United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 15, 2010 No. 53

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC.,
April 15, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable EARL BLUMENAUER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Rev. Dr. Clyde Mighells, Lighthouse Reformed Church, Howard, Pennsylvania, offered the following prayer:

O Lord, who called this Nation into being through the lives and sacrifice of those whose hearts were stayed upon You; be upon and within this congressional body as they conduct the work of this great Nation.

Grant them courage to stand for what is right, resistance when pressed to do wrong, compassion for the concerns of Your heart, and the ability to preserve and protect the Constitution of these United States of America.

May the very mind of Christ be upon them as they labor to write the next chapter in the legacy of this great land; that their plans might be guided by the heritage upon which we stand, that their lives might reflect the calling to serve, and that this great Nation might continue to embrace and support the work of freedom and democracy throughout the world.

It is in the blessed name of our Lord, Jesus Christ, that we lay these requests at Your feet. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KAGEN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KAGEN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REV. DR. CLYDE MIGHELLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it has been a rare privilege this day to have the minister from my church, the Lighthouse Reformed Church in Howard, Pennsylvania, the Reverend Dr. Clyde Mighells, lead the prayer before the House of Representatives.

Dr. Mighells was born the son of a tent evangelist, and followed his father into the ministry when he was ordained by the Presbyterian Church, USA, in 1985. He then took his master's from Dubuque Theological Seminary and his doctorate at Newport University in 1996.

While performing the tasks of pastoral ministry, Dr. Mighells followed his father's example of using magic tricks as teaching tools. He found that magic tricks would pique the interest of his listeners and create a more receptive audience.

After 20 years serving churches across New York and Pennsylvania, in 2006 Dr. Mighells and his wife Sharon developed a performance ministry, taking the message of escaping drugs and the timely topic of anti-bullying into elementary, middle, and high schools. In 2009, they were featured at the International Fellowship of Christian Magicians.

We are lucky enough to have Pastor Mighells as our minister, and we don't mind sharing him with his continuing great ministry work in schools, churches, and with other groups.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 10 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

TRIBUTE TO LARRY WEYERS

(Mr. KAGEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Larry Weyers of Green Bay, Wisconsin, as he enters his retirement. For 24 years, Mr. Weyers has served northeastern Wisconsin as a distinguished community leader. As his friends, family, and colleagues will gather at the Green Bay Packer stadium, Lambeau Field, on April 19 to pay tribute to him and his dedicated service to our community, I respectfully request my colleagues join in honoring this outstanding individual.

Among his many accomplishments, Mr. Weyers has been presented with the Rotary Free Enterprise Award and received an honorary Golden Apple Award from the Green Bay Area Partners in Education. In 2009, he was a nominee for the Platts Lifetime Achievement Award. Mr. Weyers has supported his community, and we wish him well in his retirement.

Printed on recycled paper.

Mr. Speaker, as Mr. Weyers celebrates his retirement, I ask all of my colleagues to salute him and to remind him that retirement is simply reoccupation, and he will be just too busy to go back to work.

SURRENDERING OUR SUPERIORITY IN SPACE TECHNOLOGY

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for as long as I can remember, America has reached for the stars. Nothing has gotten more kids to do their math and science homework than the dream of being an astronaut. All of America stood still, huddled at their black-and-white TV sets, when Neil Armstrong stepped out on the moon.

America put a man on the moon, setting the imaginations of our children on fire, feeding that good old American desire to be the best, to achieve, to dream of things not yet done. But the administration says they are canceling NASA's Project Constellation and America's return to the moon. America is surrendering our superiority in space technology to the Russians.

Unilateral space abandonment is nonsense. So next time our astronauts want to go into space, they will have to hitchhike with the Chinese or the Russians. And if we need to repair a defense satellite, I am sure our buddies, the Chinese, will be glad to give us a lift. Yeah, right. Our children, our future will suffer for this incompetent decision. This ought not to be.

But that's just the way it is.

HONORING ERICKA DEBENEDICTIS

(Mr. HEINRICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. Speaker, I have often said that innovation is what America does best. Recently, I had the honor of meeting one of our great current and future innovators, Ericka DeBenedictis. Ms. DeBenedictis is an 18-year-old Albuquerque student who recently won the prestigious Intel Science Talent Search, which recognizes our best and brightest young scientists. This long-standing award has been characterized as the equivalent of winning a junior Nobel Prize.

Ms. DeBenedictis received the top prize because of her research in low energy orbit software, a program which would enable space vehicles to navigate the solar system using gravity's pull and minimal fuel.

On behalf of everyone in New Mexico's First Congressional District, I want to say how incredibly proud we are of Ms. DeBenedictis and the hard work that she put into her project. As I've said, innovation is what America does best. And it looks like innovation might be what Ms. DeBenedictis does best too.

TAX DAY

(Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, as Kentuckians file their taxes today, sending their hard-earned dollars to the Federal Treasury, Americans want to know exactly what they are getting in return. Like jobs maybe? Over the last 2 years, Congress has given America three things: a series of bailouts, a failed stimulus package, and a government takeover of health care, each costing around a trillion dollars or more. In return, there are over 225,000 Kentuckians and 15 million Americans out of work. Everyone agrees that the economy and job creation have been at the top of the list of what Americans are saying is the most important things to be done.

Rightfully, in my mind, we hear over and over again, ''Where are the jobs?'' Well, we are going to focus on climate change or we are going to focus on other things that Americans don't care about when in fact we need a sound energy policy, a sound manufacturing policy, and a sound trade policy. Instead of focusing on the economy and job creation, the agenda in Congress has left Americans with uncertainty.

When Americans feel their tax dollars aren't being used right, the Democrats in Congress say, ''Just send more.'' Well, Americans expect our focus to be on policies that create jobs, building a future for our children. And business can't thrive on an economy falsely buoyed.

IN MEMORY OF REVEREND BENJAMIN HOOKS

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, a great cedar, a great lion, a leader, a golden-throated warrior and silver-tongued orator of the Gospel, and a great civil rights icon, Benjamin Hooks, fell in Memphis, Tennessee this morning.

The Reverend Benjamin L. Hooks was the head of the NAACP from 1977 to 1992. He was also the first African American on the Federal Communications Commission, appointed by President Nixon. He served 5 years, from 1972 to 1977. And the first African American trial court judge in Tennessee, appointed by Governor Frank Clement in 1965, and elected in 1966.

The Reverend Hooks led this country through some of its more difficult times in civil rights. He joined with Dr. King in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in 1956 after he had been ordained as a minister in Memphis at Middle Baptist Church. He was an attorney, he was a businessman, he was a minister, he was a civil rights leader.

He was awarded the Medal of Freedom by President Bush in 2007, and recently was up here in Congress and talked to many Members of the Congress in the Rayburn Building just 2 months ago. He leaves his wife Frances and many, many millions who benefited from his leadership and his courage. His was a life well lived.

Thank you for coming our way, Benjamin Hooks.

''WE THE PEOPLE'' EVENTS IN AIKEN

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, a grassroots group in Aiken, South Carolina, is holding meetings to educate the residents about the Constitution and the principles of our Founding Fathers. Coordinated by Debbie Nix, the group is called ''We the People, Aiken.'' I am pleased to have attended one of their weekly Constitution classes recently at the H. Odell Weeks Activity Center.

During my recent visit to the group meeting, I highlighted my concerns about the government health care takeover and discussed how simply repealing it is not sufficient. We believe we must swap it with a more affordable solution that is centered around the patient and not the government. That is why I introduced H.R. 4944, the Siding With America's Patients (SWAP) Act, to continue to cover preexisting conditions, but will repeal the tax hikes and the unaffordable mandates on individuals and small business owners.

I want to thank the members of ''We the People, Aiken'' for their warm welcome and for their efforts to promote America's founding principles.

In conclusion, God bless our troops and we will never forget September 11 in the Global War on Terrorism.

TAX CUTS BENEFIT OHIOANS

(Mr. WILSON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as this country's economy was about to fall off the cliff, Congress acted. We strengthened and improved our economy by helping working families. On Tax Day, it is important to note that 99 percent of the working families in my State of Ohio have benefited from 25 different tax cuts through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

Mr. Speaker, according to the Citizens for Tax Justice, working people in Ohio received on average $1,046 from these breaks. That includes an average of $496 from one of the fastest and most widely shared tax cuts in American history, the Making Work Pay tax cut. Social Security recipients received a one-time recovery payment of $250. And more than 879,000 families in Ohio were protected from paying higher taxes under the alternative minimum tax.

More must be done as we put America back to work, but I am proud to have supported the Recovery Act and am pleased to see the tax cuts helping so many Americans.

GOVERNMENT GONE WILD

(Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, spring break just ended, but if you thought Washington tax-and-spenders were taking a vacation from their money-grabbing ways, you were badly mistaken. Every day it seems another headline is proclaiming the administration's latest plans to dramatically increase your taxes in order to pay for its trillion-dollar spending binge.

Now, there are some close to the President who are throwing out the possibility that after the election they are going to throw out a value added tax not in place of our current tax system, but in addition to it. Mr. Speaker, this isn't the latest video of spring breakers going wild, this is a real life example of government gone wild.

The President, backed by the largest Democrat majorities in Congress since the 1970s, has doubled the Federal deficit in just 1 year, and has forced down our throat a government takeover of health care that, mark my words, the American people don't want and we cannot afford. Ironically, hardworking taxpayers will have until midnight tonight to file their tax returns. They have worked 4 long months just to pay their Federal tax bill. And soon they will be working even longer to feed this addiction. This has got to end.

□ 1015

HONORING OUR VIETNAM VETERANS

(Mr. KLEIN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the veterans of the Vietnam War in my congressional district in south Florida and around our country. These heroic soldiers answered the call of duty, and we're all grateful for their service and their sacrifice.

Many of our Vietnam veterans didn't get the welcome home they deserve, and that is why this Saturday, one of our great local veterans, Commander David Knapp, is organizing a welcome home event in Ft. Lauderdale. It may be belated, but I say, better late than never.

Every day I go to work fighting to make sure that every man and woman who has worn the uniform of our country has access to the full range of benefits they have earned. That means world-class health care, access to a college education and more.

I look forward this weekend to honoring the service of our local Vietnam veterans and every day as we work together to stand with those who served our country.

TAX DAY

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, tax day. Today is a grim day for many Americans. It was only last week that the average American taxpayer had worked enough days to pay their annual bill, and the current Congress is looking to add even more days to that burden.

In the present Congress alone, taxes have been increased by $670 billion, and at least 14 new taxes will hit middle-income Americans. At the end of the year, the death tax will snap back up to its 2001 level, gobbling up family farms and small businesses. Marginal tax rates will snap back up to previous levels reducing America's take-home pay. And now we hear that the administration may consider a new value added tax to pay for the entitlements and increased government spending.

The simple fact is that more money in the pocket of the government is less in the bank accounts of our family businesses.

Today is a grim tax day. But I worry that 2011 will look much worse for the American taxpayer.

TAX RELIEF

(Mr. SIRES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, as today is tax day, it is important that American people are aware of the savings and tax cuts brought to them over the past year. In conjunction with President Obama, we have ensured that tax breaks no longer focus on the wealthy, but rather on the hardworking Americans.

With the enactment of the Recovery Act, we are able to provide tax breaks for many aspects of American life, from investing in small business, to investing in energy efficiency, to sending your child to college, to buying a new car. These tax reductions are helping families and businesses across America get back on their feet while spurring business investment and job creation.

All totaled, Congress has enacted over $800 billion in tax cuts, including 25 within the Recovery Act. Perhaps one of the most critical provisions of the past year was the Making Work Pay tax credit, which is dedicated to providing 95 percent of all American workers with a tax break, including 254,000 residents in my district alone through the reduction in tax withholdings by their employer.

As Americans return their tax forms today, a majority will find that a portion of their burden has been lifted through the swift action of this Chamber.

IT'S TIME TO CUT TAXES AND SPENDING

(Mr. FLEMING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, as millions of Americans, and the people in my State of Louisiana, file their income taxes today, they are reminded how they labor under a tax scheme that discourages hard work, investment and savings.

Federal, State and local taxes claim almost 27 percent of the average American's income. This means the average taxpayer worked until April 9 this year just to make enough money to pay their taxes. Meanwhile, our budget deficit this year is a record $1.5 trillion, three times the highest Bush deficit.

This tax increase equates to more than $2,100 for every person in the United States and explodes the President's pledge not to raise taxes on Americans earning less than $200,000.

And now we hear that the administration is considering a value added tax which taxes goods and services at every point in the process.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to taxes and our budget, let me suggest that Americans are not undertaxed; Washington is overspending. It is time for Congress to cut taxes across the board and stop the wasteful spending programs.

TAX RELIEF FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES

(Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, today, as Americans put the finishing touches on their tax returns, they'll see that Congress and this President have enacted tax cuts that benefit middle class and working class families. Despite the echo chamber of right wing misinformation, some of it we've heard here today, Mr. Speaker, we can finally set the record straight. For 8 long years, the Republicans put the interests of the wealthy few above the interests of middle class families, and they gave massive tax cuts for only a few Americans, sent the national debt soaring, and they had no way to pay for it.

In this last year we've cut $800 billion in taxes focused on helping middle class families and small businesses. Americans are getting jobs, they're buying homes or a car, and they're sending their children to college.

As Bruce Bartlett, adviser under Presidents Reagan and George H.W. Bush recently noted, ''Federal taxes are very considerably lower by every measure since Obama became President.''

And so while the other guys stand with the banks and insurance companies and CEOs, we'll continue to stand on the side of working families.

WHO WOULD HAVE EVER IMAGINED?

(Mr. JORDAN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, who would have ever imagined in the greatest country in history we would see the things we have over the last year from the Democrat Congress and the Obama administration?

Who'd have ever thought we'd see a $1.4 trillion deficit? Who would have ever thought we'd see a $12 trillion national debt?

Who would have ever imagined we'd have $670 billion and counting in new taxes imposed this year on American taxpayers, including taxes on the middle class?

And, now, who would have ever imagined coming soon to you and your family, a value added tax?

How bad does it have to get before we stop the madness, before we stop the excessive spending, the excessive borrowing and the excessive taxation?

Mr. Speaker, today, on tax day, the American people get it. Hopefully, soon the Democratic Congress will.

COMMEMORATING THE DISTINGUISHED CAREER OF STEVE JOHNSON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE WASHINGTON PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICTS ASSOCIATION

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, we have been doing a lot of work here in the House to try to lead the country forward on energy independence and energy security, but there's been some great local leadership as well.

I want to honor today one of those great local leaders, Mr. Steve Johnson, one of my constituents who, for 23 years, has served with distinction as the executive director of the Washington Public Utility Districts.

Steve has had an incredible career leading this group forward, which represents 27 public utility districts. That's over 1.7 million citizens. And I want to note three of this local leader's achievements.

First, he has led to reforms which have benefited Washingtonians who have not had high speed telecommunications available to them, truly a visionary action by Steve.

Second, Steve's leadership has always helped PUDs obtain funding for more energy efficiency and conservation projects. Steve's been ahead of his time.

And, third, Steve's been a real leader in municipal water systems. Steve's career has really been notable for moving the PUDs forward. He's been a great local leader. We hope the country follows his leadership.

Congratulations to Steve and Vicki in their next great pursuit.

A WIN FOR AMERICAN WORKERS

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, American workers have just won a great and historic victory. Employees of Mohawk Industries will share the $18 million that the company agreed to pay to settle a lawsuit accusing it of hiring illegal immigrants in order to hold down wages.

The settlement comes on the heels of the Obama administration's decision to largely abandon enforcement of our immigration laws at America's workplaces. This legal victory gives a valuable tool to other workers who suffer at the hands of employers who want to keep wages low by hiring illegal immigrants.

If the Obama administration won't act to protect American workers, American workers now have the power to protect themselves by filing lawsuits against employers who hire cheap and illegal labor.

Mr. Speaker, if employers continue to break immigration laws, may there be many more such lawsuits.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ROB KRENTZ

(Ms. GIFFORDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Rob Krentz, a rancher whose family has been in southeast Arizona since 1907.

On March 27, Rob was shot and murdered on his ranch. This senseless act is a stark reminder why the federal government must do more to protect citizens who live and work along the southern Arizona border. Law enforcement officials believe the killer may have been a drug smuggler who escaped to Mexico.

Mr. Krentz was a pillar of the ranching community. He had a heart as big as the land that he loved. Many who spoke at his funeral said that Rob was the nicest guy you will ever meet.

He was a humanitarian who provided food and water to the people that he found in distress, and was likely doing just that when he was murdered.

Rob will be known for his work with the Malpai Borderlands Group, ranchers who are dedicated to conservation of the land.

Rob Krentz was a husband, a brother, a father, a grandfather, an uncle, and a friend to so many. We grieve his loss and send our prayers to his wife, Susan, and children, Andy, Frank, Kyle, and all that knew this great man.

He will be deeply missed, but he will never be forgotten.

YOU CANNOT HAVE EMPLOYMENT WITHOUT EMPLOYERS

(Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, you cannot have employment without employers. One year after the enactment of the $787 billion stimulus package, unemployment continues to hover near 10 percent, yet congressional Democrats just keep on spending.

Against the will of the American people, this Congress has enacted a $2 trillion takeover of our Nation's health care system and pushed the Nation's debt limit to an astounding $14.2 trillion. The burden of this massive spending falls on the shoulders of the American taxpayers.

Government-run health care alone raises $569 billion through new taxes, regulations, and costly mandates on individuals, employers, and health care providers.

Furthermore, the administration proposes to increase taxes by $2 trillion by allowing the vital cuts that benefit small businesses to expire, increasing tax rates on capital gains and reinstating the dreaded death tax.

As the economy struggles to recover, Congress must halt this reckless spending and end its assault on American job creators.

SENDING OUR SINCERE CONDOLENCES TO THE PEOPLE OF POLAND

(Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, in New Britain, Connecticut, on Sunday, over 1,000 people came together at Sacred Heart Catholic Church to mourn the 96 public servants, diplomats and military leaders who died in the tragic plane crash in Poland.

This tragedy has shocked the entire world, but it's hit my district particularly hard. The Polish American community in Connecticut has deep roots and remains strongly connected to their homeland.

Our Polish inheritance is visible throughout the community of New Britain, Connecticut, and the surrounding suburbs. Broad Street in that town has been named ''Little Poland'' by the city council. There are people grieving today at Casimir Pulaski School in Meriden, at Pulaski Middle School in New Britain, and certainly this summer during the annual Dozynki harvest festival, a tradition which Polish immigrants brought to New Britain, Connecticut, during their immigration to the United States.

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 addressing 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 Piscatisqua 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 national 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 long 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 colleagues 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 Treasure 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
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Giffords
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—171

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

NOT VOTING—23

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1337

Mr. BLUNT changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 14, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of a letter received from the Honorable Kurt S. Browning, Secretary of State, State of Florida, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special Election held April 13, 2010, the Honorable Theodore E. Deutch was elected Representative to Congress for the Nineteenth Congressional District, State of Florida.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk.

Enclosure.

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Tallahassee, FL, April 14, 2010.

Hon. LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. MILLER: Attached are the unofficial results of the Special Election held on Tuesday, April 13, 2010, for Representative in Congress from the Nineteenth Congressional District of Florida.

To the best of our knowledge and belief at this time, there is no contest to this election, As soon as the official results are certified to this office by the Supervisors of Elections for Palm Beach County and Broward County, an official Certificate of Election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

KURT S. BROWNING,
Secretary of State.

Enclosure.

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF STATE, DIVISION OF ELECTIONS, APRIL 13, 2010 SPECIAL GENERAL CONGRESSIONAL 19 & HOUSE 4

UNOFFICIAL ELECTION NIGHT RETURNS (MAY NOT INCLUDE ABSENTEE OR PROVISIONAL BALLOTS)

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE DISTRICT: 19

County	Edward Lynch (REP)	Ted Deutch (DEM)	Jim McCormick (NPA)	Josue Larose (WRI)
Broward	5,837	7,342	458	0
Palm Beach	18,702	35,913	1,447	0
Total	24,539	43,255	1,905	0
% Votes	35.2%	62.1%	2.7%	0.0%

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE THEODORE E. DEUTCH, OF FLORIDA, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida, the Honorable THEODORE E. DEUTCH, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will Representative-elect DEUTCH and the members of the Florida delegation present themselves in the well.

Mr. DEUTCH appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 111th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE THEODORE E. DEUTCH TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to introduce to you today our newest member of the Florida delegation, Congressman TED DEUTCH.

After serving with distinction in the Florida State Senate, TED now joins us to represent the people of Florida's 19th Congressional District here in Washington. TED brings with him a commonsense and results-driven approach that distinguished him during his time in the Florida State Senate, where he wrote and passed landmark legislation, including a health care bill that will raise $1 billion for essential health services for Floridians, and he also passed the Iran divestment legislation that made Florida the first State in the Nation to put direct economic pressure on companies doing business in Iran.

Throughout his career in public service, TED has fought on behalf of those who risk losing the most, including seniors, working families, children, Holocaust survivors, veterans, members of the Armed Services, and small businesses.

I have worked alongside TED as a leader in the community and as a legislator. I know him well, and I am confident that he will do an excellent job replacing our former colleague and good friend, Robert Wexler, who is with us today, do a good job representing Florida's 19th Congressional District.

Madam Speaker, please join me in welcoming TED DEUTCH, his wife Jill, their three children, Gabrielle, Serena, and Cole, who are here on the floor with us, to our congressional family. I would also like to recognize TED's mother Jean, his four siblings, extended family, and friends who are here today to celebrate this special occasion with him.

At this time, Madam Speaker, I would like to yield to my distinguished colleague from Florida, the dean of the Florida delegation, Congressman C.W. ''BILL'' YOUNG.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from Florida for yielding the time to me, and I want to say on behalf of the Republican members of the Florida delegation, the great delegation here in the Congress, Congressman, welcome.

Congratulations. You will be serving in the people's House. Your oath of office that you have just sworn to uphold the Constitution is something that you will find very challenging as you go through your career here. But just rest assured that those of us in the Florida delegation on both sides of the aisle will be here to be helpful to you as you carry out your important activities. Again, welcome. Congratulations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the newest Member of the House of Representatives, Congressman TED DEUTCH, is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. DEUTCH. Thank you, Speaker PELOSI.

This is a truly humbling day, and the honor of a lifetime. My constituents are an extraordinary collection of Americans, seniors who served our Nation valiantly in times of war and rebuilt this country after the Great Depression. They are hardworking families who strive to pass on a better world and greater opportunities to their children.

I want to thank Speaker PELOSI and Majority Leader HOYER for their exceptional leadership. I am also grateful to my South Florida friends, Representatives KLEIN, MEEK, and WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and especially our dean, Congressman HASTINGS. I want to thank Congressman Wexler for his service, as well as his support and friendship.

I will never forget my family, friends, volunteers, and most importantly voters, who helped send me here today. I want to profoundly thank my wife, Jill, and my three children, Gabrielle, Serena, and Cole, who are all here with us today. Their love and support means the world to me.

In all of her 86 years, my mother, Jean Deutch, never could have imagined hearing her name in this Chamber, and she is here with us today.

□ 1345

Mom, thank you for making me believe that I could be anything I wanted to be, because today I am a Member of the United States Congress.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath of office to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), the whole number of the House is 431.

Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING THE COAST GUARD GROUP ASTORIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCCOLLUM). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1062, as amended, 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 motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1062, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 0, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 205]

YEAS—401

Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—29

Ackerman
Barrett (SC)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Boyd
Brown, Corrine
Cardoza
Ehlers
Engel
Gallegly
Gonzalez
Hoekstra
Jackson Lee (TX)
Kosmas
Lungren, Daniel E.
McCotter
Meek (FL)
Miller (FL)
Olver
Rothman (NJ)
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Slaughter
Tiahrt
Towns
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Young (AK)

□ 1356

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. EHLERS. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 205, I missed the vote on H. Res. 1062, due to an important vote.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

RECOGNIZING DR. HECTOR GARCIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 222.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 222.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1400

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4715 and include extraneous matter in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

CLEAN ESTUARIES ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1248 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4715.

□ 1404

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the 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, with Mr. CUELLAR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) deserve very special recognition and appreciation for their collaborative work taking the lead on this legislation to bring new focus and new energy and new legislative authorities to the National Estuary Program under the Clean Estuaries Act of 2010.

Without that concerted effort, we would be losing an extraordinary opportunity to protect and to restore the Nation's estuaries, among our most valuable natural resources.

This legislation was approved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure by voice vote. We have solid support on both sides of the aisle on a bill that was carefully crafted over many months by participation, input, and recommendations from both sides, all of which suggestions have been incorporated into this final legislative product.

Estuaries are very unique bodies of water. They are the places where fresh and salt water meet, the places where new forms of life are created, not just in the United States but all throughout the world. Estuaries are critical mixing points for the basic ingredients of life, including new life itself. Estuaries are the most ecologically diverse, the most economically productive natural resource areas on our entire planet.

Estuaries and their associated coastal resources are major economic forces, as well, for our country. Commercial and recreational fishing annually accounts for $185 billion in revenue, 2 million direct jobs. Commercially and recreationally important fish and shellfish species—striped bass, shad, salmon, sturgeon, shrimp, crabs, lobster, clams, oysters, muscles, and bay scallops—all depend on the estuary for stages of their life cycle.

Estuaries are habitat for three-fourths of all of the commercial fish catch and 80–90 percent of the recreational fish catch. And that is true not just for the fresh and salt water meeting places of estuaries, but also for the riverine and lake meeting places of estuaries on the Great Lakes.

Beyond fishing, estuaries produce significant economic value for our fellow citizens in tourism, energy production, navigation, cultural and recreational opportunities, boating, fishing, swimming, surfing, birding. Ports and harbors are located in our estuaries, including our ports of Duluth Superior, which I share with my dear friend and colleague from across the water, Mr. OBEY, in northwestern Wisconsin/northeastern Minnesota.

The University of California and the Ocean Foundation have reported that, annually, beach going generates $30 billion of economic value, and wildlife viewing generates up to $49 billion, also, in economic value.

But, unfortunately, estuaries, by definition, are downstream. Each estuary is the repository for all of the pollution discharged into the rivers and other bodies of water that drain into estuaries from upstream. As the pollution loading increases, the estuary, the repository of those pollution deposits, deteriorates. The water becomes degraded. The animal and plant communities suffer. Chesapeake Bay is a powerful example of that degrading and deterioration. Only 1 percent of the historical oyster population remain in Chesapeake Bay.

An impaired estuary is bad for commercial and recreational fishing, results in depleted fisheries, decreased tourism revenues, and deteriorated property values. In addition, because of deterioration of the estuary and the borderland around it, we've seen increased flooding, shoreline erosion, damaged infrastructure, particularly when storms occur, which happens every year.

The Federal Government has a number of authorities at its disposal with which to control water pollution, and typically we have used a permit-based system to regulate pollution discharge into our waters. The 1987 amendments to the Clean Water Act provided a new authority in the National Estuary Program. We are reauthorizing that program today in this bill. It's a nonregulatory program. It includes 28 separate estuaries, and each of these estuary initiatives is run by a non-Federal entity. Some are run by States, others by nongovernmental organizations, and a few others by universities.

A central feature of each program is a management plan developed on a consensual basis; not a top-down, not imposed, but a cooperative, inclusive initiative where all elements of government and private sectors and, sort of, stakeholders—a term I don't particularly like, but that's a good inclusive term covering all of those who have a share or a responsibility in the watershed—all develop a bottoms-up process to manage the discharges into and the use of the estuary. It has been very popular and it has been also very effective in improving the health of our estuaries.

This bill does four things: increased transparency and accountability for each of the estuary programs; increased Federal coordination in restoration, protection of the estuaries; third, programmatic changes to the natural estuary program; and, fourth, increasing the authorization level for the program from $35 million to $50 million. Not very much. Not very much especially considering the erosion of the value of the dollar over the years since this program was established.

We set the minimum level of $1.25 million a year for each of the 28 approved estuaries. The program was last authorized in 2000 and erosion of the dollar would have required an increase over those years to an estimated $44 million. We take it just a little bit higher to $50 million in order to account for other estuaries that are important that may be added in the coming management of this program.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4715 reauthorizes the National Estuary Program found in section 320 of the Clean Water Act and adds some important accountability provisions. These improvements require performance measures and goals in order to track implementation of management plans for estuaries. The EPA will evaluate every 4 years and report on the implementation of each management plan. In addition, after the EPA evaluates and reports on a plan, each management conference will be required to update their plans.

I note that H.R. 4715 increases the authorized level of funding by 43 percent from $35 million per year to $50 million a year. The average appropriation over the past 5 years for this program has been only $26.8 million. The President's recent budget requests $27.2 million.

While I support the National Estuary Program and improvements made here in H.R. 4715, I know many of my colleagues, as well as myself, are concerned about increasing authorized levels of spending for programs when Congress has not been able to fund the program close to its current authorization.

□ 1415

Certainly in our current economic crisis we should carefully weigh any proposed increase in authorization levels. We must also consider the importance to estuaries. They are the nursery grounds for much of the planet's sea life and the source of the seafood that we enjoy. They are a unique habitat for a unique group of fish and wildlife.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to express my great appreciation to our subcommittee chair, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, who has done a superb job of holding the hearings that led up to the creation of this legislation and bringing together the parties on both sides of the aisle; Mr. BOOZMAN for his splendid participation in the deliberations of the subcommittee and then at the full committee level; and also my great appreciation to Mr. MICA, the ranking member of the full committee, with whom I have a splendid partnership in all of the work of our committee.

Before I recognize and yield time to Ms. JOHNSON, I just wanted to say, it's true, as the gentleman from Arkansas pointed out, that the funding level has been well below the new authorization we propose, and I know these are tight budgetary times. Our job as an authorizing committee is to set what is the reasonable, responsible level of funding for programs under the jurisdiction of our committee, set that forth, put it

into law, and then we will have to fight with the rest of the budget for their fair share of the funding level.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield myself 30 additional seconds.

But if we don't raise that level from time to time to keep pace with inflation, keep a target out there, then they will continue to be underfunded. At least they can go in and compete and advocate with other Federal Government programs for the amount of funding and have to justify themselves to do that.

And, furthermore, we have a half dozen programs that have a poor rating. The accountability provisions of that bill are targeted to raise their level of performance and to hold them up to public scrutiny. And I think that justifies us—and also they haven't had the funding level they have needed to do the right job. So if we believe in the program, we believe that estuaries are important for new forms of fish and shellfish and aquatic life, we ought to protect them and enhance——

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield myself 30 additional seconds.

Then we need to increase the funding level but also increase their accountability, also increase their responsibility to the public. That's, I think, a very important and new initiative in this legislation.

I now yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I thank my committee chairman.

I rise in very strong support of H.R. 4715, the Clean Estuaries Act of 2010.

Estuaries are the bodies of water that receive both freshwater from rivers and saltwater from the sea. The mix of water makes a unique environment that is extremely productive in terms of its ecosystem values. Estuaries are rich in plant life, coastal habitat, and living species. The ecological productivity of these regions translates directly into important economic productivity. Government studies have found that estuaries provide habitat for 75 percent of the U.S. commercial and 80 to 90 percent of the recreational fishing catches.

Perhaps the central problem in the protection and restoration of estuaries is that they ultimately lie downstream from all. Everything that enters the smallest stream, tributary, or headwater in a watershed eventually runs into its respective estuary, impacting, in some way, all the biological elements of that system and all of the commerce that revolves around that estuary.

To address estuary impairments properly, we cannot look to the Federal Government alone. Indeed, we cannot necessarily look to the Federal Government as the lead. Instead, proper watershed management and estuary protection must be a process that involves all levels of government and all manner of stakeholders.

Today's legislation, the Clean Estuaries Act of 2010, provides the resources and means to do just that. As the chair of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, the subcommittee charged with primary jurisdiction for protective water quality, I am pleased to support this bill. This legislation increases the authorization for appropriations, allows for increased and improved Federal coordination, increases accountability, and includes some necessary programmatic changes.

The increase in authorized appropriation levels will not only provide more resources to localities and organizations on the ground, it will also enable more communities and estuaries to be involved in this important national program.

I am well aware of the effectiveness and popularity of these nonregulatory, community-based programs. We should be seeking to encourage the use of these types of programs in order to address problems in a grassroots fashion. In this sense, by making cleaner estuaries, we hope to achieve healthier communities and stronger economies through collaborative processes. I ask all Members of this Chamber to join me in supporting communities and estuaries through the passage of this bill.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he might desire to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO).

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Clean Estuaries Act.

I want to particularly thank Chairman OBERSTAR for his continued leadership and for moving so very quickly on this important legislation. I would also like to thank Chairwoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Mr. MICA, and Mr. BOOZMAN for their help on this very important issue as well. Finally, I would like to thank Mr. BISHOP for his leadership and once again allowing me to join with him on an issue that we both find important and that we can make a difference with on a critical bill to keep our waters clean and to do this for future generations.

As we have heard, the bill would authorize the National Estuary Program for another 5 years, allow the program to expand protections to other watersheds and provide—and I think this is very important—greater accountability on how taxpayer money is spent, something that we should be doing more of. The bill will improve transparency, also something very important, by establishing periodic reviews of management plans and by requiring partners to demonstrate results, something, again, that is very important that we see what the results are.

Partners that fall out of compliance with their plans will lose grant funds, and that's as it should be, because they should have to produce results. These changes will improve the National Estuary Program and enhance the protection of our Nation's estuaries while ensuring that the taxpayer is getting a strong return on investment.

In my district, the Delaware estuary is home to the second largest concentration of migrating shorebirds in the Western Hemisphere, which is pretty incredible when you think about it, as well as dozens of protected species and the largest population of horseshoe crabs in the world. The estuary is also home to over 5 million people and some of the largest refineries and chemical manufacturers on the east coast.

The group charged with understanding how to manage the demands of these two forces is the Partnership for the Delaware Estuary. As one of the 28 designated NEP organizations, the Partnership has done an absolutely outstanding job, a tremendous job, to not only protect and enhance the Delaware estuary but also to raise the public awareness about the need to act responsibly and care for this unique ecosystem.

I want to commend the Partnership for the Delaware Estuary and the 27 other partnership organizations that have made the National Estuary Program so successful, and I urge all Members to support H.R. 4715.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) who coauthored this bill with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Let me start by thanking Chairman OBERSTAR for his unwavering commitment to clean water issues, and we also thank Chairwoman JOHNSON for her leadership.

Finally, let me thank my good friend, Congressman LOBIONDO, for sponsoring this legislation with me. Congressman LOBIONDO and I have worked together on several issues of mutual benefit to our constituents over the years. I think we have formed a very nice partnership.

To those of us on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, it sometimes feels as if we are part of the last remaining bastion of bipartisanship in this institution, and I am always heartened by the way our committee works closely with each other to produce initiatives that improve our infrastructure, our environment, and the lives of the American people. I appreciate the way our committee has moved forward very quickly on this important legislation.

My district encompasses 300 miles of coastline and includes two of the 28 estuaries of national significance, the Long Island Sound and Peconic Bay. I am very proud to represent some of this country's most popular and beautiful beaches and precious water bodies. Maintaining coastal estuarine health is an integral objective toward preserving the Nation's environment

and sustaining the economies of our coastal States.

The Clean Estuaries Act of 2010 reauthorizes the popular and highly effective National Estuary Program originally designated as section 320 of the Clean Water Act and makes four primary changes to the program.

First, the bill increases the accountability for approved estuary programs by requiring evaluation and updating management of their plans on a periodic basis. This requirement increases transparency and encourages adaptive management of the programs by incorporating evaluation results into the period management plan updates.

Secondly, approved programs must identify vulnerabilities and impacts due to climate change and prepare adaptation responses as well as raise public awareness of the issues facing the health of estuaries and performance measures and targets.

The third important improvement to the program is provisions to enhance Federal agency coordination. As many Federal agencies oversee activities that impact estuaries, our bill requires they participate in the management planning process and incorporate local priorities when practicable.

Finally, authorization is increased from $35 million to $50 million per year and requires that each program approved receive a minimum of $1.25 million. This increase in authorization allows the program to keep pace with inflation and provides for the entry of new programs into the NEP program where 38 sites have expressed interest in the past to become an approved program.

Our coastal areas support more than 28 million jobs in the United States, and commercial and recreational fishing in these areas generate roughly $185 billion in sales and support nearly 2 million jobs. In fact, estuaries produce more food per acre than the most productive farmland.

Approximately 75 percent of commercial fish species depend on coastal areas for their primary habitat, spawning grounds, and nursery areas. In my district, the Long Island Sound produces over $5.5 billion in revenue for State and local economies in the tourism, fishing, and boating industries each year.

Setting aside the obvious and vital role that estuaries play to environmental ecosystems, the economic benefits of estuaries alone are reason enough to improve upon the investments Congress has made on behalf of the American people. Estuaries are proven job creators and provide a rate of return rarely seen on Wall Street.

Let me once again thank Chairman OBERSTAR, Ranking Member MICA, Chairwoman JOHNSON, Ranking Member BOOZMAN, Congressman LOBIONDO, and both majority and minority staffs for their hard work and dedication to this issue.

I hope my colleagues agree with the merits of this legislation. I ask for their vote today on H.R. 4715, the Clean Estuaries Act.

□ 1430

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I do want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) for the very positive changes in the bill of accountability and transparency.

Mr. Chairman, I will continue to reserve. We don't have anymore speakers.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H.R. 4715, the Clean Estuaries Act of 2010. The reauthorization obviously provides opportunities to clean up our Nation's waterways.

I want to thank Chairman OBERSTAR and Ranking Member BOOZMAN and the other cosponsors on a bipartisan basis. This is a good example of how we work together.

In California, we have a lot of challenges with our own waterways. A persistent degradation of the largest estuary on the west coast is California's San Francisco Bay and the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta system. Unfortunately, in my opinion, two flawed biological opinions focus solely on exported water to the valley and southern California for the decline in this important estuary for both the bay and the delta, ignoring other significant contributing factors.

Meanwhile, urban centers continue to pollute this bay-delta with toxic runoff, waste discharged from sewage facilities, refineries, city streets and power plants, significantly degrading the ecosystem and putting water supply to the valley and to southern California at risk. This single-minded view has resulted in the loss of jobs and endangered livelihoods of farmers, farm workers and farm communities in the San Joaquin Valley who rely on that water to grow half the Nation's fruits and vegetables.

Enough is enough. It's time for other regions of California to share in the responsibility for the decline of water quality and fisheries. Playing the blame game and pointing fingers at our valley's economy and some of the hardest working people in the country will not solve our water crisis in California; however, working together will. Step one is reducing and preventing the longstanding pollution that is threatening the Sacramento-San Joaquin River systems and our region.

Passing this measure will help our Nation's estuaries, and we must do more. I want to commend, once again, the chairman and the cosponsors of this measure and look forward to continuing to work with them.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), who has made a splendid contribution to this bill, and thank her for her contribution.

Mrs. CAPPS. Thank you, Chairman OBERSTAR, for recognizing me.

I rise today to express my support for H.R. 4715, the Clean Estuaries Act, a bipartisan bill to reauthorize and make improvements to the National Estuary Program.

I wish to thank my colleagues, TIM BISHOP and FRANK LOBIONDO, for introducing this bill. We each represent coastal districts that are home to amazing estuary systems of great importance to our communities.

In my district, the Morro Bay National Estuary is an ecological treasure. Lagoons and wetlands that were once common along the southern California coast are now nearly all filled and developed, but the Morro Bay Estuary has survived largely thanks to local efforts and now the support of the estuary program.

Like other national estuaries, the one in Morro Bay provides vital habitat for birds and fish. It is an important stopover for more than 150 species of migratory birds and it acts as a nursery for more than 75 percent of commercial fish species right in the immediate area.

Since the Morro Bay Estuary was incorporated into the national program in 1995, the inspiring team of local staff and volunteers has spearheaded numerous efforts to preserve and restore the estuary. I particularly want to commend former program director Dan Berman, interim director Mike Multari and his staff, as well as the Bay Foundation of Morro Bay. Their accomplishments over the years are a reflection of the strong partnerships and community support that define the Morro Bay National Estuary Program. For example, partnering with local ranchers, the hardworking team in Morro Bay has installed riparian fencing along nearly 75,000 feet of creek to limit cattle access. This has protected water quality and improved habitat on seven creeks leading to the estuary.

The estuary program has also been a source of funding for the city of Morro Bay's efforts to remove derelict marine vessels before they pollute local waters and damage habitat. And the Estuary Nature Center helps the public to understand the estuary's importance to water quality and conservation.

Mr. Speaker, estuaries are among the richest habitats known on the Earth, providing immeasurable economic and ecological benefits, but they are threatened by climate change, by pollution, and other human activities. The Clean Estuaries Act helps to combat these problems and improves the efficiency of our National Estuary Program.

First, the bill requires that each approved estuary program be evaluated every 4 years and the results be publicly released. Second, the bill increases Federal attention to local priorities and requires that Federal agencies participate in planning and coordinating the implementation of the site's own management plan.

Third, the bill requires that estuaries identify and plan for vulnerabilities to climate change.

And, finally, the bill increases the program's annual authorization to $50 million.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. CAPPS. Thank you.

This modest funding increase will strengthen the capacity of our existing estuaries to protect these critical coastal and marine resources; and the proposed funding increase will allow for the responsible expansion of the program to incorporate new regions that are not currently served in the NEP.

Mr. Chairman, we are at a critical juncture for our ocean and coastal resources, and the National Estuary Program is a vital part of that network. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation to protect some of our Nation's most valuable and treasured natural resources, our national estuaries.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds to express my great appreciation to the gentlewoman from California for her thorough elucidation of the specific benefits, point by point, of the estuary program in her Morro Bay area.

I now yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a refugee from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I thank the chairman for his courtesy and keeping me in his thoughts.

I rise in strong support of this outstanding piece of legislation. The National Estuary Program has been funding work around the country for 20 years to monitor and restore estuaries of national significance. It is really, I think, extraordinarily positive for us to hear the message repeated today here on the floor about the importance, the scope, the significance, and the progress that has been made.

I have a special interest in one area in Oregon and Washington; the Lower Columbia River Estuary has been part of the program since 1995. This stretches 146 miles from the Bonneville Dam to the mouth of the Pacific Ocean. It supports hundreds of species of fish and wildlife and thousands of people's economy and their quality of life. It is the largest river in the Pacific Northwest, supplying fishermen with jobs, serving as a recreational resource, and providing power through the Pacific Northwest.

I have been privileged to work for the Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership, which heads our local estuary program. It is an unparalleled bi-State, public and private partnership involving collaborative efforts among key Federal partners, including EPA, NOAA, USGS, the Army Corps of Engineers. They work with government at all levels as well as a broad array of stakeholders that address these many challenges facing the estuary from habitat degradation, to wetland loss, to endangered species, to toxic contaminants. This is a model non-regulatory, community-based program that gets results. National Estuary Partners focuses on on-the-ground activities and involving local communities with technical support and base funding coming from the Federal Government.

The accomplishments in the Columbia are impressive. The partners have restored 2,600 acres of habitat, opened more than 53 miles of stream, completed toxic and conventional pollutant water quality monitoring, and engaged the public in innovative cleanup efforts around the region such as ''drug take back'' days and working with volunteers to remove invasive plants.

There are many challenges remaining in the Lower Columbia, and this legislation will provide important funding to further progress there and around the country. Each local estuary also leverages National Estuary Partnership funds. In 2009, in our community, we were able to bring in $14 for each dollar that was provided by the Federal Government. In addition to restoring the ecosystem, these dollars create jobs for construction, design, contractors, engineers, biologists, hydrologists, builders and educators, family-wage jobs in the community. And beyond today's economic impact, the restored area will support the recovery of a commercial fishing industry that was reduced 90 percent in the course of 20 years.

Importantly, this legislation will also, for the first time, open the door to other estuaries to participate in the program. While funding goes to all estuaries, it will have benefits for the entire country. You have heard here on the floor repeatedly that healthy estuaries mean a healthy national economy. They cover a huge portion, 13 percent, of the land area of the United States where half the gross domestic product is produced, and almost 43 percent of the population.

These coastal areas provide tens of millions of jobs, which means more people employed if we have healthy estuaries. It provides fresh seafood, it provides habitat for 75 percent of the United States commercial fish catch, and 80 to 90 percent of the recreational fish catch.

These are also prime destinations for tourism. In any given year, 10 percent of the population will visit coastal Florida, 12.5 percent will visit coastal California, and every coastal State will host over 1 million out-of-state visitors.

The benefits of clean and healthy estuaries are multiple. I want to thank my colleagues on the committee for this outstanding work and look forward to its support.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield myself 10 seconds to thank the gentleman from Oregon for his constant attention to the work of our committee and to the water issues as well, and for his splendid presentation.

I now yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Maryland, a member of the committee, Ms. EDWARDS, who has worked diligently as a guardian of the Chesapeake Bay Estuary.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Thank you especially to the leadership of Chairman OBERSTAR, Mr. BOOZMAN, especially to our chairwoman of our Water Resources Committee, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and to our two leaders here, Mr. BISHOP and Mr. LOBIONDO.

I rise today in support of the Clean Estuaries Act, H.R. 4715, because I have seen firsthand the positive ecological and economic role that conservation and protection—indeed, attention—can play in improving the health of our Nation's estuaries.

We have only to take a look at today's headlines in The Washington Post highlighting the improvement of the blue crab in the Chesapeake Bay, largely due to the protection efforts that we've undertaken there, a Federal commitment, a State and regional commitment to improving the Nation's largest estuary, which happens to be a great partner for my State of Maryland.

And so in the past year we have seen that, because of the commitment of the administration and many in the Congress and lawmakers, the Chesapeake Bay, our Nation's largest estuary, has actually made great strides. And it is highlighted by the return of the blue crab, the highest levels in 17 years. The return has a positive economic impact for all sectors: fishermen experience larger catches, the price of the crab will decrease for our family restaurants, tourism will expand, and the bay is now healthier than it has been in many years. But we have a lot of work to do.

So what does that mean in terms of the Clean Estuaries Act? Well, it means, in fact, that if we pay the same attention to all of our Nation's estuaries in the way that we have with the Chesapeake Bay, we can also see improvements. And for those of us who don't live near an estuary, every time we flush, every time we drive, every time we have an impact—dropping a piece of trash on the ground has an impact on our Nation's estuaries. And so while we may not be able to see them, the impact is so great; and that's why we need this legislation, to produce a positive effect on estuaries across the country.

This deserves our support because commercial and recreational fishing accounts for $185 billion in revenues every year. Estuaries provide 75 percent of the catches for all of these revenues. And yet over the last 20 years the health of our estuaries has degraded and the size of catches has decreased.

The relationship between the health of an ecosystem and the economic output can't be overrated. The Clean Estuaries Act stands to reverse this troubling trend by adding additional estuaries and providing strong accountability measures in a way to ensure that conservation and protection are taken seriously.

We need to take positive steps toward cleaning up our Nation's estuaries by passing this bill and continuing to also invest in green infrastructure and nonstructural alternatives to protect our ecosystems.

I want to commend Chairman OBERSTAR for his leadership and thank all of our leaders for their commitment to combine environmental stewardship with economic development for the protection of the Nation's estuaries.

□ 1445

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to protect America's estuaries by strengthening the management of the National Estuary Program, NEP, and to thank Congressman OBERSTAR, Congresswoman JOHNSON, Congressman BISHOP, Congressman BOOZMAN, and beyond for their excellent, excellent work.

Mr. Chairman, we have a solemn responsibility to keep the vital habitats clean for the thousands of plants, fish, and wildlife that live, breed, and spawn there. That is why I am proud to support H.R. 4715, the Clean Estuaries Act.

Currently, there are 28 estuaries within the NEP. The NEP conducts long-term planning and management activities to restore and protect estuaries. There are 38 additional estuaries, including Tomales Bay in my district, which have wanted to join the NEP. With H.R. 4715, we can increase the authorization of the NEP to $50 million. Tomales Bay and the other estuaries that have a desire to be part of it will have the opportunity to become part of this important program.

Tomales Bay supports a diverse group of wildlife, including seasonal populations of salmon and steelhead, more than 20,000 shorebirds and seabirds, and a wide variety of shellfish. Tomales Bay is considered a wetland of significant importance under the International Convention on Wetlands, so protecting the vibrant biological hotspot from pollution through the NEP will help to preserve this estuary for generations and generations to enjoy.

I want to commend the hard work of the Tomales Bay Watershed Council, a multistakeholder group that has long championed restoring Tomales Bay. Additionally, the Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary is working on a Tomales Bay management plan, covering the bay, itself.

Extending this plan to the entire watershed through the NEP process would ensure better scientific understanding, and it would improve restoration projects. The Gulf of the Farallones would be a valuable and experienced stakeholder in developing a watershed-wide plan.

Mr. Chairman, we must protect nationally significant estuaries like Tomales Bay through better accountability, management, and coordination with local partners. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting healthy and clean estuaries by voting for H.R. 4715.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield myself the remaining time to thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his generosity in yielding time, which had inadvertently run out on our side.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 4715, the Clean Estuaries Act. This Act reauthorizes the Environmental Protection Agency's National Estuary Program, which coordinates federal, state and local government efforts, as well as cooperation from private and nonprofit groups, to help protect estuaries.

Estuaries support diverse habitats for a wide variety of species and provide significant economic and recreational benefits. Many fish and shellfish species depend on the sheltered habitat provided by estuaries, as well as the mix of saline and fresh water. The abundance of aquatic life supported by estuaries provides 75 percent of the U.S. commercial fish catch and 80 to 90 percent of the recreational fish catch.

The Environmental Protection Agency already has accepted 28 estuaries into the National Estuary Program. The Clean Estuaries Act increases the annual authorization from $35 million to $50 million, an amount that, if fully appropriated, will allow the Environmental Protection Agency to add 12 new estuaries to the program. At present, 38 estuaries are candidates for the program, including two estuaries in the State of Hawaii—Kaneohe Bay and Hanalei Bay—that could benefit greatly from the support provided by the program. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill to protect the ecological, recreational, and economic benefits of our nation's estuaries.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chair, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 4715, the Clean Estuaries Act of 2010. This bill would reauthorize for an additional five years, our nation's National Estuary Program (NEP).

As home to one of the nation's most diverse national estuaries, the Indian River Lagoon, the residents of Florida's 15th Congressional District have seen the value of this program to this important estuary and how it has enhanced our community. The NEP has proven very successful in helping restore and enhance the quality of our lagoon.

Specific NEP initiatives across our estuary included eliminating effluent discharges from more than 20 wastewater facilities, reconnecting impounded salt marshes, developing storm water treatment facilities, and reducing freshwater discharges into the lagoon.

As one of the 28 designated national estuaries, the Indian River Lagoon receives an important funding set-aside within the annual National Estuary Program (NEP) budget. This will enable the Indian River Lagoon NEP to accomplish restoration and water quality improvements that are included in their 2010 lagoon work plan.

The Indian River Lagoon was one of only two estuaries nationally to receive top quality ratings from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) when considering water quality, sediment, benthic, and fish tissue culture. While this is good, we know that there is much more work that needs to be done. Passage of H.R. 4715 will help the Indian River Lagoon NEP move forward with their comprehensive restoration and water quality improvement plans and provides more funding for this purpose.

I would also urge my colleagues to oppose an amendment by Rep. SCHAUER (D–MI), which would dilute the resources in the NEP and result in less funding for the 28 nationally recognized estuaries, including the Indian River Lagoon.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4715.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chair, estuaries, the coastal wetlands where fresh and salt water meet, are both a vital filter for urban runoff that would otherwise flow out of the river and into the ocean, and a cradle for marine and wildlife.

We are not able to create new estuaries. We either restore and protect them, or we lose them.

They are a foundation of our economy. The tourism industry needs estuaries to keep the sea clean and healthy. The fishing industry relies on them to replenish the oceans. Estuaries provide the habitat for 75 percent of the U.S. commercial fish catch and as much as 90 percent of the recreational fish catch, according to the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration and the National Research Council.

Estuaries are critically important to human life. They filter our groundwater, and are a buffer from flooding. The phytoplankton nursed in estuaries remove carbon dioxide from the atmosphere and produce oxygen in its place. In fact, phytoplankton in estuaries and oceans produce about half the world's oxygen.

So it is imperative that the House passes H.R. 4715, the Clean Estuaries Act of 2010.

The bill protects and supports 28 estuaries with grants, including the Santa Monica Bay and the Ballona Wetlands in my district.

Dozens of local groups fought for decades to acquire for the public's benefits 600 acres of Ballona Wetlands. They succeeded in 2003. Since then, the habitat has attracted more than 200 species of birds, some of which are now returning to nest after more than a 70-year absence. Ballona is home to many rare species, including the Belding's Savannah Sparrow and the recently discovered Orcutt's yellow pincushion.

Citizens have similarly banded together to protect the Santa Monica Bay. Backed by the Clean Water Act—part of which this bill reauthorizes—my dear friend Dorothy Green worked with other citizens out of her living rooms for years to force the Hyperion Wastewater Treatment plant to update its filtering system. Since then, the plant has cut its waste by 95 percent, literally bringing life back to parts of Santa Monica Bay that were once declared dead zones.

The stimulus bill in 2009 funded several innovative storm drain projects in the South Bay and a series of low impact development rain

gardens along Ballona Creek, all of which help prevent polluted storm water runoff from entering Santa Monica Bay.

The communities of Santa Monica Bay have been more than worthy partners for Washington. This bill will help to make sure the federal government lives up to its end of the deal. It will require that federal agencies participate in the management planning process for the estuaries that receive the grants, incorporate local priorities into their actions and increase coordination between the many federal agencies that either work in or impact estuaries.

But the bill also looks forward. Estuary management programs will be required to identify their estuary's vulnerability to climate change and prepare adaptation responses, and will work to educate the public on estuary health issues.

Over my eight terms in Congress I have worked to obtain federal grants and strongly supported efforts to preserve the Ballona wetlands and Santa Monica Bay. I again stand in support of those areas, vital both to our environmental and our economic health.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Chair, I rise and ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute.

I support the reauthorization of the National Estuary Program, NEP, through the adoption of H.R. 4715, the Clean Estuaries Act of 2010.

Estuaries are bodies of water that receive both outflows from rivers and tidal inflows from the ocean.

They are transition zones between fresh water from rivers and saline water from the ocean. The mixing of fresh and salt water provides a unique environment that supports diverse habitats for a wide variety of living resources, including plants, fish, and wildlife.

Estuaries provide habitat for 75 percent of the U.S. commercial fish catch and 80 to 90 percent of the recreational fish catch.

Coastal counties for 40 percent of the employment and 49 percent of the economic output for the nation. Estuaries are also vital to the health of our beaches, which produce between $6 billion and $30 billion for coastal communities each year.

We need this bill because many of the Nation's estuaries are currently in poor ecological health.

This bill requires the Administrator of the EPA to undertake a programmatic evaluation of EPA's overall National Estuaries Program to asses its effectiveness in improving water quality, natural resources, and sustainable uses of included estuaries. In addition, the bill requires the EPA to submit a report to Congress on the results of this evaluation.

H.R. 4715 includes evaluation and update requirements to ensure accountability.

With this legislation, all approved estuary programs will be evaluated and will now update their management plans on a periodic basis, increasing program transparency and improving program performance.

In addition this bill requires that Federal agencies participate in the management planning process, incorporate local priorities into their activities and actions and increase coordination within the estuary.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4715, Clean Estuaries Act.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chair, as a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee I rise to lend my strong support to H.R. 4715 "The Clean Estuaries Act of 2010."

This Act will not only improve the management of our current estuaries, but it will allow several other sites that have expressed interest in becoming a part of the National Estuaries program by significantly increasing the funding level for the National Estuaries program. The sites that are interested in inclusion in my area include the San Pedro Bay and Newport Bay, which join thirty six other sites that are also interested in inclusion.

Supporting Estuaries is critical to our prosperity because of the importance of coastal areas to our Nation's economy. Coastal counties account for 40 percent of the employment and 49 percent of the economic output for the nation.

Through the adoption of the Clean Estuaries Act of 2010, all approved estuary programs will be evaluated and will periodically update their management plans, increasing program transparency and improving program performance. Approved programs would have to identify the impact of climate change on estuaries and prepare adaptation responses, as well as work to educate the public on estuary health issues and develop performance measures and targets.

This bill will help expand the program to protect and clean our estuaries and I thank Congressman BISHOP for his hard work bringing this bill through the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and to the floor today. I ask that my colleagues today support this bill, and help protect our estuaries.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of protecting our Nation's estuaries by passing the Clean Estuaries Act (H.R. 4715).

I am fortunate to represent a district that borders the San Francisco Bay. A healthy and clean bay is central to the economic prosperity and quality of life of my constituents. Since 1987, the National Estuary Program has promoted comprehensive planning efforts to clean up and preserve estuaries. The legislation before us today would reauthorize and strengthen the National Estuary Program, providing additional assistance to communities to protect their waterways.

In my community, the National Estuary Program supports the San Francisco Bay Estuary Partnership. This partnership brings together diverse stakeholders and has created dozens of projects that support a thriving bay. For example, at the Eden Landing Ecological Reserve in Hayward, hundreds of adult and student volunteers are restoring shoreline habitat by removing invasive plants and planting native marsh grasses. In addition to improving water and habitat quality, this project is also teaching children about the bay and how to protect it. The Estuary Partnership is also working with local governments in my district to promote and replicate proven bay-friendly best management practices to decrease runoff pollution into the bay. By passing the Clean Estuaries Act, we can ensure that these initiatives and hundreds of similar efforts around the country will be continued and expanded. I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes."

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4715

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Clean Estuaries Act of 2010".

SEC. 2. NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM AMENDMENTS.

(a) PURPOSES OF CONFERENCE.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PLANS.—Section 320(b)(4) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1330(b)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) develop and submit to the Administrator a comprehensive conservation and management plan that—

"(A) identifies the estuary and its associated upstream waters to be addressed by the plan, with consideration given to hydrological boundaries;

"(B) recommends priority corrective actions and compliance schedules addressing point and nonpoint sources of pollution to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the estuary, including restoration and maintenance of water quality, a resilient and diverse indigenous population of shellfish, fish, and wildlife, and recreational activities in the estuary, and assure that the designated uses of the estuary are protected;

"(C) considers current and future sustainable commercial activities in the estuary;

"(D) addresses the impacts of climate change on the estuary, including—

"(i) the identification and assessment of vulnerabilities in the estuary; and

"(ii) the development and implementation of adaptation strategies;

"(E) increases public education and awareness of the ecological health and water quality conditions of the estuary;

"(F) identifies and assesses impairments, including upstream impairments, coming from outside of the area addressed by the plan, and the sources of those impairments; and

"(G) includes performance measures and goals to track implementation of the plan.".

(2) MONITORING AND MAKING RESULTS AVAILABLE.—Section 320(b)(6) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1330(b)(6)) is amended to read as follows:

"(6) monitor (and make results available to the public regarding)—

"(A) water quality conditions in the estuary and its associated upstream waters, as identified under paragraph (4)(A);

"(B) habitat conditions that relate to the ecological health and water quality conditions of the estuary; and

"(C) the effectiveness of actions taken pursuant to the comprehensive conservation and management plan developed for the estuary under this subsection;".

(3) INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES.—Section 320(b) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1330(b)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

"(7) provide information and educational activities on the ecological health and water quality conditions of the estuary; and".

(4) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The sentence following section 320(b)(8) of such Act (as so redesignated) is amended by striking "paragraph (7)" and inserting "paragraph (8)".

(b) MEMBERS OF CONFERENCE.—Section 320(c)(5) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1330(c)(5)) is amended by inserting after "institutions," the following: "not-for-profit organizations,".

(c) ADMINISTRATION OF PLANS.—Section 320(f) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1330(f)) is amended to read as follows:

''(f) ADMINISTRATION OF PLANS.—

''(1) APPROVAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date on which a management conference submits to the Administrator a comprehensive conservation and management plan under this section, and after providing for public review and comment, the Administrator shall approve the plan if the Administrator determines that the plan meets the requirements of this section and the affected Governor or Governors concur.

''(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—Upon approval of a comprehensive conservation and management plan under this section, the plan shall be implemented. Funds authorized to be appropriated under titles II and VI and section 319 may be used in accordance with the applicable requirements of this Act to assist States with the implementation of the plan.

''(3) EVALUATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph, and every 4 years thereafter, the Administrator shall complete an evaluation of the implementation of each comprehensive conservation and management plan developed under this section to determine the degree to which the goals of the plan have been met.

''(B) REVIEW AND COMMENT BY MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE.—In completing an evaluation under subparagraph (A), the Administrator shall submit the results of the evaluation to the appropriate management conference for review and comment.

''(C) REPORT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In completing an evaluation under subparagraph (A), and after providing an opportunity for a management conference to submit comments under subparagraph (B), the Administrator shall issue a report on the results of the evaluation, including the findings and recommendations of the Administrator and any comments received from the management conference.

''(ii) AVAILABILITY TO PUBLIC.—The Administrator shall make a report issued under this subparagraph available to the public, including through publication in the Federal Register and on the Internet.

''(D) SPECIAL RULE FOR NEW PLANS.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), if a management conference submits a new comprehensive conservation and management plan to the Administrator after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall complete the evaluation of the plan required by subparagraph (A) not later than 4 years after the date of such submission and every 4 years thereafter.

''(4) UPDATES.—

''(A) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 18 months after the date on which the Administrator makes an evaluation of a comprehensive conservation and management plan available to the public under paragraph (3)(C), a management conference convened under this section shall submit to the Administrator an update of the plan. The updated plan shall reflect, to the maximum extent practicable, the results of the program evaluation.

''(B) APPROVAL OF UPDATES.—Not later than 120 days after the date on which a management conference submits to the Administrator an updated comprehensive conservation and management plan under subparagraph (A), and after providing for public review and comment, the Administrator shall approve the updated plan if the Administrator determines that the updated plan meets the requirements of this section.

''(5) PROBATIONARY STATUS.—The Administrator may consider a management conference convened under this section to be in probationary status if the management conference has not received approval for an updated comprehensive conservation and management plan under paragraph (4)(B) on or before the last day of the 3-year period beginning on the date on which the Administrator makes an evaluation of the plan available to the public under paragraph (3)(C).''.

(d) FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Section 320 of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1330) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (g), (h), (i), (j), and (k) as subsections (h), (i), (j), (k), and (m), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

''(g) FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

''(1) ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED WITHIN ESTUARIES WITH APPROVED PLANS.—After approval of a comprehensive conservation and management plan by the Administrator, any Federal action or activity affecting the estuary shall be conducted, to the maximum extent practicable, in a manner consistent with the plan.

''(2) COORDINATION AND COOPERATION.—The Secretary of the Army (acting through the Chief of Engineers), the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Chief of the Natural Resources Conservation Service, and the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies, as determined by the Administrator, shall, to the maximum extent practicable, cooperate and coordinate activities related to the implementation of a comprehensive conservation and management plan approved by the Administrator. The Environmental Protection Agency shall serve as the lead coordinating agency under this paragraph.

''(3) CONSIDERATION OF PLANS IN AGENCY BUDGET REQUESTS.—In making an annual budget request for a Federal agency referred to in paragraph (2), the head of such agency shall consider the responsibilities of the agency under this section, including under comprehensive conservation and management plans approved by the Administrator.

''(4) MONITORING.—The heads of the Federal agencies referred to in paragraph (2) shall collaborate on the development of tools and methodologies for monitoring the ecological health and water quality conditions of estuaries covered by a management conference convened under this section.''.

(e) GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 320(h) of such Act (as redesignated by subsection (d) of this section) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) EFFECTS OF PROBATIONARY STATUS.—

''(A) REDUCTIONS IN GRANT AMOUNTS.—The Administrator shall reduce, by an amount to be determined by the Administrator, grants for the implementation of a comprehensive conservation and management plan developed by a management conference convened under this section if the Administrator determines that the management conference is in probationary status under subsection (f)(5).

''(B) TERMINATION OF MANAGEMENT CONFERENCES.—The Administrator shall terminate a management conference convened under this section, and cease funding for the implementation of the comprehensive conservation and management plan developed by the management conference, if the Administrator determines that the management conference has been in probationary status for 2 consecutive years.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 320(i) of such Act (as redesignated by subsection (d) of this section) is amended by striking ''subsection (g)'' and inserting ''subsection (h)''.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 320(j) of such Act (as redesignated by subsection (d) of this section) is amended to read as follows:

''(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator $50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2011 through 2016 for—

''(A) expenses related to the administration of management conferences under this section, except that such expenses shall not exceed 10 percent of the amount appropriated under this subsection;

''(B) making grants under subsection (h); and

''(C) monitoring the implementation of a conservation and management plan by the management conference, or by the Administrator in any case in which the conference has been terminated.

''(2) ALLOCATIONS.—Of the sums authorized to be appropriated under this subsection, the Administrator shall provide—

''(A) at least $1,250,000 per fiscal year, subject to the availability of appropriations, for the development, implementation, and monitoring of each conservation and management plan eligible for grant assistance under subsection (h); and

''(B) up to $5,000,000 per fiscal year to carry out subsection (k).''.

(g) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 320(k)(1)(A) of such Act (as redesignated by subsection (d) of this section) is amended by striking ''paramenters'' and inserting ''parameters''.

(h) NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM EVALUATION.—Section 320 of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1330) is amended by inserting after subsection (k) (as redesignated by subsection (d) of this section) the following:

''(l) NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM EVALUATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph, and every 4 years thereafter, the Administrator shall complete an evaluation of the national estuary program established under this section.

''(2) SPECIFIC ASSESSMENTS.—In conducting an evaluation under this subsection, the Administrator shall assess the effectiveness of the national estuary program in improving water quality, natural resources, and sustainable uses of the estuaries covered by management conferences convened under this section.

''(3) REPORT.—In completing an evaluation under this subsection, the Administrator shall issue a report on the results of the evaluation, including the findings and recommendations of the Administrator.

''(4) AVAILABILITY TO PUBLIC.—The Administrator shall make a report issued under this subsection available to the public, including through publication in the Federal Register and on the Internet.''.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill is in order except those printed in House Report 111–463. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. OBERSTAR

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 111–463.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. OBERSTAR:

Page 4, strike lines 13 through 15 and insert the following:

''(E) increases public education and awareness with respect to—

''(i) the ecological health of the estuary;

''(ii) the water quality conditions of the estuary; and

''(iii) ocean, estuarine, land, and atmospheric connections and interactions;

Page 8, line 15, insert ''the implementation of'' before ''the plan''.

Page 8, line 22, insert ''the implementation of'' before ''a comprehensive''.

Page 10, line 25, insert '', including monitoring activities,'' after ''activities''.

Page 11, after line 18, insert the following:

(1) RECIPIENTS.—Section 320(h)(1) of such Act (as redesignated by subsection (d) of this section) is amended by striking ''other public'' and all that follows before the period at the end and inserting ''and other public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, and organizations''.

Page 11, line 19, strike ''(1) IN GENERAL.—'' and insert ''(2) EFFECTS OF PROBATIONARY STATUS.—''.

Page 11, line 21, insert ''further'' before ''amended''.

Page 12, line 17, strike ''(2)'' and insert ''(3)''.

Page 15, after line 8, insert the following:

(i) CONVENING OF CONFERENCE.—Section 320(a)(2) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1330(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(2) CONVENING OF CONFERENCE.—'' and all that follows through ''In any case'' and inserting the following:

''(2) CONVENING OF CONFERENCE.—In any case''; and

(2) by striking subparagraph (B).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1248, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, this amendment makes technical changes to the underlying bill. It ensures the continued competitive nature of the National Estuary Program.

We ensure that the program evaluations will assess whether the implementation of a comprehensive conservation and management plan is achieving its stated goals.

The amendment will enhance public education on the connections between air, land, water, and the potential impacts of those factors on the health of the estuary.

It will strike the existing statutory priority list of estuaries.

It will remove individuals from the list of approved recipients for grants under this program.

First, the technical changes will ensure that program evaluations determine whether the implementation of a management plan is reaching its stated goals. It will ensure that not only the plan but the implementation of the plan is achieving improvements in water quality and habitat in the estuary.

Second, the amendment ensures that the public education component of any management plan will include and will highlight the connections within the estuary between air, land, and water and the potential impacts of those interactions. Estuaries will be able to highlight to citizens living within the boundaries of the estuary how their actions will affect the health of the estuary and how they can change their habits or how they can change their actions to improve the quality of the estuary.

Third, the amendment strikes existing statutory language that lists a number of States and regions to receive priority consideration under the program. That historical prioritization does not reflect estuaries that are part of the National Estuary Plan. Some estuaries on the list do not now participate in the program. The 12 estuaries that do participate are not included on the list, so that prioritization is superfluous.

This change does not mean that estuaries now in the NEP will be removed. It means that existing programs must continue to meet their obligations under the program and meet the performance requirements of the legislation to continue to be part of the National Estuary Program. It will be a competitive program. That is the purpose of the changes that I've just cited.

Finally, we strike statutory language that now allows individuals to be eligible grant recipients under the program. No individual has ever received a grant under the program, according to the EPA, so there is no need to have that language in the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition, though I am not opposed to the bill.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Again, I just rise to say that we are very much in support of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman for those remarks.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the manager's amendment offered by the Chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Mr. OBERSTAR.

This amendment makes a few technical changes to the underlying legislation and to the existing National Estuaries Program.

First, the amendment clarifies that the increased accountability called for in the bill includes a review of the implementation of existing comprehensive conservation and management plans, and not just of the plans, themselves.

Second, the amendment ensures that the public is provided with additional information on the relationship between air quality, water quality, and land use, and their potential impacts on the overall health of local estuaries.

Oftentimes, locally developed solutions are the most cost-effective and long-lasting way to improve the environment. This has been the basis of success for many of the existing national estuary programs.

Following this model, the manager's amendment includes language to encourage public education on the interconnectivity of local air, water, and land resources.

With more information, the average citizen can be more aware of how his or her actions affect the environment around them, and how small changes in an individual's everyday life can have substantial positive impacts on the local environment.

Third, the manager's amendment addresses one of the legacies of the initial authorization for the National Estuaries Program by deleting the outdated, statutory priority list of estuaries.

All but one of the estuaries on the existing list already have recognized estuary program offices.

The intent of this change is not to eliminate any of the existing 28 estuary programs, but to clarify that estuaries are not simply entitled to remain in the program. If an estuary program continues to meet its obligations under the Clean Water Act, and the enhanced accountability called for in this legislation, they will continue to remain in the program.

However, the intent of this legislation is also to ensure that individual program offices are reaching their goals of improving water quality and the overall ecological health of the estuary.

The final change proposed by this amendment is to eliminate the eligibility of individuals for grant assistance under this program. According to EPA, no individual has ever received a grant under this program, so this is unused authority.

Mr. Chair, I support the amendment and urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. OBERSTAR

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 111–463.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk that I offer on behalf of Ms. PINGREE and yourself.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. OBERSTAR:

Page 14, strike lines 17 through 23 and insert the following:

''(2) SPECIFIC ASSESSMENTS.—In conducting an evaluation under this subsection, the Administrator shall—

''(A) assess the effectiveness of the national estuary program in improving water quality, natural resources, and sustainable uses of the estuaries covered by management conferences convened under this section;

''(B) identify best practices for improving water quality, natural resources, and sustainable uses of the estuaries covered by management conferences convened under this section, including those practices funded through the use of technical assistance from the Environmental Protection Agency and other Federal agencies, and assess the reasons why such practices result in the achievement of program goals; and

''(C) identify any redundant requirements for reporting by recipients of a grant under

this section, and develop and recommend a plan for limiting reporting redundancies.

Page 15, line 4, strike ''TO PUBLIC''.

Page 15, line 6, insert ''management conferences convened under this section and'' before ''the public''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1248, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time so the distinguished ranking member of the committee may speak at this moment.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICA. I think we've reached a bipartisan accord. I support the gentlewoman from Maine and also the gentleman from Texas who have offered this amendment.

I did not have an opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to speak during the general debate. I was delayed.

After saying that our side does support this pending amendment, which, in the absence of the sponsors is being offered by the chair of the committee, I do want to take this opportunity to, first of all, thank Mr. OBERSTAR, our chair, and the ranking member, the gentleman from Arkansas, who has conceded time and is doing an incredible job in heading up our side of the aisle on a very important issue, which is water resources for the Nation.

So, Mr. BOOZMAN, thank you for your cooperation, and thank you to the chair of the subcommittee, Ms. JOHNSON from Texas.

A lot of times when I go back home and people say, Well, Congress doesn't work well, and Congress does this and Congress does that or they are always fighting and bickering, it's good to be a part of the committee, of the largest committee in Congress, I might add—Transportation and Infrastructure—which has six subcommittees and a very important one here, Water Resources. Water Resources controls all of the major water projects in the country—dams, levees. In this case, we are the stewards for the Nation and, really, for what the good Lord gave us, which is our estuaries.

Most people don't know much about estuaries, but we do have that responsibility to make certain that they are preserved, that they are protected, and that we do the best with the money that is given to us on behalf of the taxpayers to protect that part of nature and our ecological system that, again, is so vital.

I do want to thank Mr. BOOZMAN and the chairs of the full committee and subcommittee for their work because we are here together to pass this in a bipartisan manner. So, on a day when many people are coming here to protest some of the things that do go on in Washington—big spending and taxation on the day we just are all paying out to the Federal Government—this is an example of a cooperative effort.

Let me also say, too, as the Republican leader of the Transportation Committee, many people have been coming to me in the last hours and have been saying, Mr. MICA, how are you going to vote on this bill? This bill does represent an increase in funding.

Now, you are probably looking at one of the most conservative Members of Congress. They listed 435 Members, and I was listed as No. 58 in the last week or so as far as fiscal conservative voting, and I take great pride in that because I worked hard for my money. I know people out there have worked hard to make a living and have struggled to feed their families and to just make ends meet. At this time, we have got to be particularly mindful of taxpayer dollars.

□ 1500

From time to time, there are areas in which we need to spend a few more dollars, and we are talking about a few dollars. We're not talking about billions. I do know millions add up to billions, but in this instance we have invested very little, and in this instance this is a very clear Federal responsibility. This is where seawater and freshwater meet. And certainly if there is an area of responsibility, that is a Federal responsibility. The States cannot nationally be responsible for waters that flow through many jurisdictional boundaries.

So here is an arch fiscal conservative coming before Congress on a day in which we are all concerned about government spending and saying, yes, we should invest a few dollars more in something that, again, is God given, the fragile ecosystem that has been handed to us and we have to be good stewards of.

So I am going to vote ''yes'' for this amendment; and when the bill comes up you are going to see me vote ''yes'' for the bill, even though it does increase spending from $35 million to $50 million.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. TAYLOR). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished cosponsor of the amendment, the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4715, the Clean Estuaries Act, is an important step towards restoring our Nation's most critical estuaries. This bill will create jobs and strengthen communities. I strongly support the bill and want to commend my colleagues, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO), for their hard work in crafting this legislation.

One way to improve the efficiency and ensure the program is functioning at its highest level is to share information. The local estuary partnerships work closely with the Federal Government, but all too often the detailing of what works well in one estuary is not formally shared with the other estuaries.

That is why Representative CUELLAR and I are offering an amendment that requires the EPA to collect best practices and then share them with the estuaries. The amendment improves efficiency and smooth operation of the NEPs by helping them connect with other estuaries and build on work that has already been done.

Like many of you, in my district I have a mall, the largest mall in the State. It is built around a stream that flows into Casco Bay. And when it rains, the water runs off the roofs and parking lots, washing the oil, salt, and other contaminants on the pavement into Long Creek. Because of all this development, Long Creek is an urban-impaired watershed, and this means until the water quality is improved, the mall, businesses around the mall, as well as State and local government who own the roads face tougher storm water management restrictions.

This amendment will keep the businesses and local governments in the Long Creek watershed from having to start over when faced with questions on how to manage storm water. By using tested, known best practices, the businesses will save money and water quality in Long Creek will improve faster. The amendment reduces the costs of improving water quality and saves these important businesses real money.

The amendment helps to ensure that all of our estuary stakeholders, including those in Long Creek, have access to the very best tools and methods for protecting and restoring water quality.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. I want to thank the chairman, Mr. OBERSTAR; the subcommittee chairwoman also, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON); Ms. PINGREE also for the work she has done; and, of course, our ranking members, Mr. BOOZMAN, for the work that you and Mr. MICA have done.

This particular amendment is to support government efficiency. We both believe this amendment will eliminate waste and redundancies in the programs and will improve the effectiveness and cut back wasteful spending.

This amendment authorizes the Administrator of the EPA to identify, number one, best management practices for allocating resources in an efficient and effective manner. It would outline key reasons why such practices will result in positive outcomes and disseminate the best practices to the management conferences. Also, this amendment identifies redundant rules,

regulations, and requirements for reporting by grant recipients and instructs the EPA Administrator to develop a plan to eliminate those redundancies in the future.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, will make our government more efficient, more effective, and more accountable by conducting this type of evaluation. I urge support of this amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished chair of our subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

This amendment makes two important changes to the underlying bill that should benefit the overall effectiveness of the National Estuary Program.

First, the amendment requires the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct an assessment of best practices for improving water quality, natural resources, and sustainable uses of the estuary as part of the Agency's periodic evaluation of the National Estuary Program.

Following this assessment, the Administrator would be required to disseminate information on these best practices to other estuary management conferences convened under section 320, as well as to the public.

I support this provision because it will provide a good, centralized resource on successful, locally produced practices for improving the overall health of estuarine areas.

This clearinghouse should provide valuable information to other management conferences and the general public on what practices are being successfully implemented in the field so that each management conference does not have to ''reinvent the wheel'' each time they are looking for creative ideas to benefit their local environment.

While what works in one area of the country may not necessarily work in another, I would suspect that simply sharing success stories on management practices will have an overall benefit to local restoration efforts.

The second change proposed by this amendment is to require the Administrator to identify potential redundant reporting requirements for grant recipients, and to propose a plan for reducing such redundancy.

It would seem common sense that where efficiencies in reporting requirements can be achieved in such a way that reduces the overall burden on grant recipients, but does not impact the overall operation of the program or its accountability to taxpayers, such an effort should be undertaken.

I support this amendment, and urge its adoption.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. KAGEN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 111–463.

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. KAGEN:

Page 4, line 19, strike ''and'' at the end.

Page 4, line 21, strike the first period through the final period and insert ''; and''.

Page 4, after line 21, insert the following:

''(H) includes a coordinated monitoring strategy for Federal, State, and local governments and other entities.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1248, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KAGEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KAGEN. I thank Chairman OBERSTAR for allowing me to move this amendment forward. And, Ms. JOHNSON, thank you very much. And it's good to see Mr. BOOZMAN on the floor.

This is a very simple and straightforward amendment that includes language for measuring the outcomes. The coordination and cooperation between State, local, and Federal agencies will be necessary to guarantee that our dollars are well spent and that we have a very efficient operation as we protect our estuaries.

So I would submit this amendment and hope that I would have bipartisan support for it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOOZMAN. I rise to support the amendment.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment from the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KAGEN).

This amendment requires a monitoring effort on the part of National Estuary Program partners.

A coordinated monitoring program is very important to ensure the success of these programs.

Monitoring is a key piece of any restoration plan. This amendment will help to increase efficiencies, save money and reduce duplicative activities by requiring the partners to coordinate their monitoring activities.

Also, requiring monitoring by the partners will mean that the management conference, and the appropriate Federal, State and local agencies will be able to measure the accomplishments of the management conference. Without monitoring, the management conference will not be able to determine if the plan has succeeded or failed at improving water quality and the habitat of the estuary.

I commend our Committee colleague for offering this amendment, and urge its approval.

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

Mr. KAGEN. I thank the kind gentleman for agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in the true spirit of a very efficient operation, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KAGEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. SCHAUER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 111–463.

Mr. SCHAUER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. SCHAUER:

Page 15, after line 8, add the following:

(i) GREAT LAKES ESTUARIES.—Section 320(m) of such Act (as redesignated by subsection (d) of this section) is amended by striking the subsection designation and all that follows through ''and those portions of tributaries'' and inserting the following:

''(m) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms 'estuary' and 'estuarine zone' have the meanings such terms have in section 104(n)(4), except that—

''(1) the term 'estuary' also includes near coastal waters and other bodies of water within the Great Lakes that are similar in form and function to the waters described in the definition of 'estuary' contained in section 104(n)(4); and

''(2) the term 'estuarine zone' also includes—

''(A) waters within the Great Lakes described in paragraph (1) and transitional areas from such waters that are similar in form and function to the transitional areas described in the definition of 'estuarine zone' contained in section 104(n)(4);

''(B) associated aquatic ecosystems; and

''(C) those portions of tributaries''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1248, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SCHAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SCHAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The amendment before you would define ''estuary'' under the Clean Water Act to include Great Lakes near shore waters and connecting waters that are similar to traditional estuaries covered by the National Estuary Program. The amendment would allow Great Lakes estuaries eligible to apply on a competitive basis for inclusion in the National Estuary Program.

The Great Lakes and surrounding waters are a valuable natural resource of national importance, and it makes sense that they are eligible to apply for inclusion in this competitive grant program. Again, my amendment would clearly define ''estuary'' to include Great Lakes waterways and connecting waterways.

The Great Lakes hold 90 percent of the United States surface freshwater, 20 percent of the world's freshwater, and are the largest system of fresh surface water on Earth. The Midwest relies on the Great Lakes for commerce,

tourism, and drinking water. Unfortunately, the health of the Great Lakes has been threatened by pollution, invasive species, and water withdrawals. Failure to protect the Great Lakes now could result in more serious consequences. Conservationists, environmental stewards, hunters, fishermen, and outdoorsmen from all over the country share my sentiment.

Including the Great Lakes waterways in the National Estuary Program will help create long-term planning and management of both point and nonpoint sources of pollution and protect areas of commercial importance from ecological risks.

Mr. Chair, we need to do everything we can to protect Great Lakes waterways. We can make another step in the right direction by expanding the definition of ''estuary'' to include the Great Lakes waterways and allow these waterways to be eligible for funding in the National Estuary Program. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will pull money out of the National Estuary Program and send it to address the needs of the Great Lakes.

The National Estuary Program is meant to assist those in important ecological areas in our country where the freshwater of rivers meets and mixes with seawater. By any scientific definition, there are no estuaries in the Great Lakes.

Over the years, Congress has created and funded a number of programs to address the needs of the Great Lakes. We have established an entire office in the EPA to work on the Great Lakes issue. While there are many worthy projects that could be done in the Great Lakes, I believe we should use existing Great Lakes programs to address those needs and not dilute the National Estuary Program. If the gentleman believes that more should be done for the Great Lakes, then we should have the debate on whether or not to modify the existing Great Lakes program. Members who have true estuaries in their States which are very coastal in nature should be concerned about this amendment diluting the intent and the dollars associated with this important program.

To my colleagues in the Great Lakes States who understandably might be tempted to a support this amendment, I would say this amendment makes about as much sense as suggesting that the Great Lakes Legacy Act dollars should be used to address the needs of the Chesapeake Bay. The Great Lakes and the Nation's estuaries are both important areas. Let's address them in the context of their own separate legislation and not make one complete with the other.

With that, I urge Members to oppose the Schauer amendment.

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

□ 1515

Mr. SCHAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have great respect for my colleague's comments. My amendment would merely bring this National Estuary Program into compliance and consistency with the 2000 Estuaries and Clean Waters Act. For purposes of that act, Congress's definition of estuaries included Great Lakes. So in substance, this definition would be exactly the same as the 2000 Estuaries and Clean Waters Act.

I now yield to the chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

While I respect the remarks of the gentleman from Arkansas, we specify in this amendment, Mr. SCHAUER does, that the meeting place of the rivers and the lakes is not a traditional estuary, is not a meeting place of fresh and saltwater, but that these points would be treated as estuaries. As an example, the lamprey eel lays its eggs in the discharge point of the rivers that contribute to and discharge into the Great Lakes. That is a meeting place of river water and lake water where a destructive, nonindigenous, invasive species multiplies.

Including the Great Lakes in the estuary program will provide additional authority for the Great Lakes to work to control this monster that destroys the fishery of the Great Lakes. This is not an allocation, this is not an earmark, it is not a specific designation. It simply allows the Great Lakes to compete for available dollars authorized under this program.

We think that this body of the greatest repository of freshwater on the earth ought to have standing among the others that have designation as estuaries. Those meeting places on the Great Lakes are every bit as important as the meeting places of the freshwater rivers and the saltwater repositories of a traditional estuary definition.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again having great respect for our chairman, the point that I am trying to make is that I understand the problems that we face in the Great Lakes. And this is a body of such significance. And yet, again, my feeling is that we should take care of that problem within the structure that we have within the Great Lakes program. I see no need to expand the estuary program to take care of the Great Lakes.

If we need additional moneys, if we need additional infrastructure in fighting the battles with the invasive species and things that were mentioned, then I feel like the place to do that is within the Great Lakes programs rather than diluting the moneys, a relatively small amount of money, diluting the money from the estuary program.

With that, I reserve my balance of my time.

Mr. SCHAUER. Mr. Chairman, just a couple of points in closing.

The Federal Government's Web site on this topic of estuaries, it refers to the Great Lakes as freshwater estuaries that are, quote, ''affected by tides and storms, just as estuaries along the oceanic coasts are.'' In fact, there is currently a federally-recognized freshwater estuary in Ohio located on Lake Erie.

My final point, there is a group called Healthy Lakes—Healthy Lives that wrote in support of this amendment. They state that, ''Traditionally, estuaries are transition zones along our coasts between fresh water from rivers and saline water from oceans. Regardless of whether it is a traditional mix of fresh and saltwater areas that are similar, all estuaries provide a unique environment that supports diverse habitats.''

I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I have been married for 38 years. I have a wonderful wife. I fell in love with her almost at first sight. We have been together for three, almost four decades. Probably the one I spend the most time with other than my wife is Mr. OBERSTAR in my work on the committee. We have been together on the committee for my 18 years. He has been there for 32, a lot longer. Now, with my wife from time to time I do have disagreements, like just about every day on some issue. This happens to also be with Mr. OBERSTAR sort of like that marital relation, that I would disagree both with my good friend and colleague Mr. OBERSTAR and also my colleague from Michigan.

I think that on this, this isn't worth burning the house over, and I think the gentleman is offering an amendment that is well intended, and he has a sincere interest in protecting freshwater estuaries. A definition was cited about freshwater estuaries. And yes, there are probably thousands, maybe millions of freshwater estuaries. That is the whole point here is we are expanding a limited definition of marine estuaries that have saltwater. And one of the justifications for this whole program at the Federal level is the sea does encompass the entire perimeter of our coastal areas, particularly Florida, which we have some of the biggest coastline. We have many places where fresh and saltwater mix. And that is the importance of this particularly important but very small Federal program.

The argument here isn't increasing this billions, we are going from $35 to $50 million in a program. And it is important that the additional money not be so diluted. So while I support the gentleman in what he would like to do with freshwater estuaries, I don't think that this expansion is appropriate when we are looking at including the body of freshwater estuaries. We do have a disagreement on this. And I do support the bill in general. I do take deference with this particular amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICA. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Does it help that the Merchant Marine Act of 1970 designates the Great Lakes as the fourth seacoast?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment from the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SCHAUER).

This amendment would define the term "estuary" for the purposes of this bill to include Great Lakes waters, including those near shore waters and connections that are similar to traditional estuaries.

Currently, coastal estuaries are the only estuaries that are eligible to apply for competitive grants under the National Estuary Program. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SCHAUER) would authorize interested management conferences in Great Lakes waters to apply for competitive grants under the National Estuary Program.

I support the amendment.

The CHAIR. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SCHAUER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 111–463.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin:

Page 14, strike lines 3 through 6 and insert the following:

(g) RESEARCH.—Section 320(k)(1)(A) of such Act (as redesignated by subsection (d) of this section) is amended—

(1) by striking ''paramenters'' and inserting ''parameters''; and

(2) by inserting ''(including monitoring of both pathways and ecosystems to track the introduction and establishment of nonnative species)'' before '', to provide the Administrator''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1248, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most destructive threats to the ecological integrity and health of estuaries across our Nation, as well as other water bodies such as rivers and lakes, are invasive species. Invasive species destroy ecosystems and have a devastating effect on the health and balance of these systems, including the estuaries that we are trying so hard to protect through the National Estuary Program. For example, the San Francisco Estuary has been called one of the most invaded estuaries in the world.

Once these species are established, Federal and State authorities spend hundreds of millions of dollars trying to eliminate them, and failing that, to manage them and repair the enormous ecological and economic damage they have done and are doing to these important ecosystems. As I speak, the Army Corps of Engineers is undertaking efforts to prevent the latest of these threats to Lake Michigan in my district, the Asian carp, from overrunning this ecological and national treasure.

This amendment would include assessments of the pathways by which these unwelcome guests are getting into estuaries in the long term monitoring and assessment efforts authorized through the National Estuary Program. For example, one pathway of introduction for nonnative species in an estuary is the ballast water in ships that they may discharge as they move through these bodies of water. By strengthening monitoring of this threat in the estuaries, it is my hope that it will help improve data available to the various stakeholders, to EPA's national program office and Congress on how nonnative species are affecting our estuaries, track whether this problem is getting better or worse, and guide the development of targeted and effective solutions to help address and defeat these invaders.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOOZMAN. I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOOZMAN. We just want to go on the record as supporting this amendment and urge its adoption.

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

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. I also want to thank the chairman of the House Transportation Committee, Mr. OBERSTAR, for his support of this amendment as well. I know he shares my concerns about the problem of invasive species in ballast water, and I sure look forward to working with him on another bill to address those concerns more specifically.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment from the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

This amendment would add a new focus area to the existing list of research programs the Environmental Protection Agency administrator can implement under the National Estuary Program.

In the existing statutory language for the National Estuary Program, there is a list of research programs the administrator is authorized to coordinate and implement with other Federal agencies. This amendment would allow for a research program related to nonnative species.

Nonnative or invasive species continue to be a threat to many of our waterbodies, including estuaries.

Adding a new research focus that looks at the potential impacts of nonnative species and the pathways for introduction in estuaries would be very helpful in better understanding the potential impacts of these species to the water quality, natural resource benefits, and sustainable uses of the estuary.

The programs that experience threats from nonnative species in their estuaries could incorporate any information obtained from this research into their plans in the future.

I support the amendment.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. SHEA-PORTER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 111–463.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

Page 4, line 10, strike ''and'' at the end.

Page 4, line 12, insert ''and'' after the semicolon.

Page 4, after line 12, insert the following:

''(iii) the impacts of changes in sea level on estuarine water quality, estuarine habitat, and infrastructure located in the estuary;

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1248, the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Hampshire.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I would like to thank Chairman OBERSTAR, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. LOBIONDO for their work on this bill. I have the honor of representing the First Congressional District of New Hampshire, which is home to the Piscataqua Region Estuaries Partnership. PREP, as it is known, has been a part of the National Estuaries Program since 1995. PREP works to protect two estuarine systems in New Hampshire, Great Bay/Little Bay and Hampton Harbor. The partnership has included the entire Great Bay watershed in their area of focus, which includes 42 communities in New Hampshire and 10 communities in Maine. The National

Estuaries Program has been a significant source of funding and resources, assisting PREP in their valuable work. This reauthorization we are considering today will make the program stronger and allow for more estuaries to be included.

Mr. Chairman, one of the threats facing our estuaries is sea level change. As the sea level rises, it pushes the water further inland, changing the makeup of our estuaries and wetlands. In some cases, the effect may be that the wetlands move further inland. However, in areas like the Northeast, where our land is highly developed, this may not be possible.

□ 1530

There may be no place for the plants and animals that depend on the unique make-up of these estuaries to go. They may, literally, hit a roadblock, and those ecosystems would collapse. Mr. Chairman, the threat of that happening should worry us all.

Estuaries are essential habitats. They support countless species of plants, animals, and sea life. They act as nursery grounds for oceanic species and are the pathways for many species of fish that migrate from the oceans into our rivers. In fact, estuaries provide habitat for 75 percent of the commercial fishing catch and up to 90 percent of the recreational fishing catch in this country.

Estuaries and wetlands also act as buffers to the storms that batter our coasts. I volunteered in New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina, and I can tell you firsthand the devastation that the storm caused. Many scientists have attributed the significant loss of coastal lands and salt marshes outside of New Orleans as a factor in the severity of the damage that the storm caused.

Mr. Chairman, sea levels are changing. Whether you agree or disagree that global climate change is the cause, we should all be alarmed by the potential impact rising sea levels could have on these important habitats. It has been estimated that sea level rise could convert as much as 33 percent of the world's coastal wetlands to open water. That right would be a devastating loss for our coastal community.

Mr. Chairman, this straightforward amendment would simply ensure that sea level change is taken into account when the comprehensive conservation and management plans are constructed. These estuaries are important parts of our coastal communities and their economies, and we need to help them survive.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, we do not oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Would the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I rise in support of the amendment. It does not add cost. It does not add any burden on the process, but it does add an element of review in the evaluation of these plans and that is to take into consideration sea level rise that's already happening on our sea coasts, on our salt water coasts. And the addition of this factor, I think, will make all of the planners sensitive to the effects, the erosions, shore line erosion effects of rise of water levels and their consequential effects on the health of the estuaries.

I appreciate the gentlewoman's amendment.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment from the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER).

This amendment would require that individual comprehensive conservation and management plans evaluate the impacts of changes in sea level as they apply to the surrounding estuarine region.

Changes in sea level are likely in the future and it is without question that our coasts are vulnerable to the impacts of these changes.

For example, water quality and habitat in the estuaries would be affected by changes in sea level. In addition, those wildlife and fish that make the estuaries their home could be affected by these changes.

And last, public infrastructure along the coasts and in estuaries will likely be affected by changes in sea level.

In particular, roads, bridges and water-related infrastructure could be potentially harmed, inundated, or rendered ineffective by changes in sea level.

Therefore, it is important that the management plans assess the potential impacts caused by sea level rise and include potential responses to these threats.

Again, I support the amendment and applaud the gentlewoman for offering it.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Chairman, again, I want to thank Chairman OBERSTAR, Mr. BISHOP and Mr. LOBIONDO for their work and leadership on this bill. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER).

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

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Hampshire will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. KRATOVIL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 111–463.

Mr. KRATOVIL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. KRATOVIL:

Page 6, strike line 3, and insert the following:

(b) MEMBERS OF CONFERENCE; COLLABORATIVE PROCESSES.—

(1) MEMBERS OF CONFERENCE.—Section 320(c)(5)

Page 6, after line 6, insert the following:

(2) COLLABORATIVE PROCESSES.—Section 320(d) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1330(d)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''(d)'' and all that follows through ''In developing'' and inserting the following:

''(d) UTILIZATION OF EXISTING DATA AND COLLABORATIVE PROCESSES.—

''(1) UTILIZATION OF EXISTING DATA.—In developing''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) UTILIZATION OF COLLABORATIVE PROCESSES.—In updating a plan under subsection (f)(4) or developing a new plan under subsection (b), a management conference shall make use of collaborative processes to—

''(A) ensure equitable inclusion of affected interests;

''(B) engage with members of the management conference, including through—

''(i) the use of consensus-based decision rules; and

''(ii) assistance from impartial facilitators, as appropriate;

''(C) ensure relevant information, including scientific, technical, and cultural information, is accessible to members;

''(D) promote accountability and transparency by ensuring members are informed in a timely manner of—

''(i) the purposes and objectives of the management conference; and

''(ii) the results of an evaluation conducted under subsection (f)(3);

''(E) identify the roles and responsibilities of members—

''(i) in the management conference proceedings; and

''(ii) in the implementation of the plan; and

''(F) seek resolution of conflicts or disputes as necessary.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1248, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. KRATOVIL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. KRATOVIL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 4715, the Clean Estuaries Act, and voice my support also for the underlying bill.

Let me begin by thanking the chairman, Mr. OBERSTAR, who, as the Chair knows, has the finest voice of all in Congress; and should he ever leave Congress, could certainly go forward in doing commentating somewhere.

But, in any event, Mr. Chairman, Maryland's First Congressional District is defined by the Chesapeake Bay and its waterways. Although not directly part of the National Estuary Program, the program was developed from efforts to protect our Nation's largest estuary, the Chesapeake Bay.

Estuaries are bodies of water, as you've heard, that receive both outflows from rivers and tidal inflows

from the ocean. They are transition zones between fresh water from rivers and salt water from the ocean. The mixing of fresh and salt water provides a unique environment that supports diverse habitats for a wide variety of living resources, including plants, fish, and wildlife.

Estuaries are critical economic engines that generate billions of dollars in revenue each year from fishing and tourism. The sad truth is that along with many of the Nation's estuaries, the Chesapeake is in poor ecological health as well, although we did have, Mr. Chairman, some good news yesterday in terms of the blue crab population which I'm happy to report is rebounding.

Unhealthy estuaries impact not only the commercial and recreational fishing industries, but threaten industries such as tourism, restaurants and charter boats, among others, that generate revenue and create good-paying jobs.

This bill includes effective reforms to that program that will bolster the health of estuaries, as well as the economy and infrastructure of affected communities by increasing transparency, requiring establishment of performance measures and goals, and introducing much needed accountability to the program.

This legislation will support and maintain the Maryland Coastal Bays program as one of the most effective estuary programs in the Nation and ensure that taxpayer dollars are used effectively in the fight to do so.

I have introduced an amendment that I believe will bolster the oversight and accountability of these programs by ensuring a collaborative process involving all stakeholders.

The National Estuary Program is comprised of initiatives across the country that, under my amendment, will now be subject to a streamlined management plan that will ensure all stakeholders play a role in the implementation.

My amendment calls for the equitable inclusion of all relevant estuary stakeholders, the use of neutral facilitators and processes to resolve any conflicts, and the inclusion and use of up-to-date information. Included among these stakeholders will be the region's farming and agricultural representatives, as well as environmental groups, so that all parties will come to the table and reach a consensus agreement about our mutual interests and goals.

While some programs may have used collaborative processes in the past, this amendment will ensure that all new programs and all existing programs undergoing management plan updates will collaborate going forward.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, as well as the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, again, we do not oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KRATOVIL. Mr. Chairman, I'll yield to the chairman, Mr. OBERSTAR, as much time as he may consume.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the distinguished gentleman for this amendment, a very thoughtful, well-crafted amendment to resolve conflicts. That is really what the Congress should be doing, resolving conflicts and creating structures within our programs within which conflict can be resolved. And that is particularly important in development of management plans. There are so many different parties, some at loggerheads over the management of the watershed.

This idea will ensure that we bring the development of these management plans to a reasonable and productive conclusion. And so I thank the gentleman for this amendment. Perhaps if it works, we can apply it to our work with the other body.

Mr. KRATOVIL. I thank the Chair. I also thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) for his support of the amendment.

Again, Mr. Chairman, thank you for your support.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment from the Gentleman from Maryland (Mr. KRATOVIL).

This amendment is essentially a reminder to the new programs of the National Estuary Program that collaborative processes should be used when developing the management plan.

Many of the estuary programs are currently using collaborative processes to develop their plans and this amendment encourages these processes to continue in the future.

The gentleman's amendment ensures that all relevant stakeholders in an estuary be given an equal voice. This concept is fundamental for developing a broad-base of support for restoration efforts, and for increasing the overall likelihood of success.

The amendment would also require the use of a neutral party to resolve conflicts that arise during the development of a plan. The use of neutral parties can be an effective way to resolve differences other, more engaged stakeholders may encounter when developing a management plan.

Finally, this amendment requires the inclusion of up-to-date information in the plans.

As the management plans are updated, they should include the most recent information possible so that they are useful in helping achieve the long-term goals of improving the water quality and habitat in the estuaries.

I commend the gentleman for offering this amendment, and urge its adoption.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. KRATOVIL).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin) having assumed the chair, Mr. CUELLAR, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4715) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the National Estuary Program, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer the resolution previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 1255

Whereas, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct initiated an investigation into allegations related to earmarks and campaign contributions in the Spring of 2009.

Whereas, on December 2, 2009, reports and findings in seven separate matters involving the alleged connection between earmarks and campaign contributions were forwarded by the Office of Congressional Ethics to the Standards Committee.

Whereas, on February 26, 2010, the Standards Committee made public its report on the matter wherein the Committee found, though a widespread perception exists among corporations and lobbyists that campaign contributions provide a greater chance of obtaining earmarks, there was no evidence that Members or their staff considered contributions when requesting earmarks.

Whereas, the Committee indicated that, with respect to the matters forwarded by the Office of Congressional Ethics, neither the evidence cited in the OCE's findings nor the evidence in the record before the Standards Committee provided a substantial reason to believe that violations of applicable standards of conduct occurred.

Whereas, the Office of Congressional Ethics is prohibited from reviewing activities taking place prior to March of 2008 and lacks the authority to subpoena witnesses and documents.

Whereas, for example, the Office of Congressional Ethics noted that in some instances documents were redacted or specific information was not provided and that, in at least one instance, they had reason to believe a witness withheld information requested and did not identify what was being withheld.

Whereas, the Office of Congressional Ethics also noted that they were able to interview only six former employees of the PMA Group, with many former employees refusing to consent to interviews and the OCE unable to obtain evidence within PMA's possession.

Whereas, Roll Call noted that ''the committee report was five pages long and included no documentation of any evidence collected or any interviews conducted by the committee, beyond a statement that the investigation 'included extensive document reviews and interviews with numerous witnesses.' '' (Roll Call, March 8, 2010)

Whereas, it is unclear whether the Standards Committee included in their investigation any activities that occurred prior to 2008.

Whereas, it is unclear whether the Standards Committee interviewed any Members in the course of their investigation.

Whereas, it is unclear whether the Standards Committee, in the course of their investigation, initiated their own subpoenas or followed the Office of Congressional Ethics recommendations to issue subpoenas. Therefore be it:

Resolved, That not later than seven days after the adoption of this resolution, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall report to the House of Representatives, with respect to the activities addressed in its report of February 26, 2010, (1) how many witnesses were interviewed, (2) how many, if any, subpoenas were issued in the course of their investigation, and (3) what documents were reviewed and their availability for public review.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

MOTION TO REFER THE RESOLUTION

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I move the resolution be referred to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 1 hour on the motion to refer.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, this is a matter that belongs to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

I yield back the balance of my time and move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to refer.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 385, nays 0, answered ''present'' 18, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 206]

YEAS—385

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutch
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—18

Blackburn
Bonner
Butterfield
Buyer
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Conaway
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Latham
Lofgren, Zoe
McCaul
Myrick
Simpson
Walden
Welch

NOT VOTING—27

Barrett (SC)
Bean
Berry
Bilbray
Boyd
Capito
Gallegly
Gonzalez
Hoekstra
Jackson Lee (TX)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Marshall
McCotter
Meek (FL)
Miller (FL)
Mollohan
Pence
Radanovich
Rahall
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Tiahrt
Towns
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Young (AK)

□ 1616

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. WELCH changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''present.''

So the motion to refer was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLEAN ESTUARIES ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1248 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4715.

□ 1617

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further 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, with Mr. CUELLAR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, proceedings on amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 111–463 offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. KRATOVIL) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 111–463 on which further proceedings were postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. SHEA-PORTER

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 294, noes 109, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]

AYES—294

Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Butterfield
Camp
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Giffords
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Heller
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—109

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Culberson
Duncan
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves
Griffith
Guthrie
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Hunter
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Miller, Gary
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Paul
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Rehberg
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Westmoreland
Whitfield

NOT VOTING—33

Barrett (SC)
Berry
Bilbray
Bordallo
Boyd
Brown (SC)
Faleomavaega
Gallegly
Gonzalez
Hoekstra
Jackson Lee (TX)
Kosmas
Marshall
McCotter
Meek (FL)
Miller (FL)
Mitchell
Nadler (NY)
Neugebauer
Norton
Pence
Price (NC)
Radanovich
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Shuster
Taylor
Tiahrt
Towns
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Young (AK)

□ 1636

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chair, I was absent from the Chamber today, Thursday, April 15, 2010, due to the travel schedule for my return to my district on account of official business. Had I been present for the rollcall votes taken today in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union on the amendments that were offered to H.R. 4715, the Clean Estuaries Act of 2010, I would have voted as follows: "aye" on the amendment offered by Ms. SHEA-PORTER of New Hampshire (rollcall vote 207).

The CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEINER) having assumed the chair, Mr. CUELLAR, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4715) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the National Estuary Program, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1248, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1248, the question on adoption of the amendments will be put engros.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Jordan of Ohio moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4715 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 13, strike lines 1 through 3, and insert the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator an amount as determined under paragraph (3) for each of fiscal years 2011 through 2016 for—

Page 14, line 2, strike the closing quotation marks and the final period.

Page 14, after line 2, insert the following:

''(3) AMOUNT OF AUTHORIZATION.—In any fiscal year following a fiscal year in which there is no national deficit, the amount authorized under paragraph (1) shall be $50,000,000. In any fiscal year following a fiscal year in which there is a national deficit, the amount authorized under paragraph (1) shall be $35,000,000.''.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I object. I only just received the amendment. I want to read it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection has been heard.

The Clerk will continue.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have a simple motion that every American can understand. It says: Stop the out-of-control spending until we balance the budget and get our fiscal house in order. People are worried. They are worried about what this Congress is doing to their children's futures, and rightly so.

This year, the Federal Government will take in $2.1 trillion but will spend $3.6 trillion. Let me say that again. It will take in $2.1 trillion and spend $3.6 trillion. Only in Congress does that math make sense. That's like a family

making $50,000 a year but spending $80,000. If that were your family, Mr. Speaker, making 50 and spending 80, you'd do something about it. You'd cut back. You'd tighten the belt. You'd make responsible decisions. But not this Congress. No, not this Congress. This Congress is spending like there is no tomorrow.

This year, the Federal Government will run a deficit of at least $1.4 trillion. That's 10 percent of GDP. Any economist in the world will tell you that deficits shouldn't be more than 2 or 3 percent of GDP.

What are we spending money on today? Estuaries. That's right. Estuaries. Most Americans have probably never heard of the term.

With our Nation over $12 trillion in debt, borrowing money from China every day to pay our bills, taking in $2.1 trillion, spending $3.6 trillion, record deficits as far as the eye can see, not dealing with the energy crisis, not dealing with the entitlement crisis, replacing freedoms with mandates, replacing private-sector growth with 16,000 new IRS agents, what are we spending people's money on today, on Tax Day? We are spending it on estuaries, a massive increase in funding for estuaries.

Mr. Speaker, come on. Americans are taking to the streets all across the country today, Tax Day, dumping tea in the harbor and standing up against Congress, which is bankrupting their country. What are the Democrats offering them? More spending on estuaries.

Mr. Speaker, before Congress even considers doubling the funding for this program or any other nonessential spending, we must first balance the Federal budget and begin paying down some of the money we borrowed from China and other countries. Estuaries can wait, Mr. Speaker, but fiscal responsibility cannot.

All this motion says is to keep the spending at what it was last year. After all, a lot of families, a lot of taxpayers, a lot of small business owners have been living on last year's spending levels, maybe even something less.

I would ask my colleagues this, Mr. Speaker:

How bad does it have to get before we can begin to take that modest first step and say maybe estuaries can get by on the same amount of money they were on last year? That's all this motion says. All this motion says is let's just keep them where they were last year.

A ''yes'' vote on this motion tells the people you represent back home, the people who are paying their taxes today, who elected us and entrusted us to protect their hard-earned money: Yes, I agree that Congress must set priorities. Yes, I agree that we should forgo such increases until the budget is balanced. Yes, I respect you, the taxpayer, enough to say that I can hold the line on spending even if it means only $35 million for estuaries this year.

Mr. Speaker, I had a coach in high school who was a chemistry and physics teacher—the toughest teacher in the school and the toughest coach in the State. Every single day in class, every single day in the practice room, he would talk about discipline. He had a great definition. He said that discipline is doing what you don't want to do when you don't want to do it. Basically, that meant doing it his way when you'd rather do it your way. It meant doing things the right way when you'd rather do them the convenient way, the easy way.

Discipline is the quality we need in this Congress today. The easiest thing to do in the world is to spend money, particularly someone else's money.

Really simply, this amendment says: Let's have the discipline to say ''no'' to spending. Let's have the discipline to say let's do the right thing today. Let's not do the convenient thing. Let's hold the line on spending and treat taxpayers with a little respect on this day of all days. Treat them with a little respect.

I urge a ''yes'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I am sorry the gentleman from Ohio doesn't have an estuary in his district, but his State is a Great Lakes State. The Great Lakes, as the Nation's fourth seacoast, designated by an act of Congress in 1970, are also designated in this bill as a place of estuaries, of freshwater estuaries.

I am sorry that the gentleman doesn't understand that a great many people do understand what an estuary is. Three-fourths of our population live along areas that are designated as estuaries. Estuaries, the meeting place of fresh and salt water—where new forms of life are created, where new forms of fish and aquatic plants are created—are the richest places on Earth for the creation of maritime life. Estuaries are the common heritage of all Americans. There is a national interest in their protection and in their enhancement.

□ 1645

I am quite surprised at this amendment because in committee consideration no issue was raised about the funding level. Make no mistake about it. The purpose of this amendment is to cut $15 million out of the authorization level.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I do not have time to yield to correct all the gentleman's mistakes.

In the consideration of the bill, I yielded to Mr. PETRI. ''We support H.R. 4715,'' said he. He yielded to the ranking member of the Coast Guard Subcommittee, Mr. LOBIONDO, cosponsor of the bill, and he concluded, saying, ''I urge all Members to support H.R. 4715, and I yield back.''

There was no discussion in committee. No amendment was filed with the Rules Committee to cut the funding level. The ranking member of our committee, Mr. MICA, who designates himself proudly as a conservative, is supporting this bill.

This is a jobs bill.

Go ahead and laugh. Go ahead and laugh. It shows you don't understand much, Mr. Speaker, those who are laughing. Twenty-eight million jobs depend on coastal areas of the United States, $185 billion in commercial and recreational fishing from estuaries of the United States, 2 million jobs at stake. Three-fourths of all commercial fishing depend on estuaries. Three-fourths of the U.S. commercial fish catch and 80 percent of the recreational fish catch occurs in the estuarine areas of the United States, and annual fish harvests have declined by $1.5 billion every year for the last 20-plus years because of impaired estuaries.

This is an investment in America's future. This is an investment in the young people of this country for whom the gentleman proclaims to propose cutting $15 million. This is an investment. This is not an entitlement. This is an authorization to compete with other programs for the funding necessary to protect our estuaries, which are the beginning places of new life and the homes of millions of jobs and new forms of life and the future of America.

Vote down this pernicious motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules and adopt House Resolution 1242, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 214, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 208]

AYES—192

Aderholt	Boehner	Camp
Akin	Bonner	Campbell
Alexander	Bono Mack	Cantor
Altmire	Boozman	Cao
Arcuri	Boren	Capito
Austria	Boustany	Carney
Bachmann	Brady (TX)	Carter
Bachus	Bright	Cassidy
Bartlett	Broun (GA)	Castle
Barton (TX)	Brown-Waite, Ginny	Chaffetz
Bean	Buchanan	Childers
Biggert	Burgess	Coble
Bilirakis	Burton (IN)	Coffman (CO)
Bishop (UT)	Buyer	Cole
Blackburn	Calvert	Conaway
Blunt		Crenshaw

Cuellar
Culberson
Dahlkemper
Davis (KY)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Himes
Hodes
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maffei
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Peters
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—214

Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McMahon
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—24

Barrett (SC)
Berry
Bilbray
Boyd
Brown (SC)
Gallegly
Gonzalez
Hoekstra
Jackson Lee (TX)
Kosmas
McCotter
Meek (FL)
Miller (FL)
Neugebauer
Pence
Radanovich
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Slaughter
Tiahrt
Towns
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Young (AK)

□ 1708

Messrs. RUSH, JOHNSON of Georgia, CONYERS, HILL, and Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mrs. LUMMIS changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 278, nays 128, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

YEAS—278

Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Butterfield
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Giffords
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NAYS—128

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barton (TX)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Duncan
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Latham
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nunes
Olson

Owens
Paul
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Rehberg
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Turner
Upton
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wittman
Wolf

NOT VOTING—24

Barrett (SC)
Berry
Bilbray
Boyd
Brown (SC)
Gallegly
Gonzalez
Hoekstra
Jackson Lee (TX)
Kosmas
McCotter
Meek (FL)
Miller (FL)
Murphy, Patrick
Neugebauer
Pence
Radanovich
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Tiahrt
Towns
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are reminded there are less than 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1717

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, due to personal reasons, I was unable to attend a vote. Had I been present, my vote would have been "yea" on final passage of H.R. 4715—Clean Estuaries Act of 2010.

CONGRATULATING DUKE UNIVERSITY ON WINNING THE NCAA BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 1242.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1242.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SCHAUER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 390, noes 0, answered "present" 12, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 210]

AYES—390

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nunes
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—12

Braley (IA)
Cardoza
Carney
Cooper
Courtney
DeFazio
Edwards (MD)
Kagen
Kratovil
Maffei
Nye
Oberstar

NOT VOTING—28

Barrett (SC)
Berry
Bilbray
Blunt
Boyd
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Gallegly
Gonzalez
Grijalva
Hoekstra
Jackson Lee (TX)
Kosmas
McCotter
Meek (FL)
Miller (FL)
Neugebauer
Pence
Radanovich
Rogers (MI)
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Tiahrt
Towns
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Welch
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are less than 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1725

Mr. KRATOVIL changed his vote from "no" to "present."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 877

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove Ms. ESHOO of California as a cosponsor of H.R. 877.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

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 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1910

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. JACKSON of Illinois) at 7 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 15, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 15, 2010 at 6:46 p.m.:

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 4851.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4851, CONTINUING EXTENSION ACT OF 2010

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4851) to provide a temporary extension of certain programs, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order or question of consideration, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment; that the Senate amendment be considered as read; that the motion be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CONTINUING EXTENSION ACT OF 2010

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of today, I call up the bill (H.R. 4851) to provide a temporary extension of certain programs, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Continuing Extension Act of 2010''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROVISIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Section 4007 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(A) by striking ''April 5, 2010'' each place it appears and inserting ''June 2, 2010'';

(B) in the heading for subsection (b)(2), by striking ''APRIL 5, 2010'' and inserting ''JUNE 2, 2010''; and

(C) in subsection (b)(3), by striking ''September 4, 2010'' and inserting ''November 6, 2010''.

(2) Section 2002(e) of the Assistance for Unemployed Workers and Struggling Families Act, as contained in Public Law 111–5 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note; 123 Stat. 438), is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking ''April 5, 2010'' and inserting ''June 2, 2010'';

(B) in the heading for paragraph (2), by striking ''APRIL 5, 2010'' and inserting ''JUNE 2, 2010''; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking ''October 5, 2010'' and inserting ''December 7, 2010''.

(3) Section 2005 of the Assistance for Unemployed Workers and Struggling Families Act, as contained in Public Law 111–5 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note; 123 Stat. 444), is amended—

(A) by striking ''April 5, 2010'' each place it appears and inserting ''June 2, 2010''; and

(B) in subsection (c), by striking ''September 4, 2010'' and inserting ''November 6, 2010''.

(4) Section 5 of the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–449; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by striking ''September 4, 2010'' and inserting ''November 6, 2010''.

(b) FUNDING.—Section 4004(e)(1) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

''(E) the amendments made by section 2(a)(1) of the Continuing Extension Act of 2010; and''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Temporary Extension Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–144).

SEC. 3. EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF PREMIUM ASSISTANCE FOR COBRA BENEFITS.

(a) EXTENSION OF ELIGIBILITY PERIOD.—Subsection (a)(3)(A) of section 3001 of division B of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5), as amended by section 3(a) of the Temporary Extension Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–144), is amended by striking ''March 31, 2010'' and inserting ''May 31, 2010''.

(b) RULES RELATING TO 2010 EXTENSION.—Subsection (a) of section 3001 of division B of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5), as amended by section 3(b) of the Temporary Extension Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–144), is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(18) RULES RELATED TO APRIL AND MAY 2010 EXTENSION.—In the case of an individual who, with regard to coverage described in paragraph (10)(B), experiences a qualifying event related to a termination of employment on or after April 1, 2010 and prior to the date of the enactment of this paragraph, rules similar to those in paragraphs (4)(A) and (7)(C) shall apply with respect to all continuation coverage, including State continuation coverage programs.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the provisions of section 3001 of division B of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

SEC. 4. INCREASE IN THE MEDICARE PHYSICIAN PAYMENT UPDATE.

Paragraph (10) of section 1848(d) of the Social Security Act, as added by section 1011(a) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2010 (Public Law 111–118) and as amended by section 5 of the Temporary Extension Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–144), is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''March 31, 2010'' and inserting ''May 31, 2010''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''April 1, 2010'' and inserting ''June 1, 2010''.

SEC. 5. EHR CLARIFICATION.

(a) QUALIFICATION FOR CLINIC-BASED PHYSICIANS.—

(1) MEDICARE.—Section 1848(o)(1)(C)(ii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–4(o)(1)(C)(ii)) is amended by striking ''setting (whether inpatient or outpatient)'' and inserting ''inpatient or emergency room setting''.

(2) MEDICAID.—Section 1903(t)(3)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(t)(3)(D)) is amended by striking ''setting (whether inpatient or outpatient)'' and inserting ''inpatient or emergency room setting''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be effective as if included in the enactment of the HITECH Act (included in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5)).

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Health and Human Services may implement the amendments made by this section by program instruction or otherwise.

SEC. 6. EXTENSION OF USE OF 2009 POVERTY GUIDELINES.

Section 1012 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2010 (Public Law 111–118), as amended by section 7 of the Temporary Extension Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–144), is amended by striking ''March 31, 2010'' and inserting ''May 31, 2010''.

SEC. 7. EXTENSION OF NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 129 of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2010 (Public Law 111–68), as amended by section 8 of Public Law 111–144, is amended by striking ''by substituting'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''by substituting May 31, 2010, for the date specified in each such section.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be considered to have taken effect on February 28, 2010.

SEC. 8. COMPENSATION AND RATIFICATION OF AUTHORITY RELATED TO LAPSE IN HIGHWAY PROGRAMS.

(a) COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—Any Federal employees furloughed as a result of the lapse in expenditure authority from the Highway Trust Fund after 11:59 p.m. on February 28, 2010, through March 2, 2010, shall be compensated for the period of that lapse at their standard rates of compensation, as determined under policies established by the Secretary of Transportation.

(b) RATIFICATION OF ESSENTIAL ACTIONS.—All actions taken by Federal employees, contractors, and grantees for the purposes of maintaining the essential level of Government operations, services, and activities to protect life and property and to bring about orderly termination of Government functions during the lapse in expenditure authority from the Highway Trust Fund after 11:59 p.m. on February 28, 2010, through March 2, 2010, are hereby ratified and approved if otherwise in accord with the provisions of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2010 (division B of Public Law 111–68).

(c) FUNDING.—Funds used by the Secretary to compensate employees described in subsection (a) shall be derived from funds previously authorized out of the Highway Trust Fund and made available or limited to the Department of Transportation by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010 (Public Law 111–117) and shall be subject to the obligation limitations established in such Act.

(d) EXPENDITURES FROM HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—To permit expenditures from the Highway Trust Fund to effectuate the purposes of

this section, this section shall be deemed to be a section of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2010 (division B of Public Law 111–68), as in effect on the date of the enactment of the last amendment to such Resolution.

SEC. 9. SATELLITE TELEVISION EXTENSION.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 119 OF TITLE 17, UNITED STATES CODE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 119 of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)(1)(E), by striking ''April 30, 2010'' and inserting ''May 31, 2010''; and

(B) in subsection (e), by striking ''April 30, 2010'' and inserting ''May 31, 2010''.

(2) TERMINATION OF LICENSE.—Section 1003(a)(2)(A) of Public Law 111–118 is amended by striking ''April 30, 2010'', and inserting ''May 31, 2010''.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934.—Section 325(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 325(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking ''April 30, 2010'' and inserting ''May 31, 2010''; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(C), by striking ''May 1, 2010'' each place it appears in clauses (ii) and (iii) and inserting ''June 1, 2010''.

SEC. 10. EXTENSION OF SMALL BUSINESS LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM.

(a) APPROPRIATION.—There is appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $80,000,000, for an additional amount for ''Small Business Administration—Business Loans Program Account'', to remain available until expended, for the cost of fee reductions and eliminations under section 501 of division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5; 123 Stat. 151) and loan guarantees under section 502 of division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5; 123 Stat. 152), as amended by this section: Provided, That such costs shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(b) EXTENSION OF SUNSET DATE.—Section 502(f) of division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5; 123 Stat. 153) is amended by striking ''April 30, 2010'' and inserting ''May 31, 2010''.

SEC. 11. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING A VALUE ADDED TAX.

It is the sense of the Senate that the Value Added Tax is a massive tax increase that will cripple families on fixed income and only further push back America's economic recovery and the Senate opposes a Value Added Tax.

SEC. 12. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

(b) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION FOR CONGRESSIONAL ENFORCEMENT.—This Act, with the exception of section 4, is designated as an emergency for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles. In the Senate, this Act is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

(c) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION FOR STATUTORY PAYGO.—This Act, with the exception of section 4, is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4(g) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–139; 2 U.S.C. 933(g)).

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Levin moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, actually, this issue can be stated very succinctly, very briefly and, I think, very compellingly. We now have 6½ million unemployed workers who have been looking for a new job for over 6 months. That's twice the numbered of long-term unemployed compared to any other time on record before this recession. I repeat, twice the number of long-term unemployed compared to any other time on record before this recession.

Furthermore, under both Democrats and Republicans, we have routinely considered extended unemployment benefits emergency spending, and we've passed extensions before in this House by voice vote. And yet, in the other body, Republicans blocked assistance to these jobless workers and to their families. They claimed their opposition was rooted in concern about the deficit.

Well, just briefly saying what that's all about, in the past, those who now raise this issue have presided over increases in the deficit, paying for tax cuts, paying for the Iraq war, paying for other programs, passing them without paying for them at all.

□ 1915

So, in a word, we should now rise together and pass this bill. The unemployed people of this country are waiting. Those looking for work when there are no jobs available are waiting for action by this House. At long last, the Senate has acted, and I'm hopeful that we'll be able to reach beyond partisan divide, beyond partisan rhetoric and pass this bill with a strong, strong bipartisan vote.

The unemployed people of this country deserve it. They're looking to this House. And those who talk about balancing budgets who have not balanced them in the past should not be now trying to do so on the backs of hundreds of thousands of unemployed in our beloved country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself so much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support American workers and families, and that is why I must oppose the legislation before us that would heap another $18 billion onto the dangerous deficits this Congress has already amassed and that American workers will ultimately be made to pay for in the coming years. On this Tax Day, as an overburdened Nation staggering under dangerous deficits, we need to send this bill back to the drawing board and return with legislation that is paid for that will not create more debt, that will help create more jobs instead of economic uncertainty and, ultimately, more job losses.

The legislation before us would extend for another 2 months special Federal spending programs that today allow unemployed workers to collect up to 99 weeks of benefits in most States. That is nearly 2 years of unemployment checks today which are by far an all-time U.S. record. That compares with a total of up to 26 weeks of benefits payable in almost all States during normal times.

We all want to help unemployed workers who are frustrated by a White House who has taken their eye off the economic ball. They're frustrated by this Congress that has sought an extreme agenda rather than focusing on jobs. But it is impossible to ignore the fact that those extra 73 weeks of Federal benefits paid today, a full 17 months courtesy of Federal taxpayers, come at an enormous price.

In all, this bill would add $18 billion—that is more than the size of the entire NASA budget—add that to this year's trillion dollar deficit, including $13 billion more for the unemployment benefits it would extend. That is on top of the approximately $100 billion spent so far on these programs; and, if extended for the remainder of this year as we expect, another $50 billion more would be added to the national debt.

None of this has or will be paid for. In fact, the Federal unemployment account has long since been bankrupted; yet we continue to spend, and now are being bailed out with general revenues. And who will bail out general revenues when they run out? Taxpayers, through more taxes and more general revenues the government extracts from them.

So far in the past year and 2 months since the President has been in office, taxpayers are paying $2,100 more per individual because of $670 billion in new tax increases. And if President Obama's budget is approved by the Democratic Congress, we will heap almost $3 trillion more on American taxpayers. And what's sad, again, is that we continue to heap debt without any opportunity, without any promise that is kept to pay for them.

When our Democrat friends took office, they promised they would pay for the wars, pay for the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, but not a dime yet. They

promised they would balance the budget. Today we see trillion dollar deficits as far as the eye can see. They enacted PAYGO and said we're going to pay for all new spending, but as this bill today shows, they've done nothing of that and, in fact, have invented extravagant loopholes, declared anything an emergency simply as an excuse to continue spending. And, of course, they promised to curb earmarks. In fact, eliminating earmarks could nearly pay for this bill, but they've not kept that promise either.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better than this. What unemployed workers really want are jobs and paychecks, not almost 2 years of unemployment checks and more massive debt for our country. Unfortunately, jobs are something Democrats in this Congress have been totally incapable of delivering.

Instead of creating 3.7 million jobs as promised, their stimulus bill was followed by 3 million more job losses. Instead of holding unemployment under 8 percent as promised, it soared to nearly 10 percent and remains close to that today.

Sixteen million Americans are unemployed, including record numbers for over a year. In fact, the White House promised, if you passed the stimulus, 90 percent of the new jobs we create would be in the private sector. The opposite is true. The private sector has lost 3.7 million jobs, but government jobs have been created—almost 300,000. So the people who are getting these unemployment benefits are the ones whose promises have not been kept by this White House and this Democrat Congress.

We need to start over and actually start paying for new spending, starting with this bill. The only way to do that is to defeat this bill and bring it back in a paid-for fashion.

But beyond that, Mr. Speaker, we also need to do the things that really help create jobs for workers. We can start by stopping frightening the job creators; businesses who are delaying important rehiring decisions, investment decisions, frightened by all of the new taxes proposed in Congress, the new health care mandates, the rising energy taxes, the talk of new regulations. We have to stop frightening consumers who know that, ultimately, they'll be relied on to pay this terrible debt.

We need to reward innovation and small business job creation through lower taxes and support for innovation, and we need to pursue free trade agreements that find new customers for American workers and American companies. That is why, Mr. Speaker, we must send this bill back and make it paid for, and stop punishing American workers and families.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself 30 seconds.

Once again, the party of ''no'' has spoken. Every jobs bill that has come before us they have voted ''no.'' When the President came to power, we were losing 779,000 jobs a month. The last month we gained 162,000 jobs. The people of this country deserve more than a ''no,'' another ''no'' from the party of ''no.''

I now yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the State of Washington who is chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. MCDERMOTT.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Texas, I couldn't have asked for a better setup man for a straight man because, I dare say, there are many Members at one time or another who had something to say hypocritical either on the floor or on the campaign trail. But I don't ever recall the blatant hypocrisy behind the cornerstone of an argument to deny benefits to hundreds of thousands of people who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own, that is, until the recent debate about extending unemployment benefits.

The Senate Republicans, and now my House Republican colleagues, have cut off unemployment benefits for hundreds of thousands of jobless Americans for the last 2 weeks because they say they're upset about the budget deficit. Isn't that something. They claim we can't afford to help the unemployed unless the cost of these benefits is offset, even though Congress has routinely considered such benefits to be emergency spending which doesn't require offsets.

Maybe my mind is failing, I don't know, but I don't remember these concerns coming up from our Republican colleagues when there was discussion about the $1 trillion cost of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, not a penny of which was offset. President Bush never asked for any sacrifice from the American people. He said, We can just go out and fight a war and it will be paid for sometime when I'm not here. I also don't recall any Republicans expressing concern about the nearly $2 billion spent on two successive tax cuts that went mainly to the wealthy. That is why you will have to forgive me if I seem a little frustrated that Republicans have miraculously discovered fiscal responsibility. I don't know. They must have turned over a rock somewhere.

When they're talking about unemployment benefits, they suddenly worry about paying for it. A measly $18 billion. President Bush put us $3 trillion in debt, and now they're worrying about $18 billion. They were happy to help their President turn the biggest surplus in our Nation's history into the biggest deficit in our Nation's history, but now when it comes to help the unemployed workers and their families, Senate Republicans say we just can't afford to do it. So they delayed and obstructed the bill for weeks until the Senate finally cleared the Republican filibuster earlier this evening.

We're here tonight to pass that bill to provide an extension through May for a number of programs that are expiring at the end of the month, including Federal unemployment insurance. We're going to take another one of these votes in June.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. We will be back here on June 1 going through this same charade all over again. We will hear about the terrible budget deficits. But the people who are unemployed and can't buy food to put it on the table, they're not listening to you people.

The benefits under this bill will be retroactive, so unemployed workers who were cut off during the last 2 weeks will receive compensation. That is the least we can do for those who have lost their job through no fault of their own.

Six weeks from now, as I say, we will be back to continue this again. We will be pushing for a much longer extension of Federal unemployment programs to ensure that jobless Americans are not continually held hostage every month to the Republicans and their hypocrisy.

I was recently reading an article about a man who was laid off. He had an MBA. He played by the rules, made a good living, but it was taking him many months to find work. He said, For someone that is unemployed right now, you need to turn off the news. It will affect the positive attitude you need to have. You've got to be positive, because it's not easy.''

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Americans can't stomach this Republican hypocrisy anymore. And I sincerely hope that when the unemployed go to vote in this election, they remember the attitude of the Republicans toward them when they were in need, because maybe then the Republicans will get the message.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would remind people the Democratic Congress handed President Obama a trillion dollar deficit, eight times larger than Republicans when we held this Congress. The stimulus bill alone was larger than the Iraq and Afghanistan wars. And, unfortunately, only 6 percent of Americans feel the stimulus has helped create jobs in America. What a terrible waste.

With that, I would yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Today is April 15, Tax Day, and across the country citizens concerned with the direction our Nation is headed are rallying together to send Washington, D.C., a message. Though I was unable to join the people at these rallies, it is my duty to be here in the House of Representatives today to share their message and to speak and to vote against this bill.

First, this bill is shortsighted because it increases the deficit by $18 billion, a cost to be paid for by future

generations. This Congress has spent and borrowed its way into record deficits.

Second, the so-called doc fix in this bill is an example of Congress avoiding real solutions necessary to improve health care for Americans. The short-term doc fix included in this bill is hardly a fix when Kansas hospitals and doctors have to endure this wait-and-see game every few months while still working to care for folks and keep their doors open. We need a permanent solution to this ongoing problem so that doctors can regain a sense of stability and predictability in their practices.

And thirdly, despite its intention, this bill does little to address our country's persistent high unemployment rate. Rather than continuing to spend money we do not have, Congress needs to pursue a strategy of job creation. This legislation is yet another unfortunate example of ''business as usual'' in our Nation's capital; same old story from a Congress that needs to learn its lessons from the American people, a story told one more time on this Tax Day, April 15.

Mr. LEVIN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield myself as much time as I may consume for closing remarks.

□ 1930

Mr. Speaker, if the Democrat stimulus plan had worked as promised, we wouldn't be here tonight. If we had really created 3.7 million new jobs, as President Obama promised, as this Democrat Congress promised, these programs would have phased out already. Instead, we witness another 3 million Americans sitting home tonight without a job.

If the unemployment rate were 7.4 percent and falling as Democrats promised, these programs would be phased out, and we would be celebrating job creation. Instead, unemployment is near 10 percent and will remain at that level for more than a year. Consider that when the other side says we have to extend unemployment benefits to reduce unemployment, we have to extend unemployment to reduce unemployment. Consider that when the other side claims that Vice President BIDEN once said we have to spend money to keep from going bankrupt. We have to raise health care costs to reduce health care costs.

Well, we have done the stimulus and spent and spent and spent and added trillions of dollars to this dangerous American debt. Meanwhile, we are 6 million jobs short of where Democrats promised we would be. It hasn't worked. It's time to stop the madness. It's time to stop the spending. Defeat this bill and bring back legislation that will actually create jobs, not add to our Nation's horrible debt.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I close, quoting a woman who spoke to my office today from Eastpointe, Michigan. She was laid off from a large accounting firm, and she says, ''I was there for 2½ years. The firm let me go because they had some clients who closed shop because of the economy the way it is. It was nothing I did. I received a raise every year I was there. I've been unemployed ever since. That was the end of May of last year, 2009.

''Without unemployment, we'd be in a lot of trouble. I'd probably lose my car.''

Mr. Speaker, holding unemployed Americans, hundreds of thousands of them, like this woman, hostage to score what some think may be political points I think is reprehensible.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Amendment to H.R. 4851, the Continuing Extension Act, to extend a range of programs.

On March 17, the House passed H.R. 4851, emergency legislation that would extend a range of programs that unfortunately expired. These programs included: unemployment benefits; help with health insurance for the unemployed, COBRA; the highway bill; satellite TV; delay in the cut in Medicare physician payments; flood insurance; and small business loan guarantees. We passed this emergency legislation in the House, but Republican Senator JIM BUNNING single-handedly blocked passage of this emergency measure, despite the critical needs of millions of families across the United States during this economic downturn.

As a result, a 2-day shutdown of these programs that jeopardized unemployment benefits for more than 1 million Americans and furloughed thousands of highway and transit workers. This bill compensates Transportation Department employees who were furloughed during the lapse in the Federal highway, highway and motor carrier safety, and public transit programs. Unfortunately, Republican Senator COBURN has now put a hold on H.R. 4786, which passed the House by voice vote last week, to address this problem for transportation workers.

The following programs are now being extended:

Unemployment Insurance: Extends unemployment benefits, including the increased payouts and longer duration of benefits from the Recovery Act through May 5.

Help with Health Insurance for Unemployed Workers, COBRA: Extends eligibility for the COBRA health insurance 65 percent subsidy for people who have lost their jobs through April 30.

Medicare Physician Payments: Extends current Medicare payment rates for physicians, preventing a 21 percent payment reduction, through April 30, 2010.

Flood Insurance: Extends the National Flood Insurance Program authorization through April 30.

Satellite Television: Extends the compulsory copyright license used by satellite television providers through April 30, 2010.

Compensation for Furloughed Employees: Provides compensation for federal employees furloughed during March 1 and 2 as the result of the lapse in expenditure authority from the Highway Trust Fund.

Medicare Therapy Caps Exceptions: Extends exceptions process for beneficiary payment limits on outpatient therapy services through April 30, 2010.

Poverty Guidelines: Extends current provision maintaining 2009 poverty guidelines through April 30, 2010, to prevent a lowering of the poverty line due to deflation in 2009.

This bill is the right thing to do. We still need to do more to put jobs in the hands of Americans. Unemployment in the Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown region climbed to 5.4 percent in October, according to a recent report from the Texas Workforce Commission. There were 152,300 people without jobs during the month out of a total civilian labor force of about 2.8 million, compared with 144,200 people, or 5.1 percent, unemployed out of a civilian labor force of 2.8 million in September, according to the TWC. The unemployment rate in October was up from 4 percent a year ago. Getting all Americans back to work is, and should be our number one priority.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join my colleagues in doing the right thing for the American people in these challenging economic times. We owe that to the people whom we are sent here to serve.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4851, the ''Continuing Extension Act of 2010.'' Earlier today, the Senate passed this critically important measure, which will provide short term extensions to several lapsed programs, including extended unemployment benefits and COBRA health insurance subsidies. The bill also ensures that physicians who care for Medicare patients will not suffer a debilitating cut in their reimbursement rates, which could potentially cause them to cease providing care.

We pass these needed and humane extensions tonight to ease the pain being felt by our fellow citizens around the country. I sincerely hope this is the last time we are forced to cut off this social lifeline because of the dilatory tactics of Senate Republicans. Food, shelter, and health care are too important to be subjected to petty political battles. I encourage all my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Senate amendments to H.R. 4851, the Continuing Extension Act of 2010. As its title suggests, this bill continues a number of vital programs affecting people's health and economic wellbeing. It deserves strong bipartisan support. I'd like to highlight several key components.

On the economic front, the legislation will ensure that hundreds of thousands of workers can maintain their unemployment benefits by extending and fully funding both the Emergency Unemployment Compensation and Extended Benefits programs for an additional 2 months. It also continues the $25 per week supplementary payment for all unemployment recipients.

With regard to health care, this legislation will continue the temporary COBRA premium assistance program through May 31 of this year. This program was created in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and provides a 65 percent COBRA premium subsidy for workers who have been involuntarily terminated. The subsidy is available for up to 15 months. This program has allowed workers who've lost their jobs during the recession to maintain their families' health insurance as they search for new employment. It is an important program and I am pleased to support this extension. I also look forward to pursuing legislation to extend this program through the end of the year.

The bill also protects Medicare for our senior citizens and people with disabilities by forestalling a 21 percent payment cut to Medicare physicians. Passage of this bill provides a reprieve until the end of May, but isn't a long term solution.

With regard to Medicare physician payments, the House passed legislation late last year that would have permanently solved our ongoing dilemma with the sustainable growth rate, SGR, physician payment formula in Medicare. Our legislation, H.R. 3961, would have created a new formula that emphasized primary care and encouraged physicians to join together in accountable care organizations to provide more efficient higher quality care.

I am committed to continuing to work with my colleagues in Congress, the Administration, and the physician community to eliminate the SGR and move to a revised payment formula that ensures that physicians are fairly compensated and enhances quality and efficiency in Medicare.

These programs are too important to let a few Republican Senators hold them hostage month by month. I urge my colleagues to vote yes to extend these vital programs now and to work with us on a bipartisan basis for longer term solution on them all.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, despite its obvious shortcomings.

On March 17, the House approved the prior version of this bill, which would have extended Federal unemployment, COBRA and related benefits, plus the Medicare "doc fix," through the month of April.

Everyone in this town knew those benefits and programs were poised to expire at the end of March if Congress failed to act. But because Senate Democrats refused to pay for a 1 month extension and House Democrats refused to pay for even a 1 week extension, hundreds of thousands have missed an unemployment benefit payment, among other painful effects.

Now that the Senate has finally acted, we are considering a bill to extend these programs, yet again. Only this time, the extension is not just for 1 month, but 2. Predictably, this will add twice as much to the already massive deficit—$18 billion instead of $9 billion.

Unfortunately, efforts in the Senate to add offsets, so that these important provisions do not add to the deficit, were defeated. And, disappointingly, as it has continued to do in recent months, the House is debating this bill today under procedures which do not even allow us to offer a paid-for alternative.

In the past, I have consistently voted for bills extending unemployment benefits. I will reluctantly vote for this bill today, because voting yes is the only way to continue these important benefits for laid off workers in my State, where the unemployment rate is a staggering 14 percent.

Simply put, we should not punish those workers for the failure of the Congress to find a way to pay for the extension of these benefits. Similarly, we shouldn't punish seniors, who risk losing access to doctors if we don't reverse the 21 percent cut in the physician fee schedule that took effect at the start of this month. We all knew this cut was coming, yet for the second time in as many months, the Democrats' failure to act allowed this cut to go into place.

But everyone should know this bill is far removed from what we really should be doing. What we should really be doing is paying for the new spending we approved, instead of simply adding it onto our already overcharged national credit card.

In the longer run, we all know that unemployed workers and their families need something more than another round of extended unemployment benefits. Most of all they need jobs. And jobs are something this majority has been totally incapable of producing.

A little over a year ago, Democrats promised their trillion-dollar stimulus plan would create 3.7 million jobs. Yet that bill was followed by 3 million more job losses. Unemployment rose to 10 percent instead of the 8 percent peak the other side promised. And now 16 million Americans are unemployed, with millions out of work for over a year, both all-time records.

They deserve our help, but they also deserve a job and a country not sinking ever deeper into debt.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are generous. And they know that these continued unemployment benefits—especially in areas of the country where jobs are scarce—are important. But they also deserve a Congress that acts responsibly.

It is too late to add offsets to this bill, and I am not prepared to vote against it for that shortcoming, since it would further hurt many who are most in need of our help. But the next time we deal with this issue, Members need to have a real choice so that we can help workers without hurting future taxpayers by driving up the debt by tens of billions of dollars.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 289, noes 112, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 211]

AYES—289

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Camp
Cao
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Giffords
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Heller
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—112

Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Culberson
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McKeon

McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Rehberg
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf

NOT VOTING—29

Barrett (SC)
Berry
Bilbray
Boehner
Boyd
Brown (SC)
Capito
Edwards (MD)
Gallegly
Gonzalez
Hoekstra
Jackson Lee (TX)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Luetkemeyer
McCotter
Meek (FL)
Miller (FL)
Neugebauer
Pence
Radanovich
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Speier
Tiahrt
Towns
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Young (AK)

□ 2008

Mr. YOUNG of Florida changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

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.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 1 p.m. tomorrow, and further, that when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, April 20, 2010, for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATING THE PHILADELPHIA DAILY NEWS

(Ms. SCHWARTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, today, it is my unique honor to congratulate Barbara Laker and Wendy Ruderman from the Philadelphia Daily News, winners of the prestigious 2010 Pulitzer Prize for investigative reporting. Their resourceful reporting exposed a rogue police narcotics squad, resulting in an FBI probe and in the review of hundreds of criminal cases tainted by the scandal.

Their investigative reporting series in the Philadelphia Daily News exposed allegations that a narcotics cop and his informant fabricated evidence so that the police could obtain warrants to enter homes and to make arrests. The series led to appropriate actions that better ensure the integrity and confidence that our law enforcement officers deserve.

Ms. Laker and Ms. Ruderman represent the finest tradition in the profession of journalism. Their commitment to journalistic principles, including the fulfillment of the role the press can play in exposing serious public failings, has earned them this prestigious prize and the accompanying well-deserved recognition.

Ms. Laker and Ms. Ruderman have brought excellence to the Philadelphia Daily News and to the Greater Philadelphia area. I congratulate them on their achievement and on the recognition they have received for their journalistic excellence.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF FALLEN ARMY RANGER CORPORAL MICHAEL JANKIEWICZ

(Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Corporal Michael Jankiewicz, a recently fallen Army Ranger. Only 23 years old, this young man was killed in Afghanistan on April 9 when his Osprey helicopter crashed in Zabul province, just about 200 miles southwest of Kabul.

Michael grew up in my district. After graduating from Ramsey High School in 2006, he pursued his childhood dream and enlisted in the U.S. Army. You know, his father recalled that, even at 3 years old, Michael was talking about becoming a U.S. soldier. While pursuing his dream, he became a true hero, serving two tours in Iraq and two additional tours in Afghanistan with the 75th Ranger Regiment stationed out of Fort Benning, Georgia.

As an active Army Ranger, he saw some of the most dangerous action, but when Michael talked about his service to his family, his father says he would typically just say, ''I just can't wait to get back to my platoon.''

This young corporal was part of our Nation's premier light infantry force. Every day that he wore his uniform, he dedicated his best to this great country. He was among some of the best soldiers in the world because of the careful screening process and arduous training the Rangers must endure.

Michael is survived by his mother, Serena; by his father and stepmother, Anthony and Carmen; by his grandfather, Abraham Friedman; by his sister, Michelle; by his stepsister, Noemi Cagley; and by his stepbrother, Hector Emmanuelli.

His dedication to his country and to his fellow soldiers represents his tremendous sense of loyalty and selflessness. Corporal Michael Jankiewicz is a true American hero. His country will never forget him. He will never be forgotten by his friends, by his family, or by this country for whom he fought.

□ 2015

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TITUS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ALTMIRE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ARIZONA IMMIGRATION BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss the consequences of our failure to pass comprehensive immigration reform.

On Tuesday, lawmakers in Arizona passed new immigration enforcement legislation that allows local law enforcement officials to single out undocumented immigrants based solely upon a ''reasonable belief'' that they are undocumented and imprison them for up to 6 months. This bill will significantly undermine the efforts of many law enforcement agencies towards curbing racial profiling by police throughout the country and will increase crime by taking cops off their beats fighting crime and instead using them to enforce Federal immigration laws.

Arizona would force untrained State police officers to take the role of Federal immigration agents and somehow make the determination of whether the person is documented or not based upon their subjective belief or observations. It effectively mandates local police to engage in racial profiling and discrimination. This law would mandate the arrest of a person who can't present documentation of legal status. We can imagine all sorts of abuses and unnecessary harassment that will result from such an ill-conceived law. When one goes to the grocery store or takes one's kids to school, do we take a passport with us? I know I don't.

The true culprit here, sadly, is the United States Congress, not Arizona. Because we have refused to take action, States are being pressured on all sides to act. States have haphazardly passed a patchwork of laws in an attempt to deal with the pressing issue of immigration. These local laws have unintended consequences which often lead to disastrous results, as we will surely see in Arizona.

The Arizona law is a symptom of our broken immigration system, and only Congress can truly solve the crisis. Immigration is fundamentally a Federal issue, and yet we here in Congress continue to fail in meeting our responsibility that's allocated to this body and the Federal Government. Until we can pass comprehensive immigration reform, these misguided local laws will continue to be passed in vain attempts to address the issue at a local level,

and we will continue to suffer from the unintended consequences and abuses that they foster.

Yes, Arizona will suffer because of this law. How can we expect to recover from our recession if we chase away our workers, shrink our tax base, and scare honest, hardworking American families? Blanket discrimination and persecution is not the way to solve the immigration or economic crisis.

In order to prevent more States from following in Arizona's footsteps, I encourage my colleagues in Congress to act immediately to pass comprehensive immigration reform.

NO JUSTICE FOR LINDSAY BRASHIER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, Evelyn Mezzich is 32 years of age. She has a husband, a 2-year-old son, and she has a college degree she earned in the United States.

Evelyn Mezzich is also a charged killer and an absconder from the law. In a gross miscarriage of justice, she has been allowed to live out her luxurious life in her native country of Peru. She has never had to face the justice system for her crimes in the United States. She didn't have to face the consequences of her reckless conduct while living in America.

You see, in 1996, Evelyn Mezzich was driving drunk in Texas. She fell asleep at the wheel and had a head-on collision with a telephone poll. Mezzich had minor injuries, but in the collision she killed her 18-year-old roommate, Lindsay Brashier, and permanently paralyzed a third passenger.

Mezzich was indicted for intoxication manslaughter in Texas. What that means is she was charged with a felony of drinking, driving, and killing somebody.

After posting bail, she and her parents snuck out of town, and they headed back to their home country of Peru. Mezzich continues to live an unapologetic lifestyle in Peru without remorse or without reform. A few years ago, she put up a MySpace page on the Internet. She posted pictures of herself drinking and partying with friends. She had a wild bachelorette party, also drinking and partying with her girlfriends, complete with a male stripper. She listed her favorite song as Nelly Furtado's ''Promiscuous Girl.''

Here's a photograph that she placed on the Internet with some of her friends; and, of course, she is the one with the drink, partying, having a good time, all the while escaping justice in Texas for the crime that she had committed. She actually listed on her MySpace page that drinking and partying with friends was one of her favorite activities. She listed her motto: ''Life's too short; so live it up.'' Obviously, she has not changed her attitude or lifestyle.

Madam Speaker, Evelyn Mezzich knows better than anyone how short life is. She is responsible for tragically cutting short the life of another person, Lindsay Brashier, an 18-year-old honor student who was just beginning in the prime of her life.

This is a photograph of Lindsay taken shortly before the homicide in Texas. She wanted to be a surgeon; and, thanks to Evelyn, Lindsay never had that chance.

After Evelyn Mezzich jumped bail in Texas, a warrant was issued for her arrest. In 2001, the FBI found Mezzich, who was, ironically, having a good time on her honeymoon. But a bizarre loophole in the U.S. and Peruvian extradition laws meant that Mezzich would remain free. Since 2001, that loophole has been fixed, but Mezzich's not about to come back to America to stand trial. She's having too much fun in Peru.

Madam Speaker, it's time for Evelyn Mezzich to be brought back to Texas and to stand trial for the homicide of this person, Lindsay Brashier, a homicide that occurred 14 years ago. But Peru refuses to allow the criminal to be extradited. You see, it seems that Evelyn Mezzich's father is a big shot in Peru and apparently is using his influence to keep his drunk little girl from facing the music in the United States. It's a flagrant disregard for the provisions of the extradition treaty between Peru and our country. Daddy's reputation as a prominent doctor appears to be shielding his daughter from criminal extradition for homicide.

This intolerable behavior by the Peruvian Government is nonsense. By allowing Evelyn Mezzich to live in comfort and security, they are committing a grave injustice against the family of Lindsay Brashier and against Lindsay's memory.

During this month and during next week, we honor crime victims like Lindsay. Lindsay's mother, Marilyn Datz, has dedicated these past 14 years to get justice for her daughter; yet no justice has occurred.

So I urge the Department of Justice and the State Department to press Peru to overturn Peru's refusal to extradite and bring Evelyn Mezzich back to Texas to face the music. Let a jury decide what to do with this fugitive from justice. Because, Madam Speaker, justice is what we do in the United States, and it's about time there was some justice for Lindsay Brashier.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, it's the end of the week. Another week has gone by, and the Middle East continues to be a tinderbox waiting to explode. Abraham Lincoln said, ''Let the people know the facts and the country will be saved.'' And one of the things that bothers me is it's hard for us to get the facts sometimes.

The President of the United States, Mr. Obama, this week had a summit that was supposed to deal with nuclear proliferation. And they had leaders from all over the world there, and they were talking about how to stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons from getting into countries that may cause a problem and weapons that might get into terrorists' hands that could destroy an awful lot of the human race.

But he didn't talk about Iran. It almost never happens anymore. He doesn't talk about Iran. They say that there are going to be sanctions put on Iran that's going to stop them from developing their nuclear weapons program, but the sanctions never take place. We have been talking about sanctions, I know, now for at least 5 or 6 years, and Iran just keeps thumbing their nose at the rest of the world, the United Nations, the United States, and everybody, and they continue to build a nuclear weapons program. They say they're not, but they are, and I think everybody in the world knows it.

Now, this week, the head of the Iranian Nuclear Commission—I think that's the title he has—said that the Bushehr nuclear power plant will be operational in just a couple of months, the production of nuclear fissionable material within a couple of months. And our military leaders say that Iran could have a nuclear weapon in as little as 1 year, and some people say a lot quicker than that. Yet instead of doing something about it, we continue to fool around talking about putting sanctions on them week after week, month after month, year after year, and they continue to build a nuclear weapons program.

And when the head of Israel comes here, Mr. Netanyahu, the Prime Minister. The President gives him the cold shoulder and starts telling him if he doesn't do certain things that we're not going to be supporting them, as we should be. And I think that's terrible. Our only real strong ally in the Middle East that has been with us through thick and thin is Israel, and we should be supporting them right now and doing everything we can to keep the Middle East from going up in smoke. Because if Iran gets a nuclear weapon, there's no question in my mind that they'll use it if they get an opportunity. Because Mr. Ahmadinejad, the President of Iran, continues to say he wants, as his number one objective, to wipe Israel off the face of the Earth. And I can tell you right now if I know Bibi Netanyahu, and I think I do, he's not going to let that happen. So because we are fooling around, we are

still dealing with the possibility of a major conflagration over there.

Now, how does that affect the Middle East? Well, Israel is in jeopardy, but if Iran gets nuclear weapons and we don't do something about it and Israel doesn't, then all those countries around there are going to be intimidated, and they are all going to start moving toward radical Islam. That's my view, anyhow. And that is something we can't allow to happen. We can't allow that whole area to go down that road.

But in addition to that, we get about 30 percent or 40 percent of our energy from the Middle East, and if that happens, we are going to have trouble getting the oil that we need to keep our lights on, to keep the gasoline in our cars, and all the other things that we do with energy.

So I would just like to say that, instead of holding these conferences, if I were talking to him, Mr. President, and I know I can't, but if I were, I would say quit fooling around. Get with the program. Let Ahmadinejad and the Iranians know that we are not going to stand by and let them become a nuclear power with nuclear weapons. Because if they do, if they continue down that path, we along with Israel will do whatever is necessary to stop them.

They need to know that. As long as they know we're just talking and pushing papers around and talking about sanctions, they are not going to stop. They are only going to stop when they know we mean business. And, Mr. President, you are sure not giving them the right signal, in my opinion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. FOXX addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. BLACKBURN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ROHRABACHER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 2030

HONORING THE LIFE OF RICHARD J. MORGAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, on September 11, 2001, almost 3,000 individuals were victims of the most devastating act of terror in our Nation's history. First responders and civilians, mothers and fathers, husband and wives, friends and neighbors, the terrorists acted with impunity toward their victims, and our Nation still mourns this tragic loss.

This evening I'd like to specifically remember one of those victims, and that is Richard J. Morgan. Morgan, or Dick as he was known to his friends, was many things to many people. He was an adoring husband to his wife, Patricia, a beloved father to his four children, a proud grandfather to his seven grandchildren, and a respected colleague to all that he worked with, and also a cherished friend to those who were fortunate enough to ever have known him.

Dick graduated with a degree in civil engineering from Manhattan College and an MBA from New York University, and he would go on to serve his Nation in the National Guard.

Then in 1967, he and Patricia settled down in the little town of Glen Rock, New Jersey, where they became active participants in their community and a local church as well.

For 41 years, Dick worked with Con Edison, being promoted all the way from being a splicer to serving as vice president of emergency management. It was in that capacity that Dick raced to the World Trade Center on that fateful Tuesday morning. And like so many other brave first responders, Dick responded to the call of duty. He ran into the smoke and the fire but, sadly, he was lost when the North Tower collapsed at 10:28 a.m. At the time of his death, Dick was coordinating the emergency response, along with the Fire Department of New York with their chief of department. Today, quite fittingly, Dick is the only civilian memorialized with the Fire Department of New York Randall's Island Training Facility for having given his life in the line of duty on September 11, 2001.

Recently, I became aware that Dick had not been nominated for the 9/11 Heroes Medal of Valor and, as a result, had been incorrectly classified as simply a visitor on the National September 11 Memorial, instead of a first responder classification that he deserved. So over the past few months my staff has worked with the Department of Justice to ensure that this heroic first responder was properly memorialized. And last month I was happy to hear that the family has been assured that their request has now been granted. And I am thankful to the Department of Justice, to my colleagues from New York, and the many others who assisted in swiftly rectifying this oversight.

Proper recognition for our fallen heroes is but a small token of gratitude when compared with the enormous sacrifice. Whether at the World Trade Center, on the battlefield, or in the communities, our soldiers and first responders, they all take a great risk to keep us safe, and they sometimes pay the tremendous sacrifice.

And what can we here do in return? Well, we can remember their service. We can live worthy of their sacrifice and take every single opportunity to thank them and the ones that they leave behind.

On behalf of a grateful Nation, I express my sincere gratitude to Dick Morgan and pledge to his family that his example will not be forgotten. Dick will always be remembered as a man who epitomized valor, cherished opportunity to serve, and actively made his community a better place. He earned the respect of so many through his hard work, through his commitment and a genuine interest in the lives and the fates of others.

So I am proud to represent Dick's family here in Congress, and our entire Nation can be proud of the sacrifice of this American hero.

THE PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I'll claim the time for the Progressive Caucus tonight. I have some boards that

are going to assist me in the presentation, so we'll just take a very brief moment to get set up here.

Madam Speaker, my name is KEITH ELLISON, and I am here yet again on behalf of the Progressive Caucus to talk about a progressive message, a progressive message, the idea of which, Madam Speaker, is to help convey to the American people that there is a body of Members of this United States Congress who care about making America fairer, more inclusive, greater respect for due process of law, promoting peace around the world. There is a Progressive Caucus in the United States Congress. Many Members are a part of it, over 80; and we are advocating policies that would make America at peace with its neighbors, promoting peace around the world, being a force for bringing nations together.

We here are talking about immigration reform. And I'm joined today by one of our very best speakers and a freshman leader here in the Congress who has distinguished himself very early on in many areas, Mr. JARED POLIS, who I'm going to yield to in just a moment.

But tonight, Madam Speaker, we're going to be talking about taxes because today is tax day. We're going to be talking about taxes from a progressive point of view. The point is that the United States Congress has been doing some tax cutting on behalf of the American people—but not from the perspective of the people who've been most blessed among us—from the perspective of the hardworking folks who have to put it down every day to make it; those folks who can use a small tax cut to make sure that they can meet their needs, groceries, things they need around the house.

As a matter of fact, Madam Speaker, you pay fewer taxes under President Obama than under President Bush. This may not apply to the most wealthy Americans, but it applies to the vast majority of Americans. And so it's in this spirit today that we're going to be talking about a progressive message as we discuss progressive taxation, which are the dues that we pay in a civilized society to make our society function properly.

And so I'd just like to yield to the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. JARED POLIS, who's joined me tonight. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Well, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota. And people know, taxes are relative to one's income. I've heard from many people, and of course in this recession people are hurting across the board from the wealthy to the poor. And I think even those who pay the highest rate of tax, many of them would say, you know, I would gladly pay the tax rate we had in the Clinton administration if I had the income that we had through the nineties.

What you pay is relative to how much you earn. Currently, the highest marginal rate at 35 percent, with the expiration of the Bush tax cuts will return to 39.6 percent. That's the same rate it was when people were doing very well during the boom years.

Taxes are the investment. They're the price that we pay for the freedoms that we enjoy in our country. They're what fund our public projects and, yes, worthy and unworthy. I, as a taxpayer, wasn't happy that my taxes were going to fund the Iraq war, and continue to. But that's what our representative system is all about.

And I know there's many Americans out there today who weren't happy that their taxes might go to help provide health care for those who can't afford it. But the fact is, it's the price we pay for the freedoms that we enjoy as Americans, and we enjoy more freedoms as Americans than people anywhere else in the world.

The noble experiment that was begun by our Founding Fathers over two centuries ago has evolved over the years and become something that every one of them would be proud of having given birth to.

We invest in many public projects. You know, in the nature of a democracy, each and every citizen, in fact, each and every Member of Congress is not likely to agree with every item that's spent. I know I don't. I voted ''no'' on some. I know my colleague from Minnesota voted ''no'' on some. Our colleagues and friends on the other side of the aisle voted against some of those. But this is a representative democracy.

We here in Congress, each serving and being elected by our constituents, are doing our best to allocate those dollars in a way to provide for the common good, the very concept that is conceptualized so effectively in our founding documents. That's what we do every day.

And this being tax time, everybody is reminded of how much they have to pay. And I think it's also important for us to remind them how much they get, the fact that people all over the world would risk dying, going across the desert to try to live in our country, what America stands for, globally, in terms of freedom, of unprecedented levels of prosperity that our middle-class families enjoy. That's what the American Dream is all about. That's what our country is all about.

And, no, it's not just the government that establishes this dream. But what it is is it's the rule of law, and it's a government formed among men governing by the consent of the governed to provide for the common good. We won't always get it right. But that's the investment that we're making when we pay taxes.

And even though I opposed the Iraq war and didn't like to see my tax dollars go there, even though I continue to oppose the escalation of troops in Afghanistan, and don't want to see my tax dollars going there, I know that the investment I make in paying my taxes is one that I can be proud of as an American. Knowing that it goes through title I to serve schools across our country that serve at-risk youth; knowing that it goes to help make health care more affordable for American families; knowing that it goes to help so that people who are unemployed don't lose their homes, can still put food on the table for their families; to know that our seniors have health care; to know that our young people have health care, and we're making it more accessible for people in the middle; to know that we're funding our roads, our bridges, our infrastructure, our arteries of commerce that empower the private sector to produce the prosperity that has made America unique—that's what it means to pay taxes.

That's why every year, in April, when I pay mine, I feel that same lump in my throat and in my belly as every American; but I know, deep inside, that I would not trade it for anything else. And I am proud that I have this opportunity to be able to contribute to this greatest of the great countries and help America continue to be a beacon unto the nations and a light for future generations.

I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Well, I thank the gentleman for yielding back. I got a little misty there. Listening to the gentleman from Colorado, I think he just made an excellent statement about the importance of paying taxes in our society.

None of us wants to fork it over on tax day. We all kind of do it feeling like, gee whiz, I wish I could keep this dough. But the fact of the matter is that if you like great roads, if you want EMS service, if you want the United States military to protect the borders of this country, if you want police, if you want fire, if you want public schools, if you want Head Start, if you want Medicare, if you want TRICARE, if you want Social Security, if you want things like bridges and infrastructure and many other important public services, taxes are what we have to pay.

Now, I agree with the gentleman. You know, there are things that my tax dollars go to that I wish they didn't go to. But you know what? The fact is that we live in a representative democracy, and that's just the way it is. That's why we get out and we engage in the public debate to argue how and where our tax dollars are allocated. But never forget, not even for a moment, that taxes are the dues that we pay to live in a civilized society.

The fact is, though, that Democrats have been, and progressives have been, pretty good at cutting taxes for Americans. The fact is, here's a quote from somebody who was an adviser to Ronald Reagan. And I know my friends in the Republican Caucus love to brag about Ronald Reagan.

Here's what this gentleman, Mr. Bruce Bartlett, had to say about this

issue: Federal taxes are very considerably lower by every measure since Obama became President.

Now, you would think the way they bang on President Obama that he's just a tax-and-spend liberal. That's what they like to tell you, but it's not true.

The fact is, taxes targeted to working-class people can help stimulate the economy. What we're opposed to from the Progressive Caucus is giving tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans, which create deficits which all the rest of us have to bear.

But the Obama administration and the Democratic Caucus in Congress have helped to lower the burden on Americans so that Americans can take care and pay for the things that they need.

As I said before, here's an important board I'd like to draw folks' attention to. You pay fewer taxes under President Obama than under President Bush. Note, this may not apply to the wealthiest Americans. But if you're working hard every day, if you're putting it down every day, if you're working hard for a living and you're part of the great middle class, you pay lower taxes than under George W. Bush, and that is an important thing to bear in mind.

Every congressional Republican voted against a tax cut for 95 percent of America. Let me say it one more time: every congressional Republican voted against a tax cut for 95 percent of American families. So we're not talking about who's for tax cuts and who's against them. We're talking about who's for tax cuts for the middle class people and who's for tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans.

I just want to be clear: I have friends who have been very blessed and have economic wealth, and I think that's just fine. I'm not against that at all. But I do say that to whom much is given, much is expected. And that goes to taxes as well. And so I'm not in favor of cutting the taxes of the wealthiest Americans. I'm in favor of cutting the taxes of Americans who are struggling hard every day to put food on the table for their family. That's who I think needs the tax cut. And I'm going to just tell you one more thing about that.

□ 2045

When very, very, very, very well-to-do people get a tax cut, they don't need the money. It can sit up in an account somewhere. But when working-class people get a tax cut, working-class people put that money back into the economy. And that means that if they're using their little tax cut to go out and purchase an item that they need to help their family—whether it's electronic goods or whether it's a new washing machine, whatever it is—they're putting that money into the economy.

Let's say they build a new washing machine. Then somebody at some local retailer who sells washing machines is going to make a sale. And if that sale is made, then they're going to have revenue for their retail outlet, which means they're going to be able to keep my nephew and yours on the payroll at that particular retail outlet. And then the manufacturer may be able to stay in business as well.

So the fact is that when working people get a tax cut, it actually has a stimulative effect for the economy; whereas, if the very well-to-do get a tax cut, like the Republicans like to do, that really doesn't help the economy very much because the very definition of being rich is you don't need the money. So you might spend it and you may not. Who knows. But working-class people use those tax cuts.

And so when every congressional Republican voted against a tax cut for 95 percent of Americans—as I said, when every congressional Republican voted against a tax cut for 95 percent of American families, I think the American people ought to know that, because the people who claim to be the big tax cutters really are not very good at cutting taxes for people who could actually use a tax cut. They're just good at cutting taxes for people who really don't need one and who have plenty of money anyway.

So let me just go through a few things.

Since coming to Congress and assuming the Presidency, the Democratic agenda has made historic progress through creating jobs, cutting taxes for working Americans, and investing in the future prosperity of our country. This year, millions of American working families are paying fewer taxes and getting record refunds. This is not a coincidence. This is because of the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act, also known as the stimulus bill, but quite separate from the bailout which happened under George Bush's watch.

Over one-third of the Recovery Act is tax cuts for the middle class. Very important. Over one-third of the Recovery Act is tax cuts for the middle class. The Recovery Act has already provided about $160 billion in tax cuts to American families and businesses. Nearly $100 billion, nearly 100 billion, nearly $100 billion of that has gone directly into the pockets of working families. And this year's average refund is about $3,000, about a 10 percent increase over last year. That's a good thing for families who need money to keep on moving.

Federal taxes—as I just read a moment ago, a former Republican adviser to President Ronald Reagan said, Federal taxes are very considerably lower by every measure since Obama became President, and yet the Republican caucus bangs on President Obama relentlessly, mercilessly all the time. But the fact is he is better at lowering taxes for working-class people than George Bush was. This is by their own expert Bruce Bartlett. I wonder how they're going to try to misrepresent that.

Since last year, this Democratic Congress and President Obama have enacted more than $800 billion for working families and small businesses. The Making Work Pay tax cut. That gives 95 percent of working families an immediate and sustained tax relief. Now, that's a big deal. Making Work Pay.

The fact is, the well-to-do in our country, they get tax cuts all the time. But what about people who are working hard every day? This tax cut where 95 percent of American working families got immediate and sustained tax relief was an important thing. It was about $400 for the individual, $800 for joint filings. That is very important.

Here's another tax credit. Child tax credit cuts taxes for families and more than 16 million children by reducing the minimum amount of earned income used to calculate the tax credit from $3,000 to about $12,000.

The earned income tax credit. Very important antipoverty program. Earned income tax credit expands the credit increasing it for families with three or more children. This is also very important. The earned income tax credit, an active, antipoverty program which helps working people and even low-income people. It's a good thing.

The American opportunity tax credit. Up to $2,500 in tax credits to help an additional 4 million students attend college. Now, the university doors and the college doors have to stay open to the American middle class and the poor, but if you allow the other caucus, the Republican caucus to stay in charge, those doors are slowly going to be shut. But under the Democratic majority and under the progressive leadership of President Obama, we've seen the American opportunity tax credit, up to $2,500 in tax credit, to help an additional 4 million students attend college. This is a progressive thing. It's a good thing brought to you by the Democrats.

The alternative minimum tax relief. Now, this protects 26 million middle class Americans from being hit by the AMT. In the 1970s, Members of Congress said, You know what? There are some people, some folks who aren't paying any taxes at all, so we're going to have something called the alternative minimum tax to make sure everybody pays something. But because it wasn't indexed over the years, inflation made it so that people who were in the middle class were getting hit by this tax. The Democrats, under the leadership of President Obama and NANCY PELOSI, helped to protect 26 million middle class Americans being hit by the AMT. Very, very important.

First-time home buyer tax credit increases existing credit to $8,000 and removes the repayment requirement.

All totaled, the Democratic-led 111th Congress has enacted more than $800 billion in tax credits with another $285 billion making their way through Congress, such as permanent estate tax relief and R&D tax credits to spur business innovation. Many of these tax cuts are immediate, and more than half of the Recovery Act tax cuts already

are in the hands of the American families and businesses. And $40 billion of the tax credits, or 4 million small businesses offering health care coverage to their employees starting this year. That's an immediate benefit for small businesses who want to offer health care to their employees to get a tax credit, a big deal to help people get health care and to help small businesses in the same swing.

So the fact is the Recovery Act, it takes 25 tax cuts for Americans, including the fastest and one of the most widely shared tax cuts in American history, the Making Work Pay tax cut credit or tax cut. Ninety-five percent of Americans benefited from it. Not one Republican voted for it. Think about that when you think about who is looking out for the American people and trying to cut taxes, even though we started this session tonight talking about the importance of taxes and the fact that some taxes are necessary. And we don't run from that idea.

The fact is taxes are the dues you pay to live in a civilized society. But despite that, the Democrats, under the leadership of President Obama and Speaker PELOSI, have been cutting taxes. This is an important thing for people to bear in mind and think about as they go forward, particularly on this Tax Day, particularly as they think about their refund. Who helped you get that, Madam Speaker? It was the party in the majority.

The Recovery Act also gives a tax cut by making your home more efficient, buying a house, buying a car, and sending a child to college; all very important. The result of the Recovery Act is that tax refunds are already up 10 percent, pushing average refunds to a record $3,000 per taxpayer. That is huge.

So Congress has enacted job-creating tax incentives to spur hiring out-of-work Americans, strengthening small businesses with tax credits and accelerated write-offs so they can expand more and hire more.

One of the taxes is the business incentive to create jobs; 10 billion over 10 years. It involves a lot things which I'm going to talk about in a moment, but the main thing is that we need to understand that while taxes are the dues that we pay to live in a civilized society, the people who represent the majority in this Congress are actively trying to reduce that burden so that Americans can have a little extra money in their pockets, not so much the well-to-do people who already have enough.

The fact is folks who are working so hard every day to put food on the table, maybe the washing machine broke, they've got to get a new one, these things are going to help their families out quite a bit.

And I really admire those families who are well to do and who may not have been among those 95 percent who got a tax cut. Many of them know, however, that their good fortune is because of the public and the taxes people before them have paid: the people who pay the taxes for roads and bridges; the people who pay the taxes for our universities and colleges; the people who pay for Head Start, Social Security; people who pay for fire and roads, firefighters, police officers, to make our society a good place to live. These folks understand that, and so they don't complain about paying taxes. They pay them because they know that it's what we need to have a society that is free from foreign aggression, that our streets are safe, that there are firefighters out there looking out for Americans. And if they should have a problem with a fire in their home or business, we understand.

So this is not a matter of dividing well-to-do Americans from the rest of us. It's a matter of saying, Look. Middle class folks need a tax cut too, and the well-to-do have gotten well cared for while the Republicans have been in charge, and many of the policies that they enacted have brought us this recession that we're just trying to emerge from now. But the fact is, if you invest in the middle class through tax cuts, it will pay dividends in the long run.

And we're already starting to see unemployment decrease. Won't be long before we have positive job growth because of these important tax relief policies that Democrats, led by President Obama and Nancy PELOSI, have led to enact.

So, let me move on and talk a little bit about my own State of Minnesota. It's a State where people work hard every day. We're a State where we're very proud. We have among the highest voter turnout in the entire country. I'm proud to announce that only one State has a greater response to the census than our great State of Minnesota, and those are our neighbors to the east, Wisconsin. We're coming to get you, Wisconsin. We want to be first in that.

But the fact is I'm so proud to be from the State of Minnesota. It's a wonderful place, and there is no prettier place than Minnesota, especially in the springtime.

But I want to talk about the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act which significantly cut taxes for Minnesota families, too. Two million families in Minnesota. That is the number of families in Minnesota that will receive a tax cut of up to $400 or $800 for a married joint filing couple under the Making Work Pay tax credit that is included in the Recovery Act.

Also, 895,000 individuals are the number of people in Minnesota living on Social Security and supplemental security income and railroad retirement income and veterans benefits who will receive a one-time recovery payment of $250 under the Recovery Act.

And then, also, 157,000 families in Minnesota are the folks who benefited from the Federal tax credits for college expenses. Minnesota is a high education State. We have some of the highest ACT scores in the Nation, and we take education very seriously in the State of Minnesota. So it's really a great benefit that so many families will be able to benefit from the Federal tax credits for college expenses.

So in 2009 and in 2010, families in Minnesota with children in college will be able to claim a larger Federal tax credit, and that's a good thing for even me and my family since I've got two kids in college right now. And you know how tough that can be. There are more than 41,000 students in Minnesota, 41,000 students in Minnesota who previously did not benefit from the college tax credit but will now benefit as a result of the Recovery Act. That's a lot of people. A lot of young people saying, You know what? I have enhanced my skill, developed my mind, and can contribute to this society of ours in a greater way because Democrats believe in reducing and offering tax credits for me to be able to do what I've got to do.

□ 2100

For 182,000 children in Minnesota, that's the number of children in Minnesota who will benefit from the expanded child tax credit that's included in the Recovery Act.

And, of course, children need a tax relief, too, because that's where their parents can afford to get them the things they need, whether they be clothes or school supplies or food or anything like that. Children need their families to have less to have to pay if, as long as it's responsible, as long as it's paid for, as long as it makes sense, it's a good thing.

Again, I don't want to go too far. Because the fact is, folks, while I believe in cutting taxes for people, I also just want to remind folks taxes are the dues that we pay to live in a civilized society. Taxes pay to keep our roads nice and taxes pay to fill up the potholes in places like Minnesota where we have come through a large, tough, winter.

Taxes pay for police officers, taxes pay for firefighters, taxes pay for public works employees, taxes pay our soldiers so that they can defend our country, and taxes go to pay for Head Start to educate our children at university and at the middle, K–12 level.

So I am not here to say taxes are bad. That's a Republican thing to say that taxes are evil or that taxes are a punishment or that they are punitive. I don't believe that at all. I don't believe that for a second.

But I do say that when we can responsibly cut taxes to the middle class, we should do so. We should do so. That's just common sense, and the Democrats have proven that we believe that because we did it. And the fact is we didn't get any Republican support to do that. Because, as I just want to remind you for those of you who maybe just tuned in, every congressional Republican voted against a tax cut for 95 percent of Americans. I don't how they

can stand up and call themselves looking out for the American middle class with a straight face, but I am sure they will manage somehow.

Let me also talk a little bit more about Minnesota businesses. Because, of course, in Minnesota we believe in entrepreneurship. We believe that people should allow their creative talents to bring their services and goods to the market so that other people can participate in those and enjoy those things for a fair price and, therefore, those businesses can hire people, and we can really have our economy working well.

So I just want to mention, you know, that the Recovery Act significantly cut taxes for businesses as well, about 385,000 sole proprietors, 385,000 sole proprietors in Minnesota that filed with the IRS in 2007. Well, the fact is the Recovery Act provided relief for those businesses by providing, one, tax breaks for small businesses, expensing and bonus appreciation, businesses that purchased new capital equipment, providing small businesses with temporary, 5-year net operating loss, carryback, and providing small businesses with estimated tax payment relief, and excluding 75 percent of the gains on small business stock from capital gains purchased in 2009 and 2010 and, finally, providing businesses with relief from paying taxes on income resulting from discharged debt.

Minnesota businesses, again, about $1.1 billion, about $1.1 billion is the amount of additional dollars in the hands of consumers in the State of Minnesota as a result of Making Work Pay. That means that if you take that tax cut that 95 percent of all Americans benefited from and you bring it right to the great State of Minnesota and you ask yourself, well, how much did that mean to the Minnesota economy, that's $1.1 billion that our families have to be able to spend on their needs so that they can make their ends meet, and they can put that money into the economy to help bolster the sales for our businesses that are out there.

Moving right along, about 538 units, about 538 units, housing units, are being constructed in Minnesota under a low-income housing tax credits exchange program that was enacted as part of the Recovery Act. That's a lot of houses, a lot of places for people to live, and that's a very, very big deal.

So I just want to say that I think that Democrats who responsibly cut taxes on the middle class, not the irresponsible tax cuts for the well-to-do who don't even need a tax cut, but Democrats responsibly cutting taxes for the middle class are helping America get stronger and get better after an 8-year nightmare where they cut taxes for the richest people, didn't enforce the financial regulation, allowed Wall Street to run wild, and allowed predatory mortgage lending to take place. Now we pay the awful price for that, but it's a good thing because Democrats to the rescue are making sure that this economy is coming back strong, in part by responsible tax cuts to the middle class, and I am proud of that.

Let me move on to just talk a little bit about, just pose a question to people who may be listening, Mr. Speaker, and the question is, are you better off on Tax Day? There is a group called Third Way that prepares a report and asks the question, are you better off on Tax Day? And here are a few things that they found, Mr. Speaker, that I would just like to share with you.

Third Way compares three average middle-class families' tax returns from the 2007 to the 2009 returns under President Obama. They posed a question, is the average middle-class American better off under Obama's tax policies or under Bush? They compare the differences between tax credits offered by the Bush administration and the Republican Congress to those offered by Obama and the Democratic Congress. And in every case the answer was, without question, yes, Americans are better off with President Obama in the White House and Democrats in Congress.

This Third Way report, which I hope people will take a look at, says definitively on many measures that Americans are simply better off. Democrats are just better at managing the economy. We are better when it comes to deficits, better when it comes to tax cuts, better when it comes to jobs, better, better, better.

Of course, if you are a very super rich person, you may have to pay some taxes that you didn't have to pay before. But the fact is you have better services for it, and you have the pride of knowing that you are making a contribution to your fellow Americans, improving the quality of life for everybody, not just yourself. I think that means a huge deal for people. Because I think Americans, even well-to-do Americans, are extremely patriotic and want to know that their fellow Americans are doing well and that the ladder of opportunity has not been pulled up, as Republicans always try to do, but that it's still there for Americans who want to work hard and climb that ladder from the poor or even the middle class up to a higher income level.

So I just also want to talk about some results from the tax justice report on the Obama tax cuts. This Citizens for Tax Justice report says the following. The analysis notes that 53 percent of Americans believe that the President has kept taxes the same, 24 percent believe the President has raised taxes, and only 12 believe the President has cut taxes. But the fact is he has cut taxes overwhelmingly. This was part of the spin machine that we hear all the time and we are trying to correct tonight.

But by the analysis of the Citizens for Tax Justice, tax cuts enacted by Obama and the Democratic Congress reduced the Federal income taxes for the tax year 2009 for, actually, they find, 98 percent of all working families. I just said 95, but according to this think tank it's even higher than that.

The Citizens for Tax Justice also observe one reason why the broader American public may not realize that the President cut their 2009 taxes is that the tax cut that affected most people took effect gradually by reducing withholding on wages. So you see a little more in your paycheck every week, but it's still there, still there for you to be better off and do what you need to do for your family.

They also note, well, I would also add that the spin machine doesn't help. But the fact is, it's there. The folks have it.

This Center for Tax Justice also says that, in addition to massive middle-class tax cuts, the Recovery Act made direct cash payments to a large population of Americans, including Social Security recipients, and extended unemployment benefits to out-of-work Americans.

And, so, this report, which I am going to hold up so people can see, this is kind of small type, but I just hope folks can look at that, see, right there, it says President Obama cut taxes for 98 percent of working families in 2009. Mr. Speaker, I think that's pretty good. I think that that's all right, and I think that's something to be commended, something to be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, as I just want to keep saying, you know, as I am standing up here talking about cutting taxes, I don't want any of the folks who might be tuned in tonight to get the impression that I am against taxes. I am in favor of paying the dues that we must pay in order to have a civilized society. I don't want people to pay more than they should pay, and I certainly do want every dollar to be used responsibly.

I am totally against any kind of wasteful spending or boondoggles, and I am absolutely against the spending that we did to fight the Iraq war, which was offered to us by President Bush and the Republicans. They told us it was weapons of mass destruction and everything else, and none of that was true. That was an enormous expense on the American people, not to mention loss of life, both Americans and Iraqis.

But the fact is is that I don't like every expenditure that the government makes, but the fact is that in a democratic society we have the majority rules. We elect the President and trust that those decisions will be made responsibly. They are not always done that way, but I wouldn't change this system for any system in the world.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, tonight we are talking about taxes. Tonight is, today is Tax Day. Many Americans are probably still rushing out to the mailbox to make sure that that tax filing gets into the mailbox and gets stamped tonight so that they can get their taxes in on time, and maybe the ones who are the early birds have already done that a long time ago and taken care of

that business. But the bottom line is, Mr. Speaker, that today, Tax Day, is a big deal in America.

It's the day that we can stop and think about how lucky, how we have benefited by being in this great country of ours, where we have a great Constitution that protects our liberties. We have great public employees who work hard every day to make sure Americans have good services, teachers, firefighters, police officers, people who work in Head Start every day to try to help the children, people who really get out there and give all they have to help Americans.

It's a great day to just think about how lucky we are as Americans to have the Medicare system to help our seniors, TRICARE to help our soldiers, and now we are going to have over 32 million Americans get health care under the newly passed health care bill. These things, our taxes go to these things, and I am proud that they do.

It means that we live in a society that has compassion, it means we have a society that is responsible, that is going to meet the needs of all Americans, and it means that it is going to be done in a responsible way. Not the way the Republican caucus has done in the past, which is just cuts taxes for the wealthiest Americans and then creates massive deficits, but in a responsible way that's paid for and that broad cross-sections of Americans benefit from.

This is the kind of tax cut that we need. This is the kind of help that we need. Not the Bush-type tax cuts but Obama tax cuts, which go to benefit large percentages of Americans.

Every congressional Republican voted against a tax cut for 95 percent of American families, Mr. Speaker. These 95 percent of Americans, I betcha they are going to be remembering that come November.

Anyway, the fact is that this is a very important day. This is Tax Day. This is the day that we think about our investment in our country. This is the day that we say, you know what? Not everything the government spends money on I agree with, but I am happy that I am in America and can benefit from living in this great country.

Being an American is not free. If you have the income to help pay the dues, to pay the costs of this society, you should help. There is nothing wrong with it. It's not a punishment. Some of our Republican caucus friends will say it's a punishment or taxes are evil or they are bad or something like that. They shouldn't be higher than they are supposed to be, but they ought to be high enough to pay for the needs of the government so we don't have massive deficits.

□ 2115

And yet they have created these massive deficits that Democrats are trying to dig us out of right now.

So let me just say, as I begin to wind down—and just signaling to my Republican Caucus folks that if they're going to take the rest of the time, it might be a good time to think about getting up—the fact is that under Democratic leadership we passed a bill that would promote hiring incentives. We passed health care legislation that would promote health care and small businesses to be getting a tax credit in order to cover Americans to offer them health care. We have offered tax cuts to 95 percent of Americans.

Democrats believe in middle class tax cuts that are responsible and paid for. Democrats believe that it is progressive to put money in the hands of Americans when it doesn't explode deficits and when it does help spur demand and when it does help Americans meet their daily expenses. We're not in favor of huge tax cuts for people who don't really need them—and didn't even ask for them—but we are in favor of responsible tax cuts to middle class Americans.

So on tax day, I joined with you just the other day this weekend in signing my tax form. I owed this year, but as I said goodbye to my money, I knew that if it was going to take care of a kid who needed a meal or give a young soldier the equipment they need in defending our country or to help this country do better and be more effective, well, I'm willing to do that because I think it's my duty as an American to do so.

So with that, I yield back and thank the Speaker for the time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TEAGUE). Members must address their remarks in debate to the Chair and not to a viewing audience.

TAX DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the Speaker for the recognition. I thank the leadership on my side for allowing me to talk this hour.

Mr. Speaker, it is April 15. It is the day that we file our taxes, or in some cases we submit a request for an extension. In the interest of full disclosure, I did submit a request for an extension, not because—well, I will tell you, when I was practicing medicine when I was a physician, my taxes were a great deal more complicated than they are today. But even today it is difficult to keep up with all of those various pieces of paper that you must collect after a year's worth of living and deliver to your accountant in order that they may accurately and correctly assess your taxes. That is one of the things that has always bothered me. It is one thing to pay taxes. The previous gentleman said it's one of our obligations for living in a free society; I don't dispute that—I may dispute the level at which he wants to see us taxed—but at the same time, I don't see why it always has to be so hard. I would like to give people another option, and that's what I want to talk about this evening, Mr. Speaker.

But, actually, first, I do need to talk a little bit about what we just heard over the past hour because it was a wonderful story; but, Mr. Speaker, maybe if we're going to tell stories we ought to start out with, ''Once upon a time'' and end up with, ''And they lived happily ever after.''

The gentleman was quite correct in quoting a poll that said only 12 percent of Americans believe that President Obama has cut taxes. But what do you think is the reason for that? Maybe it's because in the last 15 months taxes in this country have increased by $670 billion and counting, according to the Committee on Ways and Means. Many of these tax hikes include taxes on people whom the President said during his campaign for the Presidency that people would not see a tax increase. And what are some of those? Well, the previous gentleman alluded to the fact that we just passed and the President just signed a massive health care bill. But, really, if we were honest in our discussion about that bill, we would call it a massive tax increase bill because honestly that's what it was. It didn't really have that much to do with health care, but it sure had a lot to do with taxes.

There is going to be a new tax on individuals who don't purchase government-approved insurance. And guess what? That tax will fall on Americans, some Americans who earn less than $200,000 a year, violating the pledge made by President Obama when he was campaigning for the highest office in the land. Now, for most people that's not a great surprise because there were so many promises made that were not kept during that campaign.

Oh, remember things like, I'm going to take public financing for my Presidential campaign. Remember the great transparency hoax that was played upon the American people: oh, sure, we'll create a health care bill and I'll have everybody in around a big table and we'll invite C–SPAN in so you can see who's standing with the special interests and who's standing with the American people. Well, guess what? You didn't get to do that, did you, because that was another promise that wasn't kept.

Well, promises to not raise taxes on Americans earning less than $200,000 a year unfortunately were one of the first casualties of this administration, and the sad thing is it continues to be a casualty of this administration.

What about the new tax on employers who fail to fully comply with the government health insurance mandates? That might fall on some people who earn less than $200,000 a year. It's

not going to happen for a couple of years because they did stretch some of these things out in the health care bill; but what about the 40 percent excise tax on some health plans that cost over a certain amount of money? That's the health care plan that costs over a certain amount of money, but it may belong to someone who earns under $200,000 a year or a married couple that earns under $250,000 a year.

What about the ban on the purchase of some over-the-counter drugs for people who happen to have a health savings account or a health reimbursement account? What about the increase in Medicare tax on wages and self-employment income and the imposition of a 3.8 surtax on certain investment income for individuals who earn over certain amounts of money? These are significant changes that occurred in our Tax Code, but they were passed in a health care bill. That's why you didn't know about them; they were hidden in this bill that we passed last month.

Now, for some people, not for all, but for some people with high medical expenses, there is a threshold that has to be met. Your medical expenses have to be more than 7.5 percent of your adjusted gross income before those expenses are tax deductible. Now, to be sure, if someone's medical expenses are over 7.5 percent of their adjusted gross income, that's an individual who spent a good deal of money on medical care that year. You would think that we wouldn't want to punish that person further, but in fact that's just what we did in this health care bill. We raised that threshold to 10 percent. So that means people who have a lot of medical expenses will now have to spend 10 percent of their adjusted gross income before they can begin to deduct those expenses from their income tax.

We've imposed a new $2,500 cap on people who contribute to their own flexible spending accounts. There is going to be a new annual tax on some health insurance policies. There's going to be a new tax on some pharmaceuticals; some of those taxes will fall on people who earn under $200,000 a year.

How about this? A new excise tax on medical devices, a 2.3 percent tax on medical devices. These are class 2 and class 3 devices as defined by the Food and Drug Administration. So, okay, tongue depressors and Band-Aids will not be taxed, but syringes will be. Well, who's going to pay that tax on the syringes? Well, in all likelihood in that instance it is going to be the doctor in the doctor's office because doctors have very little way of passing charges onto the patient because most of their arrangements are contractual with insurance companies or with Medicare and Medicaid, and they're not going to pay the tax. It will be difficult to pass the charge onto the patient because those charges are capped. So, actually, that will be the physician's office that gets to pay those taxes. In fact, Mr. Speaker, everything from lasers to leaches are taxed under this new excise tax that's coming on certain medical devices.

What if you earn under $200,000 a year and happen to go to a tanning salon? Well, guess what? A 10 percent tax on that activity for you even though you earn under $200,000 a year. And there will be a new tax on some self-insured health plans; and, yes, some of those may fall on people who earn under $200,000 a year.

There will be new penalties for nonqualified health savings account distributions. Now, people shouldn't take money out of their health savings accounts unless it's for a health expenditure; but rather than just having that money then convert to taxable income, there is actually going to be a double penalty on those types of purchases. And the list goes on.

The other gentleman did this, so I'll do the same thing. As you can see, there is a significant amount of writing on this page of paper. No, you can't read it from your distance, but I did read many of the things that are contained on this page. And get this, get this: all of these additional taxes, and what did we hear the other day?

Someone floated the notion of a value-added tax, a VAT tax, as a way to deal with the deficit and some of the increase in Federal spending that's going to occur as a consequence of this health care bill that we passed. We heard it a couple of times last spring when we first started talking about this health care bill. Some people came on the Sunday shows and talked about—some people from the administration came on the Sunday shows and talked about a value-added tax, and then all of that talk was tamped down pretty quickly when that trial balloon was met with so much disfavor. But now that the bill has passed, maybe we will need that VAT tax in order to pay for it. That will be a tax increase on some individuals who earn under $200,000 a year.

There is no question that unless this Congress takes some action before the end of the year—and quite honestly, I don't know where the time and energy will come for this Congress to do this, but the tax policies that were enacted in 2001 and 2003 expire at the end of this year. Many of those tax policies will affect people who earn under $200,000 a year. The expiration of a tax policy means we revert to tax levels that were present in 2001. Guess what? That's going to be a tax increase on some people who earn under $200,000 a year.

And what are we going to do about the inheritance tax, the appropriately named ''death tax''? We haven't even talked about that. That is one of those other things that will have to be tackled before the end of the year. Time is running out. It's an election year. People aren't willing to do difficult things during an election year, so it becomes problematic as to whether or not those things will be fixed.

Mr. Speaker, it's often said that there is nothing certain in this life except death and taxes. And I will tell you from the standpoint of a physician that sometimes death is less complicated than our tax system. Let me just give you an example here.

Most of us are familiar with the name Sam Rayburn because, after all, that's who the Rayburn Building is named for. Sam Rayburn was, in fact, my Congressman when I was a small child in the north and northeast Texas area. He served for a long time. When he first came to Congress back in 1913, he was part of a Congress that enacted the Federal income tax. Back in 1913, it was a bill by standards in those days, it was 400 pages. But look what's happened over time. By the end of the Second World War, it was 8,200 pages; by the time a man landed on the Moon it was 16,500 pages. In 1979, when Ronald Reagan won his second term, it was 26,300 pages. When the Republicans took control of Congress, it was over 40,000 pages. In 2004, 60,000 pages. And here we are today, 2010, and it is 71,684 pages long. That's a lot of Tax Code for people to keep up with. And as the complexity has increased, the cost for individuals to comply with their obligations under the Tax Code has increased as well.

And why has this happened? Whose fingerprints are all over all of these pages of the Tax Code? Well, it's the fingerprints of people here in the House of Representatives because under the Constitution all revenue bills have to originate with the House of Representatives.

The Committee on Ways and Means is charged with that tough duty and, as a consequence of trying to appease one constituency or punish another, we've added pages and pages and pages of complexity to the Tax Code. I dare say in various committees today there have been proposals discussed that would either punish or reward American citizens because, in trying to drive a certain type of behavior—maybe towards green jobs or renewable energy as we did in our Committee on Energy and Commerce today—we're going to drive things in a direction where we want the social transformation to occur, and we're going to do that with the Tax Code. Any time we want to punish a special interest group or reward a stakeholder, we add a new credit or a new law to the Tax Code.

□ 2130

The result is a Federal law that is literally fraught with opportunities for avoiding taxes. There are loopholes within the law that people will try to exploit, and some will do it quite successfully. For everyone who exploits a loophole and avoids taxes, some other honest American is going to have to make up that difference or is going to be added to the deficit, and that honest American's children or grandchildren are going to pick up the difference. So, these are things that are not done without consequence and that are not done without penalty. Now, think of this:

The Internal Revenue Service for fiscal year 2010, the current fiscal year, was appropriated an amount of money of almost $12 billion—$11.6 billion, so almost $12 billion—to administer the activities of that Federal agency.

What is a comparable amount?

Well, I'll tell you that is more than what this country spent in defending itself with the missile defense program. Arguably, as to what may become our first line of defense against a rogue state or a nation that means us ill, we spent more on administering the Internal Revenue Service. Guess what? That is only going to increase under the health care bill that passed out of this House a mere 3 or 4 weeks ago.

In fact, within the health care bill, there are provisions for hiring—I do not remember the number exactly, but I think it was over 16,000 new agents for the Internal Revenue Service. We didn't really do much for hiring or for training new doctors or new nurses, but we did add a ton of new IRS agents to administer and to force the new Tax Code changes that were incorporated into that bill. As a consequence, you may have to go to H&R Block for your prenatal care.

The current Tax Code is a significant burden on all Americans. We spend billions of hours and billions of dollars complying, and that doesn't even count the billions of hours that we spend complaining about the Tax Code. The average taxpayer loses about 30 percent of his or her income to Federal, State, and local taxes. That is a greater share of income than is spent on food, clothing, and housing combined. According to the National Taxpayers Union, in 2009, American families and businesses spent almost 8 billion hours complying with the Tax Code. That is 8 billion hours that they weren't spending with their families or engaged in some productive activity. The cost of all of that time spent on complying with the Tax Code is estimated in excess of $110 billion.

In addition to the lost time, last year, Americans paid nearly $30 billion for help in preparing their taxes, using either software programs or tax preparation professionals. That is a little more than $200 for the average taxpayer in the course of the year. Per person, that $200 to comply with the Tax Code doesn't sound like a great deal, but we are in a recession, Mr. Speaker. Americans are struggling to make ends meet. Who wants to be in favor of making Americans waste money that they can ill afford?

The National Taxpayer Union estimates the cost for Federal tax compliance by corporations was nearly $160 billion, which was 54 percent of the corporate income tax collected in fiscal year 2008. In other words, we are spending just as much to comply with the Tax Code but are collecting half as much. The time and money should be spent by families and businesses who are growing the economy and creating jobs.

I mean, after all, what is the one thing the American people want us to do this year? They really weren't so interested in health care. They were interested in national defense, but it still falls pretty low on the scale. The one thing they want us to do is to create a climate, to create an atmosphere, where small businesses feel comfortable about creating jobs and about adding employees. That's our number one charge this year—to grow the economy and to create jobs. It's so simple. I wonder why we can't remember that.

A Gallup Poll out today, Tax Day 2010, shows that 63 percent of Americans believe their taxes will increase in the next 12 months. Again, 63 percent believe their taxes will increase in the next 12 months. That's right. They're not buying that stuff that President Obama cut their taxes, because, as we know, he did not. Only 4 percent expect a change that will reduce their taxes. The tax climate is unsteady and unpredictable for Americans. In addition to not being right, that instability is one of the things that is responsible for the very poor showing we have had with job creation in the last 15 months.

Now, this is some polling done by a group called American Solutions. It is from last year, but I think it is still apropos to the discussion at hand.

Sixty-nine percent of people think that the Federal income tax system is unfair; 70 percent favor tax incentives for companies that keep their headquarters in the U.S. That is not a surprising figure, but look at this: 82 percent of Americans think the option of a single-rate system would give taxpayers the convenience of filing their taxes with just a single sheet of paper. That's 82 percent. As Ronald Reagan used to say, those 80 percent issues are ones that he likes to get behind.

The fact is, if the system were fair and simple, you probably wouldn't have such a high number of people thinking it's unfair. The fact is, if the system were fair and simple, you wouldn't have those billions of dollars spent in tax compliance. It would be pretty straightforward. Now, I talked a little bit about it with that opening list that I went through; but again, it is important to sort of underscore some of the changes that people are going to see this year, not 4 years from now but this year, as a result of the health care bill that was passed last month.

Beginning January 1, 2012, according to the Joint Committee on Taxation, ObamaCare will limit the medical expense deduction, which will raise taxes by $15 billion over 10 years. Under current law, if out-of-pocket medical expenses, including health insurance premiums and medical procedures, are not covered by health insurance and if they exceed 7½ percent of adjusted gross income, these expenses are fully deductible, but it will increase to 10 percent under the bill that we passed. Some of the most expensive and comprehensive health insurance plans don't cover some high-cost medical procedures, such as in vitro fertilization where the cost for the procedure and for the prescription drugs can run as high as $20,000 per treatment cycle, and some families can have multiple cycles within a year. Those are the people who are going to be hit by this change from 7½ percent of adjusted gross income to 10 percent on most Americans. The Joint Committee on Taxation estimates this new limit will affect 14 million taxpayers—or 14.8 million taxpayers, 14.7 of whom will earn less than $200,000 a year at the time that it is put into effect.

There are some things I would like to point out which Steve Forbes wrote in a book a couple of years ago, in a book on the flat tax. It's called the ''Flat Tax Revolution.'' It's probably still available on Amazon. There are some interesting facts that he relates in the book of how Washington really just doesn't get it when they write tax law.

Quoting from the book, in 1989, Senator Bob Packwood requested a revenue forecast from Congress' Joint Committee on Taxation on a hypothetical tax increase, raising the top rate to 100 percent on incomes over $200,000.

So, just as a study, just as an exercise, let's just see what their projection is if we just take all income, every scrap of income, away from people who earn over $200,000. The Joint Committee on Taxation responded by forecasting increased revenues of $204 billion in 1990—and again, these figures are somewhat old—$204 billion in 1990 and increased revenues of $299 billion in 1993.

Essentially, the Joint Committee on Taxation predicted that people would continue to work even if the government taxed them out of every penny they earned. It doesn't sound like they're living in the real world, does it? If you take every penny that people earn, why are they going to set their alarm clocks and go to work the next day? It's likely not going to happen.

A second point that they quoted in the book is that the Congressional Budget Office predicted that the 1986 corporate tax rate increase would raise government revenues from $89 billion to $101 billion. So this is over $10 billion because of the increase in the corporate tax rate. Yet what actually happened is that corporations altered business practices, and revenues decreased to $84 billion. So, instead of getting an additional $10 billion, they actually scored $5 billion less than they would have had they left the tax rate alone.

It's tough because Americans get that. They understand that. If you tell the average American, Hey, next year, your taxes are going to be 100 percent of everything you earn, they're going to say, Fine, I'm not going to work. See ya.

When we think about it, in our committees here in Congress, we say, Well, if you tax everybody at 100 percent, yeah, you're going to bring in some additional revenues. In fact, it will be significantly increased next year and the

year after that. Well, that's nonsense. That's not taking into account fundamental human behavior. If you take away everything from people, they're not going to show up for work the next day.

Now, we know what works when it comes to changing the Tax Code. We got a glimpse of it in Ronald Reagan's administration when he cut the taxes in half in 1986. As a result of that reform, the economy grew; revenues increased, and jobs were created.

Nina Olson, in writing in 2007 the National Taxpayer Advocate, talked about simplifying the Tax Code as one of her recommendations, and I'm quoting here: The complexity of the code increases the likelihood that honest taxpayers will make inadvertent mistakes. It creates opportunities for taxpayers to avoid paying their fair share of taxes and makes it difficult for the Internal Revenue Service to administer the tax system. Simplifying the tax law could improve the audit process and allow less of a taxpayer burden.

Well, what a phenomenal idea, simplifying the tax law. Now, who could be against that?

In 1981, there was a simple concept put forth by Robert Hall and Alvin Rabushka. This was revisited in 1995, 15 years ago, by my predecessor in this body, who was former Majority Leader Dick Armey, and most recently in the book that Steve Forbes published on the ''Flat Tax Revolution.'' All of those authors were calling for the same type of tax reform in our Tax Code—that it be flatter, fairer, and more simple.

So what would it look like if we were to do something like that, flatten the tax and broaden the base? Okay. I want everyone to close their eyes and visualize that shoe box or that suitcase full of receipts you took down to your accountant, and then visualize the sheets of paper you're going to get back from your accountant that you're going to have to file unless you file online.

What if it were a great deal more straightforward? What if it were a great deal simpler?

That blueprint would be the flat tax. In fact, there has been legislation that was introduced early last year—H.R. 1040 for the individuals who want to look it up on Thomas. H.R. 1040 allows for a person to opt into a single-rate tax system, to opt into a flat tax.

Why would you have it as an optional? Why would you have it as an opt-in?

Well, we have created this Tax Code, remember, of many, many thousands, tens of thousands of pages, and we've done that to drive behavior in a certain way. So one of the things you wouldn't want to do is change things suddenly. After all, we've encouraged people to comply or to live these very complicated tax lives in order to get the benefits of the tax system. You can't very well just say, well, we're going to change everything overnight, but we could allow people to opt in to a single-rate system. I, for one, would gladly do that. Even if it meant I paid more taxes, I would gladly do that and give up that shoe box full of receipts that I've got to sit down and go through every year with my accountant.

Now, a lot of people are concerned about the home mortgage deduction on things like a flat tax, but if it's an optional flat tax, then you make the decision. You know, the home mortgage deduction in some markets doesn't really amount to as much as it does in other markets. In some areas in Texas, the home mortgage deduction really may be as little as $1,000 a year in real dollars saved by itemizing and going through that exercise with your taxes. In other markets, where real estate prices are quite, quite high—and there are still some of those markets in this country—then it may be prudent to continue with taking that mortgage deduction.

Let's give people the option. Let's give them the choice. If someone has constructed their finances around being in the IRS code, fine. They may stay there. Yet, if someone wants the freedom to get out from beneath that code, we ought to allow them the freedom to do so. We ought to trust Americans to be able to make up their own minds on what would work best for them.

□ 2145

Well, how would this form work? It's really pretty simple. Yes, you are going to need a little personal information. I know the sensitivities to that with the census right now, but some personal information so that the taxes can be properly allocated to the proper individual. Income on one line: wages, tips, compensation. But this does exclude interest, dividends, and capital gains. Interest and dividends would be taxed at the point of origin, not at the point that they are received by the individual. Personal exemptions.

This form was drawn up a couple of years ago. These numbers, in fact, depending upon how incomes have grown, may change a little bit. But essentially the first $36,000 for a family of four would be exempt from income taxes. Married, filing jointly, $25,580. Single head of household, $16,330. Number of dependents multiplied by $5,510. Add those all up. Taxable income, line 1, all income; minus deductions, line 3; line 4, calculate the tax; multiply line 4 by .19; taxes already withheld, subtract that, get a refund or the taxes you owe.

What did that take? Thirty seconds? Forty-five seconds? I read fast. The print was large. How different is that from what you just went through with your accountant? How different is that from what you have been doing with the Tax Code?

If we gave the people the option of simplifying their lives or continuing the Tax Code, I think that over time you would see so many people leave the Code and opt for a simplified system as their lives became more simple, and you would no longer have the need for this great behemoth of an agency we now know as the IRS. It would just simply be a collection, a clearinghouse, for receiving these forms and tallying up the bills.

Now, I went through some of the calculations on the number of hours, the number of dollars. There is no way to calculate, no way to calculate, the hours of stress that the current IRS Code imposes on average, law-abiding Americans. It's impossible to calculate or quantify the number of migraine headaches or tension headaches that are caused by trying to keep up with the IRS forms.

One of the things that people tell me repetitively is, yes, they want to save money where they can, but one of the things they really want is they want some time back in their lives. How important would that be to give that time that is now devoted to compiling and going through check stubs at the end of the year and keeping receipts and keeping up and chasing papers all over the house and trying to run down expenses that you didn't keep up with and now you're trying to go back and recreate those trails—how about giving all that time back to Americans who would prefer to be under a flat tax?

You really do eliminate the special preferences. No double taxation of interest and dividends. This bill creates a single-rate structure. No taxes on dividends. No taxes on savings. We are told all our lives we have got to save money, and how insulting is that when passbook savings rates are extremely low but, on top of that, you have got to pay 25, 30 percent of that in income taxes? It erodes the incentive for saving.

I will give you an example. When I was in the practice of medicine, I thought at one time I need to keep 3 months of what it would cost me to run my practice. I need to keep 3 months in cash where I could get to it quickly if I needed to in order to keep the wolf from the door, if things weren't going well financially.

So I did that, and I got through the year, and everything went okay. And what I found was I was paying the business tax then on that money that I had kept in the business, and when that money was eventually distributed to the partners, the doctors, it was taxed again. So we were doubly taxed on that money.

I didn't do that very long because there's no reason to do that. Tax the money only one time when it's distributed to the partners. Otherwise, there's no reason to keep the money in the business and have to pay taxes on it twice, once when you earn it and once when it's distributed.

But the behavior behind wanting to keep 3 months of operating income, operating capital available to me, that was a good concept. It that was a sound concept. But the Tax Code punished me for doing that. The Tax Code punished

me for sound thinking. The Tax Code punished me for being reasonable.

Now, doing the tax via a flat tax would also remove the Clinton tax on Social Security earnings. And one of the things that really got me thinking about the flat tax when Congressman Armey wrote the book in 1995 and introduced the legislation, the tax year 1993, just out of pure serendipity, out of pure coincidence, Bill Clinton's first year in office as President of the United States, he and I earned about the same amount of money. I think I earned just a little bit more, but I may have had a better year.

Of course, the President's income tax filing and the amount of income taxes the President paid were public knowledge. That was printed in a story in the newspaper. So I did a very simple calculation. His salary was X. This was the amount of money he had paid in taxes. So what percentage of his salary did he end up paying in taxes? And the number was within a percentage point or two of around 20, 21 percent. I did the same for my taxes, and I paid 31 percent.

So that led me to a conclusion that there was within our Tax Code the Clinton paradox. Why should two people who earn essentially the same amount of dollars pay a substantially different tax rate?

A flat tax would make a great deal more sense. There would be no reward for perhaps a questionable deduction from your income tax; and, at the same time, we could give people back a significant amount of their time and energy during the course of the year with keeping up with receipts and that quality time that we all spend with our accountant every year. So I credit President Clinton with making me a believer in the concept of a flat tax, because it really came home at that point.

What would happen with a flat tax? You think savings would increase if we stopped punishing people for saving money? It might. Businesses also would be taxed at a flat 19 percent with deductions for goods and services, materials, wages, salaries, and pensions and the purchase of capital equipment, structures, and land. And those capital outlays would be immediately expensed. We saw the power of that in 2003 when the tax policy of 2003 was enacted.

You know, in 2003, a lot of people don't remember it now but we were having trouble with the unemployment rate being high. I think it was up to 6 or 7 percent. And it was a terrible thing that it was that high, and President Bush was to blame for this, and we really needed to hold him accountable for this high unemployment rate.

So, okay, he did something about it. He did something about it with a change in the Tax Code, and that was passed in May of 2003. It was a contentious vote when it happened. But after it passed, by July of 2003, job creation started on an upward trajectory; and really, until September of 2008, every quarter there was an increase in the number of jobs created in this country.

We have got to create between 120,000 and 150,000 jobs every month in this country just to keep up with people that are entering the workforce. So that was an extremely important change in the Tax Code, and one of the things it did was it allowed for immediate expensing of capital outlays rather than a long depreciation schedule in businesses, that the cap on capital outlays was increased significantly, from $10,000 to $30,000. The result was businesses did go out and make that capital investment, did improve their businesses; and, as a consequence, the tax receipts really increased. Jobs increased. And it appeared to me that that was a sound way to go about dealing with a downturn in the economy.

And, Mr. Speaker, I frankly do not understand, do not understand why we will not undertake similar policies today with our unemployment hovering around 10 percent. And one of the most pernicious aspects of that is young people just completing their education are ending up in the ranks of the unemployed and they are losing those early productive years, which may have a deleterious effect on the remainder of their productive lifetime.

It seems like almost any group with whom you speak, regardless of the age demographic, the beginning of the working years in the late teens and early 20s, the pre-retirement age, or those in between, everyone is having difficulty. Every one of those demographic groups is having trouble finding work. And, as a consequence, we are creating what may well turn out to be a longitudinal problem that, should we take the time to solve it now, would really be to our great benefit.

The long-term unemployment numbers are startlingly high. The unemployment numbers for minorities are startlingly high. The unemployment numbers for people who are in their late teens and early 20s are startlingly high. Why wouldn't we consider something that worked as recently as 8 or 9 short years ago? In fact, those policies are going to expire, and we may well make things worse rather than better.

One of the things that I do want to address, and we heard this in the last hour, on Tax Day 2010, are you better off this Tax Day? The little cartoon here says, ''I'm sorry, sir, but you can't claim Citibank, Goldman Sachs, AIG, Bank of America, Wells Fargo, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, GM, and Chrysler as dependents.'' So are you better off this Tax Day? You answer the question.

There is an option that we could take to fundamentally transform the tax system in this country, and it would be liberating for individuals and businesses alike. Fundamental tax reform in this country is something the American people are crying for. Eighty percent, according to the American Solutions Study from a year or two ago, want us to do something about that. Through both Democratic and Republican majorities, we have talked about it, but we haven't taken that work on. President Bush convened a tax panel during his second term. The result of that was disappointing. The recommendations were all over the place, and no one really proposed legislation as a consequence of that tax reform panel.

It is incumbent upon this Congress, the next Congress. Regardless of which party is in the majority, it is incumbent upon them to come to some realistic conclusions about simplifying the Tax Code. For too long we have put this burden on our citizens in order to get them to comply with what the previous speaker said was our obligation for living in a free society, and that is the payment of income taxes. For too long we have made that too difficult. We have made that too onerous. And, as a consequence, we have had a deleterious effect on our economy. Right now, our economy is suffering. We would do people a great service by simplifying the Tax Code, unleashing the power of the American economy.

Look, this economy is too vibrant to keep down for too long. Even the United States Congress is not capable of keeping this economy suppressed. The economy will recover. But the recovery will be more robust and more prolonged if we will create a sensible tax policy to go along with that recovery.

□ 2200

THE DIRECTION THAT THIS NATION NEEDS TO GO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it's a privilege and honor to have the opportunity to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives. And having listened to my colleague, Doctor and Congressman BURGESS, speak in the previous segment in the previous hour, I'll pick up on some things that are on my mind and see if we can clarify the direction that this Nation has taken and the direction that this Nation needs to go.

This is tax day, April 15. This is the day that there are a lot of bleary eyes from people that have stayed up way into the night trying to do their own taxes. We have some people out there that have borrowed the money to pay the tax preparer so that they can file their taxes on time. And we have people that have paid the tax preparer to file an extension because they couldn't get their paperwork in on time.

We have a huge amount of American dollars that are invested in paying tax preparers and doing tax preparations. And I often think about this economy that we have and ask the question, you know, what about these sectors of the

economy? Is there anything contributed to the economy by paying accountants and IRS agents to collect money?

And I'll argue that the White House gets it wrong. The President's economic advisers get it wrong. They seem to believe that this economy is a giant chain letter, and if they can just go into the U.S. Treasury, or borrow from China or borrow from the Saudis and dump a few hundred billion or a few trillion dollars into this economy and give a lot of it away and get people to spend the money, or do it on contracts and the shovel-ready projects, which actually are some of this that has the least amount of demerit and some merit to it—they seem to think that throwing these dollars through the economy stimulates the economy and then we grow.

But the flaw in that premise is this, that, you know, this economy isn't built on spending. It's not built on something that's viewed by the White House as a giant chain letter, where you just dump in the hundreds of billions of dollars, and somehow we go out and spend money and the economy spends. That's the Keynesian economist approach. That's the approach that John Maynard Keynes actually rebutted himself back during the thirties when he said that he could solve all the unemployment in the world.

Now, remember who Keynes was. He was an economist who was a contemporary of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. And he was credited with producing the concept that if you have a shrinking economy, you can stimulate it by borrowing money and spend; the Federal Government can dump that money into the economy and have that flow through the economy and stimulate it.

Now, John Maynard Keynes made the remark about the early or mid-thirties that he could solve all the unemployment in the world. This is how good this Keynesian economics approach it is, that he would solve all the unemployment. This is the author of his own program, of course. He would solve all the unemployment in the world this way. If he could just go to an abandoned coal mine and go out into that abandoned coal mine with a little drill rig and drill a whole bunch of holes out there across that coal mine, and then he'd take American currency, cash money, greenbacks, and then bury them down in these holes in this abandoned coal mine. And then Keynes went on to say, he'd fill that whole coal mine up with garbage.

Now we would have an abandoned coal mine with holes punched in it with drill rigs all over the place, presumably in some kind of grid pattern or random pattern, these holes all full of cash, hundreds of feet of garbage piled over the top of it. And he said he could solve all the unemployment in the world by just simply now turning the world's entrepreneurs, or the American entrepreneurs, loose to go dig out the garbage, dig up the money and take the cash.

That's pretty similar to what you're talking about with these Keynesian economics. You try to get people to work to do things that are make-work. And the President himself said, we're not going to pay people just to dig a hole and fill it back up. I thought that that was an interesting metaphor or way to compare that since I've spent my life digging holes and filling them back up. And I can tell you that it pays if you're digging the hole for some purpose, that builds something that has value.

Our economy, our economy, Mr. Speaker, needs to be built upon the foundation of increasing our productivity. Americans have to make things. We have to produce things. We have to expand services so that our economy grows.

If you think of it in terms of what it would be like if we were still back in the tribal village, and if we didn't have any money to work with, and we had to trade, how do we grow wealth?

Well, some of us would make bows and arrows, and some of us would make the arrowheads, and some of the people would skin the hides and make the clothes. And pretty soon we'd find out that some are good at one thing, others are good at another thing, and then we start to trade these products back and forth, and we have clothing, and we have weapons, and we have utensils, and we have gardeners, and we have hunters and people that specialize. And after a while, this wealth builds because we acquire material goods that increase.

First they provide the necessities of life, which the simplistic term is food, clothing, and shelter. And then we add to our material goods, all of this out of the wealth that comes from producing something that has value and trading it or selling it and then taking the money and buying something from someone else for something that has value to us. That's how this economy works. And it's got to be based on our productivity. Americans have to build things. We have to make things.

And here we are on tax day with these millions of Americans that have filled out their forms and spent their money to do so so that they can do their best to comply. And a lot of Americans that don't want to walk close to the edge of complying with the IRS, they don't want to face an audit, and so they perhaps pay a little more in taxes than they owe because they don't want the question to come up.

Frank Luntz produced a number that was pretty interesting to me, and it was this: that 58 percent of Americans would rather have a root canal than a tax audit. I didn't ask him if that was without anesthetic. For me, I'd take the root canal without the anesthetic before I would want to go through a tax audit. But a lot of the American people today are very concerned about a potential tax audit, so they're paying a little more taxes than they might otherwise.

They had to file. They drop it in at the last minute. And we have post offices that will close at midnight tonight so that people that are hustling up to fill out their tax returns can drop those in and get them postmarked by midnight. And that will be advertised, and they'll plan it. And procrastination will take place. It's not something we enjoy doing.

This day, this day that the 16th amendment enabled all those years ago was a day that brought tens of thousands of Americans into this city, and they have been demonstrating and rallying and giving speeches and singing God Bless America. These are true patriotic Americans that are here in this city today. And they're at over 700 locations around America.

We're going to try to get a real count on how many Americans came out today that carried an American flag, that brought up the new standard of the constitutional conservatives that are the new majority makers for America. The new standard is an American flag and a yellow Gadsden Don't Tread on Me Flag to fly. That Don't Tread on Me, it carries a message that adds to Old Glory. And I am very, very happy to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I have one flying outside my office at 1131 Longworth. Anybody that walks by there that sees that flag knows where I stand. That's the new standard of liberty. It's a new standard of freedom, and it supports and defends the United States of America. It flies with deference to Old Glory, and it supports and defends the principles that are in the Constitution and the principles of free enterprise and free enterprise capitalism.

I would wonder, watching the activities and the behaviors at the White House over this last year and a half or so, if they actually would agree with one of the questions that are on the naturalization flash cards that are put out by the U.S. citizenship immigration services. These are the people that provide the services to naturalize new legal immigrants to become American citizens. These flash cards, a stack about this thick, Mr. Speaker, and nice little glossy things about like that. And I regret that I didn't bring one over here.

But there are around 120-or-so questions, and it'll start out on the one side of the flash card, you can read it and it'll say, Who's the Father of our country? And you snap it over the other way and it'll say, we know this, Mr. Speaker, George Washington.

You look at one side of another flash card and it will say, Who emancipated the slaves? Flip it over to the other side: Abraham Lincoln.

Now here's the one that might stump the White House today. And it's this: What is the economic system of the United States of America? Flip that flash card over: free enterprise capitalism.

□ 2210

Haven't seen a lot of that going on out of the White House in quite some

time. In fact, when I look at what has been happening out at the White House, it starts with this. At the tail end of the Bush administration—with the full support and endorsement of then-candidate and United States Senator Barack Obama and now President, we saw the Secretary of the Treasury Henry Paulson come to this Capitol September 19, 2008. And he came into our closed-door session and he said, You need to give me $700 billion, and you need to give it to me now. And if you ask any questions or if you try to amend my request in any way, you'll mess up the works. But what's bound to happen or what could be happening is we could see a complete meltdown of the global currency and the confidence and capital and collateral, and we could see the entire world money supply fall apart if they lose this confidence.

So he said, Give me $700 billion, give it to me now, and if you have any ideas, they will not be as good as his own ideas. He said that he'd been watching this now for, I believe he said 13 months and we had only been watching it for 24 hours—some had—therefore, his ideas were a lot better than ours and his should not be questioned. And to come to this Congress and ask for $700 billion of the taxpayers' money without an assurance that his plan, if he carried it out and he got the money, would actually work. Well, that was the TARP proposal. Seven hundred billion.

The Congress eventually authorized and appropriated $350 billion in one chunk in early October, I believe it was, of 2008 and another $350 billion to be reauthorized by the next Congress, people to be elected later, approved by people to be elected later and approved by a President to be elected later and a Secretary of the Treasury to be confirmed after his tax problems later.

So that started this, $700 billion in TARP. And we saw in rapid-fire succession behind that came the nationalization of three large investment banks, government takeover of three large investment banks.

Then we saw, while this was going on, government takeover of the insurance company, Mr. Speaker, AIG, to the tune of about $180 billion dumped in because, remember, these entities are entities that are too big to be allowed to fail.

Now, that's a new concept for America. We never had that concept before. All through our history books and the current documents, I know of no place where we had come to a conclusion that these businesses were too big to be allowed to fail and so, therefore, we were going to prop them up with taxpayer dollars. But that is what happened.

$700 billion in TARP; three large investment banks nationalized, taken over by the Federal Government; AIG nationalized, taken over by the Federal Government; Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac taken over by the Federal Government; and, by the way, formally locked into that full nationalization by Executive order of the President right before Christmas last year. And that saddled the American taxpayers with a $5.5 trillion contingent liability in addition to the capital that had to go in to prop up Fannie and Freddie—and never mind all of the people that got rich out of that, including the Chief of Staff at the White House.

So we don't know what happened in all of those places because the chairs of the committees here in this Congress control the investigations of this Congress. But we saw $700 billion in TARP, three large investment banks nationalized—AIG nationalized, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac nationalized.

By now, Mr. Speaker, people are nervous, but they think they've elected some folks who understand high finance better than they do. This is a constitutional Republic, and we are to elect people to this Congress that owe the American people our best judgment and our best effort. And they trusted that best judgment and best effort and they trusted that we had access to more information and we'd use our good judgment.

But when the Federal Government got into the nationalization of General Motors and Chrysler, all almost simultaneously, the American people began to lose their faith in the judgment of the White House and their Congress and their government. Because even though the American people may not have confidence that they understand investment banking and high finance and insurance or the secondary mortgage market, the Fannie and Freddie components of this, the American people understand cars. We love our cars. We especially love our American-made cars. We love them. We drive them. We fix them. We show them. We collect them, and we make them.

And we know that if you want to make an automobile and sell a lot of them, it takes a lot of dealers to sell them. Anybody's intuition can tell them that if you go out in your garage or up in your attic or out in your shop and you invent the master widget and you patent that master widget and decide you're going to sell that widget across the country and the world, what you do easily is first lock down your patent, set up your manufacturing so you can meet the demand, and then you go out and set up dealers. And if you want to sell a lot of widgets, you have to have a lot of dealers, and you have to support and promote your dealers.

But when the Federal Government came in with a bankruptcy settlement that cut the numbers of dealers by 3,400 dealers in America, the American people know that the automakers didn't have a financial burden with the auto dealers. The auto dealers owned their franchises. They supported themselves. They paid for the services that they got out of the automakers. And for the White House to decree that there was going to be 3,400 dealers that got shut down in America, not only was that an unjust taking of the property rights of their franchise, but it also brings about sales of less automobiles. You can't sell more cars with fewer dealers even though they'll say, Well, we had bigger and better dealers that were healthier. That is not the point.

A lot of car dealers are face-to-face, retail marketing, neighborhood niche marketing. That service that goes on between the restaurant and the church and out there in the dealer's lot, a lot of that got shut down. But the American people saw that happen, Mr. Speaker, and then they really lost their faith in the judgment of the White House and this Congress and the Federal Government and they began to pay attention.

And we saw bankruptcy terms that were dictated by the White House, and when that was presented to the bankruptcy court, there wasn't a change that was made by that court. They accepted the terms that were dictated by the White House.

And we had a car czar at the White House that was 31 years old that had never made a car, sold a car, I don't think fixed a car—I don't know if he owned one, and if he did, I don't know if it was an American car. So all of this brings a high degree of nervousness on the part of the American people.

And then they see the President of the United States go down there and do his glad-handed grip and grin with Hugo Chavez of Venezuela. When I saw those fellows standing side by side with this grip and grin of this two-handed handshake—the old buddy handshake—I looked at that, and someone asked me in the Washington Journal program—I believe it was the following morning—what that made me think. Well, I thought a lot of the things that other people thought, but I also thought that Hugo Chavez is a nationalizer of the businesses that he's taken over in Venezuela, including a cargo rice plant not too long earlier than that. He is a piker when it comes to nationalization compared to our President, Mr. Speaker.

Three large investment banks nationalized. AIG nationalized. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac—formerly private, marginally quasi-government at the time—nationalized. General Motors nationalized. Chrysler nationalized. The CEO of General Motors fired and replaced by the President of the United States. The President of the United States appoints all but two of the board members of General Motors.

And the shareholders, the secured creditors saw their assets in those companies wiped out. Even though they were secured assets, they wiped them out and they handed share ownership of 17½ percent of General Motors over to the unions. And the Speaker of the House, Mr. Speaker for the evening, made the statement going into this that she would not give bargaining leverage to the automakers over the

unions, and that is the way it shook out. The unions got bargaining leverage over the automakers. And now we have a Federal Government that is running the car companies, and the unions have an ownership share, at least in General Motors, to a significant amount, 17½ percent is my recollection.

And then on top of that, if you're a government, a Federal Government, and you're running a car company like General Motors or Chrysler and you're having trouble competing, you're also running the regulatory organization.

□ 2220

So I am not, Mr. Speaker, suggesting that I know anything that the American people don't know about what might have brought about the intense scrutiny of Toyota that cost them at least a $16 million fine for their throttle and untold amounts of negative publicity on their throttle control and a number of other things.

But I will only submit, Mr. Speaker, that I have the American people coming to me on a regular basis and ask me if that intense scrutiny of the regulators on Toyota couldn't have something to do with the need of the Federal Government to see General Motors and Chrysler succeed, perhaps, more.

I don't have any evidence that would suggest that. But the appearance of impropriety certainly exists, Mr. Speaker, and the American people don't want to see one-third of their private sector activity nationalized and taken over by the Federal Government. But that's what's happened, one-third of the private sector activity swallowed up in those eight entities that I talked about.

Oh, and by the way, on the tail end of that is $787 billion in this thing called the economic stimulus plan, of which 6 percent of Americans think actually worked, 94 percent believe that it didn't help and didn't do any good.

Now, this is a pretty sick scenario, $700 billion in TARP, $787 billion in economic stimulus plan, eight huge national entities nationalized—and these are net private entities that are nationalized—one-third of the private sector activity nationalized. Now where are we? Now we get to ObamaCare, and ObamaCare is another 18 percent that was formerly private. Now it's under the auspices of the Federal Government, command and control and regulate.

Yes, some will say that these are private insurance companies, and it's not the Federal Government. But the Federal Government will effectively cancel every health insurance policy in America and reauthorize only those that meet the new standards that will be written, not the standards that we have today.

The options that the American people have will be diminished, not increased. American freedom will be diminished and not increased. The costs will go up for these premiums, because the Federal Government will impose more and more mandates on these health insurance policies. They will require that every health insurance policy covers contraceptives, and they will require that it covers mental health, and they will require piece after piece after piece, and one of these is require that health insurance policies cover the children up to age 26. Huh. I didn't really raise a family with the idea that my kids would start to grow up at age 26, and the law has been that 18 is a good place to say that they are grown up. Now, we like to keep them around longer than that and get them a college education and transition them into adulthood, but we do not need the super nanny Federal Government setting a 26-year standard because somebody in this Congress thought it was a good idea.

I had a young man come to me this afternoon at one of the Tea Party rallies; and he said, well, I am 23 years old. Don't you want me to have insurance under my parents until I am 26? And I said, no, I want you to grow up. When do you think you are going to be an adult? You are not one yet at 23?

I mean, well, then why 26? Why not 28? Why not 32? Why not all the way to Medicare eligibility? Then you have got the whole thing covered.

This is the mentality that's going on. This is a President that believes in single payer. He said so over and over again. He debated Hillary Clinton, who was for single payer. The bill that she brought back to this Congress in 1993 and 1994 was single payer. That means that the Federal Government pays it all.

They got all they could get to toss us into the abyss of socialized medicine. They went as far as they could go. They imposed a bill on the American people, that ObamaCare bill that about 3 weeks ago passed off the floor of this House and went to the White House for his signature. On the day that it passed this House and went to the White House, it could not have passed the United States Senate. On the merits of the bill, it sure looked to me like it couldn't pass the House either, Mr. Speaker.

But, nevertheless, ObamaCare became the law of the land, and it's going to take 4 years to implement the socialized medicine policy, but immediately the tax increases kick in. And so I will lay out a better sequence, I think, Mr. Speaker, and it is this.

The American people are rising up. They have filled this capital city up time and time again. They did so on November 5 of last year. They did so on November 7. They did so the previous 9/12. The day after September 11, the 9/12 Project Group, hundreds of thousands came to this city.

They are doing it again. This coming September, there will be other rallies across the country. The tens of thousands that are here in this city today are multiplied across some 700 locations, thousands and thousands of people that I think will add up into the millions that come to the streets and say, enough, I have had enough. I have had enough of watching my country run into the ditch. I have had enough of watching this overspending, this irresponsible increase in our spending without regard to trying to balance a budget or any sense of fiscal responsibility.

If you simply want something for your constituents and you sit on Appropriations Committee or you are in tight with the Speaker or you have somebody, then a staff that can write that number in for you, the spending just comes, and we will see.

We will see again no appropriation bills probably come out of this House, no budget probably come out of this House, because if we passed a budget, however irresponsible the budget is, it still is a spending constraint and a debate point. So they are going to avoid a budget and just spend all the money they want to spend. But they have a little trouble because there is an election coming and the American people are getting real savvy to these tricks.

So what I think will happen will be we will see a continuing resolution or several of them that deal with these appropriations components, kick the can down the road. Then there will be an election in early November, and then I think they come back with an omnibus spending bill that will take these continuing resolutions, these CRs, as we call them, and stack it up in about 3,600 pages and someplace between 500 billion and a trillion or more dollars will get spent. And there won't be any amendments allowed, and there will be a limited amount of debate, and, once again, the American people will not have the opportunity to scrutinize what's going on here in this House of Representatives.

I suggest this, that I have a bill that's called the CUT Act, to cut the unnecessary tab is what CUT stands for, cut the unnecessary tab, the CUT Act. And it recognizes that there is an upward spiral of spending that's naturally built into this system. The President proposes his spending. The House, by Constitution, has to start the spending here. If the House doesn't want to say no to the President of the United States, they just simply take the President's proposed budget and add the things into it that they want, and they send it over to the Senate, who doesn't want to say no to the President and doesn't want to say no to the Speaker of the House or the will of the House. So they simply accept the spending that's come from the President, increased by the House, and they stack their spending goodies on top of that.

The Senate is really good at adding lots of billions of dollars, and now it has to come back around to the House where the Speaker will not want to say no to the Senate or the President again. So it will jack up the spending

again, and the bill will go to the President's desk, and we will go deeper into debt.

That's the spending spiral that happens when you have a ruling troika, Mr. Speaker. That's when the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House, and the Majority Leader in the United States Senate, all of the same party, all with super majorities—well, HARRY REID is just one short of that super majority over there—the three of them could go into a phone booth and decide what they want to do with, to or for America.

What has happened has been a sad, sad state of affairs indeed, irresponsible spending, ObamaCare, unconstitutional, and in a whole number of ways, no budget coming forth, the tax cuts that were so important in stimulating our economy back in 2003, that would be those cuts that were signed into law May 28, 2003, the second half of the Bush tax cuts. Those tax cuts are set to expire at the end of this year.

Right now, Mr. Speaker, it's a good year to die, because there is no inheritance tax. However, it goes back to a super high rate the first of next year, and no action has been taken.

And even though we have a bit of an extenders package today, there is nothing there for the blenders credit for biodiesel, and it's hanging our capital investment out to dry. The people that have followed the direction of the Federal Government and risked their capital, when the government put out the message that was we want to see renewable fuels developed in an industry and to replace at least in part gasoline, we built an industry, the ethanol industry, the biodiesel industry. In fact, the first legislation that I drafted and introduced as a new Member of Congress was that blenders credit for biodiesel.

□ 2230

And these biodiesel plants now, with hundreds of millions of dollars invested and hundreds of thousands of employees altogether, have shut down, many of them, perhaps all of them in my State are shut down and they are being mothballed. There is silence there where there was production before, 24/7 production in many of their cases. Now it's silence. You might hear a fan run. It's a cooling fan; that's about it. They have to make a decision on whether they walk away and cut their employees loose and leave them unemployed and lose that good core workforce or whether they try to eke it out and stay in. And this Congress has an obligation to turn that card over and get that blender's credit passed so that the 14 plants that I know of in Iowa that are shut down that are viable with it can get up and running again. One of those plants is being dismantled and shipped to India.

I make this point to the Speaker and the environmentalists that are in this Congress, that if it's your idea to build a second generation of renewable fuels, such as cellulosic ethanol or sugarcane based or whatever it might be, unless we have a viable first generation which we have built—and it's not viable today without the credit—if we don't have a viable first-generation renewable fuel, then we're not going to be able to build a second generation. You cannot attract capital to that industry when government doesn't keep their word. And this time it has gone on too long; it has gone on since the first day of this year.

This is the 15th of April. That's January, February, March and half of April, and all of those have been money-losing weeks for the people that stepped forward to do the bidding of the government. So I'm hopeful that we get that turned around and get that passed out of this House and we do so soon and send that component at least to the President. It is a responsibility, and it is irresponsible to just kick the can down the road.

But, Mr. Speaker, I take us back to ObamaCare. And what is the solution? First, I think I should go through a list of some of the things that are wrong. A half a trillion dollar cut in Medicare punishes our seniors. I represent, I believe, the most senior congressional district in America. A half a trillion cut, and what happens? AARP, or the American Association of Retired Persons—or People—cut a deal with the White House to support a half a trillion dollar cut to the benefits to their members. And why? I think it's because the bill mandates that people buy insurance, and AARP is in the insurance business. I don't know that, but I would sure like to hear the straight story about what went on back there with the President and Rahm Emanuel and the representatives of AARP.

I'd like to know what went on with the health insurance companies, why so many of them supported this. This is anathema to their beliefs. But could they have just concluded that the Federal Government is going to compel everybody to buy health insurance, therefore it's a bigger market for them? And why would they feed the alligator, hoping that they get eaten last? Haven't they seen the pattern? Do I need to explain that, Mr. Speaker? Okay, I will.

I'm glad that you nodded in the affirmative. And that would be this: back in the sixties—I think the year would have been '62 and '63—we had at that time all of the property and casualty flood insurance in America was private, not government. And because we had had some floods, there was an argument made in this Congress that the Federal Government should provide all the flood insurance—or should provide, excuse me, competition in the flood insurance business. And so the Federal Flood Insurance Program began just to keep the insurance companies honest and make sure they could provide the flood insurance that was necessary in the flood plains that we had.

So one would think that the Federal Government would set up a little company and sell flood insurance and these other companies would just get more competitive, leaner and meaner, and more of them, perhaps, and we would have good flood insurance in America. But what happened was the Federal Government squeezed out 100 percent of the private sector property and casualty flood insurance so that today, Mr. Speaker, if you want to buy flood insurance for your home or your office or your factory or your farm, or whatever it might be, you have no choice but to buy that flood insurance that's provided by the Federal Government. That's what has happened. One hundred percent of the private sector in 1962, and over a number of years the Federal Government swallowed up all of the private sector flood insurance.

Now, one might say this is an anomaly, it really isn't a pattern, it was a circumstance, it had special circumstances involved with it so we can't anticipate that the Federal Government will swallow up the health insurance industry. Well, here is the definitive irony, and that is this: years ago—about the time that I was going to college anyway—I believe that all of our student loans were private, not government. And then government decided they wanted to get into the business, so they took a chunk of the student loans over. But they said, oh, we don't want to own it all, we don't want to run the whole thing, we just simply want to provide some competition here because that will make everybody better. I don't know why anyone would think that the private sector doesn't provide enough competition, and I will talk about that in a moment, Mr. Speaker.

So when the Federal Government got involved in the student loan business only to provide some competition and do a segment of the market and let them compete against each other, a lot of us said, no, the Federal Government is positioning themselves to take over 100 percent of the student loans program. And however that was denied for some time, it hasn't been denied in this Congress since Speaker PELOSI picked up the gavel, not by the other side of the aisle, not by GEORGE MILLER. It was his goal all along, and he will tell you that he's been honest about that. But in any case, that's what happened. Written into the reconciliation package of ObamaCare was the final nail in the coffin to anything except Federal student loan programs. The private stuff was all swallowed up, it's wrapped up, it's packaged up, and it's wiped out.

So we have examples before us: flood insurance, formerly 100 percent private, Federal Government got involved in that, now it's 100 percent government. You have the student loan program that was formerly 100 percent private, the Federal Government got involved in that, now it's 100 percent government. And here we are, the health

insurance program, where the President of the United States has consistently said we don't have enough competition in the health insurance industry so he just wanted to start one more company, a Federal health insurance company, just to provide some competition. No, it would never replace all those other companies, just to provide some competition. Now, here are some facts that I mentioned that I would bring out a few minutes ago:

When ObamaCare passed, we had 1,100 health insurance companies in America, 1,100. That's not a mistake; it's not a decimal point out of line. We have—or at least a couple, 3 weeks ago had that many companies, 1,100 health insurance companies selling right in the neighborhood of 100,000 possible health insurance policy variations. So if you go shopping out there, 1,100 companies, 100,000 policies and 50 States—and, yes, you can't buy in all those because buying insurance across State lines is not something that has been accepted.

So, simply, if you wanted more competition, you would allow people to buy insurance across State lines and you would end this question. But the President's idea was create some Federal competition because what happens is when the Federal Government gets involved, then they turn in and they subsidize. And when they subsidize, then no private sector can compete with them. Oh, and by the way, a little known tidbit fact, the Federal Flood Insurance Program that they run 100 percent of now is $19 billion in the red. So the premiums don't reflect the risk, and people continue to build in the flood plains out of proportion to the high risk that's there, and we have more and more property that we have to protect with Federal taxpayer dollars, and it just snowballs, and it gets worse and worse and worse.

Well, ObamaCare drives up cost, it discourages research and development, it will reduce quality, it discourages doctors and health care providers. I said that our doctors in America, they may not be on suicide watch, but they are assigned to only use plastic silverware, and it's kind of hard to conduct surgery with that, so it has been real hard on the health care providers.

□ 2240

The freedom and the liberty component of this is the worst part when we think, Mr. Speaker, that, ever since 1973, the people on that side of the aisle—I'll call it the left side of the aisle—primarily, and a few on our side made the argument that Roe v. Wade is settled law, that a woman has a right to an elective abortion under any circumstances and that the government has no business telling a woman what she can or can't do with her body. That argument was made by men and women—by almost everybody on that side of the aisle and by a few of the people on this side of the aisle. It's a pretty interesting point. The Federal Government has no business telling a woman what she can or can't do with her body.

Now look at it. The very same people who have made this argument since 1973 are saying to us, Well, the Federal Government has every right to tell everyone in America what they can or can't do with their bodies, and that includes thou shalt buy a government-approved health insurance policy or sign up for Medicaid. We'll make sure we can give you a stipend if you don't have the money, and we'll tax you if you do have the money. If you're an employer with 50 or more employees, you'll have to make sure they all have government-approved health insurance. If you're an employer with 49 employees, thou would be stupid to hire the 50th one.

So we'll see a lot of small businesses that will reach that level of growth, and they'll stop. They might go out and create another entity and roll some employees into that and stop. We will not just see all kinds of machinations of business configurations for the purposes of tax delay or avoidance that is driven by this Tax Day and the IRS, but we are going to see, also, business models that will be configured in order to avoid the Federal mandate because the Federal mandate requiring people to provide health insurance because they're employers is immoral and is unjust and is impractical, and it will create convoluted business arrangements.

I am for, Mr. Speaker, abolishing ObamaCare, for repealing ObamaCare. I have introduced a bill that repeals ObamaCare. Congresswoman MICHELE BACHMANN has also introduced a bill that repeals ObamaCare. They happen to be verbatim in their language. PARKER GRIFFITH has one and, I believe, BOB INGLIS. They are a couple other names that come to mind. I am for all of them. I want to work with all of them and with everyone else who has a bill. It's interesting. Within the 2,700 pages of ObamaCare, nobody read it all, I don't believe. If they did, they didn't understand it all.

I have a bill that I drafted that addresses this, and it's far better than the one they put in. I asked the College Republicans to sit and listen while I read through my bill, every word of it, and I asked them to pay attention and not to lose their concentration. I read the 40 words, not 2,700 pages, not 40 titles, not 40 pages, not even a page. I read 40 words on a page that essentially say to repeal ObamaCare, every bit of it, to pull it out by the roots. Now I'm going to embellish beyond the language. Take it out. Repeal ObamaCare lock, stock and barrel. Pull it out root and branch. Make sure there is not a vestige or a remnant of any DNA particle of ObamaCare left in the Federal code, because this policy that was and had become a toxic stew that was now force-fed to the American people has become a malignant tumor in our society, and what we do with malignant tumors that are on the verge of metastasizing is we take them out, and we pull them out by the roots. We cut out the entire tumor. If there happens to be a little good tissue around the edges, it's better to err on that side than it is to leave some malignant cells.

There is not one single part of ObamaCare that should be retained by this new Congress, and I expect to have a discharge petition down here at the well sometime in the next few weeks asking Members to sign onto it, working our way towards 2018 so we can send a repeal bill out of the House of Representatives. Hopefully, the Senate will pick this up as well.

The sequence becomes this: Yes, if we could get it there—and it's a hard task to get it there, and I'm not predicting it's possible. Everything is possible. SCOTT BROWN is in the United States Senate today. So, with that optimism in mind and knowing that northern Iowa beat Kansas in the NCAA tournament, I'm pretty confident there is a chance that we can repeal ObamaCare in this Congress. There is a chance. We put the marker down, Mr. Speaker. Then we have an election in November.

The President is fond of saying, Push the reset button. I think what we have in America today is that millions of people are in a different place politically than the administration is. A lot of them didn't know what they voted for. They voted for change. They had Bush fatigue. They wanted to shift the way we do business. Some of them—and a lot of them now—have buyer's remorse for what they did. You have the newly activated constitutional conservatives across this full spectrum of people. You have the 9/12 Project Group, all of the patriot groups, the Independents who are newly activated, the Republicans who are in greater numbers, newly activated constitutional conservatives, and all of that.

Mr. Speaker, they intend to make a difference, and I intend to make a difference with them. The constitutional conservatives I've described represent the new majority makers in America, the heart of the heartland, and the values that flow from there which index from California to Massachusetts into the Northeast, the Northwest, the Southeast, and beyond.

This Congress today doesn't represent the will of the American people. By 2 to 1, they oppose ObamaCare. It's still the law of the land today, and it can and must be repealed, every single bit of it. There is no excuse for those who voted ''no'' on ObamaCare to be anything except in favor of a full repeal of ObamaCare.

After this Congress has reset at the election in November and after the swearing in of the new Congress on January 3 of 2011, we will exert the will of the American people, and ObamaCare will be repealed. I expect that the President will veto such a repeal. When that happens, we will have on record the will of this Congress, the will of the United States Senate.

We will have the opportunity then with the appropriations bills to refuse

to allow any of the appropriated funds to be used to implement ObamaCare. With simple majorities in this House, which is where all funding and spending has to start by Constitution, we will be able to shut off the implementation of ObamaCare. We can do that for all of 2011 and send another repeal bill to the President's desk, which he is likely going to veto. In 2012, we can do the same thing for the appropriations cycle so that there is not a shred of ObamaCare that gets implemented, not in 2011, not in 2012.

Then we will have a new Presidential election in 2012, and we will have a new President. We will have a President who will sign a repeal of ObamaCare, and we will put it on his desk in January or February of 2013. We can begin the process then of real health care reform.

We need to do it, Mr. Speaker, not with a big Republican bill, not like this 2,700-page ObamaCare bill. We need to set up our priorities for health care, and we need to move down the line, one after another after another, with clear, standalone pieces of legislation that actually fix this problem and reform it in a way that the free market and the doctor-patient relationship are improved. The trial lawyers are going to have to give up a lot. We'll just go right on down the line, one after another, with standalone pieces of legislation. We can actually implement real, logical free market reforms and have that all done before ObamaCare would be implemented under the plan that is laid out today, because those pieces don't come into place, in finalizing most of them, until the beginning of 2014.

So what we can do is go through the sequence of this: Repeal ObamaCare; win the majority; shut off the funding for the implementation of ObamaCare; run a new election; expand a new majority in the House and the Senate; elect a new President; and repeal ObamaCare; pull it completely out by the roots so there is not a vestige of it left behind, not one single particle of its DNA left behind.

We can do all of that, Mr. Speaker, and still bring real reforms and put them in place and have them up and running before ObamaCare would have even kicked in. The American people will have their freedom, and they will have their liberty. That is the most egregious violation. From a constitutional perspective, ObamaCare is unconstitutional in several ways:

One, there is nothing in the enumerated powers that grants this Congress authority to establish ObamaCare—we can go into that in more detail—and it's a violation of the Commerce Clause. There are people and have always been people who have been born, who have lived and died who have not participated in health care at all but who would be compelled to buy a product produced or approved by the Federal Government for the first time in history just to be an American. In spite of what some of the people have tried to argue, there is no example to the contrary.

It is a violation of the Equal Protection Clause. People in Florida are treated differently than the people in Texas. It's not the Cornhusker Kickback any longer, but there is a package in Louisiana that treats Louisianans differently than it does the people in all the rest of the country.

□ 2250

There's a strong argument on equal protection violation. And there's a 10th Amendment violation; these powers need to be reserved for the States or the people respectively, not the big reach of the Federal Government.

All of this needs to happen. We can do this and we will have the leadership in this country and in this Congress to get it done.

I see that we have a strong leader from east Texas, the Aggie, my friend, Judge LOUIE GOHMERT. I would be happy to yield so much time as the gentleman from Texas may consume.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate my friend from Iowa yielding.

What was one of the most heartbreaking aspects of this health care bill that was crammed down the throats of Americans, a majority of whom were begging and pleading and demanding not to pass it, but it was the aspect of the increased taxes at a time when we're in a recession. We could not afford increased taxes which was going to bring about an end to more jobs. We couldn't afford what was in the bill which meant that people were going to be laid off. It meant that people were going to have salaries cut. It meant that people were going to lose their health care insurance. Because whoever's staffer or the special interest groups, all those folks that worked on this thing, they knew a number of things. First of all, of course, whoever's staffer in leadership helped draft it made sure the leadership staff was not included in the mandate for Members of Congress and their staffs to have to participate in the Federal program, so they knew they didn't want to be part of it.

But then here we are in a recession. It should be all about jobs. It should be about careers and helping people get back employment so that once they have the jobs, they've got employment, they can do the things they used to do that helped drive the economy: go back to the store and pick up something to wear; go back to a restaurant and get something to eat. And then that feeds those that work in the restaurant and the cycle goes on.

Instead, we increased taxes $500 billion over 10 years; $50 billion a year average. Employers were telling us in advance of the vote, If you do this, it's going to cost us billions of dollars across the country. We're going to have to either lay people off, we're going to have to cut people's salary, we're going to have to drop their health care insurance.

And so in the bill, you've got a provision that if you're considered not a small business, meaning less than 50 workers, then you've got a choice: you either provide the mandated health insurance at the level required or you pay a $2,000 fine. There's a little gimmick in there. You deduct 30 from the number of employees, so if you've got 50, then you deduct 30 and you pay 20 times $2,000, or $40,000, or you buy health insurance for all 50 employees. $40,000, less than a thousand dollars per employee, or health insurance for 50.

Well, it's a no-brainer. So many businesses with the added taxes that are in this bill are already saying, We've got to make cuts somewhere. If we can get away with only paying $40,000 instead of paying many times that for health insurance for our 50 employees, that's what we're going to have to do so we can keep them employed. That doesn't insure the 30 million that we were told was the whole purpose of this bill. In fact, it will ultimately throw more than that off of their own health insurance.

''If you like your health insurance, you'll keep it.'' People all across America heard that over and over. Apparently it simply was not true. The only question is, did the person making those statements know that they were not true when they were made? Or did it become a matter of convenience to strip everybody's health insurance at a later date? Either way, it was grossly unfair to all the people who did like their health insurance.

Reforms needed to be made, there's no question. We all agree on that. We could have worked together to provide those reforms. Instead, we had a monstrosity of a bill that simply got crammed down everybody's throat. That is what's most troubling.

I've already gotten the calls, I've gotten emails, I'm hearing people say they've been laid off, a family member has been laid off, they've been told they're going to have to cut their salaries. Why? Because we rushed this health care bill and rammed it through without most of the people in this body bothering to read it. I read all I could in the short period of time and I read enough to know that this is a disaster for America.

But if you're into government controlling everything, then you've got to love it, because it's sure going to have more government: 17,000 more IRS agents monitoring everybody monthly to make sure they're complying with the insurance requirements. How amazing, though. We hear from our friends across the aisle, We're concerned about the hardworking poor in America.

Well, guess what: If you make under 133 percent of the poverty level when this disaster kicks in in 2013, 2014, you're not going to have a choice. When you need health care, you're going to be thrown into Medicaid. I heard that Walgreens said they're not going to take any more Medicaid prescriptions. Doctors are saying we can't

make enough money to pay for the care, much less make a profit, so they're not taking Medicaid.

What a disaster for America. This needs our attention. But the heartbreaking aspect I keep coming back to is, people didn't have to lose their job, lose their insurance. Businesses didn't have to pay this much more tax. But we rushed it through. And I come back to a quote by George Washington, who said, ''Government is not reason, it is not eloquence, it is force; like fire, it is a dangerous servant and a fearful master.''

When this government was designed by our Founders, it was never intended to be the master of people. The people were meant to be the masters of this government; and this bill has thrown that all out of whack just as George Washington and so many of our Founders anticipated, and it requires the actions of Americans running to the sound of legislation to help prevent any more from this fearful master, as George Washington put it.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I very much thank my friend from east Texas, the Aggie, for coming to the floor this time of the night. I know it's been a long day, sustainful of lots of energy in rallies all across the city and the country and 700 plus of those.

We want a smaller government, not a larger government. We want a constitutional government. The number one priority that's being asked of us is to cite the sections of the Constitution that grant us the authority in every bill we introduce in this Congress. I've never done that, but I think it's a very good idea.

I'll say I have cited it when it comes to the time to pass a constitutional amendment or to repeal. I'm going to continue to pay attention to that. I think that's a very good idea. The thing that seems to draw the most emotion and the most mindset and the most thought is ObamaCare, the urge for the full repeal of ObamaCare, because we know intuitively that ObamaCare is unconstitutional, as I said; it's unfundable, it's unsustainable, and, Mr. Speaker, it's unforgivable to do this to the American people. The American people will not forget and they will not forgive and those that they do support in this new majority that's being driven by the constitutional conservatives, those that they do support had better keep their word. And when they give their oath here on the floor of this Congress, the new freshman class, which will be a large one, they better take their oath seriously to the Constitution. I continue to stand with it. I know the gentleman from Texas does. Many of my colleagues do the same. It's a serious oath.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the attention that you've given us this evening and the opportunity to address you here on the floor of the House. We covered a little bit of the subject matter that's important and imperative to this country.

I would yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. BORDALLO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business.

Mr. TOWNS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of attending a funeral.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POLIS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ALTMIRE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today and April 22.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, April 22.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, April 22.

Mrs. BLACKBURN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POSEY, for 5 minutes, April 20.

Mr. ROHRABACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4851. An act to provide a temporary extension of certain programs, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 25. Granting the consent and approval of Congress to amendments made by the State of Maryland, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the District of Columbia to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Regulation Compact.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 16, 2010, at 1 p.m.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

> ''I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.''

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 111th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

THEODORE E. DEUTCH, Florida, Nineteenth.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7022. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Potato Research and Promotion Plan [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-09-0024; FV-09-706C] received April 1, 2010 to the Committee on Agriculture.

7023. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Flutolanil; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0553; FRL-8817-9] received March 30, 2010 to the Committee on Agriculture.

7024. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter regarding mobilization of reserve component service members to the Committee on Armed Services.

7025. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Federal Home Loan Bank Housing Associates, Core Mission Activities and Standby Letters of Credit (RIN: 2590-AA33) received March 1, 2010 to the Committee on Financial Services.

7026. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Notice of Interpretation — Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD): Reconsideration of Interpretation of Regulations that Determine Pollutants Covered by the Federal PSD Permit Program received April 8, 2010 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7027. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Reconsideration of Interpretation of Regulations that Determine Pollutants Covered by Clean Air Act Permitting Programs [EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0597; FRL-9133-6] (RIN: 2060-AP87) received March 30, 2010 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7028. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and Nonattainment New Source Review (NSR): Inclusion of Fugitive Emissions; Final Rule; Stay [EPA-HQ-OAR-2004-0014; FRL-9131-9] (RIN: 2060-AP73) received March 26, 2010 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7029. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to Chapter 116 which relate to the Voiding of Permits and Extension of Permits [EPA-R06-OAR-2008-0089; FRL-9132-3] received March 26, 2010 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7030. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Divison, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 1-Propene, 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-; Withdrawal of Significant New Use Rule [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2008-0918; FRL-8816-9] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received March 26, 2010 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7031. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the General Conformity Regulations [EPA-HQ-OAR-2006-0669; FRL-9131-7] (RIN: 2060-AH93) received March 26, 2010 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7032. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's ''Major'' final rule — Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Changes to Renewable Fuel Standard Program [EPA-HQ-OAR-2005-0161; FRL-9112-3] (RIN: 2060-A081) received March 26, 2010 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7033. A letter from the Acting Associate Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Schools and Libraries Universal Service Support Mechanism [CC Docket No.: 02-6] received April 1, 2010 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7034. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor/Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Part 90 of the Commission's Rules [WP Docket No.: 07-100] received April 1, 2010 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7035. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the National Emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism that was declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001 to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7036. A letter from the Secretary, Department of State, transmitting notification that effective February 28, 2010, the 15% Danger Pay Allowance for USG civilian employees serving in Monrovia and Other, Liberia has been eliminated based on improved conditions to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7037. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting annual audit of the American Red Cross consolidated financial statements for the year ending June 30, 2009 to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7038. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998 to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7039. A letter from the Director, Congressional Affairs and Public Relations, Trade and Development Agency, transmitting the Agency's Fiscal Year 2009 annual report prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002, Pub. L. 107-174 to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7040. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish & Wildlife & Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Refuge Specific Regulations; Public Use; Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge [FWS-R7-NSR-2009-0055] [70133-1265-0000-4A] (RIN: 1018-AW15) received April 1, 2010 to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7041. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish & Wildlife & Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — 2009–2010 Refuge-Specific Hunting and Sport Fishing Regulations — Additions [Docket No.: FWS-R9-NSR-2009-0023] [93270-1265-0000-4A] (RIN: 1018-AW49) received April 8, 2010 to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7042. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the third Annual Report of the Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7043. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's quarterly report from the Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7044. A letter from the Acting Assistant Chief Counsel for Legislation & Regulations, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — America's Marine Highway Program [Docket No.: MARAD-2010-0035] (RIN: 2133-AB70) received April 5, 2010 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7045. A letter from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Electronic On-Board Recorders for Hours-of-Service Compliance [Docket No.: FMCSA-2004-18940] (RIN: 2126-AA89) received April 13, 2010 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7046. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Grants to States for Construction or Acquisition of State Home Facilities-Update of Authorized Beds (RIN: 2900-AM70) received April 8, 2010 to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

7047. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Liquor Dealer Recordkeeping and Registration, and Repeal of Certain Special (Occupational) Taxes [Docket No.: TTB-2009-0003; T.D. TTB-84; Re: Notice No. 96 and T.D. TTB-79] (RIN: 1513-AB63) received April 8, 2010 to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7048. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Stripping Transactions for Qualified Tax Credit Bonds [Notice 2010-28] received March 30, 2010 to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7049. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — American Recovery and Reinvestment Tax Act of 2009 Clarifications [Notice 2010-18] received March 30, 2010 to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 5028. A bill to allow homeowners of moderate-value homes who are subject to mortgage foreclosure proceedings to remain in their homes as renters; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. JORDAN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. CHAFFETZ):

H.R. 5029. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the private sector to create robust levels of economic growth; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BEAN (for herself, Mr. KIND, Mrs. HALVORSON, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, and Mr. NYE):

H.R. 5030. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow distributions from 529 plans for the payment of student loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 5031. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for individuals age 18 through 30 for certain retirement contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ACKERMAN (for himself, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 5032. A bill to amend the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970 to provide insurance coverage for certain indirect investors caught in Ponzi schemes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 5033. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out programs to provide youth in racial or ethnic minority or immigrant communities the information and skills needed to reduce teenage pregnancies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DELAHUNT (for himself, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 5034. A bill to support State based alcohol regulation, to clarify evidentiary rules for alcohol matters, to ensure the collection of all alcohol taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 5035. A bill to authorize appropriations for the construction of vessels for the Navy and to authorize appropriations for loan guarantees for commercial vessels; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 5036. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a program to populate downloadable tax forms with taxpayer return information; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOYLE (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. HARPER):

H.R. 5037. A bill to provide for Federal agencies to develop public access policies relating to research conducted by employees of

that agency or from funds administered by that agency; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HENSARLING (for himself and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 5038. A bill to repeal the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 5039. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Groundwater Replenishment System Expansion to reclaim and reuse municipal wastewater in the Orange County, California region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 5040. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Social Security Act to extend health information technology assistance eligibility to behavioral health, mental health, and substance abuse professionals and facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HARE (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. WATSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. OLVER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. FILNER, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SIRES, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. KILROY, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. BOCCIERI, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 5041. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the qualifying advanced energy project credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 5042. A bill to amend section 20 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to allow for a private civil action against a person that provides substantial assistance in violation of such Act; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 5043. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to modify the dischargeability of debts for certain educational payments and loans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN of Florida (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 5044. A bill to provide for enhanced penalties to combat Medicare and Medicaid fraud, a Medicare data-mining system and biometric technology pilot program, and a GAO study on Medicare administrative contractors; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ADLER of New Jersey:

H.R. 5045. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the tolling of the timing of review for appeals of final decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. AKIN (for himself, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. BONNER, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. BILBRAY):

H.R. 5046. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to require the inclusion of a statement within the decennial census questionnaire and the American Community Survey regarding certain response requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H.R. 5047. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide taxpayer protection and assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. SPRATT):

H.R. 5048. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to enhance the protection of credit ratings of servicemembers serving on active duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 5049. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to expand the matters covered by preseparation counseling provided to members of the Armed Forces and their spouses; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COOPER:

H.R. 5050. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an election for unmarried, nonitemizing individuals to have their returns prepared by the Secretary of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. WEINER, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MCMAHON, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. HIGGINS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 5051. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 23 Genesee Street in Hornell, New York, as the ''Zachary Smith Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 5052. A bill to amend Public Law 110-36 to clarify that a period of employment by the Chief of Mission or United States Armed Forces as a security advisor, translator, or interpreter in Iraq or Afghanistan is to be counted as a period of residence and physical presence in the United States for purposes of qualifying for naturalization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. AUSTRIA, and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 5053. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to enhance the Federal Protective Service's ability to provide adequate security for the prevention of terrorist activities and for the promotion of homeland security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 5054. A bill to prohibit the Internal Revenue Service from hiring new employees to enforce the Federal Government's invasion into the health care lives of American citizens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 5055. A bill to provide funds for Pell Grants by amending title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. KILROY:

H.R. 5056. A bill to authorize and request the President to award the Medal of Honor posthumously to Major Dominic S. Gentile of the United States Army Air Forces for acts of valor during the World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. CAO):

H.R. 5057. A bill to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, to prepare for attacks using weapons of mass destruction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Agriculture, Oversight and Government Reform, Transportation and Infrastructure, Foreign Affairs, Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. WEINER, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 5058. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide special rules for investments lost in a fraudulent Ponzi-type scheme; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SALAZAR (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 5059. A bill to provide for certain land exchanges in Gunnison County, Colorado, and Uintah County, Utah; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 5060. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable credit against income tax for tuition expenses incurred for each qualifying child of the taxpayer in attending public or private elementary or secondary school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. STARK, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 5061. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide assistance for programs and activities to protect the water quality of the San Francisco Bay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TEAGUE (for himself and Mr. HALL of Texas):

H.R. 5062. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to promote domestic natural gas research and development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Ms. TSONGAS (for herself and Mr. KISSELL):

H.R. 5063. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to establish a joint task force to improve the research and development of lighter weight body armor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOCCIERI:

H. Con. Res. 261. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Supreme Court should uphold laws that allow the families and friends of fallen members of the Armed Forces to mourn their loved ones in peace and privacy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. RANGEL):

H. Con. Res. 262. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Sarcoidosis Awareness Month in April 2010 and supporting efforts to devote new resources to research the causes of the disease, environmental and otherwise, along with treatments and workforce strategies to support individuals with sarcoidosis and their families; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H. Res. 1254. A resolution directing the Secretary of the Interior to transmit to the House of Representatives certain information relating to the Secretary's Treasured Landscape Initiative, potential designation of National Monuments, and High Priority Land-Rationalization Efforts; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H. Res. 1255. A resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H. Res. 1256. A resolution congratulating Phil Mickelson on winning the 2010 Masters golf tournament; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself, Mrs. BIGGERT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HIMES, Mr. POMEROY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BACA, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WALZ, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. LANCE):

H. Res. 1257. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Financial Literacy Month, 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. STARK, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SALAZAR, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. DREIER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. BACA, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. WATSON, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ISRAEL, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H. Res. 1258. A resolution expressing support for designation of May 2010 as Mental Health Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. KIND, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. KILROY, and Ms. GIFFORDS):

H. Res. 1259. A resolution recognizing and supporting the goals and ideals of Sexual Assault Awareness Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H. Res. 1260. A resolution expressing support for designation of April 2010 as Student Financial Aid Awareness Month to raise awareness of student financial aid; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ROSS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. KENNEDY, and Ms. MARKEY of Colorado):

H. Res. 1261. A resolution recognizing National Nurses Week; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mr. DICKS, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CAO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. WU, Mr. HARE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. TONKO, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BRIGHT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. PITTS):

H. Res. 1262. A resolution expressing condolences to the families, friends, and loved ones of the victims of the fire at the Tesoro refinery in Anacortes, Washington; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H. Res. 1263. A resolution expressing support for Mathematics Awareness Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MOORE of Kansas (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. TERRY, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. HOLT):

H. Res. 1264. A resolution expressing support for the designation of March as National Essential Tremor Awareness Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BACA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. CHU, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SALAZAR, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. WATSON, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. CLYBURN):

H. Res. 1265. A resolution honoring the life and accomplishments of Jaime A. Escalante; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Ms. WATSON):

H. Res. 1266. A resolution recognizing the 60th anniversary of the outbreak of the Korean War; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SIRES (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. MACK):

H. Res. 1267. A resolution recognizing the 200th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Colombia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. Res. 1268. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require chairs and ranking minority members of committees and subcommittees to indicate whether they have any financial interest in the employer of any witness at a hearing, any person retaining a witness, or any person represented by a witness; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H. Res. 1269. A resolution commemorating the 400th anniversary of the first use of the telescope for astronomical observation by the Italian scientist Galileo Galilei; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Ms. TITUS, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BUYER, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 39: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 333: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 476: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 504: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 510: Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 564: Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 635: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 678: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DENT, Mr. PERRIELLO, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 690: Mr. TONKO, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 705: Mr. LEE of New York.
H.R. 816: Mr. ARCURI.
H.R. 847: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 889: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 891: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 930: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 950: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1077: Mr. MICHAUD and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1173: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado.
H.R. 1177: Mr. CONYERS, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MICA, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 1205: Mr. LUCAS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 1250: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1339: Mr. HARE.
H.R. 1351: Mr. ARCURI, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 1392: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 1412: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1430: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1526: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1545: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1547: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 1560: Ms. HARMAN.
H.R. 1618: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 1646: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. MELANCON.
H.R. 1671: Mr. FARR and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1685: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 1708: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1751: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1821: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1908: Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 1962: Mr. LINDER.
H.R. 2057: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. ARCURI.
H.R. 2067: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 2089: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2103: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2104: Ms. LEE of California and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2132: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 2149: Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 2160: Mr. WALDEN and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 2254: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 2266: Ms. TITUS and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 2267: Ms. TITUS and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 2275: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 2287: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 2296: Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 2378: Mrs. HALVORSON.
H.R. 2413: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 2478: Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. KLEIN of Florida.
H.R. 2521: Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 2536: Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 2597: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 2600: Mr. BARTLETT.
H.R. 2737: Mr. HIMES, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CALVERT and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 2740: Mr. SCHAUER and Mr. ARCURI.
H.R. 2819: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 3006: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 3024: Mr. HIGGINS and Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 3131: Mr. HOEKSTRA.
H.R. 3186: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 3202: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3225: Mr. ARCURI.
H.R. 3233: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
H.R. 3240: Mr. LATHAM and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3243: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 3310: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 3408: Mr. NADLER of New York.
H.R. 3453: Mr. CASSIDY.
H.R. 3458: Mr. WEINER, Ms. HARMAN, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 3488: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3502: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. CHILDERS.
H.R. 3519: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3553: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 3564: Ms. NORTON, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 3592: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 3612: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey and Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 3655: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 3668: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 3712: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, and Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 3754: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3772: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3799: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 3813: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. HALL of New York, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 3973: Ms. WATSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 3995: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 4128: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 4132: Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MICA, and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 4183: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4186: Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 4197: Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 4229: Mr. BACA and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 4274: Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 4278: Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 4298: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 4299: Mr. CHANDLER and Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 4303: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 4354: Mr. ETHERIDGE and Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 4371: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. SCHAUER.
H.R. 4376: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 4386: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 4393: Mr. PERRIELLO.
H.R. 4399: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4413: Mr. MOLLOHAN.
H.R. 4453: Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 4472: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.
H.R. 4489: Ms. CHU and Mr. DELAHUNT.
H.R. 4502: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 4522: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 4524: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 4530: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 4544: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. DRIEHAUS.
H.R. 4550: Mr. HODES.
H.R. 4554: Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 4555: Mr. BERRY, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 4596: Mr. SIRES, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 4638: Mr. ALEXANDER.
H.R. 4645: Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. ORTIZ.
H.R. 4677: Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 4684: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4689: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 4694: Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 4717: Mr. HELLER, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 4722: Mr. KISSELL.
H.R. 4745: Ms. BEAN and Mr. NYE.
H.R. 4746: Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 4751: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 4753: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 4755: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 4788: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 4806: Ms. KILROY and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 4812: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HOLDEN, and Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 4829: Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
H.R. 4842: Ms. KILROY.
H.R. 4844: Mr. CASSIDY.
H.R. 4850: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 4856: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.
H.R. 4859: Ms. NORTON, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. ALEXANDER.
H.R. 4868: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 4870: Ms. KAPTUR and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 4881: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 4886: Mr. PITTS and Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 4889: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 4894: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 4903: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 4904: Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 4908: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 4910: Mr. POSEY and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 4919: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 4925: Mr. NADLER of New York.
H.R. 4937: Mr. LEE of New York.
H.R. 4940: Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H.R. 4943: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. MACK, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 4944: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 4947: Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 4951: Mr. MORAN of Kansas and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 4960: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 4962: Ms. KILROY.
H.R. 4975: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 4985: Mr. CASSIDY.
H.R. 4996: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 4999: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 5000: Ms. FUDGE and Mr. DRIEHAUS.
H.R. 5008: Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 5015: Mr. WELCH, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FARR, and Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 5020: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. OLVER, Mr. HARE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.
H.R. 5021: Ms. SUTTON.
H.J. Res. 76: Mr. SCHRADER.
H.J. Res. 79: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BONNER, and Mr. BARTLETT.
H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H. Con. Res. 50: Ms. RICHARDSON.

H. Con. Res. 137: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TOWNS, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H. Con. Res. 241: Mr. LEWIS of California.

H. Con. Res. 256: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WEINER, Mr. SHULER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. INGLIS.

H. Con. Res. 260: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NUNES, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROYCE, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DENT, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. FOXX, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HELLER, Mr. INGLIS, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MACK, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H. Res. 173: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MAFFEI, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. OWENS, Mr. LUCAS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. BOSWELL.

H. Res. 497: Mr. CALVERT.

H. Res. 855: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H. Res. 982: Mr. KIRK, Mr. MICA, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.

H. Res. 989: Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 1033: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H. Res. 1073: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Res. 1106: Mr. RUSH and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H. Res. 1171: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. ARCURI, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H. Res. 1172: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. KILROY, Mr. HARE, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WALZ, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. CLAY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. PETERS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. CHU, Ms. TITUS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. TEAGUE, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, and Mr. UPTON.

H. Res. 1175: Mr. STEARNS and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H. Res. 1187: Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. SABLAN.

H. Res. 1196: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. SKELTON.

H. Res. 1208: Mr. CAO, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BARROW, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. KIND, Mr. BLUNT, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H. Res. 1209: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H. Res. 1226: Mr. KIRK and Mr. CASSIDY.

H. Res. 1230: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H. Res. 1240: Mr. MINNICK.

H. Res. 1241: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SHULER, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 877: Ms. ESHOO.