member of the Damages Class entitled to entry of judgment if a request for exclusion is not timely postmarked.

If prior to the issuance of this notice you have filed an anticipatory notice of intent to opt out with the Clerk of the U.S. District Court for the District of Puerto Rico, with the Colegio de Abogados de Puerto Rico or through CM–ECF directly, you must still reaffirm your opt out decision by following the procedures for opting out set out In this notice.

XIII. What additional rights do I have?

You, as a Class Member, may enter an appearance in this case though an attorney if you so desire.

XIV. Who represents the Class?

The attorneys who have been appointed by the Court to represent the Damages Class are: David C. Indian, Esq., Seth A. Erbe, Esq., Indiano & Williams, P.S.C., 207 Del Parque; 3rd Floor, San Juan, PR 00912, Tel: (787) 641–4545, Fax: (787) 641–4544; Andres W. Lopez, Esq., The Law Offices of Andres W. Lopez, P.S.C., 207 del Parque St., 3rd floor, San Juan, PR 00912, Tel: (787) 641–4541, Fax: (787) 641–4544

XV. Where can I get additional information?

This notice is only a summary of the issues related to the issuance of the judgment in this case. All pleadings and documents filed in Court, may be reviewed or copied at the Clerk of Court, United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico and United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit. Additionally, the following opinions have been published: Brown v. Colegio de Abogados de Puerto Rico, 579 F. Supp, 2d 211 (D.P.R. 2008); Brown v. Colegio de Abogados de Puerto Rico, 613 F.3d 44 (1st Cir. 2010).

An automated telephone system has also been established to provide Information regarding this notice and can be reached at 1–866-329-4703.

For information visit www.colegioalitigation.com.

Please do not call the Court about this case. Neither the Judge, nor the Clerk of Court, will be able to give you advice about this case.

Dated: 01/26/2011.

Clerk of Court, United States District Court, For the District of Puerto Rico.

\square 1040

PROPOSED CUTS TO FUNDING FOR COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I've come to the well today to talk about what I call the insensitivity of the Republican majority as they seek to cut important domestic spending that will affect low-income and working class families in America.

Every Member of this Body, Mr. Speaker, understands that we must reduce the deficit. We understand that. We must put America on the path of fiscal responsibility. And so we don't need lectures from the Republican majority. We don't need partisanship. What we need, as the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee said a few moments ago, we need a bipartisan solution to these great problems.

While some of the Republican solutions in H.R. 1 will certainly eliminate

ineffective programs, these cuts cannot be made arbitrarily, and they should not be made simply to make good on a political campaign promise. Many of the proposed cuts will only cost us more in the long run.

One glaring example, Mr. Speaker: Republicans want to cut \$1.3 billion from community health centers. Republicans ignore the fact that, since the start of the recession, 4 million additional Americans have lost their health insurance, which means that more and more people rely on community health centers.

When the uninsured get sick, they do one of three things. They stay home and get sicker and lose productivity, or they will go to the emergency room and leave a bill that all of us will end up paying for and the insurance companies will pay for. Or, Mr. Speaker, they can go to a community health center to receive medical care.

Under their proposal, Republicans seek to eliminate funding for 127 clinics in underserved districts across 39 states and reduce services at another 1,096 community health centers nationwide. That is absolutely awful.

This cut would have devastating effects on the communities and patients who most need access to care: Patients with diabetes, and heart disease, and HIV/AIDS; pregnant women; and children, leaving them nowhere to turn for health care.

Under these cuts, more than 2.8 million people would likely lose access to their current primary care provider, and over 5,000 health center staff could lose their jobs.

The President's 2012 budget proposal, by contrast, builds on the health care reform law by boosting investment in health centers. The budget includes \$3.3 billion for the health centers program, including \$1.2 billion in mandatory funding provided through the Affordable Care Community Health Center Fund.

Mr. Speaker, I represent many poor rural communities in eastern North Carolina with many constituents who depend on community health centers, and I know how deeply these cuts will be felt. As we struggle with this difficult economy and struggle with difficult fiscal issues, we have an even greater responsibility, to protect our most vulnerable citizens, especially when it comes to access to health care.

Community health centers are cutting costs. They are continuing to serve our communities extremely well, and they need and they deserve congressional support.

I urge my colleagues to support worthwhile investment in community health centers and reject the unwise cuts in H.R. 1.

REPUBLICANS' IRRESPONSIBLE SPENDING BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the Republican spending bill currently before this House. This bill fails to create jobs, deeply hurts our families and seniors, and responds with extremes at a time when our fragile economy can least afford it.

I am committed to a budget that lives within our means while investing in the future and cutting our deficit. However, this irresponsible Republican spending bill hampers job creation and jeopardizes investments in American innovation, American education, and American infrastructure.

That is why President Obama vowed today to veto the irresponsible Republican spending bill because it undermines critical priorities for national security and curtails the drivers of long-term economic growth and job creation.

We must do more to focus on jobs, grow the economy, and protect our middle class, certainly, while responsibly tackling our Nation's debt and deficit. That is why I've offered 8 amendments to this bill which will protect seniors, protect energy innovation, strengthen our children's education, and most importantly, will protect and grow jobs as the fragile economy slowly recovers. We simply cannot afford to pull the rug out from underneath progress, not now, not when we are finally rebounding from the Bush recession, not with the extreme spending bill this represents.

I refuse to take America back to the failed policies that sunk our economy. My first two amendments would restore funding from the cuts to the Social Security Administration to prevent its shutdown. The cuts that the irresponsible Republican spending bill propose in this section alone would raid \$625 million from the Social Security Administration. This would affect the 53 million Americans who are collecting Social Security by furloughing every employee and closing the doors for a month or more. An estimated 400,000 people, mostly seniors, would not have their claims processed this year, creating a huge backlog and threatening the timely payment of benefits.

My amendments would restore this funding because I do not believe we should use our Nation's seniors that have worked hard and played by the rules their whole lives to somehow painfully balance our budget. This is simply extreme and, again, painfully irresponsible.

The Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, or LIHEAP, is also cut in this irresponsible Republican spending plan by some nearly \$400 million. Those are cuts that are made on the backs of the low-income residents, seniors, the disabled, and those with children like those I represent in the now cold and snowy Capital region of New York, who struggle to pay to keep the thermostat set at a livable level. LIHEAP keeps those receiving help

from having to make the heart-breaking decision about whether to pay to keep the heat on or to pay for food and prescription drugs. To pull the rug out from underneath our Nation's most vulnerable is both simply extreme and painfully irresponsible.

My fourth amendment would maintain funding for the Weatherization Assistance Program and the State Energy Program. It is amendment number 4 and is set up for a recorded vote today. I encourage my colleagues to support this bill. The State Energy Program yields \$7.22 in annual energy savings for every \$1 invested in it while renovating our 13,000 buildings per year.

The Weatherization Assistance Program helps low-income and elderly save over \$437 on their annual utility bill, and decreases oil consumption by the equivalent of 24.1 million barrels annually. To cut these jobs-producing, energy savings programs that clearly work is both simply extreme and painfully irresponsible.

I have also offered two amendments that would protect the Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act from being jeopardized under the irresponsible Republican spending plan. The Clean Air Act protects public health and safety and has saved hundreds of thousands of lives since 1970 by reducing air pollution by 60 percent, while the economy has grown by 200 percent.

The Clean Water Act protects drinking water for 117 million Americans and safeguards 20 million acres of wetlands and wildlife habitats from big polluters. Seeking to inappropriately legislate against these programs in a spending bill, the continuing resolution would threaten the air our children breathe and the water we drink. This is simply extreme and painfully irresponsible.

My seventh amendment removes unobligated funding from Fossil Energy Research and Development and transfers these funds to the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. This would prioritize our investments from dirty oil and dirty fossil fuel sources of the past to the energy of today and tomorrow, clean energy that would create jobs and make us competitive in a global market. Choosing to go sit out the clean energy race of today for the outdated energy sources of yesterday is simply extreme and painfully irresponsible.

□ 1050

My eighth amendment would restore funding for education and special ed to ensure our children and the future of our country have the resources they desperately need to compete in a global marketplace for generations to come. It prevents thousands of teacher layoffs.

The irresponsible Republican spending bill cuts over \$1.25 billion in education funding that goes directly to States at a time when we can least afford it. Balancing the budget on the backs of our children and their edu-

cation is simply extreme and painfully irresponsible.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose the current irresponsible Republican spending bill before the House. It threatens to undermine our recovery economy and job growth.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my Republican colleagues to stop their attack on women. Family planning is between women, their doctors, and their family. Republicans have no business being in that discussion.

The anti-choice, anti-women Republican majority in the House has made eliminating critical health services for women a top priority. Apparently, protection begins at conception and ends at birth.

Republicans want to gut all reproductive health care in the country and are trying to shut down Planned Parenthood. What an amazingly immoral thing to do. It is utterly disingenuous of the Republicans to go after Planned Parenthood in their inhuman crusade. Radical Republicans are catering to their most extreme base at the expense of 150 million women in this country, and they should be ashamed. But they won't.

The Republicans are also at war with the poor, again, leaving millions of low-income women and women of color with no access to basic health care.

Let's not forget, the American people sent us here to solve problems that face everyone. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership is laser-focused not on jobs or the economy or the national security, but on attacking women and children in this bill, waging a culture war to get campaign contributions from the extremists in this country.

In their rush to appease religious conservatives and undermine the health care law, Republicans have gone from pro-life to pro-government intrusion in the extreme. Republican government is about silencing you as you talk to your doctor.

Republicans love to silence Americans and anyone else they can get to on their moral crusade. Only a real Republican could love a law that says it has a gag rule.

Let me be clear. The so-called prolife agenda set by the Republicans is the most unprecedented form of government intervention on reproductive rights in decades.

I remember the seventies and the sixties. The Republicans are defining what constitutes forcible rape and penalizing private businesses that choose comprehensive insurance coverage. If that's not government intervention, I don't know what is.

Women are the victims in several major bills and amendments that the

Republican leadership is pushing at a mind-boggling speed. These radical anti-choice bills all seek to fundamentally erode the right of all women to health care. More importantly, they don't reflect the will of the American people.

A recent national survey conducted by the Lombardo Consulting Group found that more than 60 percent of the voters support family planning. How is attacking women helping the economy or creating jobs or helping our national security?

We have been in the House for a month now and we have seen lots of talks about how we're going to slice the deficit, but not one single discussion, serious discussion, about how to get there. It is irresponsible to allow these narrowly driven ideological debates about women's health to dominate the House calendar when we have a budget to work out and almost 15 million unemployed.

I urge my colleagues to abandon this vicious attack on women and to focus on issues the American people actually sent us here to solve: Looking for jobs. And I urge my Republican colleagues to get out of the doctor's office and leave women and families and doctors alone.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion in the Congressional Record an article by Joel Connelly of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer that talks about the duplications and dangerous agenda set by the House Republicans to severely restrict the rights of women, children, and low-income families.

[From www.seattlepi.com, Feb. 13, 2011] HOUSE GOP AGENDA: CURTAILING ABORTION,

CUTTING KIDS (By Joel Connelly)

The new "pro-life" Republican majority in the U.S. House of Representatives seems dedicated to a curious proposition: The protection of life begins at conception, and ends at birth.

The leadership is pushing a Protect Life Act that would prohibit any subsidies for abortion in any component of the 2010 Affordable Health Care act. It is moving to end any U.S. government support for abortion providers—anywhere.

"We need to protect human life from the unborn to the elderly," Rep. Joe Pitts, R-Penn., chairman of the Health Subcommittee of the powerful House Energy and Commerce Committee, said recently. Pitts has headed the Values Action Team, a House caucus concerned with pro-life and pro-family issues.

When it comes to spending on children and health and the elderly, however, House Republicans' new budget is The Pitts.

The budget axe is about to fall on, to use Ronald Reagan's line stating his opposition to abortion, "those who have already been born."

Women, Infants and Children was the one new, bipartisan social program passed by Congress and signed into law by President Reagan. (Then-Rep. Mike Lowry of Seattle was a lead sponsor.) House GOP budget writers have targeted it for a \$758 million cut.

WIC provides federal money to States for supplemental foods, health care referrals and nutrition education for low income women, and to infants and kids under 5 who are at nutritional risk.