

more. Why? Because bankruptcy judges are needed more than ever.

The bankruptcy filings have increased during the worst economic downturn the Nation has experienced since the Great Depression because long-term high unemployment rates and reduced incomes have sent more people into the bankruptcy court, because of the continuing mortgage foreclosure crisis which has affected so many people, and the increasingly onerous credit card obligations, and the sky-high student loans that are being collected on, and the uninsured medical debt.

□ 1530

Last year 1.6 million bankruptcy cases were filed, representing a more than 8 percent increase over the prior years. Two of the Nation's largest automobile manufacturers in Detroit, General Motors and Chrysler, filed for bankruptcy relief under chapter 11. These two cases alone involved billions of dollars, tens of thousands of workers, thousands of auto dealers, and thousands of creditors located in all parts of our Nation. Just last month, American Airlines filed for chapter 11 bankruptcy relief, and the national bookstore chain Borders filed last month.

A third factor must be kept in mind: that while we maintain the status quo, more needs to be done. Bankruptcy courts have been performing admirably but under critical strain. So while the bankruptcy courts' workload increases, judicial resources are, in fact, diminishing. And that's why we're authorizing new judicial membership in the bankruptcy courts in the coming year, if everything works out as we anticipate.

Right now, though, we merely ask the House of Representatives to support the bill that I and Chairman SMITH have cosponsored which would maintain the new judges that are on the bench but will not add any more.

I urge your support for the additional judgeships.

I reserve 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 SMITH of Texas, who is also the chair 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

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 tax increase, it's 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, multi-million-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, \$1,500; 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1021, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: ordering the previous question on House Resolution 479; adopting House Resolution 479, if ordered; and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 2471.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 10, REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2011, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 479) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 184, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 889]  
YEAS—236

Adams	Coffman (CO)	Gosar
Aderholt	Cole	Gowdy
Amash	Conaway	Granger
Amodei	Cravaack	Graves (GA)
Austria	Crawford	Graves (MO)
Bachus	Crenshaw	Griffin (AR)
Barletta	Culberson	Griffith (VA)
Bartlett	Davis (KY)	Grimm
Barton (TX)	Denham	Guinta
Bass (NH)	Dent	Guthrie
Benishkek	DesJarlais	Hall
Berg	Diaz-Balart	Hanna
Biggert	Dold	Harper
Bilbray	Dreier	Harris
Bilirakis	Duffy	Hartzler
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (SC)	Hastings (WA)
Black	Duncan (TN)	Hayworth
Blackburn	Ellmers	Heck
Bonner	Emerson	Hensarling
Bono Mack	Farenthold	Herger
Boustany	Fincher	Herrera Beutler
Brady (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Huelskamp
Brooks	Flake	Hultgren (MI)
Broun (GA)	Fleischmann	Hultgren
Buchanan	Fleming	Hunter
Bucshon	Flores	Hurt
Buerkle	Forbes	Issa
Burgess	Fortenberry	Jenkins
Burton (IN)	Fox	Johnson (IL)
Calvert	Franks (AZ)	Johnson (OH)
Camp	Frelinghuysen	Johnson, Sam
Campbell	Galleghy	Jones
Canseco	Gardner	Jordan
Cantor	Garrett	Kelly
Capito	Gerlach	King (IA)
Carter	Gibbs	King (NY)
Cassidy	Gibson	Kingston
Chabot	Gingrey (GA)	Kinzing (IL)
Chaffetz	Gohmert	Kline
Coble	Goodlatte	Labrador