

bottom line than about investing in people, investing in jobs, in education, in infrastructure, in building and growing this economy, and protecting a safe, clean way of life that we have too often come to take for granted.

I want to talk about that for a moment.

From the moment we get up in the morning, to the moment we go to bed at night, the Republican plan would make cuts that affect the daily lives of millions of Americans and millions of jobs in every economic sector.

In America, when you turn on the tap for a glass of water or take your child fishing at a local lake, someone is at work—someone with a family—who is making sure the water is safe to drink and the lake is not polluted.

But the Republican plan cuts \$700 million from the Clean Water State Revolving Fund and \$250 million from the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund that have helped municipalities and communities put people to work on water quality protection projects.

The Republican plan cuts almost \$1 billion from clean water and that means cutting not just funding, but jobs of those whose work is to keep our water safe and clean.

Is that a smart cut? Does that reflect who we are and what we want this Nation to be?

If you live on a river, a flood plain, or on the coast and a storm strikes, you know that in America there will be someone there to help if there is a flood or a coastal emergency.

The Republican plan, even after the disastrous experience in the wake of Katrina, cuts \$30 million from flood control and coastal emergencies. Is that what we learned from New Orleans? Is that what we, as a nation, believe is a smart cut?

If you wake up in the middle of the night and your child is sick and you don't know why, or you think that child may have accidentally ingested something poisonous, or your child is diagnosed with a life-threatening disease, in America you can call the Poison Control Center, take your child to a community health center, know that the Centers for Disease Control is doing its job.

In America you know that the National Institutes of Health is working every day to find the next treatment or cure that affects our families, friends, and neighbors, \$300 million of that in New Jersey, bringing thousands of new 21st century jobs to my State to help continue our economic recovery.

But the Republican plan cuts \$755 million from the CDC; \$1 billion from the National Institutes of Health; \$27 million from Poison Control Centers; \$1.3 billion from community health centers and 3,400 community health center jobs in my State of New Jersey—3,400 more unemployed New Jerseyans.

We may not immediately make the connection between what these cuts mean and our lives, but they have con-

sequences to our lives, to our families, to our prosperity. It also means some people will lose their jobs.

This morning millions of Americans got up and scrambled a few eggs and made some bacon for breakfast.

Fortunately, in this country we know it was someone's job to inspect those eggs. It was someone's job to inspect that bacon and make sure it was safe to eat. The Republican plan cuts \$53 million from Food Safety and Inspection Service, the loss of more safety inspectors at a time when we have heard numerous reports of tainted food and the need for more, not fewer, food inspectors keeping our food supply safe.

Is that reflective of our values? Is that what we think of as life in America?

If you were a middle-class New Jerseyan who, after a year of looking for a job, finally had an interview and wanted to take the train because you thought it would be a faster, easier, and more convenient way to get to that interview, you may find there are not as many opportunities because the Republican budget cuts \$224 million from Amtrak. In a post-September 11 world in which multiple modes of transportation are critical to our security, for so we learned on September 11 that when there are no trans-Hudson crossings through the tunnels or through PATH, which is the rail connection between New York and New Jersey, we had ferries that took people out of Lower Manhattan and to New Jersey hospitals. Multiple modes of transportation is not only about economic opportunity, it is about security in the post-September 11 world. Yet the budget cuts \$224 million from Amtrak, which is how we send our businesspeople to sell their products between cities, go to great research universities and to hospitals to be cured. You would be forced to take the car, buy the gas, burn the fuel, fight the traffic, and park in the city to get to your interview. Is that how we invest in our infrastructure? Is that the type of smart growth that will help us achieve a greener, cleaner future?

When you park the car and walk to your interview you expect to have enough police on the street to protect you from gangs and criminals.

Well, this Republican plan cuts the National Drug Intelligence Center by \$11 million; law enforcement wireless communications by \$52 million; the U.S. Marshals Service by \$10 million; the FBI that deals with domestic terrorism by \$74 million; State and local law enforcement assistance by \$256 million; juvenile justice by \$2.3 million; and the COPS Program that puts police on the street and provides them with state-of-the-art equipment they need by \$600 million; \$600 million from the COPS Program means fewer cops on the beat.

Are those the kind of cuts that we want.

Are those the kind of cuts that will keep our communities safe? Are they

smart cuts that reflect our values in a post 9-11 world?

Let me also mention one thing that is not specifically a cut in the Republican plan, but something it does that runs contrary to our belief as a nation that the air we breathe should be clean and safe.

The legislation presented by the Republicans eliminates many environmental protections with cuts to the EPA's budget, but it is also loaded with policy riders designed specifically to gut the Clean Air Act.

I believe that is wrong. I believe it runs contrary to American values, and I consider any attack on the Clean Air Act to be an attack on New Jersey.

Because of the emissions of dirty, old out of state coal plants, every county in my State is deemed to be out of compliance with the Clean Air Act. One of these coal powerplants is the Portland Generation Station just across the Delaware River in Pennsylvania. It emitted 30,000 tons of sulfur dioxide in 2009—almost three times the amount of all seven of New Jersey's coal plants combined.

This sulfur dioxide wafts into Warren, Sussex, Hunterdon and Morris counties and acts to cause and exacerbate a whole host of respiratory illnesses from asthma to heart disease.

We simply cannot gut the one piece of legislation that protects the very air we breathe and makes it safe for our children to go out and play without fear of being sick. This Republican plan that guts the Clean Air Act does not reflect our values as a Nation. It is simply not reflective of who we are, what we want this Nation to be, or what we want for our children's future.

The list of H.R. 1's short-sighted disinvestments in this Nation's future goes on and on. "Show me your budget and I'll show you your values."

The Republican proposal before us is, in my view, an affront to American values, not a reflection of them.

I for one do not believe for one second that it reflects who we are and what we want this Nation to be. I do believe that at a time that we are finally growing this economy, these indiscriminate cuts, as many economists have said, will throw this economy right back to the deep recession we are coming out of. That means fewer jobs here in America. That certainly cannot be part of our values. That is why I will be voting against H.R. 1, to protect American values and protect American jobs.

I yield the floor.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS BUDGET

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, we are living through one of the most important transformations in the history of the modern world. Some have likened the wave of protests sweeping the Middle East to the revolutions of 1848, which changed Europe's political landscape forever. They certainly call to mind the dramatic events of 1989, when

the nations of Eastern Europe threw off the yoke of communism to embrace free markets and democracy. Like those upheavals, there is no doubt that the events of this year will be studied for decades to come.

The challenges we face are great. We are being called upon to forge new relationships in a part of the world that has been and will remain vital to our national security. And we have been given the opportunity to demonstrate conclusively to the young men and women of the Muslim world and beyond that al-Qaida's belief that change requires violence and radicalization is wrong.

But, even as we try to navigate these momentous developments, we are contemplating drastic cuts to our international affairs programs. I understand that we face a budget crisis in our own country. But we can either pay now to help brave people build a better, democratic future for themselves, or we will certainly pay later with increased threats to our own national security.

The international affairs budget lays the foundation for our ability to fulfill our responsibilities abroad. The approximately \$50 billion that funds all our diplomats, development professionals, embassies, missions, consular services, global health programs, food aid, and disaster relief is a tiny investment for the great return we receive. Consider that this year we will spend approximately \$700 billion on our military. By contrast, the international affairs budget is less than one-tenth of the Pentagon's. As Secretary Gates once pointed out, if you took the entire Foreign Service roster, you could barely crew one aircraft carrier.

And yet our diplomats are serving on the frontlines of multiple revolutions and wars. They are making vital contributions in Afghanistan, and in Iraq they are planning the transition from a military mission to a diplomatic one so that we can cement the political progress that has cost hundreds of billions of dollars and thousands of American lives.

In Africa, they are helping to midwife the birth of a new nation in South Sudan, to resolve the situation in Darfur, and, as we make progress on those fronts, to forge a new relationship with the government in Khartoum. They are leading the fight against global challenges, like nuclear proliferation and climate change. And in countless communities around the world they are providing essential humanitarian assistance preventing the spread of cholera in Haiti, distributing food to refugees in northern Kenya, and providing shelter to flood victims in Pakistan.

This is not a time for America to pull back from the world. This is a time to step forward.

Yet H.R. 1 imposes draconian cuts that would completely undermine our core national security priorities and our humanitarian commitments. The bill threatens our ability to stabilize

Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq by slashing economic support funds by \$2.2 billion, or nearly 30 percent below fiscal year 2011 levels. In Afghanistan, for example, these cuts would make it extremely difficult to support high-priority infrastructure programs that are critical to our counterinsurgency and stabilization efforts. And they would curtail our ability to support governance, economic development programs, and basic services to districts cleared by the military.

H.R. 1 would also threaten our efforts in Afghanistan and Pakistan by zeroing out funding to meet our obligation to take up the U.S. shares in the Asian Development Bank, ADB. If we don't provide funding by April of this year, we will give up our leadership position at ADB and allow Chinese influence at the bank to surpass our own. The impact of that loss of influence cannot be overstated. The ADB funds projects throughout Pakistan and Afghanistan, supporting U.S. efforts in this critical region. GEN David Petraeus himself wrote to Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner to praise the Asian Development Bank for supporting U.S. interests, stating that "strong partnership with the ADB is part of our overall United States purpose and goals in these areas of critical importance."

The House bill also cuts our humanitarian aid by 50 percent, decimating our ability to provide food, shelter, and medicine after natural disasters and putting hundreds of thousands of lives at risk. In Pakistan, USAID would be unable to meet emergency and recovery needs in the south, where an estimated 4 million people remain displaced and require critical support. In Haiti, over 1 million displaced persons living in transitional shelters may lose funding and support. And with these cuts, more than 1.6 million internally displaced persons in Darfur will not receive critical health care, access to water, or help in meeting other basic needs.

H.R. 1 decreases global health funding by over \$1 billion, which means that over 400,000 people who would have been able to enroll in life-saving treatment programs through PEPFAR will now linger on waiting lists as their HIV diagnosis becomes a death sentence. It also means that 300,000 orphans and children will not receive care and support, and that 100,000 women who would have received medication to prevent the transmission of HIV to their newborn children will not, resulting in tens of thousands of babies that will be born HIV-positive.

H.R. 1 also slashes support for the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria. The Global Fund is a public-private partnership where every American tax dollar is leveraged twice over by the rest of the world. Its programs are also deeply intertwined with U.S. efforts: In Haiti, for example, Global Fund grants support the purchase of anti-retroviral drugs for AIDS patients, while PEPFAR ensures their

delivery to patients. Thus, these drastic reductions to the Global Fund will affect U.S. efforts as well.

Our global health programs represent some of our most successful and effective international policies. In Pakistan, as I discussed today with Bill Gates, working with the government there, we could eliminate polio entirely. Our malaria programs have already virtually eliminated that killer of children in parts of Africa. The Centers for Disease Control are working to reduce the spread of drug-resistant diseases, such as tuberculosis, before they come to our own shores. Cutting off these programs is poor foreign policy, it is poor public health policy, and it stands in sharp contradiction to American values.

The House bill also cuts nearly two-thirds of the funds devoted to promoting clean energy and increasing resilience to climate change in the most vulnerable regions of the world. This includes eliminating funding for the climate investment funds, which support exports of clean energy technology, help developing countries respond to the impacts of climate change, and promote increased carbon sequestration from forests. H.R. 1 also eliminates government positions needed to negotiate international agreements on climate change that are favorable to the United States, while ensuring that other nations live up to their commitments to limit greenhouse gas emissions.

H.R. 1 also slashes food and education for the world's poorest children by 50 percent. It eliminates feeding programs for 18 million of the world's poorest and hungriest people, and approximately 2.5 million young children benefiting from the McGovern-Dole program would lose their daily school meal. Another 15 million people, primarily women and children, would lose access to the sustenance provided through title II. These cuts are not abstractions. These are people.

The House bill would even eliminate fiscal year 2011 funding for the United States Institute of Peace, USIP. USIP is more than a Washington think tank. Created by Congress and President Ronald Reagan, it is a working instrument, utilized by the Department of Defense as well as the Department of State. Defunding USIP would significantly reduce America's ability to find nonviolent solutions to conflict, just as we are trying to resolve wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. USIP's personnel operate on the ground in dangerous areas where America's security is threatened. For example, in 2007 USIP's reconciliation efforts between Shia authorities and Sunni sheiks helped dramatically reduce U.S. troop deaths in the "Triangle of Death" near Baghdad. That in turn allowed the U.S. Army to reduce its presence in the area by about 2,000 troops and save a significant amount of money. In a letter to the Office of Management and Budget, General Petraeus called this a "striking success story."

I have long been impressed with USIP's work in Sudan, where the Institute's training in electoral violence prevention contributed to the relatively peaceful referendum and the low levels of violence in its aftermath. USIP is now actively assisting in the development of a new constitution for Southern Sudan through its Rule of Law Program. Recognizing the volatility of the north/south border areas and the potential for an outbreak of contagious violence, USIP has instituted a cross-border grazing corridor project and designed a popular consultations process in the troubled border states of Blue Nile and Southern Kordofan.

In Pakistan, another area of great concern to me, USIP is developing a network of conflict management facilitators to work at the local level, training Pakistani parliamentarians and women leaders in conflict resolution and developing a curriculum for schools based on principles of gender equality, tolerance, pluralism, and peace.

Under the Senate substitute, USIP's funding would be reduced by almost 20 percent. But any greater reduction would threaten this Federal institute that has proven it saves American lives and money. The drastic action of the House to defund USIP must not stand.

These sorts of severe cuts, which will reduce our capacity from Afghanistan to Sudan, from war zones to earthquake zones, will do almost nothing to rein in our budget deficit. But they will cost thousands of lives overseas, and they will increase the threats to our own country. At a time of great challenge to American interests abroad, we must step up at home and provide the vital funds that our diplomats need.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CENTRAL COMMAND,
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDER,
MacDill AFB, FL, February 11, 2009.

Mr. ROB GOLDBERG,
Director, International Affairs Division, National Security Programs, The Office of Management and Budget, 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. GOLDBERG, I would like to underscore the importance of the U.S. Institute for Peace (USIP) to the missions the United States is currently pursuing in Iraq and Afghanistan. While I have long been an avid reader of USIP's analytical products, which are second to none in tracking the challenges we face in both countries and in outlining policy options, I have more recently been impressed with USIP's on-the-ground peacebuilding efforts.

In Iraq, the Institute stepped up to the plate beginning in August 2007 to assist the 10th Mountain Division in a reconciliation effort in Mahmoudiya, a community on the southern edge of Baghdad that was once known as the "Triangle of Death." Since then, General Odierno and I have often cited Mahmoudiya as a striking success story. USIP's continuing reconciliation efforts at the community level, especially in Diyala

and Ninewa, as well as at the national level in Baghdad, hold great promise for the future.

In Afghanistan, USIP's work on the informal justice system has been invaluable as we work toward improving the rule of law at the provincial level. Their plans for reconciliation efforts at the community level on the Afghanistan/Pakistan border are likewise a potential key to success in the enormous challenges we face.

USIP's experience working closely with the U.S. military will be a great asset in developing stronger unity of effort between civilian and military elements of government. In fact, I hope soon to see U.S. military officers training alongside civilian governmental and nongovernmental counterparts in USIP's headquarters at 23rd and Constitution. Their facility is not just an important symbol of our nation's commitment to peace; it is also home to a wonderful training center that we hope to leverage to increase understanding and unity of effort in today's complex operations.

We can be proud of what USIP has done in the past, and I look forward with confidence to the contributions the Institute will make in the future.

Sincerely,

DAVID H. PETRAEUS,
*General, United States Army,
Commanding.*

9/11 HEALTH FUNDING

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, we rise today to engage in a colloquy regarding funding for the 9/11 health program. The chairman has been a tireless supporter of the 9/11 World Trade Center health program at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's, CDC, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, NIOSH. This program has helped our first responders who bravely rushed in on September 11 and thousands of others who were in the area on that terrible day.

The 2011 continuing resolution proposed by Senator INOUE that the Senate will vote on today makes fiscally prudent adjustments to our Nation's spending, but I wanted to clarify with the Senator, through this colloquy, that none of the spending reductions in the CR will impact the current health care screening and treatment for first responders, survivors, residents, students and others related to the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. As the Senator knows, we successfully enacted a bipartisan bill to provide mandatory funding to take care of the first responders and others who became sick from toxic fumes, dust, and smoke after the 2001 attack on the World Trade Center. This new law was our Christmas miracle. It is very important to me and my constituents that there is no disruption in the care that eligible responders and victims can receive.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senators. The Senator is absolutely correct, the 2011 continuing resolution that was proposed by Senator INOUE will not reduce any services or treatment available to responders in the World Trade Center Health Program. In fact, we

have been assured by the staff at HHS that there are sufficient funds for treatment and screening of the responders and victims to continue without interruption.

Mr. SCHUMER. It's my understanding that the fiscal year 2010 appropriation included \$70.7 million for the World Trade Center Health Program, but that the 2011 continuing resolution proposed by Senator INOUE does not specify an amount for the implementation of the new law.

Mr. HARKIN. Yes, the \$70.7 million provided to the program in the fiscal year 2010 omnibus remains available to NIOSH to use until expended. It is our understanding that \$13 million remains of that \$70.7 million and that it will be used to continue access to the program.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I thank the Senator for that clarification. I too am very concerned about continuity in the World Trade Center Health Program. The mandatory funding will start on July 1, 2011, and it is critically important that the transition be as smooth as possible. I would like to thank the Senator for ensuring that this program will be able to continue under the 2011 CR, and I would like to ask, on behalf of all of us and our constituents, that we work together to ensure that the fiscal year 2011 discretionary funds support the full and timely implementation of the mandatory program. It is very important that funding is provided to ensure that NIOSH and the World Trade Center monitoring and treatment programs can seamlessly continue their work.

Mr. HARKIN. Yes, I commit to working with the Senator. I commit to the Senators that we will specifically allocate in the CR that will pass the Senate the amount of funds that are necessary to ensure a smooth transition in July.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I thank the Chairman for that clarification and for ensuring that these American heroes were not forgotten. I hope we can all work together each year on this important program.

ARGENTINA'S DEBTS

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the treatment of American creditors by the Republic of Argentina. Almost 10 years ago, the Argentine government defaulted on over \$81 billion in sovereign debt. Nearly \$9 billion of this debt was held by the U.S. Government and American citizens. Following its default, Argentina made take-it-or-leave-it settlement offers well below international norms for settling sovereign debt defaults.

I am glad to report that recently Argentina has shown a willingness to negotiate in settling some of this debt. Argentina recently informed the Paris Club, a group of sovereign governments that includes the United States and represents 19 creditor countries, that it will pay its outstanding sovereign debt,