

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 Choosing to go sit out the clean energy race of today for the outdated energy sources of yesterday is simply extreme and painfully irresponsible.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 pro-life 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 duplicitous 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.

The budget axe in Congress' lower chamber will also fall—to the tune of \$1.3 billion in cuts—on Community Health Centers. The program supports community health, migrant health centers, health care for the homeless, and primary care programs in public housing.

Maternal and Child Health Block Grants to States have been targeted for a \$210 million reduction. The program helps train providers and support services for children with special health needs, screening of newborns, injury and lead poisoning prevention.

The cuts continue through stages of life, and programs that sustain and enhance life.

AmeriCorps, the Clinton-era program in which young people do public service work in exchange for college tuition, is marked for elimination. Job training is targeted for a \$2 billion cut.

LIHEAP, the program that provides winter heating assistance to low-income families, is to be hit with a \$400 million reduction—despite the growing need for it as America goes through the Great Recession.

The National Institutes for Health would see a \$1 billion reduction. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention would see a \$755 million reduction, or 12 percent.

Nor do cuts stop at the water's edge. A total of \$544 million would be axed from international food aid grants to such organizations as World Vision and Catholic Relief Services.

The House members championing such cuts are the very people who profess to be advocates for the unborn and defenders of life. Yet, their policies hit at society's poor and vulnerable, and at the ability to pursue the American dream.

How could anyone, in good conscience, proclaim himself/herself "pro-life" while axing a child nutrition program? Check that. The late Sen. Jesse Helms, R-North Carolina, managed it for 30 years.

The new majority seems proud of its handiwork: Rookie Tea Party lawmakers have forced even deeper cuts on the House Republican leadership.

"Remember, this is historic: The level of cuts here have not taken place in Congress since World War II," House Majority Leader Eric Cantor boasted Friday.

But we should remember another moment in history: Just before Christmas, Congress and the White House extended tax cuts to the wealthiest two percent of Americans.

Jim Wallis, editor of the Christian publication Sojourners, has suggested posing a question to the "peoples' house" of Congress. It's a variation on the familiar What-Would-Jesus-Do slogan used by some Christian believers.

What would Jesus cut?

REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, we are involved in probably the most important thing that this body does on a year-to-year basis—figuring out how to spend taxpayers' money.

The budget process is more than taking dollars from one place and spending them in another. It's a statement of our values, a statement of our values as representatives who are trusted by our constituents to do the right thing, and a statement of our values as a Nation.

I think it is pretty clear, from what we have seen in H.R. 1, the Republican

version of the continuing resolution proposal, that we have a very distinct difference in our values. At a time when millions and millions and millions of Americans, hundreds of thousands of Kentuckians are suffering, the Republican continuing resolution would take money and would put the burden of these very, very serious economic times on the people least able to afford them. At the same time, we're taking money away from incredibly important investments that this Nation has to make if it wants to remain competitive in this global economy a generation from now and two generations from now.

Instead, the Republicans would slash money from police departments, slash money from fire departments, slash money from our education system, deal a very serious blow to Head Start, all of the things that we need to fulfill our basic obligation as a government. One is to provide opportunity, one is to protect our citizens.

And then the final thing they would slash is important investments in infrastructure, which we know, if we review history, is one of the most important investments that we can make in terms of long-term economic vitality.

The Republican budget, slashing money from infrastructure, from transportation projects, would cost this economy, according to one estimate, 300,000 private-sector jobs.

Now we are fighting as hard as we can to create jobs. As a matter of fact, for the last entire Congress the Republicans kept saying on this very floor, Where are the jobs? Where are the jobs? Now, after 6 weeks of their majority rule in the House, we haven't seen one proposal to create a job. But what we've seen is a budget that is so draconian in its cuts that it would actually destroy American jobs.

This is not the type of values that the American people want to see coming out of this body. All of us agree that we have a serious long-term financial picture in this country. We do need to deal with our deficits and with our national debt. We do need to make some long-term changes.

But if you are a family and you have got a lot of people in your family and are overweight, you don't just say, "Okay, we're just going to stop eating today. We're just not going to eat." No. You say, "We're going to go on a program, we're going to reduce our calories, we're going to exercise." But we still have to do some important things. We have to eat, we have to pay for that roof over our head. We've got kids who are college age. We want to send them to college so they can have a brighter future. We do want to make those investments, even if we have to borrow money. We just don't stop. We can't stand in place, because the rest of the world is not standing in place.

So as we move forward in these few days considering the continuing resolution, H.R. 1, let's remain mindful of what our values as a country are. This

is a country that has always made investments, has always looked to the future, has always said, yeah, in a capitalistic society some people are not going to do as well or are not going to have as good of luck or are going to be downfallen, and we've got to lift them up. We've got to help them out.

Over the last 25 years, the percentage of wealth or the amount of wealth owned by the top 5 percent in this country has gone from \$8 trillion to \$40 trillion, according to David Stockman. He is the former budget director under the Reagan administration.

□ 1100

That is an enormous amount of wealth. That increase in wealth alone, for the top 5 percent of this country over the last 25 years, is more than the entire wealth of the world prior to 1985. So the people at the top have done very well, enhanced and encouraged by tax policies that Republicans have put in place. But, meanwhile, we have got to make sure that those other 95 percent of the American people do well too, and we have got to make sure that the policies we enact, the budgets that we approve in this body, reflect those values.

OPPOSITION TO CUTTING FUNDING TO FEMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to H.R. 1. First of all, I want to begin my comments by talking about last night, a couple issues that were so important to many of us. Number one, COPS grant funding, and also CDBG, which stands for Community Development Block Grants.

Now, I don't know about many of you, but I started my legislative career in local government, and, for most of us, we know that COPS grant funding is what actually puts the police officers on the streets, in the neighborhoods, that can help protect the communities. Now, I would ask you, do you want to take two police officers out of your neighborhood? I don't think so.

I would ask the question, why are we willing to support police officers in Iraq and Afghanistan and to do nation building there, and yet we are not willing to do nation building in our own country? Something is wrong with this proposal today. We don't have the right priorities, and that is why I stand in opposition.

Community Development Block Grants. When I was on the city council, what did that fund? Parks, housing, to help businesses. Do we want to say no to that? Is that what really this budget is about? Is that where the abuses have been, in the neighborhoods? I wouldn't say yes to that.

So let me end with my last comments, which I am going to focus on, which is the committee of jurisdiction