



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2011

No. 20

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, February 10, 2011, at 4 p.m.

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2011

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 9, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DANIEL WEBSTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

THE DEFICIT

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

Mr. DEFazio. Well, we hear now that the Republican majority is serious about the deficit, and that's good news because we are running up a huge pile of debt which is going to be handed on

to our kids and our grandkids and won't be paid off over 30 years. Some of this debt will weigh upon the country. But the question is, how do we get there? The deficit this year will be \$1.5 trillion, an unimaginable amount of money, borrowed, a lot of it from China, and that is just virtually unfathomable.

Now, they're going to dink around essentially and pretend they're doing something meaningful next week. They're going to take out after a Federal budget of \$3.7 trillion—and remember, \$1.5 trillion of that is with borrowed money—they are going to discuss cuts to actually \$446 billion of that. So a \$3.7 trillion budget, but the only place you can cut is \$446 billion of that. Hmm, let's see, if we eliminated that entire \$446 billion of expenditures, we'd still have a deficit of over \$1 trillion.

Now, that doesn't seem quite to work. So perhaps they've made a few too many things off-limits in terms of where we might look to cut.

Then there's one other thing they've done which is totally bizarre and I don't think many Americans would think very honest. They're saying if we decrease the income of the Government of the United States, i.e., cut taxes, give you back your money, and we don't reduce expenditures in the same amount, that doesn't count as new debt or deficit. You've got to borrow the money, probably from China; and you can send the debt forward but it doesn't count. So they're not going to look at something called tax expenditures.

So, you know, we can't begin to address things like the \$20 billion of sub-

sidies in the agriculture bill for five crops grown in eight States that are in surplus and paying people not to grow things. That's off-limits. That's mandatory spending. That can't be considered for cuts, paying people to not grow things. We can't do away with that. We're going to borrow the money so they can get paid to not grow things.

All right. Well, how about the oil companies? Now, Exxon Mobil reported the largest quarterly profit for a corporation in the history of the world the last quarter of last year, \$9 billion, and they didn't pay any taxes in the U.S. last year. None. They pay a lot of taxes around the world, but not in the United States. We actually gave them a tax refund because of the loopholes in the tax laws. That's called a tax expenditure. We're borrowing money to give to the Exxon Mobil Corporation, which had a \$9 billion profit by gouging consumers in America. Now, that's pretty extraordinary; but, no, we can't talk about eliminating the subsidy to Exxon Mobil. The Republicans have put that off-limits. That would be called a tax increase. You know, by plugging that loophole, that's a tax increase, can't talk about that.

Let's look at one other aspect of this. We were headed for a lower deficit this year. It would have been lower than last year, \$1.3 trillion last year. We were headed toward \$1.1 trillion, a good glide path, \$200 billion reduction in 1 year. If we could do that for 5 more years, we'd be down to virtually zero. But with one vote, one vote, with a deal cut between the Republicans and

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H555

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