

cuts should be permanent, not temporary. I think the additional spending should be paid for now, not just added to the deficit.

A funny thing happened in November: We elected over 80 new Republicans. The majority is going from about 255 Democrats to 242 Republicans. You cannot tell me that the week before Christmas that Americans in the business community are deciding what their capital investments are going to be for 2011. Those decisions have already been made. So I am going to vote against the rule and, with reluctance, vote against the bill, not because it's a bad compromise but because we can do better. And I fully expect in January, when the Republicans become the majority party in the House, that we will do better.

So again, this is not the worst bill that has ever been before us, but it could be better and it should be better, and so I would ask my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and "no" on the bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

Mr. RANGEL. For the first time approaching this rule, it is my understanding that if I want to stop \$23 billion from increasing the deficit by knocking out a Senate provision and substituting a Pomeroy, in order to do that I would have to accept the remainder of the Senate bill. I don't think Members of this House should have to make that choice.

It seems to me that if you believe that it is inequitable for a handful of people to receive such a large amount of money at the expense of the deficit, at the expense of discretionary spending, that we should have an opportunity, one, to vote against the Senate bill in its present form that does that, and two, to vote for Pomeroy, which would allow us to at least control the amount of tax relief that we give to estate taxes.

I yield back the balance of my time, but I do hope we get a rule that will allow us to express exactly how we feel, Republican or Democrat, because if you're not a part of the deal, it's hard to be supporting it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to my colleague from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO).

Mr. CAPUANO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, like all major bills that we do here, there is good and bad in

this bill. There are things I like and things I don't like. That is a normal circumstance here. But in the final analysis I think people have to ask themselves one simple question: Are we ever going to get to the place where we pay our bills? This bill doesn't do it.

In 2002, the last time this House had the opportunity to be fiscally responsible—and that's not the same thing as fiscally conservative or liberal; it's responsible—we voted to let the PAYGO rules go and the results are where we are today. This bill will kill our children, with very little input or benefit at the moment. It is not an emergency.

I want a tax cut just like everyone else, but I also consider myself, and I am a social liberal. I do believe in Social Security and Medicare and senior housing and all the other things that we do here. I do believe in them. I know that others don't, and I respect those who want to cut those programs. Let's have that debate, but let's not do it through the back door. If you believe in those programs, it is incumbent upon us to pay for them. Voting for this bill simply empowers those who want to cut those programs anyway, and I cannot, in good conscience, support that.

This bill must go down even if the deal we get next year is worse. I understand that, but it's not the right thing to do for those of us who believe in the programs we have.

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

Mr. Speaker, Democrats and Republicans alike share the goal of job creation and deficit reduction; we regularly hear that argued from both sides of the aisle. The best way for us to do that is to encourage economic growth. Economic growth is the key to dealing with job creation and deficit reduction.

Mr. Speaker, I don't like this bill that is before us, but I like even less the idea of increasing the tax burden on working Americans—in fact, putting into place what would be tantamount to the largest tax increase that we have ever seen.

I am very pleased that President Obama is beginning to embrace the John F. Kennedy vision for economic growth, the vision that has recognized that reducing marginal rates does in fact create jobs and create more opportunity, and the famous John F. Kennedy line, "the rising tide lifts all boats." The fact that President Obama is now moving into that direction is a very positive thing.

He has also, on another issue that is going to create jobs, done so on the issue of trade. I am pleased that he wants us to move ahead with what will be the largest bilateral free trade agreement in the history of the world, that being the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement. I think it is imperative for us to do this in Colombia and Panama as well so that we can create union and non-union jobs, good manufacturing jobs right here in the United States of America. That is an issue that I hope

we are going to be able to address early next year.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is the right thing for us to do, for us to make sure that we don't increase taxes on working Americans.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to close simply by saying that I agree with many of my colleagues who have come to the floor today to express their concern about how these tax cuts—mostly for the rich—will add an incredible debt burden on the backs of our children and our grandchildren. We can do better than this.

I am also worried because I think what my friends on the Republican side want to do is basically kind of take tax cuts for the rich off the table next year when they use a budget axe to go after domestic spending.

I would just say to my colleagues that as we have this debate on tax cuts, there are a lot of people in this country who this debate is meaningless to because they're falling through the cracks. We have an obligation to help strengthen the safety net in this country. And I worry about the agenda that my Republican colleagues are going to pursue next year. I worry that it's going to be on the backs of the most vulnerable in this country, and that is wrong. We have an obligation, a moral obligation to be able to make sure that everybody in this country not only has opportunity, but is also not allowed to fall through the cracks.

We have a hunger problem in this country. We have children who go to sleep at night hungry in the richest country in the world. We should be ashamed of ourselves. We can do better than add to the deficit by giving more tax cuts to the wealthy.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I withdraw the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution is withdrawn.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6516. An act to make technical corrections to provisions of law enacted by the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010.

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.

BANKRUPTCY TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2010

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 6198) to amend title 11 of the United States Code to make technical corrections; and for related purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

On page 3, strike lines 1 through 5 and insert the following: "and

"(F) in paragraph (51D), by inserting 'of the filing' after 'date' the 1st place it appears."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McHENRY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. CHU. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on November 19, the Senate passed an amended version of H.R. 6198, the Bankruptcy Technical Corrections Act of 2010. H.R. 6198 makes a series of purely technical corrections in response to certain drafting errors resulting from the enactment of the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005.

The Senate amendment simply removes from the bill a provision that corrected a misnumbered paragraph.

It is our understanding that some believe that this provision, which corrects a clear error in bankruptcy law, may possibly cause confusion with respect to other laws that currently contain cross-references to the incorrectly numbered paragraph. While some might question the need for the Senate amendment, we are willing to accommodate the concern.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 6198.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Bankruptcy Technical Corrections Act of 2010, as amended by the Senate.

The House passed the original version of the bill in late September to make purely technical changes to the Bankruptcy Code. Then, as now, these changes are not intended to make any change to substantive bankruptcy law.

□ 1250

Instead, these changes clean up the text of the Bankruptcy Code to make it easier to use by lawyers and judges.

The Senate amendment strikes one provision of the House bill which would have renumbered the section of the Bankruptcy Code that defines the term "timeshare plan." Rather than define "timeshare plan" in their own State codes, many State legislatures have chosen to incorporate the Federal definition by reference into their State law. The Senate amendment reflects a concern that changing the section number of the Bankruptcy Code definition would have resulted in inaccurate cross references in numerous State codes.

The necessity of the Senate amendment highlights the perils that result when States legislate by reference to provisions of Federal law. The States are sovereign in our system of constitutional federalism and they should exercise an independent duty to legislate without respect to mutable Federal laws.

The House bill, as amended, will clear up some existing confusion in the bankruptcy community regarding provisions of the Bankruptcy Code. It is important that Federal law be technically sound so that the intent of Congress is clear and judges do not use technical loopholes to practice judicial activism.

In particular, it is important that the Bankruptcy Code be technically sound because of the volume of bankruptcy filings during this recession. As America continues to struggle with high unemployment, bearish capital markets, and massive deficits, the Bankruptcy Code is playing an increasingly important role in our Nation's financial health. Unfortunately, that is the case.

As my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee stated when the House first considered this bill, it is important that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflect the bipartisan acknowledgment that this bill does not, and is not, intended to enact any substantive change to the Bankruptcy Code. Lawyers and judges who practice bankruptcy law should not understand any provision of this bill to confer, modify, or delete any substantive bankruptcy right. Similarly, no inference should be drawn from the absence in this bill of a technical amendment to any other part of the Bankruptcy Code.

With this understanding, I support the bankruptcy technical amendments bill as amended by the Senate, and I share that with my Republican colleagues on the Judiciary Committee.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 6198.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC CONTRACT LAW TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 1107) to enact certain laws relating to public contracts as title 41, United States Code, "Public Contracts".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendments is as follows:

Senate amendments:

On page 2, in the item relating to chapter 35 in the subtitle analysis, strike "and" and insert "or".

On page 7, strike lines 14 through 20 and insert "In this subtitle, the term 'supplies' has the same meaning as the terms 'item' and 'item of supply'".

On page 9, line 20, strike "support" and insert "support".

On page 25, lines 11 and 12, strike "under section 5376 of title 5" and insert "for level IV of the Executive Schedule".

On page 48, line 34, strike "employee from State or local governments" and insert "individual".

On page 55, line 36, strike "\$2,500" and insert "\$3,000".

On page 56, line 15, strike "\$2,500" and insert "\$3,000".

On page 56, line 19, strike "\$2,500" and insert "\$3,000".

On page 77, line 1, strike "his representatives" and insert "representatives of the Comptroller General".

On page 93, lines 18 and 19, strike "under section 5376 of title 5" and insert "for level IV of the Executive Schedule".

On page 110, line 21, strike "AND" and insert "OR".

Beginning on page 131, strike line 8 and all that follows through page 132, line 19, and insert the following:

"(c) CONTRACT PERIOD.—The period of a task order contract entered into under this section, including all periods of extensions of the contract under options, modifications, or otherwise, may not exceed 5 years unless a longer period is specifically authorized in a law that is applicable to the contract."

On page 185, line 39, strike "AMOUNT" and insert "AMOUNTS".

On page 185, line 40, strike "amount" and insert "amounts".

On page 186, line 1, strike "amount" and insert "amounts".

On page 201, line 13, strike "under section 5376 of title 5" and insert "for level IV of the Executive Schedule".

On page 204, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following:

"(3) PERSON.—The term 'person' means a corporation, partnership, business association of any kind, trust, joint-stock company, or individual."

On page 204, line 11, strike "(3)" and insert "(4)".

On page 204, line 14, strike "(4)" and insert "(5)".

On page 204, line 17, strike "(5)" and insert "(6)".

On page 204, line 20, strike "(6)" and insert "(7)".

On page 204, line 24, strike "(7)" and insert "(8)".

On page 204, line 31, strike "(8)" and insert "(9)".

On page 208, line 6, insert "(except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711)" after "division C".