. Congress forces the CBO to make that assumption. Every economist this side of Paul Krugman knows that that assumption is wrong. One such economist is Christina Romer, President Obama's first choice as chief of his economic advisors. She said a tax increase of 1% of GDP reduces GDP by about 1.84%. And she said that this year in a published, peer-reviewed academic paper.

5. Another top economic adviser to President Obama, Larry Summers, was more direct. "If they do not pass this [tax cut agreement] in the next couple of weeks, it will materially increase the risk of the economy stalling out and that we would have a double-dip [recession]." Bill Clinton advised that passing the tax cuts would "minimize the chances that it [the economy] will slip back [into recession]." Again, top Democrats say we must keep the Bush tax rates or the recession resumes.

6. President Obama's view is that not keeping the Bush tax rates on those making under \$250,000 "would be a grave injustice" and "would deal a serious blow to our economic recovery." Again, this is curious because Democrats keep saying that Bush's tax cuts went only to the wealthiest Americans and caused all the harm we now see to the economy. But apparently, not continuing the Bush policy for 98% of taxpayers would be a "serious blow" to the economy.

7. President Obama believes that keeping the current tax rates for those making over \$250,000 in a year "would cost us \$700 billion" and do "very little to actually grow our economy." He assures us that "economists from all across the political spectrum agree" on that. I believed he polled the same economists who said his stimulus would keep the unemployment rate below 8%.

8. As a matter of record, the final Bush tax rates passed Congress in mid-2003, shortly after Republicans retook the Senate. From August 2003 to December 2007, over eight million net new jobs were created, and real GDP grew almost 3% per year. At that same time, federal revenues increased by 2.3% of GDP (\$785 B), putting revenues above the average level of 1960-2000, the forty years before Bush. Unemployment fell to 4.4%, and the deficit fell to 1.2% of GDP. Such was the catastrophe of four years of Bush's tax rates and Republican-written federal budgets.

9. You will hear that this or that group (the top 2%, those who inherit dad's farm, etc.) does not "deserve" to have its taxes kept at the current rate. There are only two alternatives for where that money goes: the family that earned it, or the government. If the family doesn't "deserve" it, does the government?

[In fact, it appears from spoken and written comments that our colleagues think that the money that Americans earn should all belong to the government.]

As usual, this is not about anything the Democrats say it is about. If they are worried about the deficit, why did they add to the deficit to get this deal?

Republicans would have compromised by simply extending the current rates for two years instead of permanently. Obama saw that bet and raised unemployment insurance, earned income tax credit, American opportunity tax credit, child tax credit, payroll tax, and investment incentives. Congressional Democrats saw that bet and raised it ethanol and alternative fuels subsidies.

This is all about the Democrats rewarding their interest groups and blaming the certain deficit on Republicans. As usual, the Stupid Party will see that bet, holding a pair of deuces.

I'll try to clarify it with another analogy. A 700-pound man goes to the doctor. The doctor says the man needs to diet, and in fact prescribes a certain salad as the man's meal for the next few months. The 700-pound man agrees to eat the salad each meal—along with three roasted chickens, two pounds of bacon, a large pizza, and four cheeseburgers with the works. In his view, he compromised with his doctor.

Then when the man weighs 800 pounds after a few months, he blames his doctor.

Now you play doctor. Would you make that compromise, given you'll be sued for malpractice if the man gains weight?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time to speak on this legislation.

It is very clear, because of the fragile state of our economy, that there are many important provisions in this tax bill before us. For middle income families, it means their tax rates will not go up. For people in need of unemployment insurance, it extends those benefits another 13 months. And for families struggling to make ends meet, this bill extends tax credits for them so that they can pay for their children's education and they can take care of their children. These are lifelines for hardworking families that are struggling in this economy.

I have fought my entire public career for these tax breaks to support middle income families to make college more affordable. These provisions help some 155 million Americans in this economy.

But that's not all that's in this tax bill. Tragically, these 155 million Americans were held hostage to a ransom that the Republicans would only help these families, help these individuals, help these students struggling in school if we gave tax cuts to the wealthiest people in this country. It is as if the wealthy don't have enough money and struggling middle class

families have too much. But that was the price that was extracted for this legislation to help these 155 million Americans struggle through this economic downturn.

So we see that some \$25 billion will be lavished on 6,600 of the wealthiest estates in this country. These are estates in excess of \$10 million for a husband and wife. These are estates that have used all of the tax laws to minimize the size of that estate to their advantage before they pay the estate tax. But the Republicans were not prepared to give unemployment insurance to millions of Americans who are struggling to find work unless they could provide this money to the wealthiest people in the country. This is not fair, it will unnecessarily increase the deficit, and it has no stimulative value.

Economist after economist has told us what happens with this money when you give it to the wealthiest people in the country. They put it in the bank, and some day they may use it or they won't use it. It's not like middle income families that have to pay the rent, pay the lights, send their kids to school. It's a completely different operation.

□ 1110

So no stimulative value to giving billions and billions of dollars to the richest 2 percent of the people in the country; it's not fair in terms of the resources of this country being used for those individuals while other families struggle; and it creates deficit unnecessarily. If you're going to create the deficit, at least it ought to be stimulative, at least it ought to grow the economy; that's not what this does. It should be rejected for this reason because this deficit, beginning the first of the year, will start immediately coming out of the hides of programs that support these very same middle income families and the education of their children.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to my very good friend and California colleague, the gentleman from Elk Grove, Mr. McCLINTOCK.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Senate for passing the tax relief measure yesterday and I certainly hope that the House passes it today.

According to the CBO, this bill comprises \$136 billion of additional spending. That's true, but that's for \$721 billion of tax relief. That means that 15 percent of this bill is spending; the other 85 percent of it is tax relief. That means no across-the-board increase in income taxes next year, no AMT biting deeper into middle class families, a death tax that is a third less than what it otherwise would have been, threatening far fewer family farms and family businesses with extinction.

If this relief fails, when the ball drops at Times Square on New Year's Eve, Americans will have just been walloped by a tax tsunami the likes of which we

haven't seen since the Smoot-Hawley tariff. Families and small businesses will be spending the new year struggling to pay thousands of dollars of new taxes. A family making \$50,000 will see at least \$3,000 more taken from its paycheck. A small businessperson whose shop makes \$300,000 will have to cut another \$8,400—perhaps the difference between a part-time and full-time job for an employee.

From the left we're told we should raise taxes on the very rich who make over \$200,000 because they don't pay their fair share. Well, according to the IRS, those folks earn 36 percent of all income; they pay 49 percent of all income taxes. But a lot of them aren't people at all. Half of the income earned by small businesses will be hit by these tax increases. These are the job generators that we are depending upon to end the nightmare of unemployment for millions of American families. To confiscate billions of dollars more from them and then expect more jobs to come of it is simply insane.

Some of my fellow conservatives object to the 15 percent of this bill that spends money we don't have and I agree, but that damage can be corrected through offsetting spending reductions next year. The new Republican House majority can do that without the Senate or the President simply by refusing to appropriate funds—and it is committed to doing so. But it cannot rescind the taxes next year without the Senate and the President, who have made their opposition to just such a clean bill abundantly clear. And even if such a retroactive bill could be passed by spring, these families and businesses won't get their tax overpayments refunded to them until they file their returns a year later.

Mr. Speaker, massive tax increases under Hoover turned the recession of 1929 into the depression of the 1930s. Let that not be the legacy of this Congress.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio).

Mr. DEFazio. I thank the gentlelady for yielding the time.

It is fairly extraordinary to listen to the debate coming from the Republican side of the aisle. We are headed toward—before this vote—a \$1.3 trillion deficit next year. With this single vote, we will increase the deficit, the debt of the United States, by \$430 billion this year and \$430 billion next year.

Republicans want to pretend that somehow if you cut your income, you can still balance your budget. That would surprise most Americans. Most Americans don't cut back hours at work when they can't make ends meet at home unless they are forced to by their employer.

These tax cuts, the Bush tax cuts, were put into effect at a time of surplus. The rationale was give people back their money, we have a surplus as far as the eye can see. Now we're teetering on the edge of having the United

States of America's debt rating downgraded. And if you increase the debt next year by \$1.7 trillion—and you say, well, don't worry, we'll take care of it with some cuts. Cuts? \$450 billion in 1 year? I don't think so, unless basically you eliminate virtually the entire government, close the prisons, turn the prisoners out, open the borders, no Coast Guard, and we go on down the list. \$450 billion? No, you're not going to do that, and you know you're not going to do that. You're just pretending.

But even worse, \$111 billion of this is going to come from Social Security. The Social Security trust fund has been inviolate since it was set up by Franklin Delano Roosevelt and wise men 75 years ago. He said this will be an earned benefit; Congress can't touch the money and can't cut the benefits. No, but what we're going to do in this deal, constructed by the Republicans—no Democrat has ever proposed this, no hearing has ever been held on it—is we're going to give a tax holiday. But don't worry, we'll make the Social Security trust fund whole; we'll go out and borrow \$111 billion from China and we'll inject it back into the Social Security trust fund. What an absurdity and what a threat to the future of Social Security because next year they'll say, hey, we can't afford to subsidize Social Security, we can't afford to borrow \$111 billion from China, but don't let that tax go back up, that will be the largest tax increase on working people in the history of the United States—just like we're hearing now. We go back to the Clinton-era taxes, the largest tax increase in the history of the United States. We created 23 million jobs during the Clinton administration, we balanced the budget of the United States of America, and we did that under the tax rates that would come back into effect on the 1st. But now you're going to attack Social Security, hold the unemployed hostage, and reduce the income of the United States and increase our debt. What a pathetic position to take.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my very thoughtful and hardworking colleague from Livonia, Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER).

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and to the underlying bill.

Amidst our tumultuous age of globalization wherein big government's restructuring is not merely desirable but inevitable, the sovereign people's congressional servants must facilitate the conditions for sustainable economic growth so people can work, and preserve and promote America's economic preeminence in the world.

To accomplish these vital tasks, government must adopt deep and enduring tax relief, and spending, deficit and debt reduction. These policies are neither novel nor fashionable. They are necessary.

Therefore, because I oppose raising taxes, increasing deficits and debt, and

worsening the entitlement crisis, I fundamentally object to this compromised tax bill's following provisions:

One, a permanent tax increase in exchange for a temporary tax reprieve is mistaken since any and all tax increases in a recession retard a recovery.

And, two, a raid on Social Security requiring increased Federal debt to fund a temporary tax gimmick that will not increase sustainable employment is also mistaken.

Despite its proponents' best intentions, this bill will not end the suffering of the unemployed and economically anxious Americans. It will prolong it. For we cannot delay the day of big government's restructuring; and, in endeavoring to do so, we make the inevitable more painful, more prolonged, and, because it was unnecessary, more deplorable.

Finally, to those Republicans who claim no choice but to vote for a flawed bill now rather than wait 3 weeks for a better one, I disagree and offer an analogy. Imagine prior to the Battle of the Little Big Horn General Custer looking at his troops and saying: "We must strike now before there are more of us."

I disagree with this and urge my colleagues to reject the bill.

□ 1120

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank the gentlelady from New York.

I am in a lonely place today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the tax cut compromise. Although our economy is in recovery, it remains fragile. If we don't pass an extension of the tax cuts now, every American will see smaller paychecks and higher taxes in January.

This compromise provides needed assistance to every American: an extension of the unemployment insurance that the CBO says will add 600,000 jobs; an extension of Earned Income Tax Credits and Child Tax Credits for lower income families; an AMT patch for middle income families; a 2 percent cut in the payroll tax that provides up to \$2,000 in tax relief for workers; a 2-year extension of the income tax rates for all Americans; and business tax cuts that will spur up to \$50 billion in private sector investment in the economy, which is desperately needed.

According to economist Mark Zandi, this compromise will add a full percentage point to the gross domestic product next year. Although we are in recovery, it is not a robust recovery. We need all of the stimulus we can get. This isn't a perfect bill, but I support the bipartisan compromise.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, in this dealing-making, it became more important to get a deal—any deal—than to secure an agreement that reflects our American values and accomplishes our goal of renewed economic growth.

This bill is largely a mishmash of rejected Republican ideas that cost too much to accomplish too little. Under this misbegotten deal, we will borrow immense amounts of money from the Chinese and others to provide the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans with a tax cut that is greater than the median income of a Central Texas family for an entire year. This is the same fortunate 1 percent, for the most part, that took two-thirds of all of the income gains in the country during the heart of the Bush years. That is not fair, and it will not encourage significant economic growth.

The Republicans will rule this House for the next 2 years. Let's not give them an early start today. I would vote for a bill that creates more jobs and reduces the debt. This is not it.

Mr. DREIER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule and the underlying bill.

I am very excited that President Obama has demonstrated that he believes in keeping taxes low for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, you know, as I talk to people in my district and across the country, people like the fact that the Democrats are the party of staying out of their personal business, that we are not doing the moralizing of how they should live their lives—live your own life; make your own decisions—that we are the party of personal accountability and of personal responsibility. Yet they're always concerned in the back of their minds that the Democrats are going to raise their taxes. That is something I always hear.

Oh, I like the Democrats because of the liberty issues, but you know, I always worry they're going to raise my taxes.

Well, I am proud to say that we are conclusively proving here today that the Democratic Party is the party of low taxes and that President Obama has a strong pro-growth agenda to keep taxes low for all Americans.

Let me add, by the way, that this tax cut that we are supporting today most benefits middle class Americans. They receive the true benefit from this tax cut. Families making \$40,000 a year receive about a 7 percent rate reduction through this act. For families making \$60,000 a year, it's 6.1 percent, all the way up to families making \$10 million at 4.6 percent.

So this is a progressive tax cut for America. It is one that puts money

into the hands of middle class families, who are those who need it the most. They're the families making \$40,000, \$50,000, \$60,000 a year. To tell families making \$50,000 a year that they somehow need to come up with \$800 or \$1,000 more a year in taxes when they're not getting raises is going to put them out of their homes. They're struggling to make mortgage payments as it is.

Mr. Speaker, in my district, there are a few people making over \$1 million. Many of them say, You can raise my taxes. It won't affect my quality of life. But for the people who need it the most, the people making \$40,000, \$50,000, \$60,000, \$90,000 a year, who are struggling to get by—a kid in college—who are struggling to make their mortgage payments, this bill and President Obama have delivered tax relief to them.

In addition, in the midst of a recession, we cannot allow unemployment insurance to run out. Over 2,500 people a week in my home State of Colorado, if we don't act today and renew unemployment insurance, will lose their benefits—again, worsening the housing crisis, reducing the ability of their continuing to make their mortgage or rent payments, and forcing them to become liabilities rather than assets.

We will get them back to work, Mr. Speaker, especially with this pro-growth set of tax cuts that will encourage investment in our economy. We will get these Americans back to work, and we will ensure that everybody someday has the honor of paying at a higher tax bracket.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds, and I would like to ask him to yield to me, if he would.

Mr. POLIS. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding, and I would like to congratulate my friend on his very thoughtful statement and to say that, at the end of his remarks, Mr. Speaker, he talked about the notion of job creation/economic growth as a policy. Obviously ensuring that we don't increase taxes for any American who is paying income taxes is key to that.

I would appreciate hearing my colleague's thoughts on that.

Mr. POLIS. If I could request an additional 30 seconds to answer.

Mr. DREIER. Absolutely.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, this tax cut that President Obama and the Republicans and Democrats are delivering here today will encourage solid growth in our economy by keeping taxes low and by giving some predictability over a 2-year period so people can make investments and know that the government is not coming in to take their money but will let them keep their money to reinvest in the economy.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my colleague for his remarks.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the rule before us, on a nearly trillion-dollar bill between spending and tax cuts, apparently does not allow for any time for the opponents of this measure. If you look at page 2, line 4, it says this resolution allows for 3 hours equally divided and controlled between the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

It is my understanding that both of those gentlemen are for the bill. What guarantee do those of us who oppose increasing the deficit by a trillion dollars have of being able to voice our objections if this rule passes?

If Mr. MCGOVERN would like to answer that question, I would welcome it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. My understanding is that there is an informal agreement that there will be time designated for those in opposition; at least an hour.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, with that in mind, there is no guarantee for those of us who are opposed to raising the national debt by \$1 trillion.

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

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 14, nays 385, answered “present” 1, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 639]

YEAS—14

Bright	Gohmert	Pascarell
Cao	Hinche	Taylor
Dahlkemper	Hoekstra	Tiahrt
Flake	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Visclosky
Garrett (NJ)	Lamborn	

NAYS—385

Ackerman	Berman	Brady (PA)
Aderholt	Biggart	Brady (TX)
Adler (NJ)	Bilbray	Braley (IA)
Akin	Bilirakis	Broun (GA)
Alexander	Bishop (GA)	Brown, Corrine
Altmire	Bishop (NY)	Brown-Waite,
Andrews	Bishop (UT)	Ginny
Arcuri	Blackburn	Buchanan
Austria	Blumenauer	Burgess
Baca	Blunt	Burton (IN)
Bachmann	Boccieri	Butterfield
Bachus	Boehner	Buyer
Baldwin	Bonner	Calvert
Barrett (SC)	Bono Mack	Camp
Barrow	Boozman	Campbell
Bartlett	Boren	Cantor
Barton (TX)	Boswell	Capito
Bean	Boucher	Capps
Becerra	Boustany	Capuano
Berkley	Boyd	Carnahan

Carney	Hodes	Napolitano
Carson (IN)	Holden	Neal (MA)
Carter	Holt	Neugebauer
Cassidy	Honda	Nunes
Castle	Hoyer	Nye
Castor (FL)	Hunter	Oberstar
Chaffetz	Inglis	Obey
Childers	Inslee	Olson
Chu	Israel	Oliver
Clarke	Issa	Ortiz
Clay	Jackson (IL)	Owens
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Pallone
Clyburn	(TX)	Pastor (AZ)
Coble	Jenkins	Paul
Coffman (CO)	Johnson (GA)	Paulsen
Cole	Johnson (IL)	Payne
Conaway	Johnson, E. B.	Pence
Connolly (VA)	Johnson, Sam	Perlmutter
Cooper	Jones	Perriello
Costa	Jordan (OH)	Peters
Costello	Kagen	Peterson
Courtney	Kanjorski	Petri
Crenshaw	Kaptur	Pingree (ME)
Critz	Kennedy	Pitts
Crowley	Kildee	Poe (TX)
Cuellar	Kilpatrick (MI)	Polis (CO)
Culberson	Kilroy	Possey
Cummings	Kind	Price (GA)
Davis (CA)	King (IA)	Price (NC)
Davis (IL)	King (NY)	Putnam
Davis (KY)	Kingston	Quigley
DeFazio	Kissell	Radanovich
DeGette	Klein (FL)	Rahall
DeLauro	Kosmas	Rangel
Dent	Kratovil	Reed
Deutch	Kucinich	Rehberg
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lance	Reichert
Diaz-Balart, M.	Langevin	Reyes
Dicks	Larsen (WA)	Richardson
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Rodriguez
Djou	Latham	Roe (TN)
Doggett	LaTourette	Rogers (AL)
Donnelly (IN)	Latta	Rogers (KY)
Doyle	Lee (CA)	Rogers (MI)
Dreier	Lee (NY)	Rohrabacher
Driehaus	Levin	Rooney
Duncan	Lewis (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Edwards (MD)	Lewis (GA)	Roskam
Edwards (TX)	Lipinski	Ross
Ellison	LoBiondo	Rothman (NJ)
Emerson	Loebach	Roybal-Allard
Engel	Lofgren, Zoe	Royce
Eshoo	Lowey	Ruppersberger
Etheridge	Lucas	Rush
Fallin	Luetkemeyer	Ryan (OH)
Farr	Lujan	Ryan (WI)
Fattah	Lummis	Salazar
Filner	Lungren, Daniel	Sánchez, Linda
Fleming	E.	T.
Forbes	Lynch	Sanchez, Loretta
Fortenberry	Mack	Scalise
Fox	Manzullo	Schakowsky
Frank (MA)	Marshall	Schauer
Frank (AZ)	Matheson	Schiff
Frelinghuysen	Matsui	Schmidt
Fudge	McCarthy (CA)	Schock
Gallely	McCauley	Schrader
Garamendi	McClintock	Schwartz
Gerlach	McCollum	Scott (GA)
Giffords	McCotter	Scott (VA)
Gonzalez	McDermott	Sensenbrenner
Goodlatte	McGovern	Serrano
Gordon (TN)	McHenry	Sessions
Graves (GA)	McIntyre	Sestak
Graves (MO)	McKeon	Shadegg
Grayson	McMahon	Shea-Porter
Green, Al	McNerney	Sherman
Green, Gene	Meeks (NY)	Shimkus
Griffith	Melancon	Shuler
Guthrie	Mica	Shuster
Gutierrez	Michaud	Simpson
Hall (NY)	Miller (FL)	Sires
Hall (TX)	Miller (MI)	Slaughter
Halvorson	Miller (NC)	Smith (NE)
Hare	Miller, Gary	Smith (NJ)
Harman	Miller, George	Smith (TX)
Harper	Minnick	Smith (WA)
Hastings (FL)	Mitchell	Snyder
Hastings (WA)	Mollohan	Space
Heinrich	Moore (KS)	Speier
Heller	Moore (WI)	Spratt
Hensarling	Moran (KS)	Stark
Herger	Moran (VA)	Stearns
Herseth Sandlin	Murphy (CT)	Stupak
Higgins	Murphy (NY)	Stutzman
Hill	Murphy, Patrick	Sullivan
Himes	Murphy, Tim	Sutton
Hinojosa	Myrick	Tanner
Hirono	Nadler (NY)	Teague

Terry	Upton	Weiner
Thompson (CA)	Van Hollen	Welch
Thompson (MS)	Velázquez	Westmoreland
Thompson (PA)	Walden	Wilson (OH)
Thornberry	Walz	Wilson (SC)
Tiberi	Wasserman	Wittman
Tierney	Schultz	Wolf
Titus	Waters	Woolsey
Tonko	Watson	Wu
Towns	Watt	Yarmuth
Tsongas	Waxman	Young (AK)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Maloney

NOT VOTING—33

Baird	Foster	McMorris
Berry	Gingrey (GA)	Rodgers
Brown (SC)	Granger	Meek (FL)
Cardoza	Grijalva	Platts
Chandler	Kline (MN)	Pomeroy
Cohen	Linder	Sarbanes
Conyers	Maffei	Skelton
Davis (AL)	Marchant	Turner
Davis (TN)	Markey (CO)	Wamp
Delahunt	Markey (MA)	Whitfield
Ehlers	McCarthy (NY)	Young (FL)
Ellsworth		

□ 1217

Messrs. COFFMAN of Colorado, LIPINSKI, RODRIGUEZ, HEINRICH, MARSHALL, HOLT, ORTIZ, GEORGE MILLER of California, MORAN of Virginia and Ms. SHEA-PORTER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4853, TAX RELIEF, UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE REAUTHORIZATION, AND JOB CREATION ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). The gentleman from Massachusetts has 11 minutes remaining and the gentleman from California has 9½ minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, just to remind Members where we are in this debate, we are about to debate and take up a measure that would, number one, preserve the tax cuts for the wealthiest 2 percent of Americans while we have a \$1.3 trillion deficit in the current year. We would also, if this bill were to pass, create a tax exemption for estates of up to \$10 million. That is for 6,600 individuals, which brings to mind, I will paraphrase Winston Churchill who said, it has been some time since so many have been asked to do so much for so few—and with no legitimate reason, I might add.

We are also talking about raiding the Social Security trust fund for the next 2 years, a total of \$11 billion, and increasing the deficit by about \$1 trillion, which will require us to exceed the national debt limit. So in April or