

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?

I think we'd be far poorer if we did not have a foreign aid budget. And don't just take my word; take the word, for example, of the head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mullen, who said to Congress last year, the more significant the cuts to foreign aid, the longer military operations will take, and the more lives will be at risk. That's the head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, not some crazy, wild-eyed, naive person, but the head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff saying cutting diplomacy in the State Department and foreign aid threatens the lives of our warfighters, of our men and women in uniform.

Or how about when Secretary of Defense Gates, then under President Bush, said in 2008, referring to cuts, proposed cuts to foreign aid, that it has become clear that America's civilian institutions of diplomacy and development have been chronically undermanned and underfunded for far too long. This is Defense Secretary Gates, under former President Bush, relative to what we traditionally spend on the military and, more important, relative to the responsibilities and challenges our Nation faces around the world.

My goodness. Tunisia, Egypt, Lebanon, Libya, Iran, North Korea, China—to say now is the time to have fewer people understanding foreign languages, fewer embassies, fewer diplomats to try to avert war and nuclear proliferation when it constitutes less than 1 percent of the budget already? That's going to solve our problems? That not only won't solve our economic problems, that will create more and more danger to U.S. national security.

That is why, while we need to cut spending, while we need to get rid of waste, while we need to find additional sources of revenue, like the unnecessary \$4 billion that this Congress now gives already to the oil and gas and energy industries, to do what—\$4 billion to do what? To encourage them to look for energy. Well, I thought they were making a profit at that already, the greatest profits in their histories. Yes, they are. So why give them \$4 billion in subsidies? Let's use that for other purposes. Cut taxes—use that to reduce our deficit. Use that not to cut foreign aid, which returns probably 1,000 times per dollar than what we contribute in terms of the 1 percent of our budget that goes to diplomats, embassies, the State Department, and the meager foreign aid we provide to our essential military allies who are helping us protect against al Qaeda and the Muslim Brotherhood, who are helping us protect our vital sea lanes and economic lifeblood around the world.

I look forward to working with my Republican colleagues, but priorities are priorities, and we ought to make cuts where they make sense, not where they jeopardize U.S. national security.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 29 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BONO MACK) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, our strength and salvation, You are worthy of all praise because true guidance has been granted this free Nation throughout its history.

Members of Congress, now chosen to make decisions that will honestly address the present needs of Your people, need Your help. Reward their efforts to establish equal justice for all and to make judgments in accordance with Your commands.

You can reach down and shatter any present barrier that hides the vision to progress. You can raise up Your forces beyond any wall of anger or prejudice and set all free; so united they may advance Your holy will.

We place all our trust in You, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

TRIBUTE TO RONALD REAGAN

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, yesterday, Byron York, in the Washington Examiner, correctly recognized the memory of

Ronald Reagan on the 100th anniversary of the President's birth.

Without question, President Reagan stood for policies like lower taxes, less regulation, and a strong national defense.

Having served President Reagan's Energy Secretary, Jim Edwards, as deputy general counsel from 1981 to 1982, I saw firsthand his success in reducing regulations; I witnessed the success of a strong national defense by being an International Republican Institute election observer in Bulgaria, witnessing captive nations achieve freedom and democracy, with victory in the Cold War causing the defeat of communism across Europe and Asia.

Ed Meese was quoted for his contrasting the liberating policies of Reagan as opposed to the Big Government agenda of the current President.

The resources for conservatives are highlighted in California at the Reagan Library at Simi Valley and the Reagan Ranch Center of the Young America's Foundation at Santa Barbara.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

UNEMPLOYMENT RATE

(Mr. JACKSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Madam Speaker, the unemployment rate last month dropped from 9.4 percent to 9 percent, but only 36,000 jobs were created. Wow, 36,000 jobs equals 0.4 percent.

How did the rate drop so much with only 36,000 new jobs? Madam Speaker, it's an illusion. If you are chronically unemployed and have given up looking for a job, you don't count as unemployed in America. You fall out of the statistics. So as more and more people are out of work for longer periods of time, they are literally left out of the system. Houdini couldn't have performed an illusion as clever as the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

But shouldn't the government of, for, and by the people care about its most vulnerable in this economic climate?

I want to remind the government of the urgency of our economic situation. Send me your resume and your story to resumesforAmerica@mail.house.gov. I want to have your story entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to remind the Congress of the fierce urgency of "now."

Madam Speaker, stop the illusions. The American people need jobs, and they want to go to work. We have too many Americans who are chronically unemployed, and we don't even count them anymore. We need to do something about it, and we need to do something about it now.