

East, Africa, and around the globe to work on critical projects like education, agricultural development, and HIV/AIDS relief, while promoting goodwill towards America.

Similarly, I am concerned about amendments to defund the U.S. Institute of Peace. Our country is fighting a multi-billion dollar war. And as General Petraeus affirmed, USIP works closely with the military in both Afghanistan and Iraq to promote on-the-ground peacebuilding efforts and bring an end to conflict. Yet, as my colleagues propose to increase funding for the war, some have also proposed to eliminate funding for USIP, the only independent government actor that is dedicated solely to conflict prevention and resolution. That makes absolutely no economic sense.

Rather than make smart investments in civilian instruments of security, this bill and a lot of the amendments to it cut many other excellent foreign assistance programs with strong returns on investment. These include international family planning, poverty and infectious disease alleviation, and the Inter-American Foundation.

As Secretary Gates said, "Development is a lot cheaper than sending in soldiers." If we want to be better stewards of taxpayer dollars, then why are we ripping resources away from the low-cost, high-return international programs that create strategic alliances and prevent multi-billion dollar wars?

The foreign aid budget is less than two percent of our total federal budget. This boils down to about \$126 per American. That's about \$100 bucks less than an army service uniform. So, for just \$126 a head, America remains the beacon of democracy in the world. Now, that makes good economic sense.

Our job in this body is to serve the American people. But what kind of public servants are we if we vote to jeopardize America's national security so we can save a few bucks this year?

These cuts to foreign assistance masquerade as fiscal responsibility. But the reality is that this is a short-sighted proposal that endangers our long-term security, stability, and economic health. I strongly oppose this misguided legislation.

THE CORAL REEF CONSERVATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION AND ENHANCEMENT AMENDMENTS OF 2011

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced a bill to enhance and reauthorize the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000. In the 111th Congress, I sponsored this legislation as H.R. 860, the "Coral Reef Conservation Act Reauthorization and Enhancement Amendments of 2009", which the House of Representatives passed by voice vote on September 22, 2009. The bill I have introduced today, with 12 of my colleagues, strengthens H.R. 860 without changing its original intent.

The conservation of coral reef ecosystems is essential to protect public health, ensure environmental sustainability, support thousands of American jobs, and guarantee the long-term

economic progress of coastal regions across the nation. United States waters contain some of the world's greatest coral reef biodiversity. From the waters off the coast of Guam and islands in the Pacific, to Florida and the U.S. Territories in the Caribbean, our reefs provide habitat and shelter for fisheries and food and recreation for our residents. These ecosystems also protect us from storm waves and are the basis for marine tourism industries.

Today, however, our coral reefs, and the numerous ecosystem services that they provide, are under threat from pollution, climate change, and overharvesting, among others stressors. Unless the United States acts in conjunction with the global community to support focused, long-term action on coral reef education, research, and management, the state of our coral reefs will continue to deteriorate.

Since its enactment, the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000 has sparked a greater commitment to protect, conserve, and restore coral reef resources within our waters. We now have improved our understanding of the condition of our coral reefs, and have better focused our management capabilities. The Coral Reef Conservation Act Reauthorization and Enhancement Amendments of 2011 would further strengthen the original legislation by improving the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's, NOAA, ability to respond to emergency or disaster-related situations and minimize the likelihood of vessel impacts on coral reefs. Specifically, the legislation would establish community-based planning grants for states and territories to support projects that address emerging threats to corals. In addition, the legislation would promote international cooperation by authorizing NOAA to engage with international partners to protect coral reef ecosystems.

This bill would also codify the United States Coral Reef Task Force established in 1998 by President Clinton through Executive Order 13089. The work of the Task Force, and its mission to coordinate the efforts of the United States in promoting conservation and the sustainable use of coral reefs internationally, is vital to our interests and coastal economies.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to advance this legislation, enhance and conserve our coral reef ecosystems, and protect coastal jobs.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. SILVESTRE REYES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chair, I rise today to express my strong opposition to the significant cuts to community health centers included in this bill. The Continuing Resolution proposes to reduce funding to community health centers by \$1 billion, a nearly sixty percent reduction

from FY2010 levels. Over the past few years, millions of families lost their health insurance due to job losses, and they now depend on community health centers to receive health care. If these cuts are signed into law, 192,834 people in Texas alone would lose access to health care.

These cuts are especially harmful to the people of my district. Border communities face unique health concerns and challenges, and community health centers play a critical role. The cuts will have devastating effects on the communities and patients who most need access to care—patients with diabetes, heart disease, and HIV/AIDS, as well as children and pregnant women. Community health centers provide access to quality health care to those who would otherwise forgo a doctor's visit or seek treatment in an emergency when it's too late.

In my congressional district for example, Centro San Vicente, one of many community health centers, provides health services for over 10,000 people a year. The irresponsible cuts contained in the Continuing Resolution will merely shift the burden to local communities, such as the district I represent, where local property taxpayers have already spent more than \$500,000,000 since 1998 to pay for those who could not afford to pay for health care at our public hospital.

Republicans cannot merely ignore the problems that arise when 50 million people in the United States lack basic health coverage. They have voted to repeal the health insurance reform law, and now want to cut the very clinics that help lower health care costs by encouraging uninsured patients to seek treatment in a doctor's office, not in an emergency room, where the costs are substantially higher.

I understand the need for fiscal discipline, but drastically funding to a cost-effective program that has improved countless lives makes little sense from both a moral and fiscal perspective.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill which strips funding for community health centers.

THE LOWEY AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1

HON. LOUISE MCINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this amendment to restore funding to Title X family planning.

By slashing Title X family planning services in the budget, Republicans risk the lives and safety of millions of American women. These proposed cuts to family planning represent the opening salvo in an all-out war on women's health. I ask you to join with me and with my colleagues to restore this vital funding to Title X family planning.

Five million men and women depend on Title X providers for important preventive health care. Among other services, they received 2.3 million breast exams, 2.2 million cervical cancer screenings, and nearly 1 million HIV tests. These services prevent fatal illness; and for those who do have the misfortune to contract HIV/AIDS or cancer, Title X providers ensure that they receive life-saving

treatment early, when it has the greatest potential for good.

The proposed cuts in H.R. 1 would eviscerate these life-saving services.

While these cuts to family planning were proposed under the guise of being “fiscally responsible,” that is far from the truth.

For every dollar invested in Title X family planning services, taxpayers save just under \$4. Cutting family planning is not fiscally responsible, and will not reduce the bottom line.

Moreover, this cut has nothing to do with ending funding for abortions, despite claims to the contrary. Title X family planning funds simply do not fund abortions. If we want to reduce the number of abortions in this country, the methodology is clear—empower women to prevent unintended pregnancies through education and access to contraception. And, that is precisely what family planning funding does.

In my home State of New York, cuts to Planned Parenthood would impact 209,410 patients. Just last year, Planned Parenthood provided 70,490 screenings for cervical cancer in New York, detecting 7,931 abnormal results requiring medical action. Another 67,957 women received breast exams. 138,501 tests for chlamydia helped to avert the leading cause of preventable infertility in America today. New Yorkers stand to lose valuable health services.

Instead of cutting vital health care services, we should focus on rebuilding our economy and creating jobs.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I strongly support the Blumenauer, Lowey, Markey amendment to restore our commitment to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Public broadcasting provides an essential service, providing millions of Americans with educational and cultural programming. In my district, and throughout the entire Washington, DC metropolitan region, we have been admirably served by public broadcasting stations like WETA on television and WAMU on the radio for many years.

Support for public broadcasting was first provided in 1967, and has been maintained for more than 40 years—it is an American institution. Whose children have not grown up learning their A,B,Cs from Sesame Street? Who has not enjoyed one of the many rich musical performances or riveting documentaries, including Ken Burns’ historic 1990 series on the American Civil War, and a recent series on America’s national parks, shown exclusively on PBS?

In America, unlike many countries around the world, the media industry always has been a completely commercial enterprise. Public

broadcasting was not designed to supplant private media—and given the explosion of private television channels it clearly has not. Instead it merely provides viewers with a broad selection of educational and cultural programs that are available for free in every household in every community. I myself did not subscribe to cable television until just a few years ago and routinely watched PBS using rabbit ears on my old television set. Millions of Americans choose PBS, and they support it with their own money by donating to local stations during pledge drives. This has been a successful partnership, leveraging public investment with private funds for decades. That’s why the proposed Republican cut is all the more surprising, given their alleged reverence for respecting the popular will expressed on You Cut. The number of Americans who support public broadcasting with their private contributions exceeds all of the participation in You Cuts by tens of multiples.

I recognize the need to control federal spending and reduce the deficit, and I support responsible reductions to that end. However, eviscerating public broadcasting is not responsible budgeting and flaunts any pretense of respect for popular support.

While less than twenty percent of its funding comes from the federal government, any reduction in support would result in significant degradation of the educational and cultural programming it provides. Public broadcasting is an extraordinarily cost-effective investment in America’s cultural and educational advancement. For more than 40 years, PBS has brought the world to our living rooms, regardless of our financial means or where we lived. A PBS is to broadcasting what the Internet is to the digital revolution, and like the Internet democratizes and makes universal access to information. We must not sever access to such a unifying public resource at the short-sighted altar of fiscal dogma. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Blumenauer, Lowey, Markey amendment. Support the American institution of Public Broadcasting.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chair, I rise today to oppose the drastic and reckless cuts my colleagues in the Majority have included in H.R. 1. This legislation includes cuts that will destroy jobs, pollute our environment, damage our schools, threaten public safety and impact nearly every aspect of our economy. They will not strengthen our nation, they will negatively impact our natural resources and inhibit future generation’s ability to compete and innovate in the global economy.

Specifically, H.R. 1 would reduce NOAA’s operating budget by more than \$450 million

dollars, severely diminishing NOAA’s ability to protect marine ecosystems, manage our nation’s fisheries and provide weather monitoring data to weather sensitive industries. In addition, it will cut programs that provide life-saving services in every state and district. These irresponsible cuts will jeopardize thousands of jobs, threaten public safety and have lasting effects on our national and regional economies.

Of particular concern to coastal regions like Guam, are threats to coral reef ecosystems and the fisheries and tourism industries they support. The US commercial fisheries industry alone accounts for more than \$100 billion in annual sales and supports 1.5 million jobs, while the coastal recreation and tourism industry serves as one of the nation’s largest employers. These industries are critical to the long-term economic success of coastal regions however they are significantly threatened by coral reef degradation due to pollution, and climate change. Without healthy coral reefs, fishery levels plummet, and tourism declines.

Reducing NOAA’s operating budget will further jeopardize these important industries. Without sufficient funding, NOAA cannot adequately protect our coral reef resources and could be forced to reduce public access to National Marine Sanctuaries and other recreational areas. In addition, H.R. 1 would significantly deteriorate NOAA’s law enforcement abilities against illegal, unregulated and unreported fishing. The weakening of these programs would cause both immediate and long term job losses within the commercial fisheries and tourism industries. I strongly oppose all proposed cuts to NOAA’s operating budget, it is too important to our economy and preserving our marine resources for future generations.

Another reckless cut included in H.R. 1 is more than \$217 million to the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA). NIFA provides critical grants to universities around the nation, supporting food and agriculture research promoting economic growth and environmental protections. The research yields national value and is especially significant to food security, nutritional health, and increased agricultural production.

Specifically important to Guam, is the Tropical and Subtropical Research program, T-STAR. In 2010, the T-STAR program supported 46 research projects at the University of Florida, the University of Hawaii, the University of Puerto Rico, the University Guam, the University of the Virgin Islands, and at American Samoa Community College. These projects are critical to sustainable agriculture, pest control, and disease research. Funds provided by T-STAR are leveraged by a commitment of local resources, further improving public health, protecting agro-ecosystems, and saving taxpayer dollars over time. They offer a high yield on investment and funding for the NIFA and T-STAR programs should be made a priority. I strongly oppose the majority’s irresponsible cuts to these programs.