

IN SUPPORT OF TITLE X FUNDING

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of the Lowey amendment to restore funding for Title X family planning programs. My colleagues have spoken about the achievements of Title X, so I want to focus on what elimination of this highly successful program would mean to the citizens of California.

As you all know, California has been hit extremely hard by this recession and is struggling just to meet the basic needs of its residents. In 2010, Title X funded health care services for over 1.2 million people—which represent 20 percent of all Title X participants. In my district alone, over 33,000 people relied on Title X-funded clinics for their primary health care needs. Eliminating Title X funds would result in a critical loss of vital health care services to an already struggling state with limited resources.

My district has been profoundly affected by the Medicare reimbursement issue because, while we are a high cost area comparable to San Francisco, the reimbursement rate reflects rural costs. As a direct result of doctors no longer accepting Medicare patients, many seniors have been forced to turn to Title X clinics for their basic health care needs. Older adults, both men and women, are able to receive immunizations, physicals, diabetes testing, and STD testing and treatment, in addition to typical gynecological services. If Title X funds are eliminated, these seniors will lose the only access to health care that is available to them.

A vote in support of this amendment is a vote in favor of allowing millions of Americans access to vital health care services. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Lowey Amendment to restore funding to Title X.

IN OPPOSITION TO STEARNS
AMENDMENT (#10) TO H.R. 1**HON. MIKE QUIGLEY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by Mr. Stearns, an amendment which seeks to hamstring the EPA's ability to do its job.

A job which Congress determined was the responsibility of the EPA.

A job which the Supreme Court ruled was the responsibility of the EPA.

And, a job, which is necessary to save thousands of lives, and millions in healthcare costs.

Contrary to what some of my colleagues have been saying on the House floor, Americans support the mission of the EPA.

Americans also support the tenets of the Clean Air Act.

Recently, polls have been conducted in Congressional districts across the country, in districts that are home to coal and power plants, that are in the heart of steel towns and industry.

When questioned, 60 and 70 percent of people in these districts answered with a re-

sounding, "yes, the EPA can and should do more to hold polluters accountable and to protect our land, air and water."

Those same folks did not support Congress deciding how those rules should be promulgated, as this amendment strives to do.

There's a reason that rules are written by agencies—they've got the resources, and the knowledge, to write regulations that will do what's best for American citizens and communities.

Our job is to support these rules.

I stand here in support of the EPA, the EPA's ability to regulate coal combustion wastes and against the proposed amendment.

Our lives depend on it.

IN SUPPORT OF MARKEY
AMENDMENT #213 TO H.R. 1**HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, America has always been at the forefront of medical innovation—with the National Institutes of Health (NIH) making us the leader at creating life-saving technology.

Millions of Americans live healthier, more productive lives as a result of our medical research funding.

The innovative and cutting-edge research funded by the NIH has also given the United States thousands of good jobs and contributed to creating a strong middle class.

Now we're voting on a budget that will cut over \$1.5 billion from one of the key engines of American innovation.

H.R. 1 is a set back to medical research and a set back to our economic recovery.

Vote for amendment number 213 to preserve critical NIH funding.

IN SUPPORT OF QUIGLEY
AMENDMENT (#520) TO H.R. 1**HON. MIKE QUIGLEY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with an amendment that would, quite simply, allow the President to continue to consult an Advisor on Energy and Climate Change.

Section 1535 of this bill, which forbids the President from hiring such an advisor, wouldn't save taxpayers a penny.

Section 1535, which my amendment would strike, is a misguided attempt to tell the President who he can and cannot consult.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you, would any member of this body allow us to deny them counsel on energy and climate issues?

This is NOT a rhetorical question—every member of this body that employs a staffer on energy or climate issues should carefully consider whether they would deny the President that same counsel.

Whether or not you agree with the President on energy and climate issues, I would ask you—is it appropriate to silence those with whom you disagree?

I would also remind my colleagues that Section 1535 of this bill, which my amendment

would strike, does not save taxpayers any money at all—not even a penny.

All it does is deny the President the ability to consult with a certain type of advisor.

Section 1535 is an unprecedented intrusion into the President's ability to retain and consult advisors on issues of national importance.

And energy and climate change are issues of national importance.

In light of recent catastrophes like the BP oil spill, ongoing efforts to prevent the EPA from doing its job, and rising rates of mortality and morbidity due to unhealthy air, land, and water—it is more important than ever that we support increased resources for the President and the Administration to do their job of keeping us, and our environment, safe and healthy.

I've stood on this House floor many times, some of them in recent days, and talked about decreasing wasteful government spending.

I've written whitepaper reports, both in Congress and while a Cook County Commissioner, detailing the importance of streamlining and reinventing government.

But, the crux of those arguments is predicated on the fact that I believe that what the government does matters—that government's mission matters.

What we do here today, and tomorrow, and the day after that, matters.

But this CR, which combines ideologically driven cuts with pretend cuts, like Section 1535, is not the answer.

Taking a sledgehammer to non-defense discretionary spending is not the answer.

We've got to talk about what programs are working and support them at the same time we cut the ones that don't work.

We're facing a climate crisis—a climate crisis that has become political and polarizing, pushing leaders into opposite corners of this debate.

But the facts aren't a debate if they're based on science.

And science says that for decades and centuries to come we're going to be dealing with rising temperatures, acidic oceans, extinct species, and skyrocketing healthcare costs due to dirty air.

In these trying times, we're trying to tell the President of the United States he doesn't have the right to counsel on energy and climate change?

With all due respect, Section 1535 is an unserious attempt to achieve some measure of fiscal responsibility.

But the truth is, it hacks away at the constitutional separation of powers and doesn't save taxpayers any money at all.

How we address energy and climate change issues will matter for our children, and our children's children.

We must not hamstring our ability to do so.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose