

□ 1256

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. HAHN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 946, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3630, MIDDLE CLASS TAX RELIEF AND JOB CREATION ACT OF 2011

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to instruct at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The Clerk designated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 502, the motion is considered read.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Hoyer moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 3630 be instructed to recede from disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

It is December 20, and the Republicans are using it as a day to dissemble, pretending to support a tax cut for working Americans while making it uncertain and delayed.

We, of course, as we all know, could pass the Senate bill by 2 o'clock today, send it to the President, and provide certainty to working Americans come January 1 that their taxes will not go up.

The choice, I suggest to all of you, is not between 60 days and 1 year, because at least we all say we're for 1 year—we are for 1 year, we will support a 1-year extension—but we know the Senate has been unable to agree. So they sent us back an agreement that they could agree on to give us 60 days to get to that 1 year.

Instead, House Republicans refuse to even bring the Senate's bipartisan compromise to the floor. Eighty-nine U.S. Senators voted for a compromise, and you will not bring it to the floor. You create uncertainty and anxiety among the public.

□ 1300

That is shameful and disappointing.

As a result, on January 1, if there is no agreement, those of you who vote to send this to conference today and against this motion to instruct will be

responsible for 160 million Americans seeing their taxes increase next year, for 2.3 million people seeking jobs who will lose their unemployment lifeline by mid-February, and for 48 million Americans having their access to doctors placed in jeopardy.

Those are the stakes.

America thought we had an agreement this weekend. JOHN MCCAIN thought we had an agreement this Saturday—and yes, Speaker BOEHNER thought we had an agreement on Saturday. America thought there was reason to hope that middle class Americans would be spared this entirely preventable tax increase.

I tell you, my friends, if this were about the upper income tax increase, it would pass like lightning in your conference—like lightning. But no. This is about putting in jeopardy a middle class tax cut, and we could play political games with that. We're now witnessing the concluding convulsion of confrontation and obstruction in this most unproductive, Tea Party-dominated, partisan session of Congress. As a result, Speaker BOEHNER decided he wasn't for the agreement.

Now let me tell you what Speaker BOEHNER said 6 months ago, because there was a lot of talk about this 1-year extension. He called proposals to extend or expand the payroll tax cut at that point by a year “another little short-term gimmick.”

Same rhetoric. Different circumstances. But both put at risk the middle class.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield myself an additional minute.

In Senate Republican Leader MCCONNELL's own words, “The compromise that you are rejecting today was designed to pass.”

In fact, the bill that you passed you knew was designed to fail. Because you knew it was going to fail, your Republican leadership in the Senate objected to its being considered on the floor of the United States Senate, just as you have refused to consider the Senate's compromise on this floor.

It did so in the Senate. That bill that was designed to pass, according to Senator MCCONNELL, did so in the Senate with overwhelming support from 83 percent of Republicans and from every Democrat, including the entire Senate Republican leadership and the entire Democratic leadership.

Democrats, Mr. Speaker, are fighting to prevent a painful tax increase for the middle class. The way to do that is to pass the Senate compromise while we continue to work on a yearlong extension. That's what Senator REID said he'll do, Mr. Speaker, and that's what we're prepared to do, Mr. Speaker. But we don't want to put at risk January 1 coming and that tax cut disappearing. If they fail to pass the compromise, House Republicans will have to answer to the American people whose taxes will go up.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield myself an additional minute.

To the innocent unemployed and to the Medicare seniors who are seeking services from their doctors, we must not leave this work unfinished just days before the holidays and New Year. That's what the Senate did. They gave us time. They gave the American people time. We ought to be bringing relief to middle class families who are increasingly anxious about their futures during what should be a joyful and hopeful holiday season.

We ought to pass the bipartisan Senate bill. That's what this motion to instruct says. That's what the American people want to happen in Washington: to see us work together, come to agreement, act, bring certainty, stop the blame game. We can send the bipartisan agreement to the President today, and he will sign it.

Vote “yes” on this motion to instruct. Vote for the American workers, the Medicare recipient, and the unemployed. Vote for this motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to my good friend from New York, JOE CROWLEY, a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New York will control the time.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just say to my good friend from Maryland that we just voted on the Senate amendment. It was rejected by this House.

Just yesterday, Minority Leader PELOSI told the media, “I don't think we should go to conference.” In those same reports, the minority leader said that, if the House passes a motion to go to conference on the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act, she would not appoint any House Democrats to participate in the negotiations.

Set aside for a moment that a conference committee is the established way for resolving differences between the House and the Senate. It's an idea that was best articulated by Thomas Jefferson, one of the Founding Fathers and someone who provided the foundation for the rules of this House. Set aside the fact that Democrats are, with 2 weeks left before critical programs expire, refusing to work. Instead, let's just focus on what the leader of House Democrats said.

The minority leader declared that she would not appoint any House Democrats to a conference committee. Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID has echoed those same comments. So I

ask them: Who are the Democrats seeking to instruct with this motion? If the Democrats won't even appoint conferees, how can they instruct conferees?

Clearly, this is nothing more than a partisan, political stunt that keeps us from doing what the President has asked us to do and what House Republicans have agreed to do: pass a 1-year extension of the payroll tax holiday and a 1-year extension of unemployment benefits.

Turning to the substance of the motion to instruct for a minute, it seems like we've already debated this today. The motion asks the House to recede to the position of the Senate, meaning the deeply flawed bill that would sunset in 2 months and that payroll providers, job providers—experts—have said would be administratively unworkable, and that even the administration concedes would pose challenges for employers.

I urge the defeat of this motion to instruct, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Just sitting here, I was contemplating the end of the year. At the end of the business that we will conduct today, men and women from both sides of the aisle will pass each other in the well or in the hallway, and we'll wish each other health for the New Year. We'll wish each other goodness, happiness. We'll all look forward to going back to our home districts and to spending time with our families, with our friends, to looking back on the year, assessing the good things that have happened and some of the not so good things, but primarily focusing on the good things that have happened to all of us this year.

When I often say to people, "I wish you peace. I wish you peace in the new year," I wish you a peaceful mind is what I'm suggesting, of getting home to relax.

Nothing that we are doing today will give peace of mind to the middle class in this country. Nothing that we will do today will give them that peace of mind, and I think that is more than regrettable. It's unacceptable that men and women in this country are struggling—hardworking middle class people who are desperately trying to keep their homes, to afford college educations for their children, to afford health care, to be able to see their doctors, who are trying to put food on their tables, to pay their heat bills, and maybe to afford the rent.

□ 1310

This is not a story that is only in my district. This is the story of middle America in every district, be they held by a Democrat or a Republican.

What we've seen over the past few months is a complete turnaround. Two months ago, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle rejected the President's proposal for a payroll tax

cut for the middle class; and now we're coming to the end of the year, and we're running out of time. And my friends on the other side of the aisle have had a conversion. They now see the wisdom to extending this payroll tax. But now they are criticizing us because we have a bill before us that has passed in a bipartisan way in the Senate, 89 votes, that will extend this payroll tax reduction for the middle class for an additional 2 months.

Now, I could understand that if that was all we were going to do, you could complain about it. But we'll have an opportunity to come back within the next 2 months and do it for the rest of the year. Quite frankly, we can make it permanent, as far as I am concerned. But we can come back and do that. We ought not be squabbling now about time when it's only 2 months.

Don't pretend that you are working on behalf of the middle class. Don't pretend you are the working class hero. You are not. You are not.

Cheryl Williams, a constituent of mine from the Bronx—one of the many middle class workers in my district—will have to pay an extra \$1,000 to afford heating oil for their home if they do not get this tax decrease that they have been hoping for and reading about that was supposed to happen. Now all of a sudden, it may not happen.

I just want to remind my colleagues, this is not "cotton candy economics." One of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Mr. RYAN, used the term. This is cotton candy economics. This is not "cotton candy economics," Mr. Speaker. This is bread and butter economics for my constituents and for the middle class.

The word "disingenuous" doesn't do justice to what is happening here today. This is either an extension of a \$1,000 tax cut or it's not. It's as simple as that. It's either a tax cut for the middle class or it's not. A "no" vote is a vote against a middle class tax cut. It is just that simple. Don't do this now. Give the American people the peace of mind they deserve this holiday season. Let them know that this tax cut will be extended.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague for yielding.

As I was attempting to eat my lunch, I heard my name invoked more than once about what I did and what I didn't do. I just want all of my colleagues to know that the President asked us to extend the payroll tax credit for a year, asked us to extend unemployment benefits, and asked us to extend the current payment schedule for doctors who treat Medicare patients.

My colleagues and I, on a bipartisan basis, last week passed such a bill, the same kind of bill that was requested by the minority leader, the minority

whip, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. This bill is going to cost about \$200 billion. We found a reasonable offset to make sure that we were taking care of the Social Security trust fund and not depleting it unnecessarily. As I said, the bill passed the House with a bipartisan vote.

Unfortunately, our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol decided to do what happens around here all too often: it's too hard to figure it out. We're getting close to Christmas. We're going to leave. We're going to punt. And we're going to send a 2-month bill over.

My colleague from New York was arguing for what's basically a \$1,000 tax cut for the average American family. And I'm here to say to my colleague, that's exactly what we're fighting for. As I see the debate today, you are arguing for a \$166 tax cut because it's only for 2 months. I am going to give the average American family a \$1,000 tax cut; and that means doing this for 12 months, as the President requested.

Who doesn't believe that if we don't do this now that when we get to February 28, guess where we'll be—we'll be right here doing the same thing that we're doing right now.

I just think the American people expect us to do our work. We've got 10 days to do our work. We can resolve the differences between the House and Senate bill. Everybody wants this extended for a year, but it just happens to be inconvenient for some to try to resolve it at this point. Why? Because we're getting close to the holidays.

My colleagues and I are here and are prepared to do our work. We've just made a motion to go to conference with the Senate. As my colleagues know, this is the regular order of how Congress works. The House passes a bill. The Senate passes a different bill. We go to conference to resolve the differences. All we're asking is that our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol come back to town, sit down, and resolve our differences. Let's do this once; and let's do it the right way, for once.

So I would say to my colleagues, we can turn the rhetoric down. We don't have to get overly excited. There's no disagreement here. There's no disagreement at all about the fact that everyone wants to extend this for the next year. The only question is, When do people want to do it? Some want to kick the can down the road and wait until February. Then on February 28, we'll be sitting here looking at each other in the same way. Why don't we just do it now and give the American people a real Christmas present?

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, we had 3 months to do this bill. Unfortunately, we waited for the last 2 weeks to take this bill up. It's unfortunate.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank my very good friend, the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect in the world, the Speaker of the House said, We shouldn't kick the can. What they are doing, Mr. Speaker, is they are kicking the middle class in the stomach.

This is a partisan middle class mugging. The only part of the middle class tax cut that the Republicans don't like is the "middle class" part, which is why they are trying every obfuscation, every flip-flop, every flim-flam, every excuse they can come up with.

The latest excuse is, We ought to go through regular order. I cannot imagine a single American opening up their paychecks in January, seeing that there's \$100 or \$200 less and saying, If only they had gone through regular order. If only they had gone to a House-Senate conference. A House-Senate conference?

I'm sure that my Tea Party Republican colleagues campaigned on coming to Congress to support regular order and going to conference for the American people. No. They came here saying they wanted tax cuts. But when it comes time to give tax cuts, suddenly they're saying, No, we don't need tax cuts. We need a House-Senate conference to debate the tax cuts. Give me a break.

The American people want two things from this Congress, Mr. Speaker: they want tax relief for the middle class. They want a Congress that can compromise. House Democrats gave both. House Republicans said "no" to both. House Democrats wanted a full 1-year extension of the middle class tax cuts. All we said is, Let the people who are making over \$1 million pay a small surcharge on the dollars over \$1 million. House Republicans said, No, we want to take it out of Medicare cuts. House Democrats said, Our partisan differences should not cost middle class taxpayers. House Republicans said "no." The more you say "no," the more it costs the middle class.

Mr. CAMP. Earlier, the gentleman from Maryland, the minority whip, said, The Senate gave us time. No, the Senate gave themselves a vacation. The House is prepared to work to ensure Americans don't face a tax hike in 2 months.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS).

□ 1320

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, Americans who are watching are probably going to have a *deja vu*. Last time they watched Congress in action on a contentious bill near the Christmas holiday was in 2009 when the Senate had plenty of time to come into town and pass the ObamaCare bill. And the House, under the leadership of what is now the minority party, thought it was just fine to do whatever the Senate wanted.

How'd that work out for you, America?

Today, we're actually going to do what we should be doing, which is

going to conference and compromising with the Senate. Now, the motion is to concur with the Senate amendments. The Senate amendments say 60 days. Mr. Speaker, that's not kicking the can down the road; that's barely nudging the can down the road.

And why doesn't that work?

Because as a physician, I'll tell you, the real danger to our seniors is passing something that's short term time and time again, which the 111th Congress did. And I work with these docs. What they tell you, especially in rural areas where physicians are in shortage, they say: You know what? If you're only going to give me a 1-month or 2-week extension, as has been done, I'm going to have to stop seeing Medicare patients. I want to take care of Medicare patients, but that uncertainty that those short-term extensions create, I can't deal with in my practice.

Under this, if a senior wants to see a specialist, especially a good specialist, they might have to wait 2 or 3 months. They're going to have to wait until after this extension. That specialist is going to say: I don't know what's happening in March. I'm not going to see those patients.

The minority whip says the Republicans pretended to support a tax cut. I ask America, let's look at the record. We had a vote last week on the tax cut. Go look and see which party rejected the tax cut for middle class Americans.

The gentleman from New York says we pretend to be for the working class.

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

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

Mr. HARRIS. I would ask that America go to House.gov and look at the vote last week. Which party rejected a 1-year-long middle class tax cut and which party was in the majority to move that tax cut?

The minority doesn't want a 1-year tax cut. They made it clear in last year's vote. The Senate made it clear in this action they took last week.

Yes, we're going to drag them kicking and screaming to a conference. It's too bad that's what the legislative process has come to. We need to support going to conference and compromise.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time we have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 17½ minutes. The gentleman from Michigan has 24 minutes.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself just 10 seconds.

By rejecting the Senate tax cut package, Mr. HARRIS' constituents in Queen Anne's County, Maryland, will see a tax increase of \$1,503 in 2012.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, for the fourth time this year, Congress has failed to reach a consensus on a significant issue that

will affect the lives of every American and imperil our fragile economic recovery.

Today, we are on the brink of imposing the consequences of this dysfunctional Congress on those who can least afford it. If we do not act today, taxes will go up on 160 million middle- and low-income Americans. If we do not act today, hundreds of thousands of Americans will lose the safety net of unemployment coverage in the middle of the worst recession since the Great Depression. And if we don't act today, the doctors who are caring for senior citizens will have their pay slashed, placing in jeopardy their ability to provide that care. This is an unacceptable situation to the American people.

We should be here as long as it takes to get this done, and we should be voting yes or no. Is the majority more committed to gridlock than progress? Once again, for the fourth time in a year, the answer appears to be yes. The people we represent deserve better.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR).

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I want the American people to understand something very clearly: This debate today is not about policy; it is only about politics. It has always been about politics.

Number one, there is no Senate bill. Our friends on the other side keep talking about a Senate bill. There has never been a Senate bill. There was only a Republican House bill. That's the only thing that we had.

The Republican House bill was passed with a bipartisan majority. It passed this House and it went to the other House, and the Senate decided to amend it. When they amended it, they took out everything that we wanted here in the House to extend this payroll tax cut. And we decided today to reject the amendment.

One of the gentlemen from the other side said some of us did not campaign on going to conference. You know what? We did campaign on one thing. We campaigned on following the Constitution and doing the things that the Constitution requires us to do.

If you go back to your civics classes, it's very simple. The House passes a bill; the Senate passes something different; we go to conference. That's what the American people understand. You ask any third-grader about civics lessons, and they will tell you that's the way it's supposed to work.

The reason they are objecting to it today is because that's never the way they have done it. Because their idea of compromising is making sure that our ideas are off the table and their ideas are the only ones that stay on the table. That's not compromise, that's capitulation, and that's what we are unwilling to do. And you're upset. You're upset because you're unwilling to work for the American people during this week and during the next week.

We just voted on the Senate amendments. We turned them down. It's really important for the American people to understand that we have turned down the Senate amendments.

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

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

Mr. LABRADOR. The Democrats only want to have a political tool to keep hitting us over the head again and again and again. They want to spend the next 2 months debating this issue.

If the middle class does not get this tax cut, they will only have one party to blame, Mr. Speaker, and that party is the Democrats.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members that remarks in debate must be addressed to the Chair.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I just remind Mr. LABRADOR that constituents in Lewiston, Idaho, will see a tax increase of \$860 in 2012 because of the games your party is playing.

With that, I would yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear on what's happening here today. While thousands of Nevadans are struggling to make ends meet, House Republicans are trying to sentence this middle class tax cut to death by committee, by conference. Instead of allowing an up-or-down vote, House Republicans are trying to kill this middle class tax relief bill by burying it in one more Washington bureaucracy—death by committee, conference.

The American people have had enough of these cynical Washington games. I know that I certainly have.

If House Republicans don't want a middle class tax cut, they should have the courage to stand up and vote "no." The 1.2 million Nevadans who will see their taxes go up would be grateful to know the truth. The 28,000 unemployed Nevadans who are unemployed through no fault of their own, they would appreciate knowing the truth why their unemployment benefits are going to disappear on January 1.

So why won't the Republicans do this? Why won't they just come clean and express their opposition to middle class tax relief and extension of unemployment benefits?

Washington Republicans had no problem passing taxpayer giveaways to big oil companies making record profits. They had no problem passing tax breaks for corporations that shipped jobs overseas. They had no problem passing a bill to kill Medicare by turning it over to private insurance companies. But when it comes to tax cuts for middle class families, they say: No, no, we can't do this. We have to send it back to another committee, conference. Let's kill it.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to stand up for the middle class and the unemployed in

this country and the State of Nevada. I urge my colleagues to reject this Republican ploy. Let's not send this middle class tax cut to die in another Washington bureaucratic committee. Let's pass the bipartisan Senate bill and help our fellow citizens when they need our help the most.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

One year ago, Mr. Speaker, many of us stood in this Chamber and pleaded with the leadership on both sides of the aisle not to put this payroll tax holiday in place. It was bad policy to put it in place, and it's bad policy to extend it. By the end of this year, we will have taken a quarter of a trillion dollars from the Social Security trust fund. And for what purpose?

In our candid moments, we must confess that this effort is more toward securing votes than securing economic growth.

□ 1330

We may point fingers across the aisle, but it's a pox on both of our Houses. Democrats paint themselves as champions of Social Security; yet they blissfully endorse taking another \$120 billion out of the Social Security trust fund. We Republicans paint ourselves as fierce guardians of the public purse; yet we're eager to pretend that the payroll tax holiday is paid for by fleeting fees and phantom spending cuts.

We keep hearing that we're kicking the can down the road. We're \$15 trillion in debt. Ten thousand baby boomers retire every year into a program that is already running in the red. Mr. Speaker, we're out of road. The responsible thing to do is to not extend this payroll tax holiday for 2 months or for 12 months.

Mr. CROWLEY. I appreciate the gentleman's honesty.

With that, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my friend from New York.

Mr. Speaker, this is shameful. Shame. Shame. Shame. Who are we kidding? The Republican leadership is ignoring an 89-10 vote in the United States Senate, and they want us to believe they support the underlying bill of 12 months. That's not what they've said all year long. The Speaker, who was here just a few minutes ago, dismissed the payroll tax itself as "a gimmick," and the majority leader said, "There are better ways to grow the economy." Tell that to the 160 million Americans whose taxes will increase on January 1.

Republicans have consistently chipped away at Medicare and managed to eliminate it completely in a voucher system with the Ryan budget earlier this year. Tell that to the 48 million seniors who are at risk if we don't take care of the doctors' bills through the

SGR. And Republicans have made no secret of their desire to gut unemployment insurance despite the fact that it actually helps keep the economy moving during downtimes. More than 2.3 million Americans will lose benefits if we don't pass this bill, and millions more will have their benefits reduced.

Mr. Speaker, are we to believe, all of a sudden, that the House Republicans have had some kind of a miraculous metanoia and are ready to compromise? That is laughable, and the actions of our colleagues on the other side, frankly, make Ebenezer Scrooge look like a charitable humanitarian today.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND).

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, if we ask the American people what they want, I think it would be glaring. Do they want the House bill that protects seniors' access to doctors for 24 months, or do they want the Senate version for 2 months? Do they want a Federal unemployment benefits extension for 13 months, or do they want that for 2 months? Do they want payroll tax cut extensions for 12 months or for 2 months? Do they want a payroll tax break for \$1,000, or do they want it for \$167?

Do they want pay freezes for Members of Congress and for Federal workers, or do they want those freezes to go away like the Senate version states? Do they want unending unemployment and food stamp benefits for millionaires, or do they want that to continue? Then they would want the Senate version. Do they want requiring Social Security numbers for refundable child tax credits, or do they want that to go away?

This is a good one: Do they want to prevent access to welfare benefits at strip clubs and liquor stores like the House version we passed last week? Or do they want that to go away in the Senate version?

If we asked the American people, I think their answer would be glaring and clear. They want certainty. Right now, the Senate version throws the American family a life preserver drifting in a sea of uncertainty. The House version reaches out to them and pulls them out of that sea of uncertainty, putting them in a lifeboat.

I ask the American people, do you want a life preserver or do you want a lifeboat? Any commonsense American would say, put me in the boat that extends this for 1 year rather than 2 months. This isn't difficult. This is common sense.

Mr. CROWLEY. I would just remind Mr. SOUTHERLAND that failure to pass this bill will potentially mean a tax increase of \$879 to his constituents in Bay County, Florida.

With that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Let me thank the gentleman for yielding. And in this Christmas season, let me wish all of my colleagues a merry Christmas and a happy Chanukah. And for our country, there is good news. It has just been reported that unemployment has dropped in 43 States. This is the most States that we've seen unemployment drop in 8 years. The policies that have been put in place by President Obama are working. Car sales are up, home starts are up, and the stock market is above 12,000. How better off would we have been if we would just get the majority here in the House to agree to work with the President?

We have three caucuses out of four that have agreed to move forward on keeping in place the Obama tax cuts that make work pay. That is a tax cut on their payroll taxes. And we have one caucus that's decided they want to go their own way, that somehow they know better and they want to go their own way. But the other three caucuses have agreed, let's put in place a continuation of this tax cut, and let's work toward a 1-year extension.

I hear my colleagues complaining that they didn't get everything they want. Well, there are going to be Christmas trees all over our country, and there are going to be presents under those trees; but we can't always get everything that we want. We need to have common sense and an ability to cooperate.

I would ask my colleagues, my friends, in the holiday spirit, can't we come together and help this President who is lifting this economy through policies that are working? In 43 States, unemployment has dropped—the most we've seen since 2003. These policies work. Let's keep them in place, and let's ask our Republican friends to come on, let's put partisanship aside and put America first because counting against this country is a bet that you really shouldn't place. America is coming back, and it's coming back stronger than ever.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON).

Mr. TIPTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Our colleague on the Democrat side is citing the amount of tax increase that Americans will have inflicted on them. That's what we're talking about, as well.

We have an opportunity here, Mr. Speaker, to stand up today for the American people in a very clear choice: 2 months or 12 months. Easy math. We talked about waiting until February. It will be followed by March. The same challenges affecting the American people right now will be present then. This is our opportunity as a legislative body to stand up for the American people for a change rather than politics as usual. We can't afford to let them down. The American people, American businesses, and American seniors deserve some certainty, certainty that we can provide.

Out of this House we passed bipartisan legislation. The Senate passed their version, and it now needs to go to conference so the American people can be better served. This issue is not one that we should be debating, but one we should be standing together as Republicans and Democrats, because this isn't a political issue. This is about standing up for the American people. This is our opportunity to do just that.

Mr. CROWLEY. Might I inquire as to how much time remains, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CROWLEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would just remind Mr. TIPTON that his constituents in Pueblo, Colorado, will potentially see an increase in taxes of \$780 next year if this bill is not enacted.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the political games that the Republicans continue to play. We know that an extension of unemployment insurance is one of the most effective ways to get our economy going again, and it's the right thing to do, especially because people are just living on

the edge right now. Yet the GOP is ready to cut unemployment benefits for 2.2 million Americans.

They're ready to raise taxes on 160 million Americans by \$1,000. Yet they want to lower taxes for those in the 1 percent. The GOP is ready to tell 48 million seniors that they will no longer have access to their doctors. This is really outrageous. It's un-American, and it's wrong. This jobs crisis is a national emergency, and long-term unemployment is at unprecedented levels. We need an up-or-down vote on this Senate compromise.

□ 1340

This recession—and yes, for many it is still a depression—it's still hurting so many, many people. Half of all Americans are either in poverty, near poor, or low income. And it's really so sad that during this holiday season Republicans are playing with the lives of millions.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. I yield the gentlelady an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What I want to know is, why in the world won't you just bring the Senate bill to the floor and let the country see whose side you are on?

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

Which bill, the House bill, or the House bill as amended, has a bigger tax cut? Which bill? My friends on the other side seem to be confused.

Ms. LEE of California of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I will not yield.

I will enter into the RECORD the Joint Committee on Taxation, the non-partisan experts who analyze our legislation, their analysis of both proposals. They will show that the House bill that extends the payroll tax for a year provides \$120 billion in tax relief to the American worker, while the House bill, as amended by the Senate, only provides \$20 billion of tax relief to the American worker because they only extend it for 2 months.

TABLE 1.—BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF H.R. 3630, THE MIDDLE CLASS TAX RELIEF AND JOB CREATION ACT OF 2011, AS INTRODUCED ON DECEMBER 9, 2011

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2012–2016	2012–2021
[Millions of dollars, by fiscal year]												
CHANGES IN REVENUES												
Total Changes in Revenues ^a	-130,060	-46,650	-11,275	13,292	40,564	13,696	9,302	3,497	11,916	7,373	-134,129	-88,346
On-budget revenues	-39,143	-16,344	-11,270	13,302	40,582	13,717	9,325	3,522	11,942	7,401	-12,873	-33,034
Off-budget revenues ^b	-90,917	-30,306	-5	-11	-18	-21	-23	-25	-26	-28	-121,257	-121,380
CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING												
Total Changes in Direct Spending:												
Estimated Budget Authority	36,839	24,915	-1,936	-12,494	-13,041	-15,491	-16,940	-17,368	-19,939	-27,481	34,283	-62,936
Estimated Outlays ^c	36,699	24,915	-1,931	-12,485	-12,991	-15,451	-16,919	-17,363	-20,043	-27,520	34,207	-63,089
On-budget outlays ^b	127,616	55,221	-1,931	-12,273	-12,586	-14,914	-16,372	-16,846	-19,547	-27,044	156,047	61,324
Off-budget outlays ^b	-90,917	-30,306	0	-212	-405	-537	-547	-517	-496	-476	-121,840	-124,413
NET INCREASE OR DECREASE (-) IN DEFICITS FROM REVENUES AND DIRECT SPENDING												
Net Changes in Deficits	166,759	71,565	9,344	-25,776	-53,555	-29,147	-26,222	-20,861	-31,958	-34,893	168,337	25,257
On-budget deficit change	166,759	71,565	9,339	-25,575	-53,167	-28,631	-25,698	-20,368	-31,488	-34,445	168,920	28,290
Off-budget deficit change ^b	0	0	5	-201	-387	-516	-524	-492	-470	-448	-583	-3,033
CHANGES IN SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION FROM CHANGES IN CAPS ON DISCRETIONARY FUNDING												
Total Changes in Discretionary Spending:												
Estimated Authorization Level	0	-2,000	-3,000	-3,000	-3,000	-3,000	-3,000	-4,000	-4,000	-4,000	-11,000	-29,000