

the President of the United States, we increased the deficit by \$400 billion this year. Yep, the tax cuts. But remember, tax cuts don't count. Now, they increase the deficit by \$400 billion. We didn't cut expenditures by \$400 billion. So the money is going to be borrowed for those tax cuts, from China and elsewhere; and it's going to be passed on to our kids and our grandkids, part of the national debt.

But that doesn't count in the Republican world. Reducing the income of the government while not reducing expenditures by the same amount doesn't count. They pretend.

Let's not pretend. This is deadly serious. Let's not go after programs that are essential to America. They're going to put things like Pell Grants that are helping people get a college education and become more educated so they will have better lifetime earnings and our country will be more competitive, educate the next generation of folks to lead our Nation—that's on the table next week. We'll probably see some cuts there. Other programs like that will be on the table. Subsidies to oil companies? Tax cuts, yes, we can do more of those and increase the deficit.

So let's get real. It is a real problem, and let's stop pretending that you really care about it and you're going to do something about it.

FOREIGN AID: A TIME TO RECONSIDER

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up on what my friend has just said about cutting Federal spending. I agree, cutting \$400 billion is really not much of a cut, especially in these times when Congress continues to spend more and more money. So let's talk about some specific areas where we ought to reconsider putting taxpayer money, and maybe it's time to reconsider our foreign aid that we send to countries throughout the world.

There are about 192 foreign countries in the world, give or take two that sometimes exist and sometimes don't. So there's 192 countries, and we give foreign aid to over 150 of them. Now, this map over here to my left shows the world, and most of it is in red. All of those countries that are in red on this map receive American taxpayer foreign aid. The countries in green receive military aid from the United States, which is almost all of the countries in the world. There are a few countries in Europe and one part in Africa that are in blue that receive no American aid. But the vast majority receive American money, and we just keep sending it and sending it and sending it, and we send it to countries that many Americans don't even understand why we send it to those countries, and I'm going to address some of those.

But here's how it works, Mr. Speaker, and this rule needs to be changed. When a country wants foreign aid, all of the foreign aid that America gives is put into one bill. In other words, when we write a check, we're writing a check on one bill. For example, we don't separate the countries one at a time and vote up or down on whether they ought to get American money. I think if we did that, most of these countries in red wouldn't be seeing any American money. With the way the rule works, we put all 150-plus countries in one package, and we vote for all of them.

Now, I personally think it's good for the United States foreign policy that we support Israel, that we send them foreign aid and military aid. We ought to keep doing that. But if we want to continue to send aid to Israel, we've got to send it to other countries like Egypt and Pakistan and some others.

□ 1010

Right now in the crisis in Egypt, maybe it's time that we reconsider sending aid to Egypt. You know, if the Muslim Brotherhood takes over that country of Egypt, the world's in a lot of trouble. And we've all seen on television those tanks going up and down those highways and the city of Cairo. Those are American tanks. They came from American taxpayers. It would be a tragedy if those tanks and other foreign aid ends up in that radical group, the Muslim Brotherhood. Take over the government. We don't know. Time to reconsider Egypt.

But, you know, we also give money to Pakistan—Pakistan is on the border with Afghanistan—and it's given in the name of helping that country. Pakistan doesn't support us, I think, adequately in our war on terror in Afghanistan, but yet we continue to give them money.

But here is something that most Americans may not know about. We give money to Venezuela. Why do we give money to Chavez and Venezuela? He hates the United States. He defies our President, makes fun of our Nation. We don't need to give him any foreign aid.

We give \$20 million to Cuba. Why do we give money to Cuba? Americans can't even go to Cuba. It's off limits. It's a communist country. But we're dumping money over there.

And we even give foreign aid to this massive country over here, Russia, that used to be called the USSR.

And the zinger of them all, this country. Even though we are in debt \$45,000 per American, and most of that debt is owned by the Chinese, this Nation gives foreign aid to our good buddies the Chinese.

Why do we do that? It doesn't make any sense, and it's time to reevaluate our foreign aid policy. It's a time to reconsider. And let's start voting up or down on every one of these countries that want our aid.

And last thing I want to say is most of these countries we give money to,

they don't even like us. There was a poll done by FOX News yesterday that said 82 percent of the people in Egypt don't even like Americans. Well, why do we keep giving them money? We don't need to pay them to hate us. As my friend LOUIE GOHMERT from Texas says: "We don't need to pay them to hate us. They can do it on their own."

So it's time we reconsider foreign aid and save American taxpayers money. We are at war in two countries now. This debt is tremendous. We have a lot of issues in this country, and we need to start taking care of America before we start sending American money to countries throughout the world. It's a time to reconsider foreign aid.

And that's just the way it is.

POLITICAL UNREST IN EGYPT

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I was going to talk about jobs, but I think in light of the last address on the other side of the aisle, I will talk a bit about foreign policy and specifically Egypt.

There is a quote in a play by Samuel Beckett. It's called "Waiting for Godot." The quote, though, is applicable. It says something to the effect that, at this time, in this place, at this very moment in time, all mankind is us. And in many ways, Mr. Speaker, all mankind should be with the Egyptian people.

Now, it's quite true that the Egyptian people are not supportive of America's foreign policy, at least Washington's foreign policy, but they are certainly supportive of America's fundamental values. And, in fact, that's what motivates this revolution.

This protest was not started by the Muslim Brotherhood, who may, at most, be 20 percent of the Egyptian people and have forsworn violence, and, in fact, al Qaeda's second in command has issued any number of critical statements of the Brotherhood. That's not who is leading this. They may be jumping in now to take some advantage of it. But this was led by young, well-educated men and women very similar in motivation to those that led the American Revolution.

For the most part, these are folks much like the Google executive who yesterday explained that he could well lead a life of leisure. He was making a good income. His needs were being met. He had a nice apartment. But he didn't have his dignity. He didn't have his dignity when he can be arrested at any place at any time for any reason by the Egyptian Police. In fact, that's what happened. Only because he was speaking out on the street, he was arrested, blindfolded, held in captivity for 12 days, had no contact with his family. Now that he is released, he epitomizes who it is that is conducting this protest and why they are conducting it.

They want their dignity back. Sure, they would like to be able to stand tall

on an Arab street or on any street and be able to say “I am an Egyptian” without embarrassment. But most of all, they want their individual rights to vote in a free and fair election, to have a government that is not corrupt, that is responsive to their needs and desires but that, in fact, also looks out after the 36 million Egyptians who are living on less than \$2 a day.

These young people care about all of the people of that country. And they understand that under a repressive dictatorship, no one is able to fulfill their potential. They may be well cared for, some of them, but as John Kennedy said in his first inaugural address: “Unless we are prepared to address the needs of the many who are poor, we can’t possibly protect the wealth of the few who are rich.” They understand this.

It should also be said that in addition to upholding America’s most fundamental values, they are empowered by American industry, by our creativity and innovation. It’s Facebook. It’s all the social networking. It’s the Internet. It’s Google. It’s all of that technology that we have exported throughout the world. We should be proud of that. One was quoted as saying: The government can shut and lock all the doors on us, but they can’t close the windows of the Internet.

This is a time when we should be excited, when we should be proud, and we should be on the side of the Egyptian people in Tahrir Square, Freedom Square.

JOB CREATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I have said time and time again that my top priority this session of Congress is to focus on job creation and growing our economy. I think that many, if not all, of my Democratic colleagues share that same goal. However, let me share a few numbers with you here this morning on this new session of Congress. These numbers suggest that perhaps not every Member in this body shares that goal.

Five, the number of weeks that this House has been in session under the new leadership.

Twelve, the number of bills the House has voted on.

Zero, the number of House votes on bills that have been through their respective committees.

Zero, the number of House votes on bills intended to create jobs and address what should be our very top priority.

The most important contest we face today is not between Democrats and Republicans; rather, it’s America’s contest with competitors across the globe for the jobs and industries of our time. And economic growth is crucial for us to win this global race, not only for the future of our workforce but also

as a way to balance our budget and drive down the deficit.

During his State of the Union address, I was happy to hear President Obama reiterate that we share the same top priority—jobs, jobs, and jobs. In fact, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Ben Bernanke, is sitting before the Budget Committee today. I plan to discuss the economic growth rate and the GDP with the Chairman later this morning.

In June 2010, Chairman Bernanke suggested that the GDP would rise by about 3 percent over the course of the year last year and would likely increase at a slightly higher pace in 2011. In fact, the fourth quarter of 2010 showed a rate of growth at 3.2 percent. Compare that nearly double-digit turnaround to the end of the Bush administration where we saw a 6 percent downturn in GDP.

□ 1020

In addition to that slow but steady growth, we’ve seen the private sector add 1.2 million jobs, another stark turnaround from the final month of the Bush administration, where we lost more than 8 million jobs.

Though we all acknowledge that job numbers need to grow more, I’ve been surprised at the enthusiasm for these GDP and private sector growth numbers coming from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They’ve been quite enthusiastic, claiming that the growth we’ve seen in the past few months is, in large part, from their policies. And yet we return to the numbers I mentioned previously—zero, the number of House votes on bills intended to create jobs since the start of this new session of Congress—and now we look to finish the budget for this year and await the budget proposal from President Obama for next year.

We heard a lot in the campaign last year about the other side’s job plan to cut and grow. In fact, we’ve seen that plan come to fruition through the Republican Study Committee. They have proposed \$2.5 trillion in discretionary spending cuts over the next 10 years. This plan would put more than 1 million jobs at risk, halt our economic growth, and hurt middle class families. Let me repeat that. This plan would put at risk more than 1 million jobs.

Some of the examples of job losses include small businesses, where some 161,000 jobs would be lost due to \$4 billion less in guaranteed loans. Law enforcement officials would lose their jobs where 12,900 jobs would be cut. Approximately 4,000 positions for FBI agents, 800 ATF agents, 1,500 DEA agents, and some 900 U.S. marshals would be lost, as would 5,700 correctional officers in our Federal prisons.

And 27,500 weatherization jobs would be cut. Just imagine, as one of the largest and strongest winter storms of the season just swept across the country, with some areas receiving record snowfall accumulations, temperatures that dropped dozens of degrees below

zero, and deadly storms that knocked out power and left people in the cold. We are telling the weakest and neediest amongst us that they simply are not worth our investments.

Americans’ top priorities are job creation and deficit reduction, and they demand that we work together to meet these goals. We are committed to deficit reduction, but we are not going to do it in an irresponsible way that will threaten jobs, economic growth, and the security of our middle class.

The budget cannot be slashed at the expense of jobs and investments in transportation, clean energy, innovation, and rebuilding—rebuilding America, not jeopardizing our economic recovery.

I agree with President Obama that we must out-innovate, out-educate, and out-build the rest of the world, but we cannot risk our economic future by rolling back investments that will help our private sector grow and put people back to work.

PROPOSED CUTS TO FOREIGN AID

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the Republican side of the aisle, have suggested that America would be better off if we cut out foreign aid.

In my opinion, there could be nothing further from the truth, Mr. Speaker. Cutting foreign aid from the United States to our allies and others we want to work with around the world is vital to the U.S.’s national security.

I’ll say it again. Our foreign aid that we give out, which, by the way, what’s the percentage of foreign aid in our budget compared to the whole budget? It’s 1 percent. It’s actually less than 1 percent. Some people think it’s 20 or 30 percent. It’s less than 1 percent of our whole budget. And what do we do with that foreign aid? We make alliances with trading partners. We make alliances with strategic military partners all over the world. I think most Americans understand we still live in a very dangerous world and we need allies and friends and partners.

By the way, what does that foreign aid budget include? It includes money for embassies and diplomats, interpreters. Now, would we be better off in a big complex, interconnected, hostile world if we didn’t have embassies all over the world? If we didn’t have people who understood foreign languages? If we didn’t have people who had lived in these countries, who are Americans who lived in these countries but nonetheless understood the cultures and way of thinking and history of these other nations whom we are not yet friends with or whom we are friends with but want to be better friends with, or countries on the fence whom we want to bring over to democracy and to Western values?