we still have 160 million Americans at risk of suffering a tax increase, $1,000 a person on average. I don’t know how many millions of dollars that would take out of consumers’ pockets. And I don’t hear Grover Norquist or the Tea Party Republicans crying about that. If it’s the middle class, the working people who are okay. If it is the top 1 percent making over a million bucks a year, then “you can’t touch this.” Well, I think the American people know that it’s “hammer time” out here. It’s time for there to be justice and fairness for all under the law. And it’s ironic we need these bankruptcy court judges’ tenures to be extended, as this Act would allow, because there’s going to be more bankruptcies filed.

Just $1,000 can push a person over the edge in terms of their solvency. People are now just living paycheck to paycheck, hand-to-mouth, trying to determine whether or not we’re going to pay the light bill or whether or not we’re going to get the medication that we need in order to be healthy. People are deciding whether or not to pay the gas bill or whether or not they’re going to be able to eat more than ramen noodles every night for the month. So $1,000 means a lot. It may not mean a lot to a millionaire, one of those top 1 percent that my Tea Party Republican friends so heartily support, but it will hurt the little man and woman and their families, especially at Christmas time.

At a time when the corporate chieftains are getting their bonuses, multimillion-dollar bonuses based on increased profits, we’re still left on December 6 with people being worried about whether or not they’re going to suffer a tax increase on January 1. So let’s not impose an average $1,000—actually, let’s not impose the threat of a $1,500 tax increase on the middle class and working people by failing to do what we should have done much earlier. There’s no reason why we have not done this, why we have not expanded the payroll tax cut that was enacted last year. Let’s keep that $1,500 in the pockets of the average middle class family. Let’s try to keep down the need for people to go into bankruptcy court. Let’s at some point let it expire, the number of bankruptcy court judges temporarily serving.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. CONYERS. I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Mr. HANK JOHNSON, a member of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1021, the Temporary Bankruptcy Judgeships Extension Act of 2011, sponsored by my good friend Representative Smyth of Texas, who is also the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, which I am pleased to serve on.

I would point out how ironic it is because we are now in the 336th day of this reign of the Tea Party Republican Party, which is unalterably linked with the notorious Grover Norquist and his tax pledge, his pledge to not raise taxes. We’re getting ready, Mr. Speaker, to get to the end of this year, and
Mr. COURTNEY and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California changed their vote from "yea" to "nay,"

Ms. BUERKLE changed her vote from "no" to "yes."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The question was taken; and the ayes appeared to have it.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. BUERKLE changed her vote from "yea" to "no."
ONLINE CONSENT FOR SHARING VIDEO SERVICE USE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2200) to amend section 251 of title 18, United States Code, to clarify that a videotape service provider may obtain a consumer’s informed, written consent on an ongoing basis and that consent may be obtained through the Internet, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 303, nays 88, 890 and 891, I was delayed and unable to vote. Had I been present I would have voted “yea” on all three.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES. 22

WHEREAS the Congress in consenting to the compact between Missouri and Illinois creating the Bi-State Development Agency and the Bi-State Metropolitan Development District provided that no power shall be exercised by the Bi-State Agency until such power has been conferred upon the Bi-State Agency by the legislation of the States to the compact and approved by an Act of Congress;

WHEREAS such States previously enacted legislation providing that the Bi-State Agency had the power to issue notes, bonds, or other obligations in which it was provided they shall mature in not exceeding 30 years, and Congress consented to such power; and

WHEREAS such States have now enacted legislation amending this power: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, SECTION 1. CONSENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The consent of Congress is given to the amendment of the powers conferred on the Bi-State Development Agency by Senate Bill 758, Laws of Missouri 2010 and Public Act 3342, Laws of Illinois 2010, as above recorded.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment to the powers conferred by the Acts consented to in subsection (a) shall take effect on December 17, 2010.

SEC. 2. APPLICATION OF ACT OF AUGUST 31, 1950. The provisions of the Act of August 31, 1950 (64 Stat. 156) shall apply to the amendment approved under this joint resolution to the same extent as if such amendment was conferred under the provisions of the compact consented to in such Act.