

Depression; World War II did. The government—not the private sector—the government's conduct of the war and the government's role in steering the economy won World War II and pulled us out of the Great Depression. Government did that. Government stimulated the public and the private economy. If we rationally invest a similar amount of money in our domestic economy as we did to win World War II, we can pull America out of this Great Recession just like we pulled America out of the Great Depression.

Grow: We need to grow the economy in a balanced fashion. Two large tax cuts in 2001 and 2003 to the wealthy and big corporations—the so-called “job creators”—didn't create jobs in the private sector. Indeed, only 1 million net new jobs were created between 2001 and 2009, all government jobs. The private sector reported minus 600,000 jobs. So much for giving tax breaks to the “private job generators.”

Some argue against all debt, but all debts aren't bad because all debts are not the same. A \$50,000 gambling debt is bad because it has no return. The last decade showed that gambling on tax cuts for the rich to create jobs was bad. Gambling on two wars and not paying for them was bad. Gambling on a new prescription drug law that was unpaid for was horrible. And gambling on unregulated financial institutions that failed was bad. They resulted in a housing market collapse, slow economic growth, high unemployment, and huge deficits and debts—all bad.

So I think we've gambled enough on the theory that budget cuts and tax cuts generate private sector jobs and more taxes. The Laffer Curve is truly a laugh.

One more point, however, Mr. Speaker, where Republicans are right. We do have a spending problem. We spent too little in the economic stimulus package of 2009 and we spent it on the wrong things, one-third of which were tax cuts for the rich that conservative Republicans insisted be included, even though they still voted against it. Rather than spending to create jobs by directly investing in things we need—new schools, new hospitals, new water and sewer systems, public transportation, high speed rail, bridges, ports, airports, and more—Congress passed an economic stimulus package that kept us from falling into a Great Depression. But it was not enough to generate the growth necessary to create the number of jobs that we need. But too many in Congress drew the wrong conclusion.

It reminds me of a man whose house caught on fire, and when he tried to put it out with a garden hose, he concluded that water does not put out fires. Water does put out fires, Mr. Speaker, but you have to have enough of it to fit the size of the fire. You have to put it in the right place.

So, there you have it, Mr. Speaker, two choices for America: Cut, cap, and balance or invest, build, and grow.

That's the choice before the American people. Both visions offer constitutional amendments.

Cut, cap, and balance offers a balanced budget amendment that guarantees slow growth and few jobs. But a different vision of invest, grow, and build can be enhanced with a different set of constitutional amendments—education, health care, and the environment, just to name three.

According to the Congressional Research Service, over 51 percent of all jobs in America are tied to the First Amendment—television networks, radio stations, the recording industry, wire services, Facebook, Google, iPad, movie studios, the Internet, newspapers, magazines, and more. In fact, most corporate activity in America is defined as First Amendment activity.

How many jobs would be created if we added an amendment to the Constitution that gave every American student the right to a public education of equal high quality? How many new elementary schools would have to be built? How many old schools would have to be rehabilitated and made modern?

□ 1010

How many teachers and counselors would have to be hired? How much wire installed for the Internet? How many computers built and purchased? How many desks built and bought? That's what H.J. Res. 29, an education amendment, would demand.

How many jobs would be created if we added an amendment that guaranteed every American the right to health care of equal high quality? how many new hospitals built? how many doctors, nurses, dentists, administrators, and technicians trained?

Mr. Speaker, a different vision of America is possible. I am not giving up on our country, and neither should we.

BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, throughout history, great change has mostly come from steady, determined hard work performed over long, long periods of time. Think of our Revolution. It took years. Think of the war that freed the slaves and the progression towards racial equality. It has taken years. Think of the continued long march against radical Islamic terrorism that continues today.

Today, the challenge we face is a frightening economic challenge. We must put people back to work. We've got to grow our economy so we can pay off the crushing debt that has been heaped upon the next generation over the past 40 years. It is the fight of my generation. There are two world views to tackle this problem that threaten our Republic.

The first, offered by the President and those who control Washington,

D.C. today, is more government, more spending, more redistribution of wealth, and more physical and spiritual dependence on government. The American people rejected this world view on November 2, 2010.

Then there is a second view. It is one that offers liberty and freedom from government instead of control by government. It recognizes that the left's morally misguided policies will expand government, suffocate growth, further depress job creation, and push millions of people farther away from any hope of rising out of poverty. These policies negatively impact American culture by squelching individual responsibility and initiative and work ethic. America has always had a cultural bias in favor of productive work, and has disapproved of the easy acceptance of charity and welfare payments when these are not necessary and when one can provide for oneself.

These competing visions of America frame the debate over reducing our Nation's spending addiction. It is the fight we're having today. So, today, I will vote for a bill that for the first time in decades begins to turn the tide against the radical job-killing spending of our current President.

Now, it's true that the election of President Barack Obama in 2008 and the Democratic retention of the Senate in 2010 continue to have consequences, so this bill is necessarily insufficient. It does not complete the mission. If this plan is all we ever do, we plainly will have failed the task that the new class of freshmen was sent to Washington, D.C. to take on.

But it is not all we'll do. We will continue to execute the will of the American people, and we will hold this Republic together by ending this spending addiction that has afflicted this town for decades. This bill is the Lexington and Concord of the American Revolution. It is Antietam to our Civil War. It is D-day to World War II. It is the first skirmish in a very long battle.

That great Kansan, General Eisenhower, did not declare victory on June 6, 1944, after America successfully commenced its liberation of Europe. Rather, he acknowledged a good day, that the battle had been joined, and he had a deep recognition that he needed to continue to execute his battle plan.

The American people spoke on November 2, 2010, and we now begin to do what they demand that we do.

This bill we vote on today honors that commitment. We said we would not raise taxes. This bill does not do that. Our President complains. We said we would not increase the debt limit beyond the amount of spending reductions that we undertake. This bill does that. Our President complains.

These were bold commitments we made to the American people, especially when Washington, D.C. continues to be controlled by liberal Democrats. How could we be sure that a rump group of Republicans could accomplish this? It had never been done

before—but today, we have an opportunity as this monumental struggle begins.

How big will our Federal Government be? Will our country return to its constitutional role of having bounded government?

In Kansas, I know that the battle sometimes looks messy—big challenges often look that way. Today, however, I can say clearly that we have stopped a President intent on growing government, and we have begun to head down a path towards prosperity for our Nation and our freedom. It's a good day.

U.S. MUST LEAD GLOBAL RESPONSE TO FAMINE IN HORN OF AFRICA

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, last week, the United Nations declared famine in Somalia and reported urgent needs in Ethiopia and Kenya. On our nightly TV news and in our daily papers, we are seeing the pictures of people dying, of children suffering from extreme malnutrition, and of mothers carrying their babies, walking over 100 miles in search of food and safe haven.

Tens of thousands of people in Somalia have already died. The Horn of Africa is suffering a devastating drought, with this year being recorded in some locations as the driest or second driest year on record since 1951. The impact has been compounded by war, neglect and spiraling food prices.

Currently, some 11.5 million people across east Africa urgently need food aid, medical supplies and care. More than 130,000 Somali refugees have left their country for refugee camps along the borders of Ethiopia and Kenya. They arrive exhausted and physically depleted. News reports estimate that about 1,300 Somali refugees arrive in northern Kenya every single day. They join already overcrowded camps, and stress the ability of the Kenyan Government and humanitarian agencies to provide food, water, emergency care, and shelter.

Working with local partners and NGOs such as Doctors without Borders, Save the Children, and Italian Aid, UNICEF will be vaccinating hundreds of thousands of children. Dehydrated and suffering from malnutrition, these children, especially those under the age of 5, are particularly susceptible to the measles, polio, diarrhea, and pneumonia.

To date, in fiscal year 2011, the United States has provided over \$450 million in humanitarian aid to the Horn of Africa through USAID's Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance and the Food for Peace program, along with refugee assistance from the State Department's Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration.

But much more needs to be done. The next 3 to 6 months will be critical. The

drought is expected to worsen, at least through the end of the year, and then we will wait to see what happens during the next cycle of rains. Will communities be able to recover? Will small farmers be able to plant new crops or will heavy rains produce floods that drive communities deeper into poverty?

My colleagues need to understand, however, that the current crisis, as terrible as it is, could have been much worse. There is good news amongst so much tragedy. The last time a drought of this magnitude hit Ethiopia, over 14 million people faced starvation. This time, about 4.5 million Ethiopians are in need of emergency aid. The difference? Since 2005, the United States and other donors have made significant investments in Ethiopia's Productive Safety Net Program.

I saw firsthand several of these programs in 2007. They helped small farmers and poor communities diversify the crops they planted, broaden their sources of income, create local markets, better manage their water resources, and increase the nutritional content of their own diets and those of their children. This has enabled over 7.5 million Ethiopians to withstand the worst effects of the current drought. These families and communities are not part of the 4.5 million Ethiopians who require urgent humanitarian aid.

Mr. Speaker, these programs work. They were models for Feed the Future, our current global program to promote sustainable agriculture, food security and nutrition. It's how you end global hunger, Mr. Speaker. It's the difference between needing to help rescue 4 million people rather than 14 million people. It's also the difference between investing \$6 per person each year so they become more food secure and resilient to disasters—or having to invest \$250 per person to deliver emergency relief that only covers 3 to 4 months.

It's the smart way to invest our development resources. Mr. Speaker, this is why I am so appalled by what happened yesterday in the markup of the State-Foreign Operations appropriations bill.

□ 1020

Development, humanitarian, and disaster aid programs were all brutally cut. These cuts come on top of the Agricultural appropriations bill that devastated our emergency food aid programs.

With the worst drought in 60 years hitting the Horn of Africa, these cuts amount to the United States turning its back on its own strategic interests and walking away from our international commitments.

Instead, we need to increase our emergency response to the current crisis, ensure that we have the resources to invest in long-term development, and continue our global leadership in ending hunger and famine once and for all. We need to do better, Mr. Speaker.

[From IRIN, July 27, 2011]

ANALYSIS: HORN OF AFRICA AID MUST ALSO BUILD LONG-TERM RESILIENCE

GENEVA.—The images of starving children bear grim witness to the extent of the crisis affecting millions of people in the Horn of Africa, but they also symbolize a failure to act in time, say aid experts.

"It is a colossal outrage that the warnings went unheeded, that the lessons of previous famines have been ignored," says Barbara Stocking, chief executive of Oxfam.

The crisis in the Horn of Africa, triggered by drought, conflict and high food prices, is affecting at least 11.6 million people, with two regions of southern Somalia suffering from famine. And the situation may well deteriorate.

But the crisis, experts say, could have been mitigated by mobilizing the necessary resources ahead of time. There is increasing evidence that helping people become more resilient to the naturally recurring cycles of drought is far more effective than responding after disaster has struck.

It is also sound use of donor money, they say. As such, helping farmers find alternative livelihood options, or teaching them to grow drought-resistant crops, is far more effective than providing food aid when the harvest has failed.

"We have hard evidence, including from Africa, that we need only five Swiss francs [US\$6.20] per capita per annum to build up resilience," said Mohammed Mukhier, who heads the Disaster Risk Reduction unit at the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC).

"If you take the emergency response and emergency operations, you might need 200 francs [\$250] per capita to deliver relief assistance for periods of just three or four months."

Humanitarian agencies and donors agreed at an emergency meeting in Rome on 25 July that the response to the crisis must address the immediate needs of the desperate population and help build resilience to avert similar crises in the future.

RISK REDUCTION

Using donor money wisely is particularly urgent in view of the threats posed globally by natural disasters, including increasingly frequent storms, floods and droughts. Advocates of the risk reduction strategy argue that donors can no longer afford to provide funding for disasters primarily after the fact. The cost is rising and compromising regular development investment.

Yet, warnings of impending disaster in the Horn of Africa went largely unheeded.

"Measures that could have kept animals alive—and provided milk, and income to buy food—would have been much cheaper than feeding malnourished children, but the time for those passed with very little investment," said Simon Levine, of the Overseas Development Institute. Now, "it is far too late to address anything but the worst symptoms", he wrote on the website of the independent British think-tank.

While massive funding often goes to post-disaster response, funds for preparedness and contingency planning are relatively scarce. Risk prevention is often hard to fund as it does not generate the same kind of media as a high-profile emergency response. Government donors answer to taxpayers and need to demonstrate impact—something that is difficult to do when disaster has been averted.

With donors mobilized—even if funds pledged still fall well short of the US\$2 billion needed—the focus in the Horn of Africa is now on emergency as well as long-term assistance.

"Short-term relief must be linked to building long-term sustainability," said UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon. "This means