

IN OPPOSITION TO AMENDMENT
468 TO H.R. 1, CONTINUING AP-
PROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, under current law, the Lifeline program provides Americans struggling to climb out of poverty and get back on their feet a choice to receive a landline phone or a mobile phone subsidized by the Universal Service Fund. In my district of Sacramento, we have 25,000, and in the State of California we have approximately 2 million, residents who benefit from this service.

Low income people use Lifeline service to look for a job, call their doctors, reach their child care providers, or contact their family in an emergency.

But Amendment No. 468 would eliminate USF funding for mobile phone service for the poorest Americans, and maintain it only for landline phones, forcing poor people to stay at home waiting for important calls, rather than getting out of their homes to look for a job.

I have heard from many of my constituents in Sacramento who are concerned about the high costs of services, and would be impacted by these cuts to Lifeline services.

I have heard from a woman who is living off a fixed income and is counting her pennies each month to make ends meet. If her bill goes up "by one cent", she says she will have to drop her service. The Lifeline program allows her to stay connected in an increasingly connected society.

Another one of my constituents, who is disabled, can't afford in-home broadband services, and is forced to commute miles to the nearest library to access the Internet. But these all day excursions means that he misses important calls, and if something were to happen to him while he was out without a mobile phone, he would have no ability to call a friend, family member, or 911 for help. This Amendment would take that cell phone away.

Moreover, this Amendment would not return any monies to the U.S. Treasury. The Universal Service Fund is supported entirely by telephone users—not taxpayers.

In short, this Amendment picks technological winners and losers. It ignores input from legislators who have expertise on these issues. The House Energy and Commerce Committee plans to hold hearings on the Universal Service Fund this year, and the Federal Communications Commission announced its intention to review the Lifeline program.

Finally, the amendment limits both economic opportunity and discourages employment security. Studies by the Opinion Research Corporation and MIT have found that cell phones are extremely important to an individual's economic productivity and earning power. Having access to a cell phone in order to get a "call back" is essential for Americans who are out of work. When the rest of America is cutting their landlines, this amendment is forcing the poorest among us to rely on a dying technology, which the free market has rejected.

We should be expanding the lifeline program to broadband and mobile phones, technologies that are in high demand, and empower consumers to pursue a job, an education, or new career training.

For all of these reasons, I strongly oppose this Amendment, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

IN SUPPORT OF AMENDMENT 325
TO H.R. 1, CONTINUING APPRO-
PRIATIONS ACT, 2011

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express support for Amendment 325, offered by Mr. BLUMENAUER, to restore funding to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and I urge my colleagues to vote in support as well.

Recently, I spoke to one of my constituents who expressed his sorrow to me at the prospect of losing public broadcasting services. As he put it, he pays less than two dollars a year in taxes for the service, but it brightens his day every morning that he listens to his favorite public radio shows. To him, it was a simple equation of value for money.

He specifically voiced his support for National Public Radio (NPR) and Public Broadcasting Service (PBS). NPR is a public-private membership media organization that syndicates programming for hundreds of public radio stations across the country. Individual member stations, such as local university stations are required to be non-commercial, and educational in nature, and are not required to broadcast all NPR programming.

And despite what I have heard from my colleagues, the truth is that only about two percent of NPR funding is directly provided by the federal government, under the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), which also funds PBS. The reality is that the Corporation for Public Broadcasting receives around .0001% of the annual federal budget. Eliminating that funding would save Americans less than half a cent a day, and in doing so, eliminate a valuable educational, cultural, and community resource.

But the value of the services are unending. As a former board chair of my district's local PBS TV station, I can attest to the value local programming offers to my constituents. I hear from families, seniors, and everyday commuters who use public broadcasting to get local news, to learn something new about the world, and teachers who use its educational programming in their classrooms.

Moreover, public TV and radio stations employ over 17,000 people across the country—jobs that no one can afford to lose—and especially not now.

M. Chair, the number of listeners and viewers speak for themselves. Every month, over 170 million Americans use public media—through 368 public television stations, 934 public radio stations, hundreds of online services, education services, and in-person events and activities. Every month over half of all Americans use public media.

Defunding public broadcasting would be a deep and misguided error, and would lose our country a great resource.

Maintaining support for public, educational, and government channels and networks is necessary to facilitate communication, and I am dedicated to ensuring that citizens have access to tools that inform, educate, and encourage interest in local activities.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on Amendment 325, and to uphold the legacy of American public broadcasting.

HONORING LORRAINE BOCCIO FOR
HER OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO
HUNTINGTON STATION, NY

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor someone in my district who has given much to those in need. Lorraine Boccio of Huntington Station, NY, has recently been diagnosed with stage 3 pancreatic cancer and I'd like to take a moment to share some of the good work she has done.

Lorraine works in customer service at a local supermarket but spends her spare time committed to service as well. Every year she collects and mails packages to troops overseas and holds annual events for veterans on Memorial Day and Veterans Day. These events bring out hundreds of veterans and Lorraine conducts the fundraising, planning, and execution of these events. She also attends funerals and wakes of fallen troops on Long Island and collects cards from schoolchildren in the South Huntington School District for veterans.

Lorraine is also fiercely supportive of her local police and fire departments. For the holidays in December 2001, Lorraine collected and distributed food, clothing and toys to all of the children in Huntington who lost a loved one in the September 11 attacks. She takes every opportunity to honor her local police, fire, and EMS workers, including organizing fundraisers, visiting those who are injured, and paying tribute to those who served in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks.

Finally, throughout the year Lorraine organizes food drives, "adopts" families with troubles such as a child with an illness or a house fire, and donates food and supplies to Huntington's Little Animal Shelter.

Lorraine brightens the lives of her neighbors every day while working in customer service at her day job and helps anyone and everyone in need in her community. I wish her all the best for a speedy recovery and hope that the community to which she has given so much supports her in the fight of her life.

SETH KING TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to stand and pay sincere tribute to the life of Seth King. Sadly the city of Pueblo, Colorado, will have to continue on without the talents and gifts of the revered local legend. Mr. King was a barber and clinical chemist by trade, but he represented much more to the Pueblo community.

The owner and operator of King's Barber shop, Seth King cut hair for 45 years and had a positive effect on the lives of countless individuals. Mr. King moved to Pueblo as a young

man from the still segregated south. He wanted to pursue his dream of becoming a clinical chemist, and achieved that goal as he worked for The Colorado Mental Health Institute for 35 years. Mr. King was also a staunch supporter of the Republican Party, and was the first black man to run for the state senate in 1968. Seth King was also an active member of the Catholic Church and The Knights of Columbus. Whether cheering a customer up at the barbershop, or giving his time in faith-based outreach, he spent his lifetime improving the lives of those around him.

Mr. Speaker, Pueblo may have lost a wonderful member of their community, but there is no doubt that the spirit of Seth King's life still reverberates throughout the city. It has been a privilege to stand and pay tribute to Mr. Seth King's accomplished life.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. SHELLEY BERKLEY

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 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. BERKLEY. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Pence Amendment.

Rep. PENCE's amendment would prohibit Planned Parenthood from receiving any federal funds, including Medicaid reimbursement for family planning services, funding for HIV testing and counseling, funding for programs to prevent infertility, breast and cervical cancer screening funds, and funding to provide evidenced-based sex education, including information about abstinence. This amendment would have a devastating impact on communities like Las Vegas.

In my district, Planned Parenthood's Flamingo Health Center is an essential community provider and one of only three Title X facilities in Clark County. In FY 2010, 27 percent of their clients were at or below 100 percent of Federal Poverty Level (FPL) and an additional 39 percent were between 100 percent and 250 percent of FPL. Planned Parenthood provides access for many low-income women to basic and preventive healthcare, often serving as a primary care provider. In FY2010, Planned Parenthood provided basic healthcare services to more than 18,000 Nevadans.

Rep. PENCE's amendment will result in 1.4 million Medicaid patients—predominately women—losing access to their health care provider. This attack on Medicaid patients' access to their local provider occurs at the same time that the Medicaid program desperately needs more doctors and nurses to participate in the program. Existing access issues will only become exacerbated as a result of the Medicaid expansion to 133 percent of the Federal Poverty Level under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA).

Federal law already requires health care providers to demonstrate that federal funds are not used for abortion care, so this amend-

ment is a clear attempt to cut funding for cancer screenings and contraception for low-income women at Planned Parenthood health centers. Rep. PENCE's amendment has one goal—to undermine women's access to basic, preventive healthcare and the women's health providers they rely on in their communities. I oppose this amendment and efforts to deprive women access to essential healthcare services.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BLAKE FARENTHOLD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 84, I missed the vote due to a previously scheduled satellite interview in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

HONORING THE LACEY TOWNSHIP
HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL TEAM
OF LANOKA HARBOR, NEW JERSEY

HON. JON RUNYAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 2010 New Jersey State Athletic Association's South Jersey Group III Champions: the Lacey Township High School Football Team of Lanoka Harbor, New Jersey.

On December 4, 2010, by an impressive score of 56 to 7, Lacey Township High School defeated Delsea Regional High School in the South Jersey Group III Championship football game. This marks the fourth time in school history that they are the South Jersey Group III Football Champions.

During the championship game, the Lacey Township Lions were able to score seven touchdowns, resulting in 49 points. Senior running back, Jacob Dabal, scored three touchdowns, while senior quarterback, Craig Cicardo, and senior running back, Jarrod Molzon, each scored two touchdowns. The outstanding offensive output of these three young student-athletes helped pave the way to a Lacey Township victory.

Equally extraordinary was the defensive efforts of the Lacey Township Lions. In the championship game, the Lions' defense forced eight turnovers, consisting of three interceptions and five fumbles. One of those fumbles resulted in a touchdown by senior defensive back, Zach Torrell.

The Lacey Township Lions finished their 2010 football season with an undefeated record of 12 wins and 0 losses, its third undefeated season in school history.

I would like to congratulate Lacey Township High School's football coach of 30 years, Coach Lou Virillo, and his entire coaching staff. Through their inspiration and motivation, they enabled these young men to achieve an amazing accomplishment.

I would also like to thank the senior members of the Lacey Township High School Football Team. Their incredible leadership of the Lions this year not only led to another cham-

ampionship title, but also to another undefeated season.

Mister Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in celebrating the achievement of the Lacey Township High School Football Team in capturing the 2010 NJSIAA South Jersey Group III championship and finishing the year undefeated.

I ask you to join me in celebration with the coaches, players, and student body of Lacey Township High School, as well as the teachers, parents and community members who all made this victory a reality. Finally, I ask you to wish the Lacey Lions continued success in next year's football season.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 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. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, today I rise to oppose the reckless Republican proposal to eliminate funding for the Title X Family Planning Program. This cut is a legislative assault on women's health and a failure of House Republicans to strengthen American families. Instead of focusing on issues Americans are most concerned about, like creating jobs, House Republicans have decided to target women's health programs and women's health providers under the guise of deficit reduction.

Since 1970, Title X Family Planning Program has been a critical component of our nation's health care infrastructure and an essential vehicle in preventing unintended pregnancies and providing basic primary and preventive health care, including annual exams lifesaving screenings for illnesses like breast cancer, cervical cancer and HIV. If these cuts are allowed to become law, 5 million Americans will lose these services and women's access to health care will be severely restricted.

House Republicans are using this legislation to mislead the American people by suggesting that federal funds are being used to pay for abortions. This is flatly untrue, since federal law has already banned Title X funds from being used for abortion services. Moreover, in 2008 Title X supported services prevented 973,000 unintended pregnancies which resulted in thousands of fewer abortions. However, if Title X Family Planning Programs are eliminated more women will experience unintended pregnancies and face potentially life-threatening cancer and other diseases that could have been prevented.

Preventing women's health centers from receiving this critical funding stream is not the answer and the majority of Americans do not support this proposal. According to a January 2011 CBS/New York Times survey found that by a margin of 67 percent to 27 percent, Americans oppose cuts for health care and education as a means of reducing the deficit. Instead, the American people want Congress