

Schakowsky	Smith (WA)	Tsongas
Schauer	Snyder	Turner
Schiff	Space	Upton
Schmidt	Speier	Van Hollen
Schock	Spratt	Velázquez
Schrader	Stark	Visclosky
Schwartz	Stearns	Walden
Scott (GA)	Stupak	Walz
Scott (VA)	Stutzman	Wasserman
Sensenbrenner	Sullivan	Schultz
Serrano	Sutton	Waters
Sessions	Tanner	Watson
Sestak	Taylor	Watt
Shadegg	Teague	Waxman
Shea-Porter	Terry	Weiner
Sherman	Thompson (CA)	Welch
Shimkus	Thompson (MS)	Westmoreland
Shuler	Thompson (PA)	Whitfield
Shuster	Thornberry	Wilson (OH)
Sires	Tiahrt	Wilson (SC)
Skelton	Tiberi	Wittman
Slaughter	Tierney	Wolf
Smith (NE)	Titus	Woolsey
Smith (NJ)	Tonko	Wu
Smith (TX)	Towns	Yarmuth

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, December 15, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I, in my capacity as Custodian of Records for the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, have been served with a subpoena for documents issued by a grand jury in New York County, New York.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

DANIEL J. STRODEL.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members that cell phone use in the House Chamber is not permitted.

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 revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1766.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, since I made a rather lengthy speech at our first rule this morning, I am going to be giving up my time to other Members.

So I will at this point reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Rochester for yielding me the customary 30 minutes and yield myself such time as I might consume.

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

Mr. DREIER. I think it is very important for us to understand exactly what is taking place here.

About 5 minutes ago I was downstairs and told to appear on the House floor. I am here. I know that there has been a Democratic Caucus held to deal with the changes. I know that lots of people have been following what has transpired over the past few hours, and I think that before we proceed, it would be best for the distinguished chair of the Committee on Rules, Mr. Speaker, to explain to us sort of what's happened and what we're doing and what specific changes Members can anticipate in this rule.

I would be happy to yield to my friend from New York.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Thank you for yielding.

There are very few changes, if any. The caucus in the Democratic Party is really the most important part of our side of the House. The Speaker is meticulous about working with them to achieve consensus. Frankly, we had a rather raucous meeting this morning at the caucus and it was decided that it would be better if we recessed and took some time to see where we were and to make sure that all facets of the caucus had been listened to. But as I said, there will probably be very little change, if any, from the rule we had this morning.

Mr. DREIER. Well, Mr. Speaker, if I could reclaim my time, there may be

NAYS—3

Buyer	Flake	Young (AK)
-------	-------	------------

NOT VOTING—22

Baird	Hoekstra	Moore (WI)
Berry	Johnson, E. B.	Pence
Boehner	Kilpatrick (MI)	Platts
Brown (SC)	Kilroy	Radanovich
Cardoza	Marchant	Simpson
Clyburn	McCarthy (NY)	Wamp
Davis (AL)	McMorris	Young (FL)
Granger	Rodgers	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1429

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. RICHARDSON). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1745

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE) at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives:

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

very little change, but it is my understanding, just from the brief staff report that I got, that we are going to, under this rule, continue to have a vote on the Pomeroy amendment, which increases the death tax. And following that, because of a concern that was raised by Members on the majority side of the aisle, there was concern that there wouldn't be a final passage vote. So am I correct to infer that we can anticipate the only change being a final passage vote on the measure?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. The gentleman is correct. There were many Members who felt that they needed that extra vote. At the proper time we will make the decision as to whether we will call and ask for a change in the rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time again, I am trying to get a clear understanding so that Members of this body will know what the proposed changes are in this rule that is before us that we are debating now. I think that, again, looking back to what we've gone through over the last several years, transparency, disclosure, accountability, those are the guides that we're trying to use. And so before we proceed, Mr. Speaker, I believe that it's very important to have a clear understanding of exactly what it is that we are considering, and so I would ask the chair if she would explain that to the membership.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1800

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I would be happy to respond to the gentleman.

The only thing I can tell you, Mr. DREIER, as I said before, is that there is no change in this bill. We may or may not ask for an ability to have a separate vote, as you pointed out, so that people will have an up-or-down vote on the bill.

As you know, we are dealing with the resolution, and if the Pomeroy portion of it should go down, then we wouldn't normally have that up-or-down vote. If it should pass, that would normally be the end of our proceedings, and it would go directly to the Senate. We are simply adding, as a precaution and for a number of Members who have requested it, an ability to have that up-or-down vote regardless of whether the amendment passes or fails.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I am very appreciative of my friend for yielding.

Let me, Mr. Speaker, explain it the way I've understood.

So the rule is identical to the rule that we were debating earlier, that being we are anticipating 3 hours of general debate; we are expecting that there will be a vote then on the proposal by Mr. POMEROY to increase the death tax. Then, Mr. Speaker, we may or may not, following that, have a vote on final passage before the measure is sent to the Senate; and from there, it would then go on to the President.

Is that a correct explanation?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. That is correct.

Mr. DREIER. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate my friend for having explained it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Chairperson, thank you so very, very much for your leadership and for the change in the rule.

Mr. Speaker, the earlier rule presented a significant problem to us in that it had basically a vote on the Pomeroy amendment; and that would be then, if that passed, the vote on the bill without a separate vote. Separation is very, very important to many of us because we see in this particular piece of legislation numerous serious problems.

For example, we see that the Social Security payroll tax is being reduced, which, for the first time ever in history, I think, has put Social Security's security in play. In the future, we think this may be a very, very serious detriment to the well-being of the Social Security system.

In addition to that, the way in which the taxes are structured, I think, goes basically against some very fundamental principles that were best announced and laid out by Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Etched on the marble at his memorial here in Washington, D.C., are the words that speak, I believe, very directly to this piece of legislation. He said that the test of our progress is not whether those who have much get more but, rather, whether those who have little get enough.

This piece of legislation that we will be voting on, even with the proposed amendment, the Pomeroy amendment, really does give those who have much even more while those who have little get very, very little.

We strongly support the middle class tax cut. That has always been our position. We think President Obama was quite correct in announcing his support for the middle class tax cut. We think that the Republican position of even greater wealth and lower taxes for those who have much—not just a little much but a great, great deal of the wealth of America—is not justified. Therefore, we stand in support of the proposed rule, and we will speak later on the bill.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join my colleague from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) in supporting the rule and also in expressing my opposition to this bill.

A number of Members of Congress will come and express their opposition to the bill in the debate, and I wanted to use some of the time during the rule to set the climate for what many Mem-

bers of this body will be hearing. I want to start with a couple of quotes that, I think, ought to drive some of the discussion that will be taking place here on the floor.

The first is from *The Wealth of Nations* in 1776, Adam Smith: "The subjects of every State ought to contribute toward the support of the government, as nearly as possible, in proportion to their respective abilities; that is, in proportion to the revenue which they respectively enjoy under the protection of the State. As Henry Home (Lord Kames) has written, a goal of taxation should be to 'remedy inequality of riches as much as possible by relieving the poor and burdening the rich.'"

William Jennings Bryan, at the Democratic National Convention, on July 8, 1896, said, "I am in favor of an income tax. When I find a man—or a woman—"who is not willing to bear his share of the burdens of the government which protects him, I find a man who is unworthy to enjoy the blessings of a government like ours."

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in Worcester, Massachusetts, on October 21, 1936, said, "Taxes, after all, are the dues that we pay for the privileges of membership in an organized society."

There will be great debate on the floor of this Congress tonight about extending the Bush-era tax cuts. The Bush-era tax cuts, which are an extension of the Reagan tax cuts of the 1980s, represent one of the most profound shifts of wealth in our Nation from those most vulnerable to those who are well-heeled—those who are better positioned in our society to make their way through life.

So it is our hope, Mr. Speaker, that this debate be conducted in a way that allows for people to participate.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule, as amended, that will give an opportunity to both sides to address what, I think, is an egregious provision in this bill. It, unfortunately, I think, also mirrors another provision in this bill, which is the tax cuts to the wealthiest 2 percent of the people in this country and to a handful of estates, to some 6,000 estates. It gives them a \$25 billion tax cut at a time when working families are struggling to keep their families together.

Also is the fact that it does nothing in terms of stimulus, in terms of job creation. These tax cuts to the wealthy, so many economists have said, is the least stimulative thing you can do. They simply don't spend the money in a timely fashion because they don't need to spend that money. The second one, of course, is that the estate tax provides no stimulative impact either to the economy. In talking

about doing this for the sake of the economy, what we are really doing is cutting taxes to people and to estates that will not contribute to economic growth, so we are creating debt that is unnecessary to create.

You know, we are a couple of weeks away from the debt commission. We are a couple of months away from when people were concerned whether the United States was going to look like Greece or Spain or Portugal. Along we come now, and we're not even prepared to make the distinction as to whether or not we would create debt for, hopefully, stimulative purposes and/or just hand out tax breaks to people who don't need them and who won't contribute to the improvement of the economy. Yet it will clearly be put on the debt of this Nation, and it will clearly have to be dealt with in the ensuing Congresses where it will drive a series of decisions that aren't necessary, but neither was the debt necessary.

I do think this rule is an improvement because it will give the opportunity for those individuals who want to vote against this tax cut for this limited number of estates to do so. Then whether they vote for that or against that or whether that prevails or doesn't prevail, the individuals will still have the ability to vote against this legislation as this is not to suggest that the amendment addresses all that is wrong with this legislation.

□ 1810

It doesn't address the tax cuts for the high income. It doesn't address the complications of the payroll holiday and what that means to the financing of Social Security over the long term, the ability of this Congress to change that a year from now, the fact that that can lead to tax increases for individuals, and that it's less progressive than the higher provision that was in the original Recovery Act to provide assistance to middle-income families.

There are a number of good provisions in this legislation. There are tax provisions in here to help educate their children, to take care of their children, and the extension of unemployment for a year, but I would hope that we would support the rule. As inadequate as this legislation is, I would hope that we would support the rule.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER of New York. I thank the gentlelady for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to oppose this bill, however the rule comes out, for several reasons. Number one, if this bill passes, we will extend the upper income tax cuts at a cost of increase in the deficit by \$700 billion over 10 years.

We're told that in 2 years it will expire. Of course, we also know that our friends on the other side of the aisle

will try to extend it in 2 years, and in 2 years, we'll have the same kind of coercion. We'll be told that if we don't extend the upper end tax cuts, the middle class tax cuts will also expire, and I don't see any reason to believe that we wouldn't succumb to that coercion 2 years from now in an election year as much as we're doing now in this bill.

So I believe that passing this bill, in effect, would make permanent the upper end tax cuts which, in effect, would generate a \$700 billion increase in the deficit, which would make it almost impossible to fund housing, education, everything else we need. It would be the culmination of the 30-year Republican effort to starve the beast, to deliberately create huge deficits in order to provide the political cover for reducing expenditures in housing, education, Social Security, and Medicare.

Secondly, I hope that Mr. POMEROY's amendment on the estate tax will pass, but if it doesn't, that's another problem.

Thirdly, Social Security. We are going, in this bill, to provide for a 1-year tax reduction of 2 percent in the Social Security tax. That will cost us \$120 billion in 1 year, which will be replenished from the general fund, but we know perfectly well that, politically, once you make that tax cut, it will be impossible to restore it, which means it will be \$120 billion a year forever taken away from Social Security but replaced by the general fund.

Now, the conservatives have always told us we have to reduce Social Security, increase the retirement age, reduce benefits, because it contributes to the deficit. We said, no, it doesn't contribute to the deficit. Social Security is walled off; it has nothing to do with the deficit. But now it will be put right in the middle of the deficit debate, and it will cost the general fund \$120 billion a year, \$1.2 trillion over 10 years, and we'll be told you've got to reduce Social Security benefits, increase the retirement age because of the deficit, and it will be in the middle of the deficit debate. We will be told a year or two or three from now, by the way, we'll only replace \$100 billion of the \$120 billion we have taken away from Social Security this year because we need the money for education and housing and something else, and we should not want to be in that position.

FDR decided in 1935 that Social Security would be supported by its own tax, by its own situation of people paying into it year after year so they take it back when they retired. Now we are going to take some of that money away, and we're going to say the general fund will support it. FDR knew that by setting up Social Security as self-financing, it would be difficult to abolish or to reduce. This undoes that genius by the New Deal and puts Social Security at great risk, and, accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I must oppose this bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, assuming that my friend still has additional

speakers, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the gentlewoman from New York.

As of this morning, I was not prepared, much to my disappointment, to support this rule, but I do support the rule now and the ability of this House to move forward on this tax cut bill.

It is sad that later on we're going to consider a bill that isn't just about an estate tax that benefits only 6,600 families. It's about what we do with Social Security for the long term, protecting the investment that all of our seniors, people who have invested in Social Security should be able to expect in the years to come. It is about the debt that's going to be saddled onto our children and our grandchildren.

The underlying bill is so problematic in so many ways—and I'll have an opportunity to speak on my opposition to that bill—but I do stand here able to support a rule that allows me to take a vote as a Democrat, to speak to the values that I hold for working people and for working families and for our children and our grandchildren and their future.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentlewoman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, America faces two great challenges: One, we have too few jobs. Over 15 million Americans who are looking for work can't find it. Even millions more are so discouraged, they don't even go out. Number 2, too much debt; approaching \$14 trillion, in this bill would add \$858 billion more.

Now, President Obama was right in proposing legislation, absolutely right, legislation is needed to revive our economy. And President Obama is right, he is absolutely right, that we should extend those middle class tax cuts for folks up to \$250,000. They need the money. We can't shrink their paycheck, and that will help revive the economy.

But this legislation creates too few jobs and too much debt. The cost per job is in the range of \$390,000. The cost of this is largely because of the success of the Senate Republicans to insist on \$200 million both in estate tax reductions, in high-end tax reductions, that will go to the wealthiest 2 percent of Americans.

This is not about class warfare. This is not about soak the rich. This is about prudent use of taxpayer dollars. If we borrow a dollar, there should be some job bang for that dollar borrowed, and those high-end tax cuts and the estate tax cuts do not generate jobs, but they will be a bill that comes due and must be paid by the middle class and working families of this country.

We have a responsibility to focus on jobs, to focus on economic revival, and to rebuild the middle class. We can do a better job. We could have a bill that extended the Bush tax cuts up to \$250,000, and the money saved, put that into reducing the deficit and infrastructure development. We could have a bill that focussed on an estate tax that was less generous than what is being considered in this legislation, and we could have a bill that would protect Social Security. Americans know that we cannot take money out from the revenue stream and expect to have solvency in the long term.

So we have a chance to pass the legislation to revive us economically, to treat the middle class right, but to limit the debt.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

□ 1820

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairlady for giving me this opportunity.

I wasn't going to support the rule this morning, but I am going to support it now. I am going to support it because I want to be able to vote to make the estate tax more reasonable, even though the reality is, what we are voting on is whether we are going to give the wealthy with the estate tax a six-course meal with wine or a seven-course meal with wine, and we should be talking about a meat and three.

The fact is, the estate tax with a \$675,000 exemption was started with the Bush tax cuts, and now we are putting it up to a \$5 million exemption per person and \$10 million per couple. It was at a 55 percent rate and precipitously drops in this bill to 35 percent. The benefit to the heirs of the richest people in this country is unbelievable, unfathomable. And what that means, you will have a continued concentration of wealth in a few select families, lords so to speak, princes that have money beyond what anybody needs to have in this Nation and not contribute to others. The fact is, this was a very difficult vote, a very difficult decision for me. I asked my constituents to let me know what they thought. I had hundreds of people call and write and contribute to a poll, and it was about even, for and against.

The fact is, the future of our Nation is at risk. These tax cuts for the most wealthy people in our Nation, for corporations that will not produce jobs, in the hundreds of billions of dollars category, and the inheritance tax will take away the children, the aged, and the needy in years to come who will need support from this Nation. The deficit will be so great that when it comes time for deficit cutting, the cuts are going to come to the people who most are in need.

Hubert Humphrey said, "The moral test of government is how it treats

those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the aged; and those in the shadows of life, the sick, the needy, and the handicapped." He and others, like Dr. King, the Dalai Lama, and others who you look to never talk about giving more to the rich. Mr. GARAMENDI started talking about Franklin Roosevelt. The fact is, those people who are the moral tests will suffer when the cuts are made, and I don't see that as something I should support. I cannot be sure of that.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. The lack of response from the Republican side is a bit interesting because we are about to add \$430 billion to this year's deficit if this bill passes. That is \$430 billion borrowed, probably from China, added to the deficit. A record \$1.75 trillion.

Now, we have been told this is the only deal, the best deal. No, we have offered an alternative. And earlier today, I thought we had some prospect of actually voting on it, one that's much less expensive, more targeted to working families, average Americans, and those who are unemployed would have created real jobs with substantial investment in infrastructure projects, not the jobs you are going to get by giving people small tax breaks and saying, Here is some borrowed money from China; go out and buy some goods from China. That will put America on the path to recovery.

Every other industrial nation on Earth is talking about buckling down a little bit and austerity measures and having a sustained recovery. No, not here. We got out the credit card. A trillion dollars—well, no. It's only \$858 billion. And guess what, our kids and grandkids are going to be paying that bill for 30 years. And the most insidious part is that \$111 billion of that will come from the Social Security trust fund.

But don't worry, after we take the money from the Social Security trust fund and ask people to consume with it, present day consumption, in order to take care of Social Security in the long term, we will go out and borrow \$111 billion from China and reinject it into the trust fund. And then a year from today, the Republicans will say to President Obama, You can't raise taxes on every working American. You can't restore the Social Security tax. And, oh, by the way, we just can't afford to subsidize that program anymore. We are just going to have to cut it.

This is a bad deal. It isn't going to create the jobs we could create for a smaller price tag. It's not going to give the relief we, as Democrats, want to give the working families and unemployed Americans and put this country on a path to recovery.

I would urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and get made in order

an amendment that would make major structural changes to this deal. It should not be a take-it-or-leave-it deal dictated by the Republican minority leader.

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

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Republican Senators have held America hostage, held the American economy hostage, held hostage the middle class. And the President agreed to pay the ransom. Now that ransom can be paid this month with the consent not only of the President, but the Senators and this House. So we can stop the ransom from being paid until the end of the year. And at that point, the President will still be willing to pay the ransom, and the ransom will go up.

If the ransom is going to be paid, let us pay it before it goes up. Knowing that the President had agreed to the major and expensive changes that the Republican Senators demanded, I sought to amend this bill only in a modest way, only to the extent that we could do the deal by the end of the year. And I put forward an amendment that would not increase the cost of the bill by a penny or reduce the tax cuts that the Republicans have been asking for by a penny. I asked only that instead of the payroll tax holiday that needlessly involves the Social Security trust fund and comingles general funds with the Social Security trust fund, that we send out checks as soon as possible so that the money the Republicans have already agreed should go to working families would get to them perhaps in time to pay this year's Christmas bills.

Unfortunately, no effort was made at the highest levels to secure the support of even a couple of Republican Senators for that kind of minor tweaking. And so we stand today with only one choice: pay the ransom now, or pay more ransom later. This is not a place Democrats want to be. But, ultimately, it is better to pay the ransom today than to watch the President pay even more—and I think he'd be willing to pay a bit more—next month.

Therefore, we are going to have to swallow hard. We are going to see an estate tax law so bad that for the richest families where someone died in 2010, the tax rate is going to be less than zero. The family will be able to choose zero, or choose huge reductions in future income taxes. And they will be well advised, and they will pick whatever costs the Treasury the most money, and we will collect less than zero from those families. We will see those with an income—not mere millionaires but people with \$1 million in annual income—get tax relief that they won't spend and don't particularly need.

The choice is to pay the ransom now, or to watch it go up next month.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 8½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the chairperson of the Rules Committee what a terrific job she is doing. And of course I would urge us all to vote for the rule, but I don't think we should vote for this tax cut.

□ 1830

The idea is that we will kick all the tax cuts down the road for another 2 years.

Have you ever seen anybody kicking a can? They never bend over and pick it up and drop it in the trash can. They just keep kicking it. And that's what we're going to do.

We knew back in 2001 and 2003, when we were told these tax cuts are going to expire in 2011, that they weren't really going to expire. And they're not going to expire either in an election year. Our President isn't going to run in 2012 on a platform that he's going to raise your taxes.

And with regard to Social Security, do we really think that next year we're going to increase payroll taxes by fifty percent from 4 percent to 6¼ percent? We're not going to do that. And so what's really going to happen is that we're going to take money out the general revenue fund to keep Social Security solvent.

So what we're talking about is not \$900 billion. It's really about \$4 trillion more of lost revenue. That's what we're committing ourselves to over the next several years.

And yet, back in 2001, President Bush inherited a surplus. The discipline of PAYGO had created 3 straight years of surpluses. Imagine. Think about that, because it's not going to happen again in our lifetimes or the lifetimes of our children or grandchildren after this vote is taken tonight. But we had a projected surplus of \$5.6 trillion at the end of the Clinton Administration. In fact, at the end of 2010, we were going to have our debt paid off. Instead of having \$12 trillion plus of debt, we would have paid off all our indebtedness. And we would have fulfilled our responsibility to our children and grandchildren's generation. This doesn't.

This is the wrong thing to do. It's the easy thing to do. Everybody loves a tax cut. You know, let's be Santa Claus. Let's give something to everyone. In fact, there are 81 provisions in this tax bill. Most of us have no idea what they actually do. But look through it; 81 different deductions and exemptions and giveaways and accessions to lobbyists and so on. That's not what we ought to be doing at Christmastime.

We ought, when we sit with our children and our grandchildren on our laps, we ought to be proud that we have secured a better standard of living for each of them, that we have looked into the future, and done the right thing.

The Native Americans who originally lived in this land, they used to make decisions based on how they would affect the seventh generation to come. We can't even look 7 years ahead.

We ought to vote "no" on this tax bill because it's irresponsible. So I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the bill itself but "yes" on the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the estate tax provisions in this bill, and I'm thankful that the rule would allow us to vote against this estate tax.

But I also oppose the extension of the high income tax cuts, and I oppose the way we are doing the Social Security situation because I think it will result in damage to Social Security. And this rule does not give me the opportunity to vote against those two things. And therefore, it's my intention to vote against the rule.

I've tried to make it clear to my leadership that I think it's important for me to have that vote on those two issues, and they haven't seen fit to make that in order. So I feel like I must, under those circumstances, vote against the rule.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentlelady for yielding to me, and I regretfully oppose the rule and will oppose the bill. And the most important reason is that this bill will not translate into job creation in the United States of America. All it does is put our taxpayers on the hook for another trillion dollars of borrowed debt that will be from places like China, and from Saudi Arabia, in order to give more tax cuts to the rich over the next 10 years. There is no guarantee that that money will even be invested in the United States of America.

You know, the Dow is up 42 percent. NASDAQ is up 78 percent. Wall Street is on track to see its second-highest profitable year on record with a projected \$144 billion in bonuses going out the door. Couldn't they take some of that and make sure this goes to those who are unemployed and still seeking to earn their way forward in this economy?

This bill will not be a real stimulus. In fact, it will only yield 33 cents of economic impact for every dollar that is borrowed to pay for it. It will not create real robust growth and jobs in this country. There is not even a "Buy America" provision in the bill. I'm so sad for our Nation that we can't do better and help put America's unemployed back to work.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), the last speaker I have.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, May 9, 2001, was my son's 13th birthday. Thirteen was a very unlucky year for him, and every other kid in America. On that day, unemployment was 4.3 percent. Our Nation was \$5,600,286,010,418 in debt.

Nine years and 7 months since the passage of the Bush budget, unemployment is 9.8 percent, and our debt has grown by a staggering \$8,204,749,146,330.57. If there's anyone in this body who wants to tell me that the intended effect was to double the number of unemployed people and to add \$8 trillion to the debt and, therefore, we should do more of this—I rise in opposition to this rule, and I beg this body to defeat this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I've listened to a number of my friends offer great quotes. I listened to Mr. JACKSON quote William Jennings Bryant, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and Adam Smith. I listened to Mr. GARAMENDI quote Teddy Roosevelt. And I've listened to—was it Franklin Roosevelt? Okay. I thought somebody was quoting Teddy Roosevelt.

Well, I'd like to close by quoting one of our great former colleagues, the late Jack Kemp, who, many times stood here in the well and said, if you tax something, you get less of it. If you subsidize something, you get more of it.

In America we tax work, growth, savings, investment, productivity. We subsidize non-work, welfare, consumption, debt, and leisure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Jack Kemp was revered by Democrats and Republicans alike, and he was someone who understood very clearly that if you increase that tax burden on job creators, you undermine the ability of people who are trying to get onto that first rung of the economic ladder a chance to do that.

□ 1840

We have a very important vote ahead of us. I don't like this bill. I don't know of anyone who stood up and said that they liked this bill, but I like even less the prospect of increasing taxes on every American who pays income taxes today. That is why I believe we should move ahead as expeditiously as possible so that, come January, we can have this laser-like focus in our quest to grow our economy by reducing the size and scope and reach of government so that we can increase opportunity for all Americans.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in a moment I will be offering an amendment to the rule, and I want to take this opportunity to briefly describe the amendment.

The amendment shifts initial consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate

amendment to H.R. 4853 into the Committee of the Whole. After 3 hours of general debate, a vote will occur on the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules and the Committee of the Whole shall rise. If the amendment passes, a vote will occur on a motion that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment with the amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole. If the motion fails, a vote will occur on a motion that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment.

I urge a “yes” vote on the amendment, the rule, and the previous question.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I have an amendment to this rule at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. SLAUGHTER:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

“That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to 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. All points of order against consideration of the Senate amendment are waived except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the Senate amendment and the motions addressed by this resolution and shall not exceed three hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their designees. After general debate, the Senate amendment shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. No amendment shall be in order except the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment may be offered only by Representative Levin of Michigan or his designee and shall not be debatable. All points of order against that amendment are waived except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI.

“SEC. 2. Upon disposition of the proposed House amendment made in order in the first section of this resolution, the Committee of the Whole shall rise and report the Senate amendment back to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted.

“SEC. 3. (a) If the Committee of the Whole reports the Senate amendment back to the House with an amendment, the pending question shall be a motion that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment with such amendment.

“(b) If a motion specified in subsection (a) fails of adoption, the pending question shall be a motion that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment.

“SEC. 4. If the Committee of the Whole reports the Senate amendment back to the House without amendment, the pending question shall be a motion that the House

concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment.

“SEC. 5. Until completion of proceedings enabled by this resolution—

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

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

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

“(d) all points of order against pending motions specified in sections 3 and 4 are waived (except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI), and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on each such motion to final adoption without intervening motion or question of consideration.”

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the amendment, on the rule, and the previous question.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the amendment to House Resolution 1766 will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules on S. 987.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 186, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 643]

AYES—230

Ackerman	Connolly (VA)	Gonzalez
Altmire	Conyers	Gordon (TN)
Andrews	Cooper	Grayson
Arcuri	Costa	Green, Al
Baca	Costello	Green, Gene
Baird	Courtney	Gutierrez
Baldwin	Critz	Hall (NY)
Barrow	Crowley	Halvorson
Bean	Cuellar	Hare
Becerra	Cummings	Harman
Berkley	Dahlkemper	Hastings (FL)
Berman	Davis (CA)	Heinrich
Bishop (GA)	Davis (IL)	Herseth Sandlin
Bishop (NY)	Davis (TN)	Higgins
Blumenauer	DeGette	Hill
Bocchieri	Delahunt	Himes
Boren	DeLauro	Hinchev
Boswell	Deutch	Hinojosa
Boucher	Dicks	Hirono
Brady (PA)	Dingell	Hodes
Bralley (IA)	Doggett	Holden
Brown, Corrine	Donnelly (IN)	Holt
Butterfield	Doyle	Honda
Capps	Driehaus	Hoyer
Capuano	Edwards (MD)	Inslee
Cardoza	Edwards (TX)	Israel
Carnahan	Ellison	Jackson (IL)
Carney	Ellsworth	Jackson Lee
Carson (IN)	Engel	(TX)
Castor (FL)	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)
Chandler	Etheridge	Kagen
Childers	Farr	Kanjorski
Chu	Fattah	Kaptur
Clarke	Foster	Kennedy
Clay	Frank (MA)	Kildee
Cleaver	Fudge	Kilpatrick (MI)
Clyburn	Garamendi	Kind
Cohen	Giffords	Kirkpatrick (AZ)

Kissell	Murphy (CT)	Schiff
Klein (FL)	Murphy (NY)	Schwartz
Kratovil	Murphy, Patrick	Scott (GA)
Kucinich	Nadler (NY)	Serrano
Langevin	Neal (MA)	Sestak
Larsen (WA)	Nye	Shea-Porter
Larson (CT)	Oberstar	Sherman
Lee (CA)	Oliver	Shuler
Levin	Owens	Sires
Lewis (GA)	Pallone	Slaughter
Lipinski	Pascrell	Smith (WA)
Loebsock	Pastor (AZ)	Snyder
Lofgren, Zoe	Payne	Space
Lowey	Perlmutter	Spratt
Lujan	Perriello	Stark
Lynch	Peters	Stupak
Maffei	Peterson	Sutton
Maloney	Pingree (ME)	Teague
Markey (CO)	Polis (CO)	Thompson (CA)
Markey (MA)	Pomeroy	Thompson (MS)
Marshall	Price (NC)	Tierney
Matheson	Quigley	Titus
Matsui	Rahall	Tonko
McCollum	Rangel	Towns
McDermott	Reyes	Tsongas
McGovern	Richardson	Velázquez
McMahon	Rodriguez	Visclosky
McNerney	Ross	Walz
Meek (FL)	Rothman (NJ)	Wasserman
Meeke (NY)	Roybal-Allard	Schultz
Melancon	Ruppersberger	Waters
Michaud	Rush	Watson
Miller (NC)	Ryan (OH)	Watt
Miller, George	Salazar	Waxman
Minnick	Sánchez, Linda	Weiner
Mitchell	T.	Welch
Mollohan	Sanchez, Loretta	Wilson (OH)
Moore (KS)	Sarbanes	Willsey
Moore (WI)	Schakowsky	Yarmuth
Moran (VA)	Schauer	

NOES—186

Aderholt	Filmer	McClintock
Adler (NJ)	Flake	McCotter
Akin	Fleming	McHenry
Alexander	Forbes	McIntyre
Austria	Fortenberry	McKeon
Bachmann	Fox	Mica
Bachus	Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)
Barrett (SC)	Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)
Bartlett	Gallely	Miller, Gary
Barton (TX)	Garrett (NJ)	Moran (KS)
Biggert	Gerlach	Murphy, Tim
Bilbray	Gingrey (GA)	Myrick
Bilirakis	Gohmert	Napolitano
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	Neugebauer
Blackburn	Graves (GA)	Nunes
Blunt	Graves (MO)	Obey
Boehner	Griffith	Olson
Bonner	Grijalva	Paul
Bono Mack	Guthrie	Paulsen
Boozman	Hall (TX)	Pence
Boustany	Harper	Petri
Boyd	Hastings (WA)	Pitts
Brady (TX)	Heller	Platts
Bright	Hensarling	Poe (TX)
Broun (GA)	Herger	Posey
Brown-Waite,	Hoekstra	Price (GA)
Ginny	Hunter	Putnam
Buchanan	Inglis	Reed
Burgess	Issa	Rehberg
Burton (IN)	Jenkins	Reichert
Calvert	Johnson (IL)	Roe (TN)
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Campbell	Jones	Rogers (KY)
Cantor	Jordan (OH)	Rogers (MI)
Cao	King (IA)	Rohrabacher
Capito	King (NY)	Rooney
Carter	Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen
Cassidy	Kiame (MN)	Roskam
Castle	Kosmas	Royce
Chaffetz	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)
Coble	Lance	Scalise
Coffman (CO)	Latham	Schmidt
Cole	LaTourette	Schock
Conaway	Latta	Schrader
Crenshaw	Lee (NY)	Scott (VA)
Culberson	Lewis (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Davis (KY)	Linder	Sessions
DeFazio	LoBiondo	Shadegg
Dent	Lucas	Shimkus
Diaz-Balart, L.	Luetkemeyer	Shuster
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lummis	Simpson
Djou	Lungren, Daniel	Skelton
Dreier	E.	Smith (NE)
Duncan	Mack	Smith (NJ)
Ehlers	Manzullo	Smith (TX)
Emerson	McCarthy (CA)	Stearns
Fallin	McCaul	Stutzman

Sullivan Tiberi Wilson (SC)  
 Taylor Turner Wittman  
 Terry Upton Wolf  
 Thompson (PA) Walden Wu  
 Thornberry Westmoreland Young (AK)  
 Tiahrt Whitfield

NOT VOTING—17

Berry Kilroy Radanovich  
 Brown (SC) Marchant Speier  
 Buyer McCarthy (NY) Tanner  
 Davis (AL) McMorris Van Hollen  
 Granger Rodgers Wamp  
 Johnson, E. B. Ortiz Young (FL)

□ 1917

Messrs. McCOTTER, MCINTYRE, SIMPSON, OBEY, and Ms. KOSMAS changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. WATT and Ms. FUDGE changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 214, noes 201, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 644]

AYES—214

Ackerman Delahunt Kennedy  
 Altmire DeLauro Kildee  
 Andrews Deuth Kind  
 Arcuri Dicks Kirkpatrick (AZ)  
 Baca Dingell Kissell  
 Baird Donnelly (IN) Klein (FL)  
 Baldwin Doyle Kosmas  
 Barrow Driehaus Kucinich  
 Bean Edwards (MD) Langevin  
 Becerra Larsen (TX) Larsen (WA)  
 Berkley Ellison Larson (CT)  
 Berman Ellsworth Lee (CA)  
 Bishop (GA) Engel Levin  
 Bishop (NY) Eshoo Lewis (GA)  
 Blumenauer Farr Lipinski  
 Boccieri Fattah Loeb sack  
 Boren Foster Lujan  
 Boswell Frank (MA) Maffei  
 Boucher Fudge Maloney  
 Brady (PA) Garamendi  
 Brown, Corrine Giffords Markey (CO)  
 Butterfield Gonzalez Markey (MA)  
 Capps Gordon (TN) Marshall  
 Capuano Green, Al Matheson  
 Cardoza Green, Gene Matsui  
 Carnahan Gutierrez McCollum  
 Carney Hall (NY) McDermott  
 Carson (IN) Halvorson McGovern  
 Castor (FL) Hare McIntyre  
 Chandler Harman McNeerney  
 Childers Hastings (FL) Meek (FL)  
 Chu Heinrich Meeks (NY)  
 Clarke Herseth Sandlin Melancon  
 Clay Higgins Miller (NC)  
 Clyburn Hill Miller, George  
 Cohen Himes Minnick  
 Connolly (VA) Hinchey Mitchell  
 Conyers Hinojosa Mollohan  
 Costa Hirono Moore (KS)  
 Costello Hodes Moore (WI)  
 Courtney Holden Moran (VA)  
 Critz Honda Murphy (CT)  
 Crowley Hoyer Murphy (NY)  
 Cuellar Inslee Murphy, Patrick  
 Cummings Israel Nadler (NY)  
 Davis (AL) Jackson (IL) Neal (MA)  
 Davis (CA) Jackson Lee  
 Davis (IL) (TX) Nye  
 Davis (TN) Johnson (GA) Oberstar  
 DeGette Kagen Oliver

Owens Sanchez, Linda Stupak  
 Pallone T. Sutton  
 Pascrell Sanchez, Loretta Teague  
 Pastor (AZ) Sarbanes Thompson (CA)  
 Perlmutter Schakowsky Titus  
 Peters Schauer Tonko  
 Peterson Schiff Towns  
 Pingree (ME) Schrader Tsongas  
 Polis (CO) Schwartz Velázquez  
 Pomeroy Scott (GA) Visclosky  
 Price (NC) Serrano Walz  
 Quigley Sestak Wasserman  
 Rahall Shea-Porter Schultz  
 Rangel Sherman Waters  
 Reyes Shuler Watson  
 Richardson Sires Waxman  
 Ross Slaughter Waxman  
 Rothman (NJ) Smith (WA) Weiner  
 Roybal-Allard Snyder Welch  
 Ruppertsberger Space Wilson (OH)  
 Rush Speier Woolsey  
 Ryan (OH) Spratt Yarmuth  
 Salazar Stark

NOES—201

Aderholt Foxx Murphy, Tim  
 Adler (NJ) Franks (AZ) Myrick  
 Akin Frelinghuysen Napolitano  
 Alexander Gallegly Neugebauer  
 Austria Garrett (NJ) Nunes  
 Bachmann Gerlach Olson  
 Bachus Gingrey (GA) Paul  
 Barrett (SC) Gohmert Paulsen  
 Bartlett Goodlatte Payne  
 Barton (TX) Graves (GA) Pence  
 Biggert Graves (MO) Perriello  
 Bilbray Grayson Petri  
 Bilirakis Griffith Pitts  
 Bishop (UT) Grijalva Platts  
 Blackburn Guthrie Poe (TX)  
 Blunt Hall (TX) Posey  
 Boehner Harper Price (GA)  
 Bonner Hastings (WA) Putnam  
 Bono Mack Heller Reed  
 Boozman Hensarling Rehberg  
 Boustany Herger  
 Boyd Hoekstra Reichert  
 Brady (TX) Holt Rodriguez  
 Braley (IA) Hunter Roe (TN)  
 Bright Inglis Rogers (AL)  
 Broun (GA) Issa Rogers (KY)  
 Brown-Waite, Jenkins Rogers (MD)  
 Ginny Rohrabacher  
 Buchanan Johnson (IL) Rooney  
 Burgess Johnson, Sam Ros-Lehtinen  
 Burton (IN) Jones Roskam  
 Calvert Jordan (OH) Royce  
 Camp Kanjorski Ryan (WI)  
 Campbell Kaptur  
 Cantor Kilpatrick (MI) Scalise  
 King (IA) Schmidt  
 King (NY) King (NY) Schock  
 Kingston Scott (VA)  
 Kline (MN) Sensenbrenner  
 Cassidy Lamborn Sessions  
 Castle Lance Shadegg  
 Chaffetz Latham Shimkus  
 Cleaver LaTourette Shuster  
 Coble Latta Simpson  
 Coffman (CO) Lee (NY) Skelton  
 Cole Lewis (CA) Smith (NE)  
 Conaway Linder Smith (NJ)  
 Cooper LoBiondo Smith (TX)  
 Crenshaw Lofgren, Zoe Stearns  
 Culberson Lucas Stutzman  
 Dahlkemper Luetkemeyer Sullivan  
 Davis (KY) Lummis Taylor  
 DeFazio Lungren, Daniel Terry  
 Dent E. Thompson (MS)  
 Diaz-Balart, L. Lynch Thompson (PA)  
 Diaz-Balart, M. Mack Thornberry  
 Djou Manullo Tiahrt  
 Doggett McCarthy (CA) Tiberi  
 Dreier McCaul Turner  
 Duncan McClintock Upton  
 Ehlers McCotter Walden  
 Emerson McKeon Watt  
 Etheridge McMahan Westmoreland  
 Fallon Mica Whitfield  
 Filner Michaud Wilson (SC)  
 Flake Miller (FL) Wittman  
 Fleming (MI) Miller (MI) Wolf  
 Forbes Miller, Gary Wu  
 Fortenberry Moran (KS) Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—18

Berry Johnson, E. B. McCarthy (NY)  
 Brown (SC) Kilroy McHenry  
 Buyer Kratovil McMorris  
 Granger Marchant Rodgers

Ortiz Tierney Young (FL)  
 Radanovich Van Hollen  
 Tanner Wamp

□ 1926

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL PROTECTING GIRLS BY PREVENTING CHILD MARRIAGE ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 987) to protect girls in developing countries through the prevention of child marriage, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, nays 166, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 645]

YEAS—241

Ackerman Davis (TN) Jackson Lee  
 Adler (NJ) DeFazio (TX)  
 Altmire Delahunt Johnson (GA)  
 Andrews DeLauro Kagen  
 Arcuri Dent Kanjorski  
 Baca Deuth Kennedy  
 Baird Dicks Kildee  
 Baldwin Dingell Kilpatrick (MI)  
 Barrow Doggett Kind  
 Bean Donnelly (IN) Kirkpatrick (AZ)  
 Becerra Doyle Kissell  
 Berkley Driehaus Klein (FL)  
 Berman Edwards (MD) Kosmas  
 Bishop (GA) Edwards (TX) Kratovil  
 Bishop (NY) Ehlers Kucinich  
 Blumenauer Ellison Langevin  
 Boccieri Ellsworth Larsen (WA)  
 Boren Engel Larson (CT)  
 Boswell Eshoo Latham  
 Boyd Etheridge LaTourette  
 Brady (PA) Farr Lee (CA)  
 Braley (IA) Fattah Levin  
 Bright Filner Lewis (GA)  
 Brown, Corrine Foster Loeb sack  
 Butterfield Frank (MA) Lofgren, Zoe  
 Capps Frelinghuysen Lowey  
 Capuano Lujan  
 Cardoza Garamendi Lynch  
 Carnahan Giffords Maffei  
 Carney Gonzalez Maloney  
 Carson (IN) Grayson Markey (CO)  
 Castle Green, Al Markey (MA)  
 Castor (FL) Green, Gene Marshall  
 Chandler Grijalva Matheson  
 Chu Gutierrez Matsui  
 Clarke Hall (NY) McCollum  
 Clay Harman McDermott  
 Clyburn Hastings (FL) McGovern  
 Cohen Heinrich McIntyre  
 Connolly (VA) Herseth Sandlin McMahan  
 Conyers Higgs McNeerney  
 Cooper Hill Meek (FL)  
 Costa Himes Meeks (NY)  
 Courtney Hinchey Melancon  
 Crenshaw Hinojosa Michaud  
 Critz Hirono Miller (NC)  
 Crowley Hodes Miller, George  
 Cuellar Holt Minnick  
 Cummings Honda Mitchell  
 Dahlkemper Hoyer Mollohan  
 Davis (AL) Inslee Moore (KS)  
 Davis (CA) Israel Moore (WI)  
 Davis (IL) Jackson (IL) Moran (VA)