

As Americans, and as a people with deep and lasting Polish roots, we together mourn this terrible tragedy and send our sincere condolences to the people of Poland.

□ 1030

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4715, CLEAN ESTUARIES ACT OF 2010, WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1248 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1248

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4715) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the National Estuary Program, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. In the case of sundry amendments reported from the Committee, the question of their adoption shall be put to the House en gros and without division of the question. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The Chair may entertain a motion that the Committee rise only if offered by the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or his designee. The Chair may not entertain a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill (as described in clause 9 of rule XVIII).

SEC. 3. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a

report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of April 16, 2010, providing for consideration of a measure relating to the extension of unemployment insurance.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order at any time through the legislative day of April 16, 2010, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules relating to a measure addressing the extension of unemployment insurance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Maine is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina, Dr. FOXX. All time yielded for consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous materials into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 4715, the Clean Estuaries Act of 2010. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI and provides that the bill should be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against the bill itself.

The rule makes in order the seven amendments printed in the Rules Committee report and waives all points of order against those amendments except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. With respect to the amendments reported to the House, the question of their adoption shall be put en gros and without division of the question. The rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The rule provides that the Chair may entertain a motion that the committee rise only if offered by the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or a designee. The Chair may not entertain a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill.

The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of April 16, 2010, providing for consideration of a measure relating to an extension of unemployment insurance.

Finally, it should be in order at any time through the legislative day of April 16, 2010, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules relating to a measure ad-

ressing the extension of unemployment insurance.

Mr. Speaker, many of the Nation's estuaries are in poor environmental health. An impaired estuary not only impacts commercial and recreational fishing, it also harms small businesses that rely on clean water and reduces the number of tourists coming to the State. Degraded coastal wetlands result in increased flooding, shoreline erosion, and damaged infrastructure.

Estuaries are unique places where freshwater mixes with salt water from the oceans. The mixing water provides a productive and dynamic habitat for a wide variety of fish and wildlife. Lobsters, clams, and striped bass all depend on the estuaries as a habitat. They also provide critical habitat and breeding areas for hundreds of species of birds and other wildlife.

We're here today to discuss a bill to help restore our Nation's estuaries by promoting comprehensive planning efforts in nationally significant estuaries such as Casco Bay and the Piscataqua River Estuary on the Maine-New Hampshire border. Many of these estuaries are part of the National Estuary Program and provide an excellent example of how a stakeholder-driven, collaborative program can successfully address water quality problems.

Estuaries provide habitat for 75 percent of the U.S. commercial fish catch and 80 to 90 percent of the recreational fish catch. Estuaries and associated coastal areas help drive the Nation's economy. In my State alone in Casco Bay, the economic value in a good year of just one species of shellfish, the softshell clam, is estimated to be between \$1.6 and \$15.7 million annually. Without clean water, the men and women who depend on these resources lose their jobs. We cannot let that happen. We owe it to these hardworking individuals to invest in these precious areas.

Investing in the National Estuary Program, the NEPs, is a good investment in our communities, and the NEPs make good use of their Federal funds. Between 2003 and 2009, NEPs leveraged \$1.98 billion from \$140 million in EPA grants.

The Casco Bay Estuary Partnership is truly a partnership and they work with our local towns. The estuary partnership and Brunswick, West Bath, Phippsburg, and State and Federal agencies are working together in the New Meadows River Watershed Partnership. The partnership works on coastal protection, especially related to water quality and keeping clam flats open for harvesting. This effort has been largely funded by the estuary partnership.

Beyond providing habitat and a place for commercial activities, estuaries are great places to kayak, boat, swim, or go bird watching. It is important to know that much of the value of estuaries declines if people, if the public, cannot access them.

The underlying bill requires the consideration of sustainable commercial

businesses and the management planning process, and it is important for the estuaries programs to explicitly recognize the role working waterfronts play in providing jobs and access to our estuaries. Without working waterfronts, we lose access to the estuary and the economic and cultural heart of many coastal communities.

As an organization with strong ties to its community, the Casco Bay Estuary Partnership relies on the participation of a whole range of stakeholders, local governments, State and Federal agencies, environmental groups, businesses, schools, and local universities. These stakeholders come together to develop a comprehensive conservation and management plan. The management plan provides the framework for protecting and restoring the estuary and identifies discrete activities to address priority problems such as water quality, nutrient loading, and habitat restoration.

The Casco Bay Estuary Partnership exemplifies the watershed focus, and the partnership works closely with the Portland Water District, local land trusts, and other organizations who all share the common interest of a healthy watershed. These partnerships pay off when the partners come together and tackle multiple issues with the same solution.

The estuary partnership also helps to create good jobs through restoring the health of our estuaries. The Casco Bay Estuary Partnership is working closely with the town of Brunswick to replace an undersized culvert on Adams Road on the Thomas Cove salt marsh. The existing culvert is in need of replacement for purely engineering reasons. The partnership carried out local investigations and funded design work, developing a vision of how replacing a structure with a larger one would increase tidal flow and fish access to the salt marsh landward of Adams Road. The estuary partnership's work helped the town with a grant application to NOAA's Gulf of Maine Program restoration fund to raise additional money to support the effort. The success of these and other projects across the country show how much we can achieve by working together.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Maine for yielding time. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here very troubled with the legislation the Democrats in charge have chosen to bring forward today. While the goal of having good water quality in our Nation's estuaries indeed has its merits, I'm distraught that we are not debating something today which will address the dire challenges that are keeping my constituents up every night wondering how they will continue to feed their children and find work.

I'm concerned that this legislation does not reflect the economic challenges confronting our Nation. Our na-

tional debt stands at \$12.8 trillion and is growing every day; yet this bill increases funding levels for the National Estuary Program under the EPA to \$50 million per year, a 43 percent increase. Actions speak louder than words, Mr. Speaker, and this action suggests the Democrats in charge, at best, are in denial or, at worst, are simply indifferent to the economic situation our country is facing.

At a time of record budget deficits, it's crucial that we hold the line on spending. The Obama administration likes to talk about fiscal restraint, but we have yet to see these words put into action. This bill is a classic example of legislation that could be trimmed back by keeping the authorization levels static rather than increasing them, but the Democrats refuse to allow such restraints and instead continue to appear to be oblivious of the fact that our Federal deficit is growing each day.

This bill is also being brought forth today under a structured rule, adding to the record number of structured and closed rules the Democrats have arbitrarily used since they've been in the majority. Democrats have chosen to stifle and control the debate today presenting the Congress with another structured rule, eliminating both Republicans' and Democrats' ability to offer important amendments affecting their constituents.

After promising to have the most open and honest Congress in history, why has the Speaker consistently gone back on her word? Why are Democrats in charge shutting off debate and silencing their colleagues from both sides of the aisle? Are they afraid of debate? Are they protecting their members from tough votes?

Regardless of their motives, one thing is clear: The Democrats in charge are doing the American people an injustice by refusing to allow their Representatives to offer amendments on the floor of the people's House.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, according to ExpectMore.gov, a watchdog for Federal Government program performance, the National Estuary Program is only performing adequately. This performance rating indicates that the program needs to set more ambitious goals, achieve better results, improve accountability, and/or strengthen its management practices. As usual, the Democrats in charge have decided that the best way to fix a problem is simply to throw more money at it—money which we do not have, money which we have to borrow—and hope the program performs more effectively. This is a wrongheaded, fiscally irresponsible policy, and I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and vote “no.”

And with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the thoughts from my good friend from North Carolina, but I have to disagree with her.

First, I want to remind her that we are here today to debate and talk

about the rule for the National Estuary Program, and as someone from North Carolina who also represents a lot of coastal communities, I am sure that your fishermen and your tourism industry depend just as much on clean water and healthy estuaries as we do in the State of Maine. And I don't want to underestimate the importance to jobs, to job growth and to a healthy economy that the estuary program has in a coastal State.

I also want to say that this merely increases the authorization for the funding. This isn't spending the money today, and decisions can be made down the line. But important decisions do need to be made to protect more estuaries in our country to make sure that these vibrant areas that produce much of our fishing stock and are critical to our tourism industry continue to thrive and are vibrant.

Estuary counties only make up 13 percent of the Nation's land area but account for 49 percent of the GDP and support 28 million jobs. So if you want to talk about jobs and you're from a coastal State and you're going to neglect taking care of our estuaries, I think you need to go home and talk to the people of those coastal districts, commercial fishermen, people who depend on the tourism industry and know what a critical bill we're talking about today.

But if you want to sidetrack the debate and you want to get into a debate about the deficit, I want to remind you that when my party left office, we had a surplus and we were comfortably moving ahead with the economy. But for 8 years, we had a tremendous amount of unpaid bills in this country. The majority of our deficit came from two wars that weren't paid for, of which we have people who disagree with our involvement in these wars today; tax cuts for some of the wealthiest people in this country who didn't need those tax cuts, but those tax cuts were not funded; a prescription drug program that was not paid for. And, in fact, when the Republicans passed that bill, they didn't even require that we negotiated with the pharmaceutical industry.

□ 1045

In fact, we pay the highest prices in the world, and you wonder why our economy and our deficit is in bad shape? I think you have to look at the last party in power when you are looking at where to place the blame.

Look, people in my State are hurting. We have a tough economy. We have lost a lot of our manufacturing industry to jobs overseas, to a tremendous change in that economy, and I don't want to say for one minute that the people in my State are comfortable with the job situation. They are hurting, and they want more help.

But, unlike the Republicans, the Democrats put forward the Recovery Act. Much of that money has come to

my State and yours. And while we are not there yet, it's had an effect. It's helped us rebuild some of our roads and bridges. It helped keep teachers and firefighters and policemen in their jobs. It has funded research and development. It's gone to a whole host of necessary clean water infrastructure development. The list is long of how that money has been invested in our State.

We have \$35 million to extend our train service, which is very important. Extending Amtrak in the Northeast has been a great boon and will be very helpful to our economy.

To say that the Democrats aren't, one, paying attention to the deficit and, two, doing all they can to assist in the job creation in this country is to neglect exactly what those facts are. I, again, will not say that we are where we want to be in this economy, but, last month, the U.S. economy gained more jobs than any other month over the last 3 years, an increase in 162,000 jobs. That is a sign that the labor market is at least moving in the right direction to stabilize.

Let's remember, though, when President Obama took over when I was first elected as a freshmen, the economy was losing 700,000 jobs a month; and the previous President had already had to go in and bail out the banks because of the lack of oversight of our financial services industry. So we took over an economy in very tough shape, and at least it is moving in the right direction.

There are other numbers that, while they don't give us all that we need, they are a positive sign. In the last month, the manufacturing industry added 17,000 jobs, retailers have added 15,000 jobs, and leisure and hospitality accounted for another 22,000 jobs. We are moving in the right direction.

When I go home to my district, I ask the people who work in the tourism industry—tourism is now the largest industry in our State, and I am sure it is a big industry in North Carolina. I ask them how they are doing; and they say, well, we are getting some positive signs. We have more bookings, more people are coming in this spring. People are feeling a little bit more comfortable about the economy. And while that's not where we need to be, at least we have people moving in the right direction.

We also have gained the confidence of people who say, thank goodness you passed some health care reform, health care reform that will cut the deficit in the long run, stabilize Medicare. And I can tell you from my small businesses what I hear more than anything else is from people who say how am I going to cover my employees, how am I going to cover myself as an individual? And I can now go back home to my State and say, if you have 25 employees or less, you will get a 35 percent tax credit this year. You are going to get real assistance in providing your employees with health care. And we are doing it with

also cutting the deficit and cutting the instability in the Medicare system.

I just want to say that, A, we are here to talk about estuaries, which, in my opinion and from my coastal State, is a very important job creator and revenue enhancer and critical to our fishing industry, which is very important in our State. I think you have to look at where you are laying the blame when you talk about this tough economy. Nobody likes the situation we are in, but nobody is working harder to change it than the Democrats.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I am tempted to say, so much to say, so little time. I was going to ask my colleague to yield so she could clarify to me her comment that we are cutting the deficit.

You know, this is a classic example of the Democrats saying one thing and doing another. It just happens over and over and over again. The American people, Mr. Speaker, are waking up to this issue.

My colleague wants to talk about how, when President Obama came to office, what a sorry state the economy was in. She never, along with her other colleagues, ever acknowledged the fact that Democrats were in charge of the Congress for 2 years before President Obama came into office and put this economy on the skids. It's the Democrats who are in charge of Congress who have the fault laid directly at their feet.

Before the Democrats took over the Congress, we had 54 straight months of job growth in this country under President Bush and with a Republican-led Congress. They bash. They talk about unpaid bills. They created the unpaid bills when they came in in January of 2007.

They have increased spending in the past 2 years 84 percent. And what has it accomplished? More government jobs. Tout the 162,000 jobs all you want. Those are primarily government jobs, short-term jobs with the Census.

My colleagues call things something that they are not. The Recovery Act? That is the bailout that occurred in February last year that was supposed to keep the trillion dollar spending, that was supposed to keep unemployment below 8 percent, that was supposed to create 3 trillion jobs? Please.

The American people aren't buying it anymore. They know that the Democrats are the ones who are in control, and they know that the Democrats are the ones who are responsible for the disaster that we are seeing in this economy.

Unemployment is over 11 percent in my State. Yes, we want the estuaries to be protected. They are vital to many jobs in North Carolina. But spending more money is not the answer. Having the Federal Government live beyond its means is simply not the answer.

This year, the Federal budget deficit is projected to be between \$1.3 and \$1.5

trillion. And, again, my colleague mentioned cutting the deficit, when we hear even from President Obama's own appointees at the CBO and Chairman Bernanke that we cannot maintain our status as the greatest country in the world with this horrible debt and deficit that the Democrats are placing on our backs, on the backs of our children and our grandchildren.

And I love the way my colleagues talk about this prescription drug program that was passed under a Republican President and the Republican Congress that was not "paid for." They hate it. And yet what they are going to do in their health care bill, they are going to close the doughnut hole. Sure, they are going to add to the spending on the prescription drug plan, the one that they hate so much. They hate it on the floor here when they want to use it as an excuse, but then they love it when they want to put more money into it.

Come on, folks, let's have a little consistency here in the approach that you take. Most of your consistency does involve putting the government in control of our lives and spending, spending, spending. The American people know that in these tough times they should save, not spend money.

And last but not least, let me say my colleagues always say this is not spending, this is only authorizing. And then when it comes to the appropriations, they will say, well, we have to appropriate because this was already authorized. This is another gimmick that they put in place simply to spend more money. And, again, the American people are waking up. They understand it, and they don't like it anymore.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, my colleague mentioned that this bill is a bill that's important because it creates jobs. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle, along with the President, have done such a poor job of creating jobs in the past with all the spending that they have done, and yet everything that comes up is a jobs bill.

I now want to quote from a March 3 Washington Times editorial: "From immigration to clean energy to expanding the social safety net, there's no better way to grease the skids for new government programs in Washington nowadays than to declare them job-producing bills. Then watch supporters line up and potential opposition crumble."

Mr. Speaker, when I was home in North Carolina the past 2 weeks for our Easter break, numerous constituents shared with me their concerns that the Federal Government is borrowing and spending too much. The American people know that in these tough economic times they should save, not spend money. But the Federal Government doesn't reflect the common sense that I see throughout the Fifth District of

North Carolina. Instead, the Democrats in charge continue to borrow more and spend more, increasing our Federal deficit on the backs of our children and grandchildren.

My colleagues can no longer blame the deficit and economic difficulties today on the previous administration, although they continue to try. The Democrats in charge have shown they don't care about the deficit by continuing to dig America into a bigger and bigger hole with more reckless spending. All of this borrowed money is being spent by the ruling Democrats, while the unemployment rate continues to rise and the deficit continues to grow. I think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are so in love with their power that they believe that they can overrule the laws of economics.

Since the Democrats took control of Congress, Mr. Speaker, in January of 2007, they have raised the debt limit five times and the national debt has increased by 42.4 percent, or \$3.68 trillion.

Democrats enacted a debt increase in February 2009, promising that borrowing another trillion dollars would create jobs immediately and unemployment would not rise above 8 percent. However, there were still 85,000 job losses this past January, and unemployment has consistently been hovering around 10 percent in the country and much higher than that in many of our States.

I have opposed all these efforts to raise the debt limit. According to the analysis by The Heritage Foundation, the White House projects \$10.6 trillion in new deficits over the next decade. This is nearly \$80,000 per household in new borrowing.

It's beyond time to stop digging. The new budget estimates, including an estimated total national debt of \$24.5 trillion in 2019 under President Obama's budget, are alarming and unsustainable. The result would be the highest level of spending and debt in American history.

We hear now also that our colleagues across the aisle don't even want to present a new budget. And why don't they want to present a new budget? Because they would have to reveal again these really distressing numbers to the American people and have to respond to them.

This is an irresponsible lack of fiscal restraint carried on the backs of our children and grandchildren. My constituents at home and Americans across the Nation are not operating their family budgets as recklessly as this Congress is spending taxpayer dollars. We have to point out all the time, this is not government money. This is money earned by hard-working taxpayers, more and more of whom are losing their jobs every day and losing the opportunity to work and pay their taxes, not money that's created by the government, except, of course, when they print it, which is going to result in inflation.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the distinguished gentlelady for yielding and for her outstanding leadership on behalf of taxpayers.

I rise in opposition to the rule, to follow ordinary protocol, but it's impossible to come to the floor today and not talk about what hundreds of millions of Americans are thinking about today, some of whom will be driving late to the post office, heavy laden with an envelope that they hope they got right, to file their taxes. It is tax day in America, April 15; and it is a tough, tough day for working families, small businesses, and family farms.

□ 1100

You know, Will Rogers said famously the only difference between death and taxes is that death doesn't get worse when Congress is in session. And that has probably never been as true in my 10 years here on Capitol Hill as it has been in the last year and a half under this administration and this majority in Congress.

Now, we heard a lot yesterday here on the floor of the Congress about tax cuts that have been passed into law. I rise this morning, Mr. Speaker, to really set the record straight because the American people have a choice to make this fall, and they deserve to know the facts.

Yesterday, I enjoyed a number of speakers from the Democrat majority who came down boasting of having cut taxes by hundreds of billions of dollars. I think I even heard one speaker say that this Congress had cut taxes more than any Congress in American history. That one elicited a chuckle yesterday, and I can't help responding the same today. Here are the facts:

First and foremost, this Congress has voted and this President has signed into law \$670 billion in tax increases in the last year and a half, \$670 billion. And the list includes 14 tax hikes signed into law, totaling \$316 billion on middle class families in direct violation of the pledge that President Obama made not to raise taxes on individuals that make less than \$200,000 a year or families filing jointly that make less than \$250,000 a year. It really is astonishing. And thanks to the great work of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Republican minority there led by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, DAVID CAMP, people can go to the Web site, they can go to gop.gov, they can go to the Web site of the Ways and Means Committee and look at this full list.

Under the health care bill, Public Law 111-148, new taxes on individuals who don't purchase government-approved health insurance, it's \$17 billion over 10. A new tax on employers who fail to fully comply with government

insurance mandates, \$52 billion in tax increases. A new 40 percent excise tax on certain high-cost health plans, that's \$32 billion in tax increases over 10, and on and on and on the list goes. But that's not where it ends.

Under SCHIP, Public Law 113-3, tobacco tax increase and expanded enforcement authority, \$65.515 billion in tax increases over 10. So-called stimulus bill repealed guidance allowing certain taxpayers to claim losses of an acquired corporation, that's a \$6.9 billion tax increase. And on the list goes. It is \$670.341 billion and counting. And I say again, not only has this Congress increased taxes by \$670 billion since President Obama took office, but the list includes 14 tax increases totaling over \$316 billion on middle class families.

It is truly astonishing to think that arriving on the scene during the worst economy in 25 years that the response of this administration and this Congress has been to take what in my judgment was excessive spending under Republican control and put it on steroids and pay for it with hundreds of billions of dollars in new taxes, and of course enacting more government.

Now, taking directly on the assertion of my Democrat colleagues, in the time I have remaining, the suggestion that Democrats have passed the largest tax cuts in history, you know, the American people have got to be asking, Are they kidding? But no, they're not. In fact, the President, in remarks while signing the government takeover of health care with \$570 billion in tax increases in it, actually said, "And when this exchange is up and running, millions of people will get tax breaks to help them afford coverage, which represents the largest middle class tax cut for health care in history."

Now, I was on a television show right after the distinguished Senator from Illinois, Senator DICK DURBIN, where he made the same assertion. And even PolitiFact, an independent and analytical organization online, took a look at what Senator DURBIN said, suggesting that Obama Care was the largest middle class tax cut in history, and they gave it a false the next day.

Here are the facts, and here is where the stretch comes from: it is the assertion, presumably, by Democrats that the \$466 billion in subsidies paid directly to insurance companies in the health care takeover represents tax cuts. Well, if I can just say for the record from my heart, paying insurance companies isn't a tax cut to me, okay. I mean, I was raised south of Highway 40, but I'm trying to keep—if this Congress ever wants to get around to actually cutting my taxes, writing checks to insurance companies that you're paying for with higher taxes, that's not a tax cut to me. A tax cut to me is reduce my taxes so I can keep more of my hard-earned money.

There are other nickel and dime things in the stimulus bill, the refundable tax payments they're pointing to,

but the biggest chunk of their claim of having cut taxes is \$466 billion in subsidies paid directly to insurance companies in the health care takeover. I think that's why PolitiFact referred to Senator DURBIN's assertion as false as an independent analysis and why independent observers have also rejected that.

Look, it's a serious day in the life of the Nation. The truth is the American people are hurting. This government is running about a \$1.3 trillion deficit. We ought to get serious about fiscal discipline in Washington, D.C. and we ought to get real about giving the American people across-the-board tax relief. Only cutting taxes across the board—like John F. Kennedy did, like Ronald Reagan did, like George W. Bush did after the towers fell—only by cutting taxes across the board for working families, small businesses and family farms can we hope to ignite the entrepreneurial energy of this country to lift Americans and to create jobs once again.

I appreciate the time the gentlelady has yielded. It is important to set the record straight. The American people deserve to know on tax day that this administration and this Congress have increased taxes by \$670 billion and counting, because in just a few months after Congress has made its decisions, the American people are going to get a chance to make theirs.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We can go back and forth all day about he said, she said, who has lowered taxes more, who has cut the deficit, who has done what, but let's just recall when the Republicans were in office. They cut taxes for the wealthiest people in this country, which contributed considerably to the deficit. And while the Republicans did not vote for the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, one-third of that and more is our tax cuts for the middle class. So if one of my colleagues was on the floor saying that this was the largest tax cut ever enacted, it may or may not have been, but I think it was the largest tax cut for the middle class and the group of working people in our country who need it more than anybody.

I just want to read a quote here from Bruce Bartlett, the domestic policy adviser under President Reagan and Treasury Department economist under President George H.W. Bush. He said on 3/19/2010: "Federal taxes are considerably lower by every measure since Obama became President." According to the JCT, last year's \$787 billion stimulus bill, enacted with no Republican support, reduced Federal taxes by almost \$100 billion in 2009 and another \$222 billion this year.

Let's just talk a little bit about what's in there because people love to talk about these abstract notions of did you or didn't you lower taxes. Well, here's what's in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, one-third of

which was tax cuts. Congress has enacted more than \$800 billion in tax cuts with another \$285 billion working its way through Congress, and this Recovery Act had 25 different tax cuts for Americans in this country.

The Making Work Pay tax cut provided immediate and sustained tax relief to about 95 percent of all American workers and their families. It's a refundable tax credit up to \$400 per worker or \$800 per couple filing jointly. That has already been enacted. Over 110 million working families, that's about 95 percent of Americans, now are getting the tax relief they need right now.

The Child Tax Credit: I hear from so many people how difficult it is for working families to be able to afford the cost of childcare. Republicans decided to vote against the childcare tax credit, which cut the taxes of families of more than 16 million children through an expansion of the Child Tax Credit, a very important thing, I think, that we enacted this year.

The Earned Income Tax Credit: expanded the Earned Income Tax Credit, providing tax relief to families with three or more children and increasing the Marriage Penalty Relief. Now, again, that's for working-class families. Those are tax cuts for the wealthiest in this country, which is what the Republicans did during their time, making sure the rich got richer. No, we went for the Earned Income Tax Credit.

The American Opportunity College Tax Credits: how often do we hear from working class families today struggling to provide for tuition for their kids' college? That helps more than 4 million additional students attend college with a new \$2,500 tax credit for families, which is partially refundable, already been enacted.

The Alternative Minimum Tax Relief, protecting 26 million middle class families who are being hit by the alternative minimum tax.

And we all know about the First-Time Homebuyers Tax Credit which allowed the first-time homebuyer \$8,000, moved it up from \$7,500. That has been extended. Now, maybe you don't hear this in your district; but you wouldn't be listening if you didn't hear from real estate agents who talk about how beneficial that has been in moving the stagnant housing market. I hear about it all the time. I hear about it from them to want to make sure that we continue to extend that tax credit that went directly to working families, to those people who needed the benefit, who wanted to invest in a new home, who wanted to have that opportunity. And I know I hear all the time about what a great benefit that has been.

Incentives to buy new cars were in there, to provide a tax deduction for State and local sales taxes and excise taxes paid on the purchase of new cars. We all know we had to do everything we could to get Detroit working again to help American manufacturing.

Now, that is just what individuals benefited from. Let me just talk about

a few of the business tax incentives to create jobs. That was \$10 billion over 10 years, supported by the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers. That was in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act that was voted for by the Democrats and opposed by the Republicans. And I'm sorry to see that, because this was an important issue for the Chamber of Commerce, certainly important for our businesses. That included bonus depreciation, helping businesses to quickly recover the costs of new capital investments by extending the increased bonus depreciation for businesses making investments in new plants and equipment in 2009. I don't know about you, but we're anxious to have new capital investments in our plants and equipment, and so I was very proud to stand behind that.

Small business expensing: spurring small business investment by extending small business expensing, doubling the amount that small businesses can immediately write off on their taxes for capital investments and purchases of new equipment. The write-off has helped many of the businesses in all of our districts.

Buying back debt: providing assistance to companies looking to reduce their debt burdens by delaying the tax on businesses that have a discharged indebtedness which will help those companies strengthen their balance sheets so they can invest in job creation.

Small business loss carrybacks, which increase the cash flow for small businesses by providing a 5-year carryback of net operating losses. I know I hear about this frequently and was proud to support it and help those businesses in my district who felt this was essential. Sorry to see that the Republicans didn't want to vote for yet another small business and business tax investment.

We had the small business investments, spurring investments by small businesses by cutting capital gains tax on investors in small business who buy stock in the next 2 years and hold it more than 5 years.

We had a tax credit for jobs, for recently discharged, unemployed veterans and disconnected youth. How often do we hear about those people who served our country, many of whom are unemployed? How important is that to make sure that we give more jobs to recently discharged, unemployed veterans? Those are just a few of the tax measures that were enacted under the Recovery Act.

For a party, the Republicans, who say they want to cut taxes, they seem to only want to do it on the wealthiest people in this country. Or big corporations who ship jobs offshore, I guess it's okay to cut taxes there; but when it comes to the middle class, when it comes to helping people with tuition, when it comes to childcare tax credits, the very difficult price that working moms and working families pay to

keep their children in childcare—which we know is a growing expense for young families—giving them a tax credit, that's where I think our tax credits should go.

And what about the renewable energy and energy efficiency tax incentives to spur energy savings and create jobs? I don't know how people feel in your district, but I know in mine they want to end their dependence on foreign oil. They want to invest in making their homes more efficient, and those energy-efficient tax credits have been very helpful in my State. I meet up with people all the time who say, I'm so glad I had the opportunity to invest in winterizing my home. I know it doesn't get as cold in North Carolina, but in Maine we're a cold State. We're about the most dependent State in the country on oil.

□ 1115

So for those of us in Maine, in New England, we actually may have the oldest stock in the Nation as we are 38th in per capita income and as we have the greatest percentage of seniors in this country, so we have a perfect storm. We have a lot of very old people without much income who are living in very old houses. Our State is basically 80 percent dependent on oil. So, when the costs of oil rise, people are left struggling in their homes, unable to pay those bills. Many of them have to decide whether to heat their homes, to buy their prescription drugs, or to put food on their tables. For them, having energy-efficient home tax credits has been great. It has allowed a lot of people to put on new storm windows, to add that layer of insulation in order to tighten up the home, to really find ways to reduce the costs of getting through the winter, and to reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

We have the plug-in hybrid tax credit, which spurs the next generation of cars by providing tax credits for people who purchase plug-in hybrids and all-electric vehicles. What more could you ask for in this country but to spur on innovation and new technology and to help out our ailing automobile and manufacturing industries.

There are tax credits for renewable energy, easing the credit crunch for renewable energy. I am in a State that wants to develop our wind power capacity, that wants to have more solar power, and that wants to have tidal energy. These very tax credits are helping our individuals and businesses to do it, and this is just the beginning. Then, as we talked about earlier, we also enacted health insurance reform.

So I think this is the party which is thinking first of the middle class, of small businesses and which is very worried about how people get through Tax Day. This party has done a variety of things to help that along, and I hope that we can find some Republican votes to do more in the future in order to continue to spur on job creation and to cut taxes for our middle class.

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

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Maine failed to mention her own State and what it is doing, and I find it very interesting. I have an article from June 24, 2009, from *The Wall Street Journal*, entitled "Maine Miracle." I will just quote a couple of things from the article.

"At last, there's a place in America where tax cutting to promote growth and attract jobs is back in fashion. Who would have thought it would be Maine?"

"This month, the Democratic legislature and Governor John Baldacci broke with Obamanomics and enacted a sweeping tax reform that is almost, but not quite, a flat tax." This is a big income tax cut, especially given that so many other States in the Northeast have been increasing rates.

At the end, it says, "One question is how Democrats in Augusta were able to withstand the cries by interest groups of 'tax cuts for the rich?' Mr. Baldacci's snappy reply: 'Without employers, you don't have employees.' He adds: 'The best social services program is a job.' Wise and timely advice for both Democrats and Republicans as the recession rolls on and budgets get squeezed."

My colleague leaves out so cleverly the fact that her own State has gone against the grain of the Federal Government. I want to say that I am quite, quite interested in hearing her list all of these supposed tax cuts that are being made, but she never mentions the tax increases that are going into effect which offset these tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, there is an arrogance across the aisle that is almost palpable. It is that the Federal Government should be picking winners and losers in this country. What I was struck by was the very targeted tax cuts that my colleague has been bragging about. As my colleague from Indiana said, what we should be having in this country is an across-the-board tax cut. That's what Republicans believe in. We believe the money that hard-working Americans earn is their money, not the government's money. It is not our right to decide how they spend their money.

As to what Republicans did, yes, we cut taxes for wealthy individuals, but we cut taxes for everyone. What the Democrats do over and over and over again—and again, it comes from an arrogance, a hubris, which says we are smarter than the American people, which says we know how to spend your money better than you know how to spend your money. Therefore, we are going to tell you where you can get tax cuts.

If these tax cuts by George Bush were so horrible, why is it that President Obama is going to continue some of those? He is going to let some expire, but he is going to continue some. So

my colleagues across the aisle obviously are bashing their own President when they say these were horrible, horrible tax cuts that were put into effect by the Bush administration.

The motto of the State of North Carolina is to be rather than to seem, and that hits me so often when we are on the floor, when I'm listening to my colleagues across the aisle, because they are always trying to seem rather than to be. They are trying to say to the American people, Look at the wonderful things we're doing for you. The American people have had about all they can stand of the good things that the Democrats are trying to do for them, and I think today is a great example of that.

It is ironic that this is Tax Day. There are probably going to be a million or so people out on The Mall this afternoon near the Washington Monument. These are folks who have said, I've had it up to here with the Federal Government. These people are involved with the tea party movement. I welcome them to Washington, and I welcome the fact that they are everywhere today, all over the country, having these meetings where they're saying, It's time for us to take back our country. It's time for us to tell the Federal Government, We've just about had enough of you in terms of your taking away our money and deciding where to spend it.

I think it's a wonderful movement and that we should encourage it at every opportunity, because this is what this country is about. The first three words of the Constitution are written larger than the rest of the words, and they are "We the People."

We need to be honoring those people who are coming here and who are demonstrating all over the country that they've had it with the Democratic Party, that they've had it with government spending, that they've had it with debt. I want to encourage them to do more and more and more and to send the message to our colleagues that they don't care for the way they're being treated by the Democrats in charge of this government right now. They've had enough of it, and they want us to cut spending and to cut taxes across the board, not to decide who are the winners and the losers.

[From the *Wall Street Journal*, June 24, 2009]

MAINE MIRACLE

At last, there's a place in America where tax cutting to promote growth and attract jobs is back in fashion. Who would have thought it would be Maine?

This month the Democratic legislature and Governor John Baldacci broke with Obamanomics and enacted a sweeping tax reform that is almost, but not quite, a flat tax. The new law junks the state's graduated income tax structure with a top rate of 8.5% and replaces it with a simple 6.5% flat rate tax on almost everyone. Those with earnings above \$250,000 will pay a surtax rate of 0.35%, for a 6.85% rate. Maine's tax rate will fall to 20th from seventh highest among the states. To offset the lower rates and a larger family

deduction, the plan cuts the state budget by some \$300 million to \$5.8 billion, closes tax loopholes and expands the 5% state sales tax to services that have been exempt, such as ski lift tickets.

This is a big income tax cut, especially given that so many other states in the Northeast and East—Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey and New York—have been increasing rates. “We’re definitely going against the grain here,” Mr. Baldacci tells us. “We hope these lower tax rates will encourage and reward work, and that the lower capital gains tax [of 6.85%] brings more investment into the state.”

These changes alone are hardly going to earn the Pine Tree State the reputation of “pro-business.” Neighboring New Hampshire still has no income or sales tax. And last year Maine was ranked as having the third worst business climate for states by the Small Business Survival Committee. Still, no state has improved its economic attractiveness more than Maine has this year.

One question is how Democrats in Augusta were able to withstand the cries by interest groups of “tax cuts for the rich?” Mr. Baldacci’s snappy reply: “Without employers, you don’t have employees.” He adds: “The best social services program is a job.” Wise and timely advice for both Democrats and Republicans as the recession rolls on and budgets get squeezed.

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

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me, and I want to associate myself with her remarks.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican friends talk about fiscal responsibility, and they talk about how we need to focus on the economy. Let’s review the record here.

George Bush inherited from Bill Clinton a sound economy and a surplus. The Republicans came in. They basically eliminated the surplus, and they drove this economy into a ditch. What President Obama inherited was the worst economy since the Great Depression. That is what they did.

My friend from North Carolina wants to talk about arrogance. What about the arrogance of creating this enormous debt, of taking this surplus that they’ve inherited and just frittering it away and creating an all-time high, historic national debt? Where is the arrogance of that?

Tax cuts for rich people that weren’t paid for. That went onto our debt.

Two wars we are fighting. None of it paid for and trillions of dollars onto our debt.

When they were voting for all of this stuff, there was no mention of the implications to average families.

A prescription drug bill not paid for. Hundreds of billions of dollars added to our debt.

Do you want to talk about arrogance? That’s arrogance. That’s what they gave us. They gave us the worst economy since the Great Depression. They drove this economy into the ditch, and now they’re complaining about the size of the tow truck.

It is Tax Day. At this moment in our history, we have to clean up a mess. It’s easy. It’s fun to create a mess. When we were kids, it was always fun to mess things up. It wasn’t so fun when our mothers told us, “You’ve got to clean things up. We are cleaning things up. We are cleaning up their mess. I wish we didn’t have to, but that’s what they left us.”

In terms of tax relief, we have the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. It had tax cuts for average working families, tax incentives for businesses to create jobs by increasing bonus depreciation, by allowing small businesses to immediately write off new equipment purchases, and by providing a 5-year carryback for net operating losses. They had an opportunity to vote for that, and they voted “no.” They voted “no.”

On health reform, there are tax credits to help families pay for health care coverage. The cost of health care has become obscene. There are tax credits for small businesses to help them offer coverage to their employees. What did they do? They voted “no.”

There have been hiring incentives to restore employment, the so-called HIRE Act. There has been a payroll tax holiday for businesses that hire unemployed workers and retain them. How did they vote? “No.” They voted “no” on that.

The Small Business and Infrastructure Jobs Act provides tax incentives to help spur investments in small businesses. They all talk about small businesses. How did they vote on that? “No.”

There has been permanent estate tax relief that ensures that nearly all estates—99.8 percent—are exempt from taxes. How did they vote? “No.” On every measure that provides relief to average working families, they voted “no.”

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

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I am sorry. I say to my Republican friends that we are not trying to accommodate the Donald Trumps of the world and that we are not interested in providing more and more tax breaks, you know, to big corporations and to big financial institutions that created this mess on Wall Street. We have a different set of priorities, which is to help average working families get through this economic crisis that they created, and we are going to do that with or without their help.

So I am proud to stand with the President and with the leadership in this Congress to focus on working families.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that remarks in debate are properly directed to the Chair and should not be addressed in the second person.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, again, I constantly find it amazing how our col-

leagues want to rewrite history and how they assume that nobody is going to check up on what they are saying. That’s not happening these days.

I want to remind my colleagues that, when the Democrats took over the Congress in January 2007, President Bush was still in office. The deficit was less than \$400 billion. Since President Obama’s inauguration, the U.S. has had an average monthly deficit of \$122.6 billion. By comparison from the year 2000 to 2008, the average annual deficit was \$196 billion. Again, they can try to rewrite history, but the numbers are out there.

I also want to point out that my colleague was talking about the child tax credit. I was really confused about that, so I double-checked. The child tax credit is going to drop from \$1,000 to \$500 in January 2011 as a result of the Bush tax cuts being changed by our Democrat friends. It seems they don’t have quite the concern for children and married couples that Republicans have.

In an article today in Congress Daily, entitled “Credit Check” by Peter Cohn, I read, “In a quirk of the law’s drafting—” this is about the tax credit for first-time home buyers “—each spouse must meet the same test. A married couple would have had to have lived in the same home for 5 years to get the long-time resident credit or each would have to be a first-time buyer to get the higher credit.”

There is a real antipathy towards married couples in the policies that our Democratic colleagues continue to pass. Again, they are always picking winners and losers instead of allowing the American people to do with their money what they would like to do.

My colleagues talk about these rich people all the time. It appears that they simply never want to see another rich person in this country. They have such antipathy for the rich. What Republicans want is for every American to be able to be rich. Why is that not a wonderful goal to have?

[From CongressDaily, Apr. 15, 2010]

CREDIT CHECK

(By Peter Cohn)

Democrats this week have been touting the middle-class tax cuts they’ve doled out, such as a new credit for home purchases, as Americans face today’s filing deadline.

But they haven’t mentioned an unhappy little accident of the November law that extended and expanded the credit. In many cases newlyweds are out of luck, even if they would have qualified before they were married. (Full disclosure: This column’s author recently discovered this “marriage penalty” applied to him and his wife.)

The November law extended an \$8,000 tax credit for first-time buyers—defined as someone who had not owned a home in the last three years—through April 30, provided the settlement occurs before June 30. The law also created a \$6,500 credit for buyers who had owned their previous home for five of the past eight years.

In a quirk of the law’s drafting, each spouse must meet the same test. A married couple would have to have lived in the same home for five years to get the long-time resident credit, or each would have to be a first-time buyer to get the higher credit.

That freezes out married couples who would have met the different requirements individually (as in the author's case), but now don't get a penny. The same goes for newlyweds who had previously been longtime owners of separate homes. Now take unmarried couples purchasing a home: say one is a first-time buyer and the other a long-time homeowner, according to the IRS, they get to split the more generous credit of \$8,000.

Despite protests, the Treasury Department and IRS had to interpret the law based on its wording, a Treasury spokeswoman said.

Even as they trumpeted the credits' benefit this week, lawmakers have no plans to extend them. They are expensive—\$12.6 billion worth had been approved for 1.8 million taxpayers as of Feb. 20, according to Treasury. And fatigue has set in after relentless lobbying by groups like the National Association of Realtors and National Association of Home Builders, who have promised to hold their powder this time.

Sen. Johnny Isakson, R-Ga., a lead sponsor of the credit, said he pledged "to not come back to the well, and I'm not going to." He said he hadn't heard of the marriage penalty, however, and few lawmakers have been stirred to action as the credit eligibility period winds down.

Tonya Rutherford, a nurse in Milwaukee, brought the issue to the attention of Rep. Gwen Moore, D-Wis. Rutherford had owned her home for 11 years, thus on her own would have qualified for the \$6,500 credit. But since she recently got married to a man who had not lived with her for at least five years, the couple is ineligible.

Moore has introduced legislation to change the law so that only one spouse has to qualify. She has three co-sponsors: Reps. Dave Loebsack, D-Iowa, Bennie Thompson, D-Miss., and Joe Sestak, D-Pa., who is challenging Sen. Arlen Specter, D-Pa., for his party's nomination this fall.

Rep. Eliot Engel, D-N.Y., introduced separate legislation to allow a couple to claim the reduced credit if both would have qualified before they were married, or if one spouse would have qualified for the first-time buyer credit and the other would ordinarily get the longtime resident credit. Engel also has three co-sponsors: Reps. John Hall, D-N.Y., Steve Kagen, D-Wis., and Mary Jo Kilroy, D-Ohio, who signed on Tuesday.

"I do not believe Congress wanted to exclude couples based on technicalities: Engel said. "By fixing this so-called 'marriage penalty,' Congress will provide a further boost to the recovering real estate economy and reflect the importance of marriage as a cornerstone to our society."

Joseph Rand, managing partner of Better Homes & Gardens Rand Realty in New York's Hudson Valley, brought the problem up with Engel after coming across it when putting together an eligibility calculator for clients in December. Rand began blogging on the subject and set up a Web site where homebuyers could share stories about being locked out of the credit because of marital status.

"This is the kind of thing that should pass 400-5. People should be lining up in front of microphones to stand up for marriage," Rand said. "But I've been mostly shouting in the dark about it."

Engel's bill has been endorsed by a small Realtors' group that only represents buyers, the National Association of Exclusive Buyers Agents. But the larger and more powerful Realtors' lobby has stayed away from the issue. A spokesman could not be reached for comment by presstime.

The homebuilders' lobby noticed the problem early on, said NAHB economist Robert Dietz, raising the issue with Treasury. They argued for a more liberal reading of the law allowing married couples to benefit. "Unfortunately, we lost in making that argument," Dietz said. "I can tell you that I've fielded a

number of angry e-mails and phone calls about this," he said.

Rand said he thought part of the reason there has been so little attention is because Congress has been swamped with other issues and because many taxpayers have waited until the last minute to file their returns and are only now discovering the problem. "You're going to see so many angry people popping up this week" he said. (Full disclosure: The author was planning on a new home purchase anyway, but that tax credit wouldn't have hurt.)

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

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, this discussion has gotten a little bit away from this bill about trying to preserve Americans' estuaries so Americans can go fishing with their kids. It's kind of gotten a little far away from estuaries.

I will note that, painful as it is to pay our taxes, some of my constituents don't think it is a bad idea to be able to go fishing with their kids and to keep estuaries. That is a legitimate purpose, and this bill is going to help it along the way.

□ 1130

But my Republican colleague from North Carolina has tried to turn estuaries into the discussion about taxes because it is April 15, and I think it's appropriate to address a couple of facts about that issue, and I thought I might inject a couple facts into this discussion.

There is always a disagreement between sides of the aisle on what reality is. I thought I might turn to a fellow that might have an interesting viewpoint about this. His name is Bruce Bartlett. He is the former Domestic Policy Adviser under President Ronald Reagan and Treasury Department economist under President George H.W. Bush.

On March 19, 2010, here is what this former Reagan and Bush administration official said, and my friend from North Carolina might be interested in this from this former staffer under Republican Presidents. He said, and I quote, "Federal taxes are very considerably lower by every measure since Obama became President. According to the JCT," the Joint Committee on Taxes, "last year's \$787 billion stimulus bill, enacted with no Republican support, reduced Federal taxes by almost \$100 billion in 2009 and another \$220 billion this year."

Now, that is not some Democrat Member of Congress saying it. This is the official under Ronald Reagan and President George H.W. Bush.

Now, what does that mean in the State of North Carolina? My colleague from North Carolina has been down there suggesting that there has been a horrendous event on taxes. Let's look at what the Citizens for Tax Justice say the result of these tax cuts under President Obama are. Because I want to make sure people understand what they mean in the real world.

According to the Citizens for Tax Justice, in the State of North Carolina,

the State that my colleague is now attacking the President from, the lowest 20 percent of her fellow citizens in North Carolina have received average tax cuts, average tax cuts, of \$612. That's an average. The next 20 percent, average tax cuts of \$792; the next 20 percent, average tax cuts of \$646; the fourth 20 percent, average tax cuts of \$711.

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

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I am glad to yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. INSLEE. The next 15 percent, \$1,900; the next 4 percent, \$4,600; and the next 1 percent, \$3,019.

In fact, my colleague, who is today on a bill about estuaries trying to fan April 15 into a jihad against supporting Uncle Sam, every single one of the quartiles that you represent has had their taxes cut under this President and you voted against—excuse me, Mr. Speaker—the speaker voted against every single one of those tax cuts. Those are the facts.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that remarks in debate are properly directed to the Chair and should not be addressed in the second person.

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the need, again, to protect water and to protect estuaries. We all understand that. I grew up carrying water to my home, so I understand the value of water about as much as anybody here. But while we're increasing spending to protect estuaries, my constituents can't afford the bait and tackle to go fishing because they are out of work, they have lost their jobs, and there's no prospect for them to get jobs.

I can't be responsible for ill-informed Republicans who have said things that my colleagues have quoted. And I want to say I don't vote against tax cuts, but every bill that they have put in that has had tax cuts have had tax increases in them. Republicans are voting against tax increases.

What we have to be aware of here is that we should be dealing with the real problems that the American people are facing, and they have to do with the economy.

In 2009, the budget deficit was \$1.4 trillion, the first time in history the deficit exceeded \$1 trillion and the first time the deficit exceeded 10 percent of gross domestic product since World War II. The consequences of this reckless spending are worth highlighting. But today the cost of the national debt is \$41,398 for every man, woman, and child in the U.S. According to the March, 2010, monthly Treasury report, the Federal Government is projected to spend \$425.127 billion paying interest alone on the national debt. We should be dealing with that.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to say that this bill,

the bill we started talking about, about estuaries, which is very important for economic development in my State, will also help the NEPs keep their management plans current by requiring them to be periodically reviewed and updated. This will make them more dynamic, more responsive to changing conditions in the estuaries. Updating the plans will include identifying estuary vulnerability, climate change impact, preparing adaptation responses, as well as working to educate the public on estuary health issues.

One such issue that is emerging as an important issue nationally is the role of toxins from plastics like flame retardants like Deca. Deca is found in increasing amounts in many coastal estuaries. While this legislation does not require the NEPs to address toxins like Deca, it does provide them with the opportunity to further consider the impacts and any actions, including education, that the NEP might take.

I am proud of the good work being done in Maine and across the Nation to protect and restore our estuaries. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill. I urge a “yes” on the previous question and the rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 38 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1304

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. MCCOLLUM) at 1 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 1248, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 1062, by the yeas and nays;

H. Con. Res. 222, de novo.

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. 4715, CLEAN ESTUARIES ACT OF 2010, WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of House Resolution 1248, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 171, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 204]

YEAS—235

Ackerman	Donnelly (IN)	Larsen (WA)
Adler (NJ)	Doyle	Larson (CT)
Altmire	Driedhaus	Lee (CA)
Andrews	Edwards (MD)	Levin
Arcuri	Edwards (TX)	Lewis (GA)
Baca	Ellison	Lipinski
Baird	Ellsworth	Loeb
Baldwin	Engel	Lofgren, Zoe
Barrow	Eshoo	Lowey
Bean	Etheridge	Lujan
Becerra	Farr	Lynch
Berkley	Fattah	Maffei
Berman	Finer	Maloney
Berry	Poster	Markey (CO)
Bishop (GA)	Frank (MA)	Markey (MA)
Bishop (NY)	Fudge	Marshall
Blumenauer	Garamendi	Matheson
Bocchieri	Giffords	Matsui
Boren	Gordon (TN)	McCarthy (NY)
Boswell	Grayson	McCollum
Boucher	Green, Al	McDermott
Brady (PA)	Green, Gene	McGovern
Braley (IA)	Grijalva	McIntyre
Bright	Gutierrez	McMahon
Brown, Corrine	Hall (NY)	McNerney
Butterfield	Halvorson	Meeks (NY)
Capps	Hare	Melancon
Capuano	Harman	Michaud
Carmahan	Hastings (FL)	Miller (NC)
Carney	Heinrich	Miller, George
Carson (IN)	Herseth Sandlin	Mollohan
Castor (FL)	Higgins	Moore (KS)
Chandler	Hill	Moore (WI)
Childers	Himes	Moran (VA)
Chu	Hinche	Murphy (CT)
Clarke	Hinojosa	Murphy (NY)
Cleaver	Hirono	Murphy, Patrick
Clyburn	Hodes	Nadler (NY)
Cohen	Holden	Napolitano
Connolly (VA)	Holt	Neal (MA)
Conyers	Honda	Nye
Cooper	Hoyer	Oberstar
Costa	Inslee	Obey
Costello	Israel	Olver
Courtney	Jackson (IL)	Ortiz
Crowley	Johnson (GA)	Owens
Cuellar	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
Cummings	Kagen	Pascarella
Dahlkemper	Kanjorski	Pastor (AZ)
Davis (AL)	Kaptur	Payne
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Perlmutter
Davis (IL)	Kildee	Perriello
Davis (TN)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Peters
DeFazio	Kilroy	Peterson
DeGette	Kind	Pingree (ME)
Delahunt	Kissell	Polis (CO)
DeLauro	Klein (FL)	Pomeroy
Dicks	Kratovil	Price (NC)
Dingell	Kucinich	Quigley
Doggett	Langevin	Rahall

Rangel	Sestak	Tierney
Reyes	Shea-Porter	Titus
Richardson	Sherman	Tonko
Rodriguez	Shuler	Van Hollen
Ross	Sires	Velázquez
Rothman (NJ)	Skelton	Visclosky
Roybal-Allard	Smith (WA)	Walz
Rush	Snyder	Waters
Ryan (OH)	Space	Watson
Salazar	Speier	Watt
Sanchez, Loretta	Spratt	Waxman
Sarbanes	Stark	Weiner
Schauer	Stupak	Welch
Schiff	Sutton	Wilson (OH)
Schrader	Tanner	Woolsey
Schwartz	Taylor	Wu
Scott (GA)	Teague	Yarmuth
Scott (VA)	Thompson (CA)	
Serrano	Thompson (MS)	

NAYS—171

Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	Mitchell
Akin	Garrett (NJ)	Moran (KS)
Alexander	Gerlach	Murphy, Tim
Austria	Gingrey (GA)	Myrick
Bachmann	Gohmert	Neugebauer
Bachus	Goodlatte	Nunes
Bartlett	Granger	Olson
Barton (TX)	Graves	Paul
Biggart	Griffith	Paulsen
Bilirakis	Guthrie	Pence
Bishop (UT)	Hall (TX)	Petri
Blackburn	Harper	Pitts
Blunt	Hastings (WA)	Platts
Boehner	Heller	Poe (TX)
Bonner	Hensarling	Posey
Bono Mack	Herger	Price (GA)
Boozman	Hunter	Putnam
Boustany	Inglis	Radanovich
Brady (TX)	Issa	Rehberg
Broun (GA)	Jenkins	Reichert
Brown (SC)	Johnson (IL)	Roe (TN)
Brown-Waite,	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Ginny	Jones	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Jordan (OH)	Rogers (MI)
Burgess	King (IA)	Rohrabacher
Burton (IN)	King (NY)	Rooney
Buyer	Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Kirk	Roskam
Camp	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Royce
Campbell	Kline (MN)	Ryan (WI)
Cantor	Lamborn	Scalise
Cao	Lance	Schmidt
Capito	Latham	Schock
Carter	LaTourette	Sensenbrenner
Cassidy	Latta	Sessions
Castle	Lee (NY)	Shadegg
Chaffetz	Lewis (CA)	Shimkus
Coble	Linder	Shuster
Coffman (CO)	LoBiondo	Simpson
Cole	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Conaway	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Lummis	Smith (TX)
Culberson	Lungren, Daniel	Souder
Davis (KY)	E.	Stearns
Dent	Mack	Sullivan
Diaz-Balart, L.	Manzullo	Terry
Diaz-Balart, M.	Marchant	Thompson (PA)
Dreier	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Duncan	McCaul	Tiberi
Ehlers	McClintock	Turner
Emerson	McHenry	Upton
Fallin	McKeon	Walden
Flake	McMorris	Westmoreland
Fleming	Rodgers	Whitfield
Forbes	Mica	Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Wittman
Fox	Miller, Gary	Wolf
Franks (AZ)	Minnick	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—23

Barrett (SC)	Jackson Lee	Schakowsky
Bilbray	(TX)	Slaughter
Boyd	Kosmas	Tiahrt
Cardoza	McCotter	Towns
Clay	Meek (FL)	Tsongas
Gallegly	Miller (FL)	Wamp
Gonzalez	Ruppersberger	Wasserman
Hoekstra	Sánchez, Linda	Schultz
	T.	Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.