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

on which I serve. I am the ranking member of the Emergency Communications, Preparedness, and Response Subcommittee. I stand in opposition to Sections 1628 through 1634 and 1648 of this bill, which cut funding to the Federal Emergency Management Agency, also known as FEMA. I oppose these provisions because they are unwise, irresponsible, and they undermine what our Nation learned.

Do we want to go back? How many of us remember watching on television when we looked at 9/11. How many of us remember Hurricane Katrina. It wasn't that long ago, and I know I don't want to go back.

This bill that the Republicans have brought to the floor is reckless. It is not only reckless to our economy, it is reckless to the American workers, and, above all, it puts our national security in harm's way.

The terrorist acts of September 11 revealed the catastrophic consequences of our inability to communicate. Have we forgotten? We just got interoperable radios in my district in Signal Hill just last year. They are not all connected, and it is a huge vulnerability for all of us. Communication glitches also occurred during the response to Hurricane Katrina, yet the Republicans want to step back and terminate those grants for interoperable emergency communications.

Have we not learned anything? These draconian cuts will put our first responders at risk and slow down the response to terrorist attacks and natural disasters. I cannot in good conscience, and I don't think any of you can as well, accept these cuts to such vital pieces of emergency equipment that we all need and we depend upon.

Further, this shortsighted Republican plan also puts our Nation's firefighting ability at risk. Now, I am from California. We know about fires. We know about the need for firefighters. This bill would eliminate the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response Grants program. You tell the resident who has lost their home that, oh, we will deal with this next year. Fires aren't something you plan. They are an emergency that has to be responded to.

So when we call upon our firefighters, the International Association of Firefighters, they are opposed to this. Why? Not because they are not being fiscally responsible, but because this bill would cut jobs, 5,200 jobs on top of the 5,000 firefighters we have already lost. Is your community willing to lose more firefighters? I don't think so.

The city of Compton in my district is the future home to an emergency operations communications center operated by FEMA. My district is home to several major oil refineries, gas treatment facilities, petrochemical facilities, and, of course, the challenges and opportunities of two ports, of both the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. These centralized major business economic engines thrive. But we also have problems sometimes, and that is why we need the appropriate support of fire and communications to protect them.

This Republican bill seeks to destroy jobs, to end operation centers, all of the things that we have learned from the past. I can't support depriving first responders of the equipment they need to do their jobs. I can't support this bill and hurt our firefighters, our police officers and those who choose to serve us.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1, and I urge my colleagues to really look at this bill closely and make sure that our communities aren't paying. But the real abuses that got us here, that is where the cuts should begin.

CALLING FOR A PEACEFUL SOLUTION TO THE EASTER ISLAND CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. Faleomavaega) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I'm not wanting to detract from today's spirited discussion or debate on H.R. 1, which I will discuss at a later point of time in the day, but I want to discuss with my colleagues and the American people the current crisis now happening between the government of Chile and the people of Easter Island, also known as Rapa Nui among its native people.

Easter Island was settled by Polynesian voyagers about 700 AD. The island is famous for some 887 monumental statues carved out of stones weighing tens of tons. These statues are known throughout the world for their archeological wonder and mystery in terms of how these ancient Polynesians were able to carve and move these tremendous statues to different locations on the island. Less well-known is that Easter Island is home to roughly 2,500 indigenous people, known as the Rapa Nui Nation. The people of Easter Island carry a vibrant culture dating back centuries before the arrival of Europeans.

Like many other islands in the Pacific, Easter Island has had its sovereignty determined by more powerful outside influences. In 1888, the Rapa Nui Nation entered into a disputed treaty with the government of Chile. The Chilean government used the treaty as a license to treat the island and the indigenous people as property of the State. Chile confined the people to a small area, about 1 square mile, believe this, Mr. Speaker, today known as Hanga Roa. To this day, the validity of the 1888 agreement is contested by most of the Rapa Nui people.

Chile then annexed Easter Island in 1933 without the consent of or even consultation with the Rapa Nui people. The government of Chile unilaterally leased the majority of the island to private sheepherding enterprises, without the Rapa Nui Nation's consent.

The lands that were wrongfully taken from the Rapa Nui people have not been restored. Instead of returning the lands to their rightful owners, the Chilean government continues to favor private enterprises interested in exploiting the Rapa Nui culture for private gain.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, to the serious land rights disputes, several other issues threaten the livelihood of the people of Rapa Nui. For example, roughly 50,000 tourists each year flock to Easter Island to view these huge Moai statues. Yet the Chilean policies prevent the Rapa Nui people from benefiting from the tourism industry. Non-indigenous individuals and corporations possess most of the land, while jobs related to tourism often go to continental Chileans. Uncontrolled migration to the island has caused widespread unemployment among the native people, exploitation of natural resources and increased pollution.

Within this context, Mr. Speaker, the Rapa Nui Nation began taking a stand. In July and August of last year, the Rapa Nui people wrote several letters to the President of Chile, Sebastian Pinera, to negotiate a peaceful solution to the underlying problems of Chile's relationship with the people of Easter Island. The Rapa Nui people also began to peacefully reoccupy their ancestral lands, including the Hotel Hanga Roa, a five-star hotel supposedly being built by the Schiess family, a non-indigenous family, on ancestral Rapa Nui lands.

□ 1110

Mr. Speaker, while the Government of Chile attempted to initiate a dialogue with Rapa Nui individuals, the problem is that the Chilean Government also sent military police to this little island which is 2,300 miles from Chile. I can't believe, Mr. Speaker—we have 17 million people, good people, living in Chile—sending police forces to take control of this little island with some 2,500 Rapa Nuians and they have not even been given any consultation or even an opportunity to conduct consultations, serious consultations, with the Government of Chile.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the Government of Chile can begin a dialogue for ways to help the Rapa Nui people achieve a greater sense of self-determination and self-governance in their lands. I ask President Pinera to advocate for a more positive approach for partnership and dialogue with the indigenous people of Easter Island. It is my honest belief that the indigenous people of Easter Island do not wish any harm to the good people of Chile. Nor is there a possibility that the people of Easter Island will ever pose a threat to the military and strategic or national security interests of the people and the Government of Chile.

Mr. Speaker, I also hope that the White House and the State Department and Assistant Secretary Valenzuela will take a stand against these violent