

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. CAPUANO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution is withdrawn.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.