

would make it possible so that they would not have to send their catch off to another State or even another country to be processed. If we can build that freezer in Portland, hundreds of jobs could be created, and our working waterfronts could be strengthened.

Also in Maine, the community of Brunswick has been hit by BRAC, a base closure; and they have worked long and hard to develop economic development opportunities that will strengthen that community and reuse the base. They have successfully attracted exciting new projects, including an aircraft manufacturing facility using carbon fiber, high-technology materials and the highest technology in new engineering and building on the site of the former air base.

But those projects and the hundreds of jobs that they will create are counting on the EDA funding to help transform what was once a former Navy base into a civilian economic engine. The economy is just starting to turn around, and eliminating the critical investments we need to keep it going is the last thing we should be doing right now.

I want to say a couple of things too about the President's budget. The President has put forward a budget on the table that does many of the things that we need to have done: investing in infrastructure, science and technology, education, the very kinds of things that will make our country competitive and move us forward. There are many good things in this budget, whether it's eliminating the tax breaks for big oil companies, or no further extensions of tax cuts for the wealthy, or making sure we do increase the Economic Development Administration and invest in economic development.

Investing in health care, continuing to implement the health care reform bill where we are putting money into the critical training of 4,000 more primary care providers—I know that's a huge need in my State and so many other States—as well as working to move forward on the permanent fix to the SGR so that our physicians are adequately reimbursed.

Investments in housing, making sure that the homeless veterans are no longer on the streets anymore and that people have more choices to move forward in housing. Eliminating tax breaks for big oil companies. Making our commercial buildings more efficient, even cutting defense in strategic ways. Up to \$78 billion in wasteful spending is cut out of the President's budget. Cutting of the alternative engine for the F-35, which is just wasteful, unnecessary while at the same time he is making sure that our military personnel get a pay raise and that they are recognized and supported.

I do need to discuss one issue in the President's budget that will be a problem for my constituents in Maine. The President's budget proposes to cut LIHEAP funding. LIHEAP funding helps nearly 70,000 Maine households

make ends meet by offsetting home heating costs. Funding is especially important for Maine. We have some of the country's oldest housing stock, and we are heavily dependent on oil for heating. In fact, we are the most dependent State in the Nation on oil heat.

The cost of heating oil is going up, from a low of about \$2.25 at the beginning of the economic downturn to about \$3.35 now. Maine communities are still struggling in the down economy. Slashing funding for this program would not be appropriate, and it must be changed in the President's budget.

DO NOT CUT LIHEAP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I come before the House today to talk about a critically important program that I think all Americans need to know about which is hanging in the balance as we approach this continuing resolution. The program I am here to talk about is the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, also known as LIHEAP.

LIHEAP is a program commonly believed to be an income-support program. But actually, Madam Speaker, it is not an income-support program. LIHEAP, which provides energy to low-income families, heating oil, things like that, is actually a health program and a program that is designed to make sure that citizens do not have to choose between heat and eat. You do not have to choose between dinner and a warm room. Many of us who are from places like Minnesota, my own home State, but also Michigan, Maine, New Jersey, New Hampshire, add to that many others—Montana, many others, and even some States that we think of as warm-weather States, but in the winter can get cold too—really, people depend upon these programs to really survive.

In my own State, if LIHEAP is cut, many people will simply go without. And of course I have statistics here, Madam Speaker; but rather than talk about statistics, I want to talk about a man who lived in my district who was actually not a LIHEAP recipient but was eligible for the program and didn't use it. He didn't have enough money for his heat, so what he did was he kind of jerry-rigged some space heaters, and he kind of made due. And this caused a fire, Madam Speaker, which resulted in his death.

And when I looked up what really happens, how often people die from space heaters, the numbers are not always consistent, but upwards of 32 percent of all home fires are because of space heaters; and about 75 percent of all home-fire deaths are due to space heaters, deaths.

□ 1050

People die when this happens because they don't have the energy assistance

that they need. And our Congress, right now, under Republican majority, is talking about cutting this program even more.

Now, you think about a winter like this one, Madam Speaker, where there have been record snowfalls in many places around our country, and it's been cold since October in Minnesota. And the fact is that programs that provide LIHEAP funding are already running out of money. And if they were drawn back to 2008 spending levels, we would have run out of LIHEAP funding in January. In Minnesota it really does not warm up until around April. And so this is terrible.

Madam Speaker, let me tell you, if you look at young people, kids, statistics show that if a family does not have to put a bunch of money into heating the home the child's diet improves, and the kid has enough to eat before he goes to school, which means that that little girl or that little boy can sit in the classroom without their stomach growling and can actually pay attention to the lesson that's going on because their family has some home energy assistance.

Our seniors are poor. It's about the prescription, or it's about the heated room.

Madam Speaker, it's not right to tell Americans that the wealthiest and most well-to-do among us get their tax break extended, and the poorest among us, well, they can just go get another blanket. That's wrong. We're failing a moral test of our Nation when we do things like this.

Madam Speaker, I want to raise this issue that we consider what we are doing to our society. It's not welfare; it's not income support. It is a health program. It is a health program designed to make sure that Americans don't freeze to death in their own homes. It is a health program designed to make sure that Americans don't have to make awful decisions about medication, about food, and things like this. It is a health program. And it's a program that has done countless amounts of good for many, many people that helps seniors, that helps children.

I'm very proud, Madam Speaker, as I close, to quote a man from my State of Minnesota. His name was Hubert H. Humphrey, and he said, The moral test of a Nation is how it treats people in the dawn of life, our children; people in the twilight of life, our seniors; and people in the shadows of life, the poor and underprivileged.

If we cut low-income energy assistance, we've failed that moral test.

ELIMINATION OF TITLE X FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, it has been 6 weeks

now since Republicans assumed control of the House of Representatives, and we have yet to see a single job-creation bill brought to the House floor.

Indeed, just last week we spent roughly 10 hours debating a primary function of Congress, that of congressional oversight, something we already do. Yet still no legislation brought forward to spur job creation.

But while the Republican Congress has yet to bring forward a jobs agenda, they have found plenty of time to bring forward an extreme anti-woman agenda. Just recently we saw the introduction of H.R. 3, legislation that originally sought to redefine the definition of rape. Yes, that's right, legislation that would change rape from acting without a woman's consent to instead require women to prove force was used in order to prove rape.

It remains to be seen whether Republicans working on this legislation have shelved their plans to redefine rape and whether they will revise the language in H.R. 3. Still, 163 Republicans signed on as cosponsors of the bill with the forcible rape language included.

But the extreme anti-woman agenda doesn't stop with attempting to redefine rape. This week the House will vote on an amendment introduced by Representative MIKE PENCE that would eliminate family planning and life-saving preventive care to millions of individuals each year. Mr. PENCE's amendment does this by eliminating title X funding.

Since 1970, the title X family planning program has been a key component of our Nation's health care infrastructure and an essential element in the winning strategy to reduce unintended pregnancies. Efforts to cut the title X program would take away funding from essential women's health care providers like Planned Parenthood.

Today, title X serves over 5 million low-income individuals every year. In every State, women and men rely on title X for basic primary and preventive health care, including annual exams, lifesaving cancer screenings, contraception, and testing and treatment for sexually transmitted diseases.

In fact, in 2009 alone, title X providers performed 2.2 million Pap tests, 2.3 million breast exams, and over 6 million tests for sexually transmitted diseases including nearly 1 million HIV tests.

And preventive care isn't limited to cancer screenings and education on how to avoid STDs. Title X actually reduces the number of abortions. In fact, title X services help prevent nearly 1 million unintended pregnancies each year, almost half of which would otherwise end in abortion.

Planned Parenthood and the title X program provide vital family planning services which help improve the life of the mother and the child. Indeed, family planning keeps women and children healthy. Studies have shown that when women have better access to family planning, it leads to healthier outcomes for both mother and child.

When women plan their pregnancies, they are more likely to seek prenatal care, improving their own health and the health of their children. In fact, access to family planning is directly linked to declines in maternal and infant mortality rates.

Eliminating the national family plan program will result in millions of women across the country losing access to basic primary and preventative health care and to the providers that offer these services. Without title X, more women will experience unintended pregnancies and face potentially life-threatening cancer and other diseases that could have been prevented.

The simple fact is that this proposal is anti-woman and anti-family.

Now, I know that we're all interested in finding ways to cut Federal spending, and Representative PENCE's amendment to eliminate funding for title X is framed in the context of fiscal responsibility.

But even more important than cutting spending is asking the question, are we reducing the deficit? Unfortunately, the answer to whether the Pence amendment would also cut the deficit is "no." That's because title X actually saves taxpayer dollars. Since many of the patients served by title X are on Medicaid, preventative care like cancer screenings and contraceptive counseling actually means fewer costs to the taxpayer in the long run. Indeed, for every public dollar invested in family planning, \$3.74 is saved in Medicaid-related costs. That's savings to both Federal and State governments.

Every year, Planned Parenthood works tirelessly to help to improve the health of communities across this country. Efforts to undermine the title X program and this essential health care provider are not only reckless, they are also anti-woman, anti-child, and anti-taxpayer.

Can we please stop the relentless attack on women, stop pursuing the divisive anti-woman legislation and focus on job creation and spurring economic growth once and for all?

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 58 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

You, Lord God, are our beginning and our end. For us to be aware of this leads to gratitude and petition.

So we praise and thank You for all the blessings of the past which bring us to this present moment.

We seek Your continued guidance and wisdom to accomplish great deeds in Your Holy Name and give You glory both now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

RETURN TO FISCAL SANITY

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, this week marks an important turning point in restoring fiscal sanity to our country as we begin consideration of a measure that will reduce Federal spending by over \$100 billion. Many Members of Congress committed to this reduction, which would return Federal spending to 2008 pre-stimulus levels. This is more than just a promise, Mr. Speaker; this is fundamental to the health of our economy and the future security of our Nation.

The consideration of spending cuts must be careful and deliberate. The budget of every department must be scrutinized while keeping in mind the promises made to our constituents, mine in the Eighth District of Pennsylvania and the millions of Americans who showed concern with our growing deficit.

It is notable that, for the first time, this resolution will be considered under an open rule to allow this process to be collaborative. I am sure at times it will be trying, but I am looking forward to working with my colleagues towards the collective goal of reducing our deficit.

The Federal deficit did not get out of hand overnight, and it certainly will