

CFPB's mission is to take the tricks and traps out of financial products we use every day like credit cards and mortgages.

So even though GOP Senators are filibustering the confirmation of the agency's top official, the Bureau is already at work on behalf of consumers. This project, Know Before You Owe, aims to simplify credit card agreements and student loan disclosure forms so consumers know exactly what they're getting into when they borrow.

Importantly, CFPB is asking consumers for their input on this important task. So I encourage all citizens to visit consumerfinance.gov to share their experiences about credit cards and loan agreements. Consumers can also file complaints about credit card companies or mortgage services and learn how to protect themselves from financial scams.

For the first time, we have a dedicated watchdog looking out exclusively for the interests of consumers. I urge all American consumers to take advantage of these great new resources.

TYPE 1 JUVENILE DIABETES

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Leawood, Kansas, I had the privilege to meet with a bright, energetic young man named Garrett. Garrett is 4 years old and suffers from type 1 juvenile diabetes.

Garrett's story is touching, and it is all too familiar to families across this country who struggle with the stress and strain of juvenile diabetes and the constant concern about the right diet, the right insulin levels, about the highest quality of life for their children.

Last month, I was pleased to hear the Food and Drug Administration issue new guidelines aimed at helping speed up the development of artificial pancreas systems.

Mr. Speaker, it's clear that we as a country need to continue to do all that we can to help bright children like Garrett who need better tools to manage their disease and prevent life threatening and costly complications.

A RESPONSIBLE TAX EXTENDER PACKAGE

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, 160 million Americans stand on the brink of a tax hike. Republicans in Congress need to get serious about working together on a bipartisan package to extend the payroll taxes for the middle class and renew unemployment benefits.

The Republican extender package reduces eligibility for unemployment benefits by 40 weeks. It would require everyone receiving benefits to have a GED. My dad, who only had a third-

grade education, would not be eligible. And it cuts \$21 billion from affordable health care programs, causing 170,000 Americans to become uninsured.

Republicans are asking seniors to pay more for their Medicare, and they're asking the Federal employees to have serious cuts or salaries frozen until the year 2015. Yet they refuse to ask millionaires and billionaires to pay one more cent. No taxes, no jobs.

Let's pass a responsible plan to extend the payroll tax and unemployment benefits before it's too late.

TIME FOR CHANGE ON TAX EXTENDER

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, Joyce Timmons from Suitland, Maryland, called my office to say that the extra money in her paycheck from the soon-to-expire payroll tax cut is important to her and her family.

Joyce and 160 million workers are wondering why my Republican colleagues are now for raising taxes on working people before they were against raising taxes. That's right. The Republicans oppose extending the payroll tax cut except by blackmail.

By extending the tax cut, working people like Joyce Timmons would receive, on average, a thousand dollars next year. It's not a \$10,000 bet; it's real money in the economy.

Republicans go out of their way to block job creation and protect tax cuts for the 1 percenters, but they want to raise taxes for the 99 percenters. And they won't stop there.

More than a million Americans have been out of work for a really long time, including 25,000 Marylanders; yet Republicans want to be the grinch who stole Christmas by denying an unemployment check so that people who want to work but can't find work can buy groceries, pay rent and utilities, and tide their families over.

Republicans want to go home for the holidays, but they want working people to pay more in taxes next year and lose out on an unemployment check.

The Grinch became a good guy; Scrooge found a heart; even Mr. Potter changed his tune. It's time for Republicans to change too.

HOW LOW CAN YOU GO?

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. This weekend I attended a senior citizen party and we had a dance contest, and two people would hold a stick and others would try to go under it. And the disk jockey would ask the question: How low can you go? Can you go to the floor?

And I submit that if we refuse to provide unemployment tax extensions, I'd

have to ask the Congress: How low can you go? Can you go to the floor?

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 13, 2011.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on December 13, 2011 at 9:48 a.m.:

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 1801.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3630, MIDDLE CLASS TAX RELIEF AND JOB CREATION ACT OF 2011

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 491 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 491

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3630) to provide incentives for the creation of jobs, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 90 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

POINT OF ORDER

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order against H. Res. 491 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 a violation of section 426(a).

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

The gentlewoman has met the threshold burden under the rule, and the gentlewoman from Wisconsin and a Member opposed 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 gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. I thank you so much, Mr. Speaker.

Sadly, we're here once again with my Republican colleagues who are trying to ram through this fat-cat tax extenders legislation, providing mere crumbs from the master's table for working people that will neither help the American people weather this economic malaise nor create a single job.

□ 1240

To add insult to injury, the Rules Committee has rejected all attempts to allow any amendments to this horrible piece of legislation. I proposed four amendments, which were not considered, and in fact, the Republican majority rejected a Democratic substitute.

There is a song by the group Cameo—and I know Mr. DREIER will appreciate this—called “Talkin’ Out the Side of Your Neck.” The lyrics are:

So you can see we're back into this same old mess.

Seems like every time we get out of one situation we're back into it all over again.

All you people that watch you talk, you better get it together or we won't get it done.

We sit down while you cuss and fuss. But guess who's suffering. Nobody but us.

That's exactly what the Republicans are doing—talking out of both sides of their necks. They talk and talk and talk, making false claims to the middle class, false promises, when they're really trying to protect the interests of the 1 percent; and like the song suggests, those in the middle class are the ones who are suffering.

Once again, through this sham piece of legislation, the Republicans claim to be creating jobs when the cruel thing is that, when 160 million workers are given a small payroll tax holiday, the cost is they are held hostage with the tax breaks for the fat cats. Additionally, the Congressional Budget Office reports that this legislation adds over \$25 billion to our Nation's deficit.

But those grinchers don't stop there, Mr. Speaker. They're trying to steal the holiday spirit from hardworking Americans. How? With this legislation.

Our overall unemployment rate did drop recently from 9.1 percent to 8.6 percent, and I am happy to be joined this afternoon by some of my colleagues from the Congressional Black Caucus who will talk to you a little bit more about how this pertains to black unemployment.

Briefly, though, while unemployment dropped for white men from 7.9 to 7.3 percent, black men endured a spike from 16.2 percent unemployment to a disturbing 16.5 percent. Of course, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, unemployment declined for every demographic group within the white community but increased for every de-

mographic group within the African American community. Further, Mr. Speaker, this bill cuts the Federal unemployment program by more than half in 2012, eliminating 40 weeks of benefits, cutting benefits so drastically for those workers and communities that have been most hurt by this recession.

One of the most egregious aspects of this bill is that it promotes State drug testing for workers in order for them to qualify for unemployment benefits. Mr. Speaker, did the authors of this provision know about the Constitution of the United States? This bill also imposes new limits on unemployment compensation by restricting the benefits that employees have paid for.

This is just outrageous. It is time to stop the doublespeak and to give them real talk, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote against this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to yield to one of my good friends from the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentlelady from Ohio, Ms. MARCIA FUDGE.

(Ms. FUDGE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FUDGE. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I rise today in strong opposition to this rule and the underlying bill.

How in good conscience can we allow States to fund re-employment programs with money that would otherwise be in the pockets of the unemployed?

My amendment mandates transparency and accountability. It requires States to make public the amount of money taken from the checks of unemployed Americans. It's not that I am against re-employment, Mr. Speaker, but I am against decreasing the amount of money that beneficiaries get every month. I mentioned Karen from Cleveland on the floor last week. Karen was laid off in March. Her unemployment check is allowing her to keep her home and to pay for expensive prescriptions. She relies on every single dollar.

Let's cut the partisan posturing, and let's extend unemployment insurance without unnecessary riders.

Ms. MOORE. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to my colleague from the Virgin Islands, Dr. DONNA CHRISTENSEN.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this point of order on H. Res. 491.

Here we go again with another misnamed bill that is designed not for middle class tax relief or for job creation but to hold a “must pass” vehicle hostage through some misguided Republican pet projects and policy initiatives that harm the environment and threaten public health. It is also a bill that is wasting time, time that could really be used to create jobs and help the middle class because, with these poison pills, it is going nowhere. Unfortunately, the good things in the bill are threatened because of these other provisions.

The payroll tax deduction, the 2-year SGR fix, as well as one or two other health care provisions are good parts of the bill that are needed by our Nation's families, our doctors and Medicare beneficiaries, but they should not be weighed down by the provisions that allow the Keystone pipeline to bypass regulations, that allow industrial boilers and incinerators to pollute, and that cut billions of dollars and, therefore, important services that are in the Affordable Care Act. With millions of our fellow Americans out of work, it also fails to provide the full extension of unemployment that is needed in this time of improved but still slow job creation—something the Republican leadership has talked a lot about but has done nothing to help.

This bill is pure politics. And what is it that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not understand about drug addiction being an illness?

One of the Republican Governors tried a similar proposal for food stamps in Florida. Not only was it bad policy, it yielded nothing. It unfairly targeted and branded poor people, and it wasted taxpayer dollars. All of this is designed to deny unemployment benefits that they have resisted and are still not fully funding. I hear a lot about class warfare, but real class warfare is protecting everything for the rich and punishing the poor, the middle class, the elderly, and the unemployed. It has got to stop.

I urge my colleagues to support this point of order and to vote against the rule and the bill. We need a clean extension of the payroll tax, 99 weeks of unemployment, and a 2-year SGR fix. Yet it should not be paid for by taking funds from programs that are needed to protect public health and safety.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of the remaining time on this side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that I am going to be claiming time in opposition to the point of order that my friend has raised, and I'm not going to consume the entire amount of time. So, when I do that, I would like to yield 1 minute to my friend in the spirit of the season and in the spirit of bipartisanship.

I would just like to state that for the record.

Ms. MOORE. That is very kind of you, Mr. DREIER.

I would now yield 1 minute to my good friend from Oakland, California, Representative BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. I want to thank the gentlelady for yielding time and for her leadership on an issue so critical to extending a safety net to those who are desperately looking for jobs and who need this bridge over troubled waters at this point.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican bill would gut unemployment benefits to the millions of Americans who are looking for work when there are, roughly, four people for every one job. It would reduce unemployment benefits down to 59 weeks from 99 weeks at a time when we are facing a serious crisis among our long-term unemployed. It makes no economic sense, and quite frankly, it is heartless.

The Lee-Scott amendment would have replaced these Republican Christmastime cuts with real extensions of unemployment benefits, and it would have added an additional 14 weeks of unemployment insurance for the millions of Americans who have already exhausted their benefits, but the Republicans did not make any amendments in order—no fixes allowed to the heartless and senseless cuts that this contains.

This bill is really a sham. It's a shame, and it's a disgrace. It will cost our Nation jobs, and it is a slap in the face to job seekers. We should really be about the work of reigniting the American Dream, not making it more of a nightmare for people as this bill would do.

Ms. MOORE. I would now yield 1 minute to my good friend from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Wisconsin for yielding.

I rise in strong support of her opposition to this amendment. I rise in strong support of the passage of the underlying bill.

This resolution fails to recognize that there are disproportionate opportunities and a lack of opportunities for members of some groups, such as minority groups who are African American and who are Hispanics. There is no consideration given to these facts. Therefore, I must be in opposition to the rule and to the bill.

□ 1250

Ms. MOORE. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. MOORE. I would yield 1 minute to my good friend from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield, I will just remind her that when I claim my time, I will be yielding an additional minute to my friend. So she certainly can feel free to yield any of that time once I do that.

Ms. MOORE. That is quite generous of the gentleman. And so I will yield a minute and a half to my very eloquent colleague, the gentlelady from Texas, Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague from Wisconsin in thanking the gentleman from California for his generosity, but I also thank my colleague from Wisconsin for her astute assessment that causes me to pause.

Her point of order is whether or not this is what we call "an unfunded mandate," this bill that we will be discussing on the floor of the House. And even though the rule says that the points of order or the issues of being an unfunded mandate have been waived, please understand that that is an action that can be taken. It doesn't mean that it eliminates the truth.

And I raise a question, whether this humongous bill that we are going to discuss, that does not answer the crisis of what we are facing—which is 6 million people without unemployment insurance who will not be able to pay mortgage, rent, food, to be able to have a quality of life, to create income, to create some 700,000 jobs on the unemployment end, and to pull 3.2 million people out of poverty—is now going by the wayside. And the payroll tax cut now is shackled with unwanted baggage.

So I rise to argue the point of order as to unfunded mandates and argue to support the position of Mr. LEVIN from the Ways and Means Committee, which is to declare the unemployment issue an emergency, to do the payroll tax and a surtax on 1 percent of the American population for 10 years starting in 2013, and adopt a fix, used and paid for with Medicare savings. This is an unfunded mandate. This is not a bill that should pass, and we should support the unemployed and those who need a payroll tax cut.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim time in opposition to the point of order and in support of proceeding with the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. With that, as I said, in the spirit of bipartisanship, which is the basis of the underlying legislation and the spirit of the Christmas season, I am happy to yield not just a minute, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to yield a minute and a half to my good friend from Milwaukee, with whom I share an affection for our great, fine music.

Ms. MOORE. Again, I want to thank the gentleman for allowing our side to have some voice in this matter. He yielded me time in the name of the season; so I will frame my remaining remarks in that frame.

The season is the reason;

'Tis almost treason to extend full benefits to corporations, who are people,

And leave those who are unemployed feeble.

The season is the reason to extend full benefits to the unemployed. It is almost a ploy to provide tax breaks to corporations and to leave the people with no resources.

I ask my colleagues to support my point of order. It would be egregious if we were to move forward on this bill, on this resolution, without considering the plight that we would put the unemployed in.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, as I have said, to speak in opposition to the point of order and in support of our moving ahead with the resolution.

My friend is a very, very thoughtful poet herself, and I've been the beneficiary of much of her fine work. She and I share an affection for R&B music. She quoted Cameo and "Talkin' Out The Side Of Your Neck." I don't really know that song, I have to admit, Mr. Speaker; but I'll have to check it out.

But what I would like to do is, since we've heard of the eloquence of Cameo and the eloquence of GWEN MOORE, the great poet, I would like to quote William Shakespeare. William Shakespeare said, "In such business, action is eloquence."

Now we have before us a measure that is designed to do one thing and one thing only, and that is to focus on getting our economy growing and generating job opportunities for the American people. The American people are hurting. We know that. There are people across this country hurting. And as my friends have just outlined, there are individuals who have suffered greatly. It is absolutely imperative that we do everything that we can to ensure that they have job opportunities and that those who are unable to find job opportunities have the assistance that they and their families need to proceed, especially during this time of year. Any action that my colleagues are proposing on the other side will simply delay our effort that will ensure that we extend the payroll tax holiday for an additional year, and it will prevent us from providing those benefits to people who are unable to find work today.

So I will be discussing the underlying legislation when we proceed with consideration of this rule, but I urge my colleagues to oppose this point of order and allow us to proceed with consideration of the resolution so that we can put into place a legislative package that will get the American people back to work and ensure opportunity for all.

With that, Mr. Speaker, 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 was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. MOORE. 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 227, nays 174, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 917]

YEAS—227

Adams	Bachus	Biggert
Aderholt	Barletta	Bliley
Akin	Bartlett	Blirakis
Alexander	Barton (TX)	Black
Amash	Bass (NH)	Blackburn
Amodei	Benishek	Bonner
Austria	Berg	Boren

Boustany	Harris	Pitts
Brady (TX)	Hartzler	Platts
Brooks	Hastings (WA)	Poe (TX)
Broun (GA)	Hayworth	Pompeo
Buchanan	Heck	Posey
Bucshon	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Buerkle	Herger	Quayle
Burgess	Herrera Beutler	Reed
Calvert	Huelskamp	Rehberg
Camp	Huizenga (MI)	Reichert
Campbell	Hultgren	Renacci
Canseco	Hunter	Ribble
Cantor	Hurt	Rigell
Capito	Issa	Roby
Carson (IN)	Jenkins	Roe (TN)
Carter	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Cassidy	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
Chabot	Jones	Rohrabacher
Chaffetz	Jordan	Rokita
Coffman (CO)	Kelly	Rooney
Cole	King (IA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Conaway	King (NY)	Roskam
Cravaack	Kingston	Ross (FL)
Crawford	Kinzinger (IL)	Royce
Crenshaw	Kline	Runyan
Culberson	Labrador	Ryan (WI)
Davis (KY)	Lamborn	Scallise
Denham	Lance	Schilling
Dent	Landry	Schmidt
DesJarlais	Lankford	Schweikert
Diaz-Balart	Latham	Scott, Austin
Dold	LaTourette	Sensenbrenner
Dreier	Latta	Sessions
Duncan (SC)	Lewis (CA)	Shimkus
Duncan (TN)	LoBiondo	Shuster
Ellmers	Long	Simpson
Emerson	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Farenthold	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Fincher	Lummis	Smith (TX)
Fitzpatrick	Lungren, Daniel	Southerland
Flake	E.	Stearns
Fleischmann	Manzullo	Stivers
Fleming	Marchant	Stutzman
Flores	Marino	Sullivan
Forbes	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Fox	McCaul	Thompson (PA)
Franks (AZ)	McClintock	Thornberry
Frelinghuysen	McCotter	Tiberi
Gallely	McHenry	Tipton
Gardner	McKeon	Turner (NY)
Garrett	McKinley	Turner (OH)
Gerlach	McMorris	Upton
Gibbs	Rodgers	Walberg
Gibson	Meehan	Walden
Gingrey (GA)	Mica	Walsh (IL)
Gohmert	Miller (FL)	Webster
Goodlatte	Miller (MI)	West
Gosar	Miller, Gary	Westmoreland
Gowdy	Mulvaney	Whitfield
Granger	Murphy (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Graves (GA)	Neugebauer	Wittman
Graves (MO)	Noem	Wolf
Griffin (AR)	Nugent	Womack
Griffith (VA)	Nunes	Woodall
Grimm	Nunnelee	Yoder
Guinta	Palazzo	Young (AK)
Guthrie	Paulsen	Young (FL)
Hall	Pearce	Young (IN)
Hanna	Pence	
Harper	Petri	

NAYS—174

Ackerman	Clay	Engel
Altmire	Cleaver	Eshoo
Andrews	Clyburn	Farr
Baca	Cohen	Fattah
Baldwin	Connolly (VA)	Frank (MA)
Barrow	Conyers	Fudge
Bass (CA)	Cooper	Garamendi
Becerra	Costa	Gonzalez
Berkley	Costello	Green, Al
Berman	Courtney	Green, Gene
Bishop (GA)	Critz	Grijalva
Bishop (NY)	Crowley	Hahn
Blumenauer	Cuellar	Hanabusa
Boswell	Cummings	Hastings (FL)
Brady (PA)	Davis (CA)	Heinrich
Braley (IA)	Davis (IL)	Higgins
Brown (FL)	DeFazio	Himes
Butterfield	DeGette	Hinche
Capps	DeLauro	Hinojosa
Capuano	Deutch	Hochul
Cardoza	Dicks	Holden
Carney	Dingell	Holt
Chandler	Doggett	Honda
Chu	Donnelly (IN)	Hoyer
Cicilline	Doyle	Inslee
Clarke (MI)	Edwards	Israel
Clarke (NY)	Ellison	Jackson (IL)

Jackson Lee	Moore	Schakowsky
(TX)	Moran	Schiff
Johnson, E. B.	Murphy (CT)	Schrader
Kaptur	Nadler	Schwartz
Keating	Neal	Scott (VA)
Kildee	Olver	Scott, David
Kind	Owens	Serrano
Kissell	Pallone	Sewell
Kucinich	Pascrell	Sherman
Langevin	Payne	Sires
Larsen (WA)	Pelosi	Slaughter
Larson (CT)	Perlmutter	Speier
Lee (CA)	Peters	Stark
Levin	Peterson	Sutton
Lipinski	Pingree (ME)	Thompson (CA)
Lofgren, Zoe	Polis	Tierney
Lowey	Price (NC)	Tonko
Lujan	Quigley	Towns
Lynch	Rahall	Tsongas
Maloney	Rangel	Van Hollen
Markey	Reyes	Velázquez
Matsui	Richardson	Visclosky
McCarthy (NY)	Richmond	Walz (MN)
McCollum	Ross (AR)	Wasserman
McDermott	Roybal-Allard	Schultz
McGovern	Ruppersberger	Waters
McIntyre	Rush	Watt
McNerney	Ryan (OH)	Waxman
Meeks	Sánchez, Linda	Welch
Michaud	T.	Wilson (FL)
Miller (NC)	Sanchez, Loretta	Woolsey
Miller, George	Sarbanes	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—32

Bachmann	Gutierrez	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (UT)	Hirono	Paul
Bono Mack	Johnson (GA)	Rivera
Burton (IN)	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (MI)
Carnahan	Lewis (GA)	Rothman (NJ)
Castor (FL)	Loeb sack	Schock
Coble	Mack	Scott (SC)
Duffy	Matheson	Shuler
Filner	Myrick	Smith (WA)
Fortenberry	Napolitano	Thompson (MS)
Giffords	Olson	

□ 1322

Messrs. CARNEY, GRIJALVA, BERMAN, RICHMOND, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

So the question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. RIVERA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 917 I was unavoidably delayed. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 917, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, December 13, 2011, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 917. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on the question of consideration of the resolution, H. Res. 491, providing for consideration of H.R. 3630, to provide incentives for the creation of jobs, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOLD). The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend from Worcester, Mr. MCGOVERN, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time will be yielded for debate purposes only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

House Resolution 491 is a closed rule, which, as we all know, is customary under both Democrats and Republicans for a measure that has emerged from the Ways and Means Committee. But we have chosen in this rule to expand the debate time so that both Democrats and Republicans will have an opportunity to be heard. So we have expanded the debate from 60 to 90 minutes, a 50 percent increase in the amount of time, because of the gravity of this measure, because there are Members who want to be heard. We will have this hour debate on the rule itself, which clearly will get at the substance of the legislation, and then we will have an additional hour and a half, so a total of 2½ hours.

Mr. Speaker, we all know what our job is here. Right now our job is jobs. Our job is jobs. We have a responsibility to put into place policies which will encourage job creation and economic growth, and that's exactly what this legislation is designed to do.

Our fellow Americans across this country are hurting. Part of the area that I represent in southern California has a 14 percent unemployment rate, substantially larger than the national average. We have people in my State of California and across this Nation who have lost their jobs, who have lost their homes, who have lost their businesses.

We, today, are dealing, very sadly, with a chronic unemployment rate. It has been sustained for a longer period of time than has been the case since the Great Depression. And it seems to me that, as we look at where we're going on this, we have to recognize what it is that gave us this positive number of a reduced unemployment rate from 9 percent to 8.6 percent. It was because, very sadly, hundreds of thousands of Americans decided to give up looking for work, and that's what allowed the unemployment rate to drop. But we know that it is not acceptable; and especially as we go into this holiday season, Mr. Speaker, to have so many Americans who are suffering is not acceptable.

And that's why we are here today, to take steps to ensure that we, first and foremost, put into place job opportunities and, second, address the needs of middle-income working Americans and those who are struggling to make ends meet and don't have jobs. And that's why we have chosen to not only extend unemployment benefits—and we're doing so, I'm happy to say, with very important reforms, very important reforms that deal with things ranging

from drug testing to encouraging people to qualify for their GEDs. It doesn't mandate it. It gives States an opportunity to in fact waive it if they choose, but it encourages people to move in the direction of seeking opportunities. Our goal, as we extend unemployment benefits, is to encourage re-employment of our fellow Americans who are having a difficult time trying to make ends meet.

This measure also, as we know, Mr. Speaker, puts into place a policy that will allow for the extension of the so-called holiday for the payroll tax. Now, I will admit that I am a supply-side, growth-oriented guy. I came here over three decades ago with Ronald Reagan, believing very strongly that we need to put into place pro-growth economic policies. The extension of the payroll tax holiday, based on analyses from economists from both the left and the right, is that it's not necessarily a pro-growth measure. But, Mr. Speaker, as we look at where we're headed today, during difficult times, it's important for us to realize that anyone who opposes what we are doing here today is standing in the way and preventing us from moving ahead with providing that payroll tax holiday for our fellow Americans.

□ 1330

I know that there are a lot of people who will say—and as I look at my friend from Worcester, I recall last night in the Rules Committee when he said we've been doing everything under the sun here except for focusing on job creation and economic growth.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I think everyone knows, Democrats and Republicans alike, our fellow Americans know, there are 27 pieces of legislation that have passed the House of Representatives, which happens to be for the Republican majority. And at this moment, all 27 of those measures sit in the United States Senate, and they have not passed. And the Senate, of course, has a Democratic majority.

Bipartisanship is what we want. That's what the American people want, and I'm happy to say that this measure is a bipartisan bill. One of the things that makes it a bipartisan measure, beyond extending unemployment benefits, beyond extending the payroll tax holiday, is this thrust towards creating jobs by proceeding with the Keystone XL pipeline.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we know that there has been some controversy around this earlier, but while we look at the imperative of expanding the payroll tax holiday and ensuring that the American people, who are struggling, have the benefits that they desperately need, we need to get at the root cause of the problem. And the root cause of the problem is that we have not put into place policies, we've not been able to pass out of both houses of Congress and get to the President's desk policies that can immediately jump-start and get our economy growing.

I'm looking at my friend from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) over here. He and I have talked on numerous occasions over the past several years about our shared goal of putting into place tax reform, reducing the top rate on job creators from 35 to 25 percent, while closing loopholes.

I know my friend from Worcester regularly talks about subsidies and loopholes that exist for the oil industry and a wide range of other areas. We want to do this in the context of overall tax reform, and I hope very much that we can get to the point where, in a bipartisan way, we can do that. That's a policy that both President Obama and former President Clinton have talked about, this dealing, as Mr. ANDREWS and I have discussed in the past, with this tax issue. These are the kinds of policies that can enjoy bipartisan support, Democrats and Republicans working together to ensure that we can get this economy growing.

And I will say that this Keystone XL pipeline is one of those items, as we all know, that enjoys bipartisan support. It would immediately create jobs based on the projection of that construction. And while we look at our quest, I don't think we're going to gain total energy self-sufficiency in this global economy, but we would have greater energy self-sufficiency working very closely with one of our closest allies, our ally to the north, Canada, in ensuring that we can proceed with this. We know that the question mark over whether or not we're going to proceed with the pipeline has raised an understandable quest of the Canadians to deal with the Chinese.

And so, Mr. Speaker, as we look at these challenges, this is a bipartisan measure. Let anyone stand up and start pointing the finger of blame at Republicans. But I will tell you that we have—90 percent of the items in this measure have enjoyed bipartisan support. Many of these are proposals that President Obama has made within his jobs package. So that's why we've got an opportunity to do this. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we can do it.

Unfortunately, we can't simply legislate full employment in the United States. Legislating full employment is not an option. I know that some of my friends on the other side of the aisle might like to figure that we could legislate full employment. If we could do that, we wouldn't be faced with the difficulty that we have today.

What we can do is we can encourage America's innovators and entrepreneurs with pro-growth policies, and that's what we have repeatedly sent to the Senate. I hope that our colleagues in the other body will report those out.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to encourage my colleagues to support this very, very important, bipartisan legislation, get it to the other body so that our Senate colleagues can consider this, and get it to the President's desk so that the American people, who want to have a degree of confidence that

they're not going to see a tax increase take place, and that they're going to, in fact, if they're struggling and don't have a job opportunity, have their benefits continue, and to ensure that we get at the root cause of the problem by putting into place opportunities for private sector jobs to be created. I urge an "aye" vote.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, can you tell us how many Democrats have cosponsored H.R. 3630?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry but may engage that point in debate.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I raised the issue, Mr. Speaker, because the gentleman said this was a bipartisan bill and I don't know of any Democrats that are cosponsors of the bill.

First of all, let me thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, my good friend, Mr. DREIER, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this closed rule and to the underlying bill. This bill and this process is so lousy, I barely know where to begin today.

Let's start with the process. The bill, the way this bill was conceived, drafted and brought up may be the worst yet under this Republican-controlled Congress. Simply, this process is shameful. It's an embarrassment. This 369-page monstrosity was presented on Friday afternoon.

The gentleman says that this was reported by the Ways and Means Committee. It was presented by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. It was not reported out of that committee. I use the word presented because it was introduced on a day when no committees met and we had no votes in the House.

It was referred to 12 committees, 12 different committees. That's more than half the committees in the House of Representatives. But not a single committee held a hearing or a markup on this bill. It never saw the light of day in any of these committees.

There are 348 Members who sit on the committees that have jurisdiction over this bill. That's 348 Members of the House who should have had an opportunity to offer amendments and question witnesses about this bill in committee hearings or markups. Not one of these Members had an opportunity.

And last night in the Rules Committee, Members came up, 12 amendments were offered. Every single one of them was rejected.

Mr. LEVIN, the ranking member on the Ways and Means Committee, asked for a Democratic substitute to be made in order. That was rejected too.

The gentleman from California says that it's traditional, when Ways and Means bills are presented, that they be done so under a closed rule. That's when it's a tax bill. This is a tax bill plus 1,000 other things that have nothing to do with tax issues.

And this lousy process, I will say to my colleagues, leads to bad legislating. Just look at this bill. It's long, and it's sloppy. The Republicans who rushed to put this bill together have already found an error which we're trying to correct in the rule. Who knows how many other errors there are?

Last year Speaker BOEHNER and Majority Leader CANTOR, Whip MCCARTHY and other members of the Republican leadership rolled out their Pledge to America, their campaign pledge to run this House in a more open way. Yet all year long they have been chipping away at their pledge, and now we have this bill that flat out breaks their pledge.

In their pledge, the House Republicans promised to, and I quote, "end the practice of packaging unpopular bills with 'must-pass' legislation to circumvent the will of the American people. Instead, we will advance major legislation one issue at a time." That's what they said.

Yet we have three provisions—extension of the payroll tax cut, extension of unemployment insurance, and SGR, or doc fix—that are must pass by the end of this year. And do we have a clean bill that is free from unrelated provisions? Of course not. That would be logical and make too much sense.

No, Mr. Speaker, the bill we have before us is loaded up with goodies to mollify the extreme right wing that is in charge of this House. Along with the extension of the payroll tax cut and doc fix, this bill includes the following: Requires the approval of the controversial Keystone pipeline; requires millions of seniors to pay more for health care; increases taxes on working families by forcing large, end-of-the-year health care payments; slashes prevention funding that actually reduces Medicare and Medicaid costs; undermines air quality, endangering the health of children and families by blocking mercury pollution reduction; cuts retirement programs for Federal workers; and extends the pay freeze for Federal workers.

Each of these provisions are different. They have nothing to do with one another. Why are they all bunched together in this one bill?

And these policies are bad for America. They are bad for the American people. Yet the Republican leadership continues to push these extreme and harmful policies.

And even though the unemployment insurance program needs to be extended, this bill actually erodes the support program by cutting unemploy-

ment insurance benefits for 1 million Americans who lost their jobs through no fault of their own. And it imposes new limits on unemployment compensation by restricting benefits employees have paid for.

□ 1340

Why is it so difficult for this Republican-controlled House to help the middle class and those struggling to get into the middle class? Why do they throw roadblock after roadblock in front of middle class Americans who are trying to make their lives better? Why do they continue to make it virtually impossible for us to help average people, while at the same time they do everything in their power to protect subsidies for big oil companies and tax cuts for the Donald Trumps of the world?

Extension of the payroll tax cut, extension of the unemployment insurance program, and the doc fix should not be controversial. And these extensions should have been done a long, long time ago.

My friends on the other side of the aisle are playing a very risky game. We know this failure to extend the payroll tax cut will mean a \$1,500 tax increase on middle class Americans. We know that 160 million Americans will see their taxes go up if we don't act before the end of the year. So why are Republicans bringing a bill to the floor that we know will not pass the Senate?

We know, by the way, the President will not sign it. I have a Statement of Administration Policy, which I would like to place in the RECORD, which basically makes it very clear that the President would veto this bill.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT,
AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, December 13, 2011.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 3630—MIDDLE CLASS TAX CUT ACT OF 2011

(Rep. Camp, R-Michigan, and 5 others)

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 3630. With only days left before taxes go up for 160 million hardworking Americans, H.R. 3630 plays politics at the expense of middle-class families. H.R. 3630 breaks the bipartisan agreement on spending cuts that was reached just a few months ago and would inevitably lead to pressure to cut investments in areas like education and clean energy. Furthermore, H.R. 3630 seeks to put the burden of paying for the bill on working families, while giving a free pass to the wealthiest and to big corporations by protecting their loopholes and subsidies.

Instead of working together to find a balanced approach that will actually pass both Houses of the Congress, H.R. 3630 instead represents a choice to reflight old political battles over health care and introduce ideological issues into what should be a simple debate about cutting taxes for the middle class.

This debate should not be about scoring political points. This debate should be about cutting taxes for the middle class.

If the President were presented with H.R. 3630, he would veto the bill.

So why are we wasting precious time?

The Republican leadership insists on playing chicken with the American

people just to score cheap political points. This is not a time for political theater. This is the time for responsible leadership. It's time to do the right thing for the American people and drop these controversial provisions from this bill.

This is not the time to increase taxes on middle class Americans. It's time to extend the payroll tax cut and unemployment insurance and the doc fix.

Mr. Speaker, this House needs to get back to doing the people's business, and the people's business is jobs. It would be nice if my Republican friends would allow the President's jobs bill to come to the floor for a vote rather than bills that reaffirm our national motto or make it easier for unsafe people to carry concealed weapons from one State to another.

I say to my Republican friends, the American people are outraged. They're outraged at Republican indifference to the middle class. They're outraged by Republicans' callous attitude to the most vulnerable in this country. They're outraged that Republicans are playing politics with their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to do the right thing, to pass a clean extension of the payroll tax cut, properly extend unemployment insurance and the doc fix. Do the right thing, and do it the right way. That's all the American people are asking for.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say to my colleague that he has performed just as I had expected, pointing the finger of blame when we're trying to work in a bipartisan way to make sure that we get this done. We want the doc fix. We want to ensure that people who can't make ends meet and are looking for work have access to those benefits. We want to extend the payroll tax holiday.

We also feel it imperative that we get at the root cause of exactly what my friend just said, Mr. Speaker, and that is creating jobs. And everyone knows, Democrat and Republican alike, many leaders in organized labor focus on the fact that the Keystone XL pipeline is a job creator and can go a long way towards doing exactly what my friend and I share in common as a goal.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to a hardworking new member of your class, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Lawrence, South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. There are but two points I want to bring up in support of the bill before us today.

Thomas Jefferson said this: "A wise and frugal Government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, which shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government."

I believe that America works better when hardworking Americans keep

more of the money that they earn, keep more of their paycheck. That's why I support the payroll tax cut provision in this bill.

The second point, Mr. Speaker, is this: the administration can be for jobs, or the administration can support a radical environmentalist policy. Mr. Speaker, I believe that they are mutually exclusive and you cannot support both.

The Keystone pipeline is a segue to job creation in this Nation. You remember the jobs created in the 1970s with the Alaskan pipeline? I do. The Keystone pipeline will create both construction jobs and long-term jobs as our Nation refines the hydrocarbons into energy products here in American refineries. Failure not to do this means the possibility that this Canadian oil will be refined in and used by China.

Today, we can pursue North American energy independence by partnering with our closest ally and largest trading partner, Canada. Or we can continue the same failed policies of this administration which lead to higher prices at the pump for Americans and the continuation of sending dollars overseas for Middle Eastern oil.

This bill cuts taxes, it reduces spending, it ends the regulatory quagmire for American businesses and provides a path forward for American energy security.

I support its passage, and I ask that God will continue to bless America.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am very proud to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California, the Democratic leader, Ms. PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding and appreciate his presentation on why we are here today and why the rule that is being brought to the floor is not the right one, because it does not allow for us to have options for the American people to be considered.

One of those options I want to talk about has been described by the President.

President Obama last week in Kansas made a glorious speech harking back to President Roosevelt's speech about the middle class and its importance to America's democracy, how it is the backbone of our democracy. President Obama said last week we are greater together when everyone engages in fair play, where everyone gets a fair shot and everyone does their fair share. This isn't about one percentage and another percentage. It's about all Americans working together.

President Obama put those words into legislative action with his proposal for a payroll tax cut for middle income families, as well as unemployment insurance for those who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own.

Democrats have a proposal today which we cannot take up on the floor because the Republican rule is perhaps afraid of the vote we might get because it does so much for America's working families.

I want to remind our colleagues that for a long time the Republican leadership did not support a payroll tax cut at all. Rhetoric coming from the Republicans was, We don't believe in extending the payroll tax cut; however, we do want to make permanent the tax cut for the wealthiest people in America—those making over \$1 million a year.

So the President taking this to the public and the reinforcement of that message by our Democratic colleagues in the House and in the Senate has made the payroll tax cut an issue too hot for the Republicans to handle.

So they're bringing a bill to the floor today which says they're for a payroll tax cut, but has within it the seeds of its own destruction because it has poison pills, which they know are not acceptable to the President and do not do the best effort for the American people.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. You have plenty of time, Mr. Chairman. You're the chairman of the committee; I'm not.

Mr. DREIER. I just wanted to ask a question.

Ms. PELOSI. I'm not going to yield to you because you make your points all day. I'm making mine now.

And one of the points I would like to make is about the Democratic substitute which the chairman of the committee said we could not bring to the floor. But it's important for the American people to know that it mirrors what the President has proposed.

The bill would cut taxes by \$1,500 for the typical American family. It would secure a critical lifeline for those who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own. It would ensure that seniors still get to see the doctor of their choice with a permanent doc fix that is contained in the bill. Our proposal would protect and extend the tax cut for 160 million Americans while asking 300,000 people, those making over a million dollars a year, to pay their fair share.

□ 1350

The Republicans not only said no to the bill; they said, no, your substitute cannot even be considered on the floor.

The President has said—and the Democrats in Congress agree with him—that we cannot go home unless we pass a tax cut for the middle class, that we cannot go home unless we pass the unemployment benefits for America's working families.

Across the country, families are sitting at their tables. Christmas is coming. I say it over and over that Christmas is coming. For some, the goose is getting fat, and for others, it's very slim pickings. Families are sitting around their tables, having to make difficult choices: Can we put gas in the car and still afford to put food on the table? As the holiday season comes upon us, can we buy toys for our children during the holidays and be able to pay the bills when they come due in January?

As families gather around those tables, making those decisions, Democrats have put our ideas on the table. We are willing and ready to reach across the aisle in order to complete our work and give 160 million Americans the gift of greater opportunity and security, of hope and optimism during the holiday season and the New Year. You cannot do this by saying, We're going to put something in the bill that the President says he will not sign.

It's hard to understand how you can say you're for something except you're going to put up obstacles to its passage. The macroeconomic advisers have said that the proposal the President has put forward will make a difference of 600,000 jobs to our economy. If we fail to do this, we are, again, risking those jobs and we're missing the opportunity. As the previous speaker said, let's put the money in the pockets of America's workers.

Welcome to the payroll tax cut, I say to our Republican colleagues—what you have long resisted but what the President has demonstrated there is public support for.

Let's reject this rule so that we can have a fair debate on the President's proposal, which is fair to America's workers and stronger in terms of the macroeconomic impact it will have to inject demand into the economy, which will create more jobs and make the holiday season a brighter one for many more Americans.

Let us put the Republican proposal on the table and the President's proposal on the table, which has the full support of Democrats and Republicans in the House and Senate, as opposed to the Republican proposal they put forth in the Senate, which didn't even win the support of a majority of the Republicans. Let's come together; let's find our common ground; let's get the job done; but let's understand that we cannot leave Congress—that we cannot go home—until we meet the needs of the American people.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question and to fully support the best possible payroll tax cut for the middle class, unemployment benefits for our workers, as well as for our seniors to have the ability to have the doctors of their choice.

I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) for his leadership on this important legislation.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I'd be happy to yield to my dear California colleague, Ms. PELOSI, if she would want to respond to anything I'm about to say here as I was looking forward to getting to debate.

First of all, my colleague from California began by saying that there was no opportunity for Democrats to have a proposal that is considered. Members of the minority, the Democrats, are entitled to a motion to recommit. That is provided in this measure, although we often were denied that when we were in the minority.

Second, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) did, in fact, propose that we have a substitute made in order; but, Mr. Speaker, since last Friday, when this bill was made available, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the ranking member of the committee, never came forward with a substitute for us in the Rules Committee. We only received one just a few minutes ago.

Then to the important point about the so-called "poison pills" that my California colleague mentioned, the distinguished minority leader: The idea of saying that we want to encourage those who are unemployed to move towards GED qualification does not seem to me to be a poison pill.

Mr. Speaker, the idea of saying that we should have drug testing—and that's, again, optional drug testing—so that people who are receiving these unemployment benefits are not using those resources to purchase drugs is obviously not a poison pill. Then the idea of having millionaires benefit from the program, which we eliminate in this proposal, should not be a poison pill.

So, Mr. Speaker, with that, I am very happy to yield 2½ minutes to another hardworking member of the freshman class, the gentleman from Bryan, Texas (Mr. FLORES).

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about options for American middle class jobs and American energy security. In this regard, I want to talk about two real-world examples that highlight the differences between President Obama's plan and the GOP plan for America's job creators.

Option A is Obama's plan. Option B is the GOP plan. Here are the examples: Under option A, Solyndra. Under option B, the Keystone XL pipeline.

How many part-time jobs were created under option A? One thousand. They have come and gone. Under the Keystone XL pipeline, there were over 20,000.

How many full-time jobs from Solyndra? None. They're gone. How many full-time jobs from option B, the Keystone XL pipeline? Thousands.

What did option A do for America's improved energy security? Nothing. How about for option B? Yes, we get improved American energy security.

In reducing the demand for Middle Eastern oil, Solyndra provided none. The Keystone XL pipeline will offset Middle Eastern demand by 700,000 barrels per day.

The cost to American taxpayers for Solyndra? Over \$1.5 billion wasted. For the Keystone XL pipeline? Nothing. Nada.

What was the taxpayer return on Solyndra? There was none. What is the taxpayer return on the Keystone XL pipeline? It's infinite.

Who benefited from Solyndra? The President's political contributors. Who benefits from the Keystone XL pipeline? The American middle class.

How do you get more information? Go to jobs.GOP.gov for more informa-

tion about the GOP plan for America's job creators.

Mr. Speaker, we can't wait for more middle class, Main Street jobs, so I urge my colleagues to vote for both the rule and the underlying bill. H.R. 3630, the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2011, is just the answer that we need at this critical time.

I also wish all Americans a very Merry Christmas.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, there are no Democrats on this bill. I don't know what all this bipartisan talk is about. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) didn't even see it. None of us knew.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. No. If you don't mind, I'd like to get through my speech. We've heard this all day.

I understand that there is great hope for a number of Democrat votes—and I don't know how that will turn out—but, frankly, I don't think that this bill will ever see the light of day anyway. There is not much support for it in the Senate, and the President said he won't sign it. So what I am hopeful for is that, when we really get down to business here, we can have a bipartisan bill. It is possible to do that. Just invite the Democrats to take part in it.

Let me make it clear that you cannot call anything "bipartisan" when there is not a single Democrat on it. Also, a motion to recommit is nowhere near a substitute bill, which we were not allowed to do.

Instead of extending tax cuts to the middle class and giving assistance to the unemployed, this majority is holding the middle class hostage in order to extract concessions for their friends in Big Oil. Furthermore, instead of asking those with the most to help those with the least, which is what we are supposed to do, today's bill asks millions of seniors to pay more for health care. In exchange, the majority will graciously continue the Federal unemployment insurance programs, although they are grievously cut; and 10 States will get waivers not to have to pay unemployment insurance at all. So that's a sort of Russian roulette idea.

They cut the maximum number of weeks as Christmas approaches, which is the time of goodwill toward men, women, and children who are out of work through no fault of their own. In a country where there are four persons applying for each and every available job, that gives us some idea of how dire it is to face this Christmas and the rest of this year without jobs.

□ 1400

Why can't the Grand Old Party help the middle class without demanding a quid pro quo?

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlelady 1 additional minute.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Why can't they serve the middle class without playing Secret Santa for special interests like the Keystone XL?

In addition to the misguided brinksmanship of the majority, today's bill flies in the face of regular order and makes a mockery of the majority's CutGo rules for all bills. We've seen in the Rules Committee the fact that it has been waived many times today. It is waived yet again. And it says to the Office of Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office that they count the savings in this bill but not the cost. If only middle class families could use that kind of accounting.

This is hardly the deliberate and thoughtful legislative process that the majority promised us when they assumed office almost 12 months ago. So because of the rushed process and the legislative acrobatics used to mask the true cost of the bill, I strongly oppose today's rule and the underlying legislation and urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Ninety-eight days ago, the President of the United States came to this Chamber and proposed to create jobs by cutting taxes for middle class families by about \$1,500 per year. For 98 days, the majority refused to take up legislation that would enact that jobs plan. So finally today we have their version of it, which unfortunately does not cut taxes for middle class people the way we proposed but at least avoids a tax increase on those families which is looming on January 1.

But I can't support this bill because of how it pays for that middle class tax relief. First let me say this: I agree as a general rule when we cut taxes here on anyone, we ought to pay for it, not increase the deficit. But the majority has never subscribed to that principle until today.

So when the wealthiest people in America got an enormous tax reduction in their tax rates in 2001 and again in 2003, there was no requirement that we offset that in order to pay for it. But now that middle class families are getting some relief, all of a sudden, there has to be.

Let's talk about what that offset is. One major portion of it essentially reduces unemployment benefits for Americans down the line. And as I understand this, there are some reforms that really ought to take place. When I hear about GEDs and drug testing, I think that is fairly sensible. But it

isn't sensible to say to someone, if you've been looking for work day after day and week after week and trying your best to find your next job, it's your fault if you didn't find it. But that is essentially what this bill says. If you are unemployed, look in the mirror. It's your fault.

I don't think the authors of this bill know many unemployed people. I know they don't know that for every four unemployed people in America today, there is one job. For every one job that's listed as being open, there are four unemployed people for that job. I don't think they understand that even though there is a law against age discrimination in this country, age discrimination in this country is an everyday painful fact of life for a lot of people over about 40 years old in this country.

So I would say to all those who are about to vote to extend middle class tax relief by blaming the unemployed for their own plight that they ought to walk for just a day or a week or a month in the shoes of a 50-year-old man or woman who has been out of work for a year and a half, who has circled every want ad, gone to every Web site, taken every job interview he or she could get, and still cannot find a job. We should vote against this bill.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. At this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee who was denied his right to have a substitute when he was at the Rules Committee, Mr. LEVIN.

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

Mr. LEVIN. You know, when there is an issue as serious as this, you would think that the majority would let us introduce a substitute. Instead, the answer is a stone wall. So I am going to explain what is in my substitute. I want the American public to know what would be in it.

A 1-year extension and expansion of the employee payroll tax cut to 3.1 percent, as the President proposed; a 1-year extension on the bonus depreciation; and a 1-year extension on unemployment insurance is in the bill that Mr. DOGGETT and a lot of us introduced, H.R. 3346—and a 10-year SGR fix.

I want the American public to understand what's at stake here and how we pay for it. This chart shows very vividly what the Republicans essentially are doing. I want everybody to look at it. Under their proposal, seniors sacrifice \$31 billion. Under their proposal, Federal employees sacrifice \$40 billion. Under their proposal, unemployed Americans—unemployed, looking for work—sacrifice \$11 billion. And under their proposal, essentially people earning over \$1 million sacrifice nothing, nothing. They don't pay for this bill, while seniors and everybody else indi-

cated here, Federal workers and the unemployed, do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LEVIN. I will just say to the majority, get in the shoes of the unemployed. If you don't, I think those who deny it deserve their unemployment.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the Committee on Financial Services, the gentleman from Fullerton, California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule. This is a question, as it relates to this Keystone pipeline project, of whether we're serious about an economic recovery in this country. And frankly, it's a question about whether or not we're serious about our national security.

Now, we have a shovel-ready project here, the Keystone pipeline, that will create tens of thousands of jobs. By the Chamber's estimate and by the estimate of the unions involved in supporting this, it's actually hundreds of thousands in terms of the consequences of developing this resource and bringing it down from Alberta, Canada. These are good jobs, good jobs for men and women in this country that are involved in manufacturing pipe and earth movers.

And frankly, when you think about it, why, why do we keep delaying this at a time when unemployment is as high as it is? Because I can tell you, the Canadians aren't waiting. The Chinese are not waiting. Make no mistake about it, the Canadians will develop and export the oil they're developing in western Canada. The Prime Minister met with Hu Jintao of China, and the deal that they're talking about striking is one that accrues to the benefit of China at the expense of the United States. If this energy does not transit the United States and go to refineries here, it will go to China, and it will fuel their manufacturing sector.

□ 1410

That is what we are concerned about. We are concerned about throwing away this opportunity. I don't know about you, but it sure bothers me to see China playing in our hemisphere and the administration does not seem to care.

Americans have been told about the importance of energy independence. We have been on the hook, my friends, to Middle East producers for decades now; and we're sending billions every year to that cartel. And these countries in that cartel are unstable. They all collude to control prices, and we have a chance instead to get this oil from our allies, and we're being told by this administration and by the other side of the aisle that despite the jobs that this would create, that this is going to be stopped.

Well, today we have a chance to develop an energy resource in the Amer-

icas, working with our Canadian allies, creating good jobs, creating access to cheaper energy here. Energy in China is 20 percent higher than energy here in the United States. Why would we want to inverse that? Why don't we want the cheaper source of energy here? Yet the administration stalls and gives the advantage to China.

I just want to tell you, colleagues, support this rule, support the underlying legislation. Take a stand for jobs. Take a stand for American security and consider the fact that China has already advantaged itself in Africa and Latin America and elsewhere at our expense.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I rise today in strong opposition to this act and in opposition to the rule. It's a shame that the majority is playing legislative chicken with middle class tax cuts on a bill that will never be signed into law.

I'm open-minded on the Keystone pipeline, but it has no place in this bill. It's mixing apples with oranges. It's a poison pill. It's designed to kill it. The President has already said that he won't sign a bill like this. So what do my Republican colleagues do? They give us more so they can score some political points with their base.

The American people want us to meet in the middle. The American people want us to approve things to move the country forward. We need to pass a simple extension of middle class tax relief. We need to pass a simple extension of unemployment insurance. This is what we should do. This is what the American people want us to do. Unemployment is hovering around 9 percent. People need help, and we're not helping them.

This bill also forces millions of seniors to pay more for health care while giving the 300,000 wealthiest Americans another free pass. That's not right. This is unacceptable. We cannot solve our debt problem on the backs of working families.

Mr. Speaker, I have always prided myself as a moderate and someone who wants to work across the aisle. The chairman knows that. We have spoken many, many times. I plead with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I think the American people want us to do some good work in the closing days of this session. We need unemployment extension. We need a middle class tax cut extension. Let's not mix apples with oranges. Let's pass a clean bill and go home and say we did something good for the country.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute, and I would be happy to engage my friend if he'd like to. Let me make a couple of comments.

First, I think that as we look at the issue of the Keystone XL pipeline, the notion of saying that somehow we're trying to appeal to our base when we

know the most outspoken and enthusiastic supporters of the Keystone XL pipeline happen to be the labor unions, organized labor in this country. We know because they want to create jobs, and they are supportive of this so that we can create jobs.

People throw around terms like “poison pill,” why are we using this issue. Because as we extend unemployment benefits to people who are unable to find jobs, and as we extend the payroll tax holiday, we feel that it’s absolutely essential that we get at the root cause of the problem. We have protracted unemployment in this country. Very, very sadly. We know it has gone on for an extended period of time—the end of the last administration into this administration. We all know that we were promised that if we passed the stimulus bill that the unemployment rate would not exceed 8 percent. Now it’s at 8.6 percent. I’m gratified that it went from 9 percent to 8.6 percent. But why did it do that?

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds, Mr. Speaker.

Because hundreds of thousands of Americans have chosen to give up even looking for work. And so we’re saying, yes, we will agree to extend unemployment benefits; yes, we will agree to extending for another year the payroll tax holiday. But let’s get at the root cause of the problem. So that’s why we see these as being very closely intertwined.

It’s true the President did say that he would reject this; but I believe if we can pass it through this House with bipartisan support, pass it through the United States Senate and get it to the President’s desk, that extending unemployment benefits at this time of year especially, and that payroll tax holiday, with a measure that the President has indicated support for, dealing with the XL pipeline, that the President will, in fact, sign it.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD a letter from William Samuel, the director of the government affairs department at the AFL-CIO, in strong opposition to H.R. 3630.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR
AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,

Washington, DC, December 13, 2011.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the AFL-CIO, I am writing to urge you to oppose the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2011 (H.R. 3630), which would replace a modest surtax on income over \$1 million with drastic benefit reductions for jobless workers, pay cuts for public employees, reduced premium assistance for low- and middle-income individuals buying health insurance, cutbacks in preventive health services, and higher premiums for many Medicare beneficiaries.

H.R. 3630 would cut the federal unemployment insurance (UI) program by more than half in 2012, reducing benefit eligibility by 14 weeks in every state and by 40 weeks in

states with the highest unemployment rates. These benefit cuts would reduce economic activity by \$22 billion and cost 140,000 jobs.

Even more troubling, H.R. 3630 would fundamentally change the nature of unemployment insurance and erode the unemployment safety net for the future. Unemployment insurance (UI) is a social insurance program, to which workers make contributions in the form of reduced wages. H.R. 3630 would change the nature of UI by allowing states to require jobless workers to “work off” their benefits, in effect allowing UI to be transformed into a workfare program. H.R. 3630 would further undermine social insurance by introducing means testing, which would surely be used to restrict UI eligibility to fewer and fewer workers over time.

The authors of this legislation do not seem to understand that America faces a continuing jobs crisis, and they seem to think that jobless workers—rather than Wall Street—are to blame for high unemployment and the lack of jobs. In addition to cutting unemployment benefits, H.R. 3630 would allow drug testing of all workers before they can receive benefits; require workers without a high school degree to be enrolled in classes before they can receive benefits; and make jobless workers pay out of their own pockets for reemployment services offered by the government.

In order to spare millionaires from having to pay one more penny in taxes, H.R. 3630 would also require federal employees to sacrifice even more than they have already. Not only would H.R. 3630 extend the current pay freeze for federal employees, but it would also raise \$37 billion in revenues by increasing federal employee pension contributions and reducing their retirement income.

H.R. 3630 would also have a substantial negative impact on the health care of working families. It would impose daunting subsidy repayment requirements on families whose economic circumstances improve, which would deter 170,000 people from accepting premium assistance under the Affordable Care Act, according to the Joint Tax Committee. As a result, thousands of middle- and lower-income families would be unable to afford health insurance. In addition, H.R. 3630 would increase Medicare premiums for at least 25 percent of all beneficiaries, requiring many in the middle class to pay substantially more, and would reduce federal support for new preventive services.

H.R. 3630 would protect the most privileged one percent of all Americans from having to pay one more penny in taxes, and it would do so by demanding still more sacrifice and pain from jobless workers, federal employees, and low- and middle-income families. The authors of H.R. 3630 obviously have more sympathy for millionaires than for the victims of the economic crisis caused by Wall Street. We urge you to vote against this cruel and selfish piece of legislation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL,

Director, Government Affairs Department.

At this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, unrelated, partisan riders often have received scorn in the past. In 2008, for example, now-Speaker BOEHNER mentioned his strong distaste, stating: “Attaching these riders is the sort of stunt that has made Americans extremely cynical about Washington.” But when finally agreeing to vote on a payroll tax cut for 160 million Americans, this bill is riddled with riders.

Preventative health care, for example, improves wellness and lowers costs. When provided the opportunity for free preventative services, 70 percent of Medicare recipients enrolled. But this bill cuts that care. Why? It’s a rider.

What do payroll tax cuts and shipping more gasoline to China have in common? Republican Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM acknowledged this political gamesmanship saying: “I think we should debate the Keystone pipeline, and we should debate tax policy separately.” Sadly, it’s another rider in this bill.

Finally, Republicans included a poison pill with actual poison—mercury, arsenic, and other toxins. What does gutting the Clean Air Act have to do with payroll tax cuts? Nothing. It’s a rider.

I strongly support extending the payroll tax cut to help 160 million Americans; but first we need to cut the partisan riders.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and to the underlying bill. This rule rejected all attempts to amend the bill, limits the general debate time, and contains egregious provisions which allow States to apply measures such as drug testing; you’ve got to have a high school diploma or be enrolled in a GED program. Well, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that people who are addicted to drugs don’t need testing. What they need is treatment. People who are sick need health care. People who are unemployed need a job and the opportunity to work, or they need benefits until such time as they can receive it.

This bill goes in the wrong direction. I strongly oppose it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my very good friend from Omaha, Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think coupling—putting the unemployment extension, the tax holiday, the doc fix, and a real jobs bill together—which is what the American people have been telling Congress for the entire year, that they want to see tangible job creation. There’s no better job creator in the pipeline—pun intended—than Keystone XL.

□ 1420

It’s a 1,700-mile, \$7 billion, shovel-ready project—not the fake shovel-ready in the stimulus, but real, ready, earnestly ready to start digging right now. The only holdup for Keystone pipeline’s permit is the politics of the 2012 election. The process sits in the State Department.

So what we say is in this bill, State Department, use the information that has been sitting on your desk collecting dust. You said you would make a decision by December 31. We just want you to make it 60 days after the permit's again requested, with the carve-out for the Nebraska exemption.

Why is it so important? Well, it really does displace 700,000 barrels of imported oil, almost the entire amount from Venezuela or about half from Saudi Arabia. It creates 20,000 jobs nearly instantaneously, 20,000 new jobs.

It seems to me that as we're talking about putting food on the table and Christmastime that this is meat and potatoes. The potatoes will sustain you like the unemployment insurance, but what people really want is the red meat of good, high-paying jobs, labor that they can go to. And I bet you that the AFL-CIO wants this Keystone pipeline built.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, again, the AFL-CIO still opposes this bill.

At this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. I don't think anyone disagrees with my good friend who discussed the Keystone pipeline that it would create jobs. There's nothing that has been said that would suggest that at the appropriate time of review that that project would not go forward.

But what we're talking about today is a crisis in the American public dealing with two major issues: continuing a tax relief and tax cut for working and middle class Americans, number one; and, number two, to keep 6 million Americans from rolling into the street and falling on their own spear for lack of unemployment insurance being extended, disallowing them to pay their mortgage, disallowing them to pay their rent, and, in essence, saying to them there is no light at the end.

It is also about Republicans and their commitment to the American people. In their pledge to America, the GOP leadership indicated in September that they would end the practice of packaging unpopular bills with must-pass legislation. This is must-pass legislation. And look what they're doing besides the pipeline provision that has been supported in a bipartisan manner yet this in the wrong process; they have got broadband spectrum; they are ending jobless benefits to the extent that they are requiring burdensome drug testing on college persons who can't find a job; they are suggesting that if you can't find a job, it's your own fault; changes to Medicare that are burdening senior citizens; and, on top of that, we've got an appropriations bill to deal with.

My friends, there is a simple way of doing this. The Payroll tax can be increased by the surtax on just the 300,000 top 1% of America for 10 years, allowing 160 million Americans to get payroll tax relief.

How do we help the 6 million persons who need unemployment insurance? We call it an emergency. It is an emergency.

How do we fix Medicare reimbursement for our doctors? We use the savings from the ending of the Iraq war. It's a simple, clean process, a simple vote to help Americans.

How can they violate their pledge, Mr. Speaker, of not putting everything under the Christmas tree on a bill that must pass on behalf of the American people? That's the challenge today.

I'm against the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of my friend how many speakers he has on his side?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I have at least two more speakers.

Mr. DREIER. In light of that, Mr. Speaker, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The President has announced that we cannot leave Congress without passing an extension of the middle class tax cut and an extension of unemployment benefits.

Now, originally, the "no new taxes" folks in the GOP Republican Senate said that they couldn't do that, that they were going to let the middle class tax increase expire, they were going to let the taxes increase on the middle class, but they were going to refuse to raise taxes on the superrich. Now, if you were not superrich, this was bad news for 99 percent of all Americans; and they spoke out, and they said they would like this tax cut.

Now the Republicans have come back with all types of riders that the President does not support. We need a clean bill.

The payroll tax cut that the Democrats are supporting would mean that a typical middle class family would have 1,000 extra dollars to spend.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. MALONEY. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office found that the payroll tax cut is one of the most powerful tools that we could use to increase the number of full-time jobs. The other policy option that they supported for stimulating the economy was extending the unemployment benefits.

So it's time for our colleagues across the aisle to get with the spirit of this season. Pass the tax cut without the harmful riders; pass the extension of unemployment benefits; and—excuse my Dickens—stop with all the humbug and let's get forward with helping the economy and helping the American people.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. I thank the gentleman and I thank the House.

There is a time, a place, and a season for everything. I would argue to the House that this is not the time for us to be playing around with the financial fortunes of 160 million Americans that are enjoying a tax cut today that we'd like to extend and the President would like to extend going forward over the next year.

Now we've had some 21 consecutive months of private sector job growth in this country. Now, I know that the President has almost had to lift this economy single-handedly since the GOP has decided they don't want to do anything to help move the American economy forward; but the idea that you would actually stand in the way of, at a minimum, keeping this tax cut in place, and to do it in the holiday season—as we prepare our Christmas tree at home and my wife and daughters have been decorating it—we all need to understand that in this Christmas season that it is wrong for us to approach the holidays and to create this uncertainty.

We've got so much concern about uncertainty in the business community but no concern about uncertainty in the homes of 160 million Americans.

Now, if we want to pass any bill on any day, you have a majority, you can do it. You don't have to merge the pipeline with this tax cut. You don't have to tie the fortunes of 160 million Americans' economic fortune together with the pipeline.

We could move this today. The President is prepared to sign it. I would urge my colleagues, let's do this in the appropriate way.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I advise the gentleman from California that I am the last speaker.

Mr. DREIER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I will close after the gentleman does.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD an article from Politico entitled, "GOP takes packaging path," talking about how my Republican friends have broken their Pledge to America.

[From Politico, Dec. 11, 2011]

GOP TAKES PACKAGING PATH

(By Jake Sherman)

The year-end rush to extend the payroll tax holiday has House Republicans struggling to keep up with a key promise from last year's election as they bundle together a hodgepodge of issues before skipping town for Christmas.

In the Pledge to America, released by GOP leadership under much fanfare in September 2010, Republicans said they would "end the practice of packaging unpopular bills with 'must-pass' legislation to circumvent the will of the American people. Instead, we will

advance major legislation one issue at a time," they said.

They'll be doing the exact opposite this week.

The year-end legislative package centered on extending the payroll tax has turned into a holiday tree filled with legislative ornaments ranging from the Keystone XL oil pipeline, the sale of broadband spectrum, an extension of jobless benefits, changes to Medicare and easing of certain environmental standards. On top of that, the House will also try to clear a nearly \$1 trillion catch-all year-end spending bill—the type of appropriations package that Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) himself has decried as inadequate.

Republicans bristle at the comparison, insisting they're in full compliance with their election-season promises, but the manner with which they're passing the legislation underscores larger issues Congress has to contend with as a winter chill settles on Washington: Republicans want to score political points from Democrats; the Senate is split; President Barack Obama is in reelection mode; and tax provisions are slated to expire as the Christmas recess looms.

A GOP leadership aide said the comparison is "a half-assed attempt at a 'gotcha' story—and it's weak even for POLITICO on a quiet Friday afternoon."

Michael Steel, a spokesman for Boehner, said the extension bill "does not fit the definition of 'must-pass' legislation—which generally refers to funding bills, or an increase in the debt limit—nor does it contain any 'unpopular' provisions. Therefore, it is entirely consistent with the Pledge to America."

Any number of Republicans, though, have said that the tax holiday must be extended, saying its expiration would amount a tax increase when it's least needed.

Whether it's a "must pass" or not, the package of bills is seen as critical for both parties: If Congress doesn't act, taxes will go up on more than 100 million families, jobless benefits will expire and doctors who treat Medicare patients will have their fees slashed.

Over the past week, the narrative has shifted significantly. Both Republicans and Democrats now say they want to extend the provisions, recognizing both the political and economic peril that would come from allowing the measures to run out.

The argument is now over how the government will pay for it and what will ride alongside it for Republicans to say they tried to create jobs.

It's all pretty familiar to Capitol Hill on-lookers and could help explain Congress's 9 percent approval rating. The year-end dash—Boehner says he wants the House to be done by Friday—mirrors Congress's work during the previous 10 months. There's political posturing on both sides and panicked legislating, all set against the backdrop of a looming holiday deadline.

Here's where things stand: Top GOP aides say the Republicans' Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act represents their last offer. The legislation extends the payroll tax holiday, jobless benefits and the "doc fix," in addition to other sweeteners. To blunt conservative angst about the bill and to offset its cost, GOP leaders tacked on language to force President Barack Obama to restart the Keystone XL pipeline project, in addition to easing environmental standards on boilers and slashing money from the Democrats' health care law.

It will hit the House floor this week. Senate Republican leaders say it has enough steam to sail through the upper chamber. Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) said on "Fox News Sunday" that

Democrats such as Sens. Barbara Mikulski of Maryland and Ron Wyden of Oregon support rolling back the boiler regulation. Some Democrats, including lawmakers from labor-friendly districts, support the pipeline construction.

But Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) said flatly that the House bill with the pipeline won't pass—and Democrats are weighing what bill to put on the floor this week.

"It's the highest priority of the president and the Democrats in Congress," Senate Majority Whip Dick Durbin of Illinois said of the payroll tax extension on NBC's "Meet the Press."

But there's still blowback on the pipeline issue.

Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.), also appearing on NBC, said flatly that the "pipeline is probably not gonna sell."

"At the end of the day, the payroll tax will get extended as it is now," Graham said. "It won't get expanded; it'll get extended. And we'll find a way to pay for it in a bipartisan fashion."

Senate Democrats say that's what they're trying to do. Democratic sources suggest the party might abandon its plan to institute a surtax on millionaires, eyeing instead a package with more palatable spending cuts to attract Republican support.

There are a few question marks on the House side. When the package was rolled out, the conference rallied behind Boehner. But should it fray, so might its support. Boehner told members in a closed meeting he wants all 242 House Republicans to support the bill.

If the Republican support does not stay intact, House Democrats will again be necessary for passage. It's an open question what they would support to offset the cost of the bill.

On Friday, House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) was cool on changes to Medicare—including means testing for millionaires—and cutting unemployment benefits from 99 to 59 weeks.

"Some things [that] might be acceptable in terms of a big, bold and balanced plan are unacceptable if we're not only not going to the place where President Obama wants to go on the payroll tax cut, have a more modest proposal and on top of that, have consumers of Medicare pay the price," Pelosi said.

She minced no words when talking about the Keystone pipeline.

"This is not about the Keystone pipeline," she said. "The Keystone pipeline is a completely separate issue. People on both sides of the issue agree that this shouldn't be on this package. It's just not polite; it's a poison pill designed to sink the payroll tax cut."

Mr. Speaker, the House Republicans have designed a bill to fail, and it contains poison pills which will result in tax hikes for 160 million workers and the loss of hundreds of thousands of existing jobs. They say they're for extending the payroll tax cut for middle class Americans, they say they want to help the unemployed, but yet they demand a ransom in order for us to get this passed. And the ransom that they are demanding is quite high.

You've heard from Members on our side of all the poison pills that are in this bill. I have introduced into the RECORD the statement from the administration saying that they would veto this bill, because it is so awful, if it comes to the desk of the President. We know that the United States Senate will not move on this bill.

So why are we wasting our time with precious few days left in the session? Why aren't we doing what most Americans want us to do, and that is to extend the payroll tax cut for middle class Americans and extend unemployment insurance for the millions of people who are out of work, through no fault of their own, because it's the right thing to do?

My friends on the other side of the aisle have no problem with bailing out big banks on Wall Street, but when it comes to helping middle class families and working people, they squawk.

□ 1430

You've heard over and over that this is the Christmas season; we're supposed to be generous in our hearts. I don't feel the generosity on the other side. I don't feel the compassion. I'm not sure if my colleagues understand how Americans are struggling, what it feels like to be out of work. People who are in their 50s and 60s who have lost their job and can't find another job, and my colleagues are trying to make it more difficult for them to be able to get benefits so they can keep their homes and put food on the table.

My friend from California talks about, well, Mr. LEVIN, the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, didn't submit a substitute, he only asked for one. Well, this bill, I will again remind everybody, was presented to us on Friday when Members were home. And we had an emergency Rules Committee—which bypasses the normal procedures and the normal time given for Members to be able to offer amendments. So, I mean, everything was stacked against anybody offering an amendment in advance.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to make in order Mr. LEVIN's amendment in the nature of a substitute, which extends middle class tax relief, unemployment benefits, and the doc fix the right way.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I will just close again by urging my colleagues to stand with working people in this country, to stand with those who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own. I mean, it's so easy for the other side to stand with big oil companies and protect tax breaks for the wealthiest in this country. Let's have a little justice in our tax system, a little fairness.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question so we can amend this bill and make it actually address these urgent issues in a thoughtful and reasonable way, I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 8½ minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

There is a way to ensure that President Obama will sign this legislation. There is a way to ensure that he will sign this legislation, and that way is if we have Democrats join with Republicans in an overwhelming bipartisan vote.

Now, the message that we've gotten is that they're poison pills—"hostage" is the term that both the President and my colleague have just used in trying to move forward the important provisions of expanding the payroll tax so that working Americans can keep more of their own money, and the doc fix to ensure that doctors are reimbursed and that Medicare beneficiaries are able to have access to the health care that they need. And of course for those at this time of year who are struggling and need their unemployment benefits expanded, there is a way to get that done. Our goal is to get at the root cause of the problem.

As I said in the opening, Mr. Speaker, right now our job is jobs. Our job is jobs. And that's exactly what we're trying to do. Tragically, tragically we are dealing with a protracted unemployment problem in this country. You know it's been going on for an extended period of time. The only reason that we saw the unemployment rate drop from 9 percent to 8.6 percent is that hundreds of thousands of Americans have given up looking for work.

Now, as we listen to people say that at this time of year we need to make sure that we create jobs, we have to make sure that there are opportunities out there. My friend from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) was talking about the fact that there are four people looking for one job. Let's put into place the kinds of policies that will allow us to see the private sector create jobs. We cannot legislate full employment. We cannot legislate full employment, but what we can do is we can pass legislation that will lay the groundwork for America's entrepreneurs, for America's innovators to have success by creating job opportunities.

There are 27 pieces of legislation that we have passed from this House that is in the Republican majority that are now sitting in the Democratic-controlled Senate. Those measures—increasing access to capital for small business men and women to create opportunities, making sure that we decrease the regulatory burden, which we all know has undermined job creation and economic growth in this country—these are the kinds of measures that are out there that we hope very much will be considered in the Senate.

Now, as we look at the issue of so-called "poison pills," which my California colleague, Ms. PELOSI, the dis-

tinguished minority leader, talked about—and I tried to engage in a discussion with her on the House floor. I yielded to her and she chose to walk off the floor rather than engaging in a discussion. I guess the reason is that it's sort of hard to claim that encouraging an individual to move towards GED qualification is a poison pill. Isn't it kind of hard to claim that saying that we should allow States to engage in drug testing for people who are on unemployment is a poison pill? Making sure we reimburse for overpayments to recapture those hard-earned tax dollars, how can that be a poison pill? These are commonsense proposals to deal with the fact that we have a \$15 trillion national debt.

And the American people know that Big Government is a problem. Just this morning I read the Gallup poll which shows that we are at near-record levels with Democrats, Republicans, and Independents being suspicious of Big Government. What we need to do is we need to unleash this potential that is out there, and this measure will do that.

Now, we keep hearing that politics is being played with this. Well, Mr. Speaker, we've gotten the word today that the majority leader of the United States Senate, Mr. REID, has chosen to prevent Members from signing the conference report for the absolutely essential spending bill that is out there, the minibus spending bill, because of this issue that's before us right now. If that isn't playing politics, I don't know what is.

Right now we're faced with the threat of a government shutdown on Friday. If the Democrats don't sign that appropriations conference report—which has been negotiated in good faith again between both Democrats and Republicans with the House and the Senate—we're going to be faced with a government shutdown that Leader REID will in fact have created by preventing Members from signing that conference report.

We need to come together and do that, sign that conference report, get that work done. This measure, this measure, once again, Mr. Speaker, will get at the core problem that we face, and that is the lack of jobs that exist.

The Keystone XL pipeline will create, as has been said, 20,000 to 25,000 jobs, if not more, immediately—immediately—and it will allow us to decrease our dependence on overseas oil. And it will allow us to work closely, as my friend Mr. ROYCE said, with our close ally to the north, Canada, rather than see them—understandably—engage in a stronger relationship with China.

There are so many benefits to this, so many benefits all the way across the board that I believe that, since roughly 80 to 90 percent of the provisions in here have been proposed by President Obama—many of which were discussed in his jobs bill that 98 days ago he proposed here in his address to the Joint

Session of Congress. We are bringing these items up. We keep being told, bring up the jobs bill, bring up the jobs bill. This measure does just that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Democratic colleagues to join with Republican colleagues so that we can do what the American people want us to do, especially at this time of year. As we go into the holiday season dealing with these issues, it would be a very important message to send around the United States of America and throughout the world.

I began, as we were debating the point of order, by raising the famous quote of William Shakespeare, and I'll close with that, Mr. Speaker: "In such business, action is eloquence."

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 491 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

(1) Strike "The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except:" and insert the following:

The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except:

(2) Strike "and (2)" and insert the following:

(2) the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the Congressional Record pursuant to clause 8 of rule XVIII and numbered 1, if offered by Representative Levin of Michigan or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and which shall be separately debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3)

(The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the

vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here’s how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 491, if ordered; and motions to suspend the rules with regard to H.R. 3246, if ordered, and S. 384, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 182, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 918]

YEAS—236

Adams	Benishek	Brooks
Aderholt	Berg	Broun (GA)
Akin	Biggart	Buchanan
Alexander	Bilbray	Bucshon
Amash	Bilirakis	Buerkle
Amodei	Bishop (UT)	Burgess
Austria	Black	Burton (IN)
Bachus	Blackburn	Calvert
Barletta	Bonner	Camp
Bartlett	Bono Mack	Campbell
Barton (TX)	Boren	Canseco
Bass (NH)	Boustany	Cantor

Capito	Hurt	Quayle
Carter	Issa	Reed
Cassidy	Jenkins	Rehberg
Chabot	Johnson (IL)	Reichert
Chaffetz	Johnson (OH)	Renacci
Coffman (CO)	Johnson, Sam	Ribble
Cole	Jones	Rigell
Conaway	Jordan	Rivera
Cravaack	Kelly	Roby
Crawford	King (IA)	Roe (TN)
Crenshaw	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Culberson	Kingston	Rogers (KY)
Davis (KY)	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (MI)
Denham	Kline	Rohrabacher
Dent	Labrador	Rokita
DesJarlais	Lamborn	Rooney
Diaz-Balart	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen
Dold	Landry	Roskam
Dreier	Lankford	Ross (FL)
Duncan (SC)	Latham	Royce
Duncan (TN)	LaTourette	Runyan
Ellmers	Latta	Ryan (WI)
Emerson	Lewis (CA)	Scalise
Farenthold	LoBiondo	Schilling
Fincher	Long	Schmidt
Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Schock
Flake	Luetkemeyer	Schweikert
Fleischmann	Lummis	Scott (SC)
Fleming	Lungren, Daniel E.	Scott, Austin
Flores	Manzullo	Sensenbrenner
Forbes	Marchant	Sessions
Fortenberry	Marino	Shimkus
Fox	Matheson	Shuster
Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (CA)	Simpson
Frelinghuysen	McCauley	Smith (NE)
Galleghy	McClintock	Smith (NJ)
Gardner	McCotter	Smith (TX)
Garrett	McHenry	Southerland
Gerlach	McIntyre	Stearns
Gibbs	McKeon	Stivers
Gibson	McKinley	Stutzman
Gingrey (GA)	McMorris	Sullivan
Gohmert	Rodgers	Terry
Goodlatte	Meehan	Thompson (PA)
Gosar	Mica	Thornberry
Gowdy	Miller (FL)	Tiberi
Granger	Miller (MI)	Tipton
Graves (GA)	Miller, Gary	Turner (NY)
Graves (MO)	Mulvaney	Turner (OH)
Griffin (AR)	Murphy (PA)	Upton
Griffith (VA)	Neugebauer	Walberg
Grimm	Noem	Walden
Guinta	Nugent	Walsh (IL)
Guthrie	Nunes	Webster
Hall	Nunnelee	West
Harper	Olson	Westmoreland
Harris	Palazzo	Whitfield
Hartzler	Paulsen	Wilson (SC)
Hastings (WA)	Pearce	Wittman
Hayworth	Pence	Wolf
Heck	Petri	Womack
Hensarling	Pitts	Woodall
Herger	Platts	Yoder
Herrera Beutler	Poe (TX)	Young (AK)
Huelskamp	Pompeo	Young (FL)
Huizenga (MI)	Posey	Young (IN)
Hultgren	Price (GA)	
Hunter		

NAYS—182

Ackerman	Clarke (NY)	Eshoo
Altmire	Clay	Farr
Andrews	Cleaver	Fattah
Baca	Clyburn	Frank (MA)
Baldwin	Cohen	Fudge
Barrow	Connolly (VA)	Garamendi
Bass (CA)	Conyers	Gonzalez
Becerra	Cooper	Green, Al
Berkley	Costa	Green, Gene
Berman	Costello	Grijalva
Bishop (GA)	Courtney	Hahn
Bishop (NY)	Critz	Hanabusa
Blumenauer	Crowley	Hastings (FL)
Boswell	Cuellar	Heinrich
Brady (PA)	Cummings	Higgins
Braley (IA)	Davis (CA)	Himes
Brown (FL)	Davis (IL)	Hinchey
Butterfield	DeFazio	Hinojosa
Capps	DeGette	Hirono
Capuano	DeLauro	Hochul
Cardoza	Deutch	Holden
Carnahan	Dicks	Holt
Carney	Dingell	Honda
Carson (IN)	Doggett	Hoyer
Castor (FL)	Donnelly (IN)	Inslee
Chandler	Doyle	Israel
Chu	Edwards	Jackson (IL)
Cicilline	Ellison	Jackson Lee
Clarke (MI)	Engel	(TX)

Johnson (GA)	Murphy (CT)	Schwartz
Johnson, E. B.	Nadler	Scott (VA)
Kaptur	Neal	Scott, David
Keating	Olver	Serrano
Kildee	Owens	Sewell
Kind	Pallone	Sherman
Kissell	Pascarell	Shuler
Kucinich	Pelosi	Sires
Langevin	Perlmutter	Slaughter
Larsen (WA)	Peters	Smith (WA)
Lee (CA)	Peterson	Speier
Levin	Pingree (ME)	Stark
Lewis (GA)	Polis	Sutton
Lipinski	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Loebuck	Quigley	Thompson (MS)
Lofgren, Zoe	Rahall	Tierney
Lowey	Rangel	Tonko
Lujan	Reyes	Towns
Lynch	Richardson	Tsongas
Maloney	Richmond	Van Hollen
Markey	Ross (AR)	Velázquez
Matsui	Rothman (NJ)	Visclosky
McCarthy (NY)	Roybal-Allard	Walz (MN)
McCollum	Ruppersberger	Wasserman
McDermott	Rush	Schultz
McGovern	Ryan (OH)	Waters
McNerney	Sánchez, Linda T.	Watt
Meeks	Sanchez, Loretta	Waxman
Michaud	Sarbanes	Welch
Miller (NC)	Schakowsky	Wilson (FL)
Miller, George	Schiff	Woolsey
Moore	Schrader	Yarmuth
Moran		

NOT VOTING—15

Bachmann	Giffords	Myrick
Brady (TX)	Gutierrez	Napolitano
Coble	Hanna	Pastor (AZ)
Duffy	Larson (CT)	Paul
Filner	Mack	Payne

□ 1504

Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. BECERRA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 918, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, December 13, 2011, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 918. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on ordering the previous question of the rule, H. Res. 491, providing for consideration of H.R. 3630, to provide incentives for the creation of jobs, and for other purposes.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, December 13, 2011, I missed rollcall 918. Had I present, I would have voted “no.”

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, noes 180, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 919]

AYES—236

Adams	Akin	Amash
Aderholt	Alexander	Amodei

Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)

Graves (MO)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen

NOES—180

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps

Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa

Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison

Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hiro
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin

Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebbeck
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Neal
Oliver
Owens
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond

Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Bachmann
Coble
Duffy
Filner
Giffords
Gohmert

Griffin (AR)
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Mack
Myrick
Napolitano

Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Scott, David
Tsongas

□ 1512

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 919, my battery went out on my beeper, and so it never went off. As a result, I missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 919, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, December 13, 2011, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 919. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 491, providing for consideration of H.R. 3630, to provide incentives for the creation of jobs, and for other purposes.

SPECIALIST PETER J. NAVARRO
POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 3246) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 15455 Manchester Road in Ballwin, Missouri, as the “Specialist Peter J. Navarro Post Office Building.” 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. Issa) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CICILLINE. 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 415, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 920]

AYES—415

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)

Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al

Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski