

The TMDLs are tough—but they are realistic about the reductions in pollution we need throughout the 64,000-square-mile watershed to restore the Bay's health.

Over the past decades, the effort to restore the Chesapeake Bay has been largely based on voluntary agreements within and among the states.

Recent assessments of the Bay show us that the pledging of earnest promises, the utterance of heart-felt slogans, and the signing of agreements enforced only by good will have achieved water quality in the Bay that is still rated "very poor"—even though billions of dollars have been spent in support of these promises.

If we are serious about cleaning up the Bay, we must implement the TMDLs—and the EPA must be fair but insistent in applying these requirements.

It is therefore essential that the TMDL process get off to a fast, efficient, and effective start.

Eliminating funding for the enforcement of the TMDLs is tantamount to arguing that we should continue to allow the Chesapeake Bay to be a sewer—where pollutants running out of storm drains and waste treatment plants, from overly fertilized front yards, and off farm fields collect and create "dead zones" where life cannot be sustained.

The Virginia Institute of Marine Science has estimated that 40 percent of the jobs in Maryland and Virginia associated with crabbing were eliminated between 1998 and 2006—an outcome resulting from the decimation of the crab population due to the pollution accumulating in the Bay.

In the face of such losses, a vote against enforcement of the TMDL is a vote that says job losses are acceptable—and that though options are available to restore the Bay, a polluted Bay is good enough.

I urge my colleagues to reject this position by voting against this amendment and in favor of a robust effort to clean the Chesapeake Bay.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chair, I oppose the continuing resolution put before us by the Republican leadership, which proposes to cut \$100 billion in spending below the funding levels President Obama requested in his budget for fiscal year 2011.

According to a summary developed by the House Appropriations Committee, these cuts are "a massive down payment on the new Republican majority's commitment to drastically decrease discretionary funding in order to help our economy thrive and spur job creation."

Sadly, there does not appear to be any accompanying material that specifies exactly how cutting funds from programs that make essential investments in our communities and in our Nation's infrastructure will spur economic growth. Specifically, I would like to know how many jobs will be created by cutting \$581 million from state and local law enforcement assistance or by cutting billions in funding for the high speed rail program.

I would also like to know how cutting hundreds of millions of dollars from each of the HUD community development fund, the clean water and drinking water state revolving funds, or from transit capital investment grants will support job creation.

Frankly, I don't believe these cuts will create any jobs—nor do I believe they will support the economic growth that will move our country out of the recession created by an appalling combination of regulatory failure and corporate recklessness.

Mr. Chair, while I agree that the current deficit is not sustainable, we are also not going to create jobs by cutting aid programs for the poor.

According to an October 2010 report released by the Congressional Research Service, 3.7 million more persons fell below the poverty line in 2009 compared to the number below the poverty line in 2008. These 3.7 million people were pushed into poverty by a recession they did not create.

As a result, in 2009, a total of 43.6 million persons had incomes below the poverty line—more than at any time since we began tracking this measure in 1959.

Within that figure, 1 in every 5 children in this country lived in poverty in this Nation in 2009.

These figures can only be described as appalling.

And yet we are told that cutting billions from job training programs, cutting a billion dollars from community health centers, cutting a billion from Head Start, and cutting \$747 million from nutritional programs for mothers and infants will help eliminate our \$14 trillion dollar national debt and will also "help our economy thrive and spur job creation."

Mr. Chair, these cuts will not contribute to a thriving economy or create a single job—but they will take essential aid from the millions in our Nation who have the least.

If we are serious about cutting our debt, we must understand what has created that debt. Poor people did not create this debt.

However, an analysis developed by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities in mid-2010 found that "just two policies dating from the Bush Administration—tax cuts and the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan—accounted for over \$500 billion of the deficit in 2009 and will account for almost \$7 trillion in deficits in 2009 through 2019, including the associated debt-service costs."

Despite the central role that tax cuts for the wealthy have had in increasing national debt, Congress voted just a few months ago to extend the Bush-era tax cuts, adding billions more to the national debt, including more than \$80 billion for the tax cuts provided to the highest 2 percent of earners.

Given this choice, it should not come as a surprise that our national debt is continuing to grow.

Since we appear to be unable to consider serious proposals that will cut the deficit while

truly supporting economic recovery, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment and to vote no on the continuing resolution.

IN HONOR OF THE CORPORATION
FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY
SERVICE

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 2011

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support for reinstating funding for the Corporation for National and Community Service. Following the recent votes on the House floor, I urge my colleagues to recognize volunteerism as a historic and valued tradition, and we cannot close the door on millions of Americans who want to serve their country.

As a Returned Peace Corps Volunteer, I know firsthand the expansive value of service. America has an unparalleled history of extending a helping hand to lift up our neighbors in times of need. Now more than ever, we must rebuild our country and strengthen our national spirit through service in our communities.

The Corporation for National and Community Service is one of our country's finest expressions of volunteerism. Through programs like AmeriCorps, Senior Corps, and Learn and Serve America, CNCS creates important opportunities for Americans of all walks of life to offer their brains, brawn, and heart in service to others. I am proud to say that there are 1,117 folks from my district currently serving in CNCS programs. And they are part of a five-million strong corps of volunteers across the country who are dedicating part of their lives to meet our nation's critical needs in education, health, safety, and the environment.

CNCS exemplifies the best of what America has to offer. Senior Corps volunteers have given over 1 billion hours of service as foster grandparents for at-risk youth and companions to the elderly. More than 400,000 Americans have served in AmeriCorps on critical projects ranging from Hurricane Katrina and Deepwater Horizon disaster relief to homelessness and neighborhood revitalization around the country. And well over 1 million high school students have experienced the power of civic engagement through participating in Learn and Serve programs. CNCS' work touches public agencies, schools, national and local non-profits, and faith-based organizations.

Yet despite the critical mass of people wanting to serve and the widespread need for service, my colleagues have chosen to eliminate CNCS from our national budget. This dissonance between supply and demand makes absolutely no sense. For the sake of saving .03% of our total federal budget, my colleagues have taken away the ability for millions of Americans to help their fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I honor the service of my constituents on the Central Coast and Americans across the country. I reject this legislation and will fight to restore robust funding so that we can continue our noble legacy of service to those in need for this and future generations.