

So, Mr. Speaker, again, my hearty congratulations to the people of Egypt.

AMERICA WORKS TOGETHER, COMES TOGETHER

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. As I was traveling, Mr. Speaker, to Washington, I had the opportunity to read the local newspaper. It's a good time for us to reconnect with our community, those that we have not been able to see, to hear their stories. And I was impacted by a story of two students at the University of Texas from different walks of life who had had a passion for football in one instance and a passion for basketball in another instance.

Unfortunately, as they were aspiring to their dreams, both of them found that they had a congenital or a serious heart defect. Young men. One who had come out of the heart of Acres Home, a historically African American community, raised by his grandmother whom he loved; and he chose to stay close to home by going to UT Austin to play basketball. What a devastating blow to find out he could not play when he first got there. What about the young man, huge in size, that almost lost his life on the football field?

But the story is, in this month when we commemorate African American History Month, one was a Caucasian, and one was an African American. It just shows in this Nation how we can work together and come together. These young men have, in a sense, overcome their challenges, and they represent America's heroes. I pay tribute to these two athletes at the University of Texas and thank them for their leadership.

FUNDING FOR THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT MUST BE DENIED

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, today, I sent a letter to Kathleen Sebelius, Secretary of Health and Human Services, asking, in light of Judge Vinson's ruling in Florida 2 weeks ago today where a declaratory judgment was issued that the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is indeed unconstitutional, that further implementation of this act not go forward.

In fact, Judge Vinson stated that officials of the executive branch will adhere to the law as declared by the court. As a result, the declaratory judgment is the functional equivalent of an injunction. There is no reason to conclude that this presumption should not apply here.

Now, I believe the judge is correct, that the administration should not proceed with implementation, and I've asked the Secretary for clarification

that that is indeed her position and will be her position going forward.

Of course we do have debate and a vote on the continuing resolution to fund the United States Government for the next 7 months. It is my expectation that funding for provisions of enacting the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act will not be funded in the continuing resolution.

The American people have made it very clear, and even recently the Florida ruling confirmed that the health care law is unconstitutional, and Congress must do its job to make sure funding for this legislation is denied.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 11, 2011.

Hon. KATHLEEN SEBELIUS,
Secretary of Health and Human Services,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY SEBELIUS: I write to inquire of the Department of Health and Human Services your response to and specifically subsequent implementation decisions made by the Department in the wake of Judge Vinson's ruling in *The State of Florida v. United States Department of Health and Human Services*. As you are well aware, the plaintiff sought declaratory judgment that the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is unconstitutional as well as an injunction against its enforcement.

In his opinion, Judge Vinson relied on precedent in Committee on Judiciary of U.S. House of Representatives v. Miers to determine that when a court issues a declaratory judgment against federal officials, the "declaratory judgment is the functional equivalent of an injunction." He quoted a previous United States Court of Appeals decision which further addressed his point, "that officials of the Executive Branch will adhere to the law as declared by the court. As a result, the declaratory judgment is the functional equivalent of an injunction . . . There is no reason to conclude that this presumption should not apply here. Thus, the award of declaratory relief is adequate and separate injunctive relief is not necessary."

I would like to request information on how, in light of the declaratory relief issued by Judge Vinson, the Department plans to proceed in its implementation of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Thank you for your time and consideration on this issue and I look forward to your response. Should you have any questions, please contact me in my Washington office at (202) 225-7772.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL C. BURGESS, M.D.,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANSECO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS HOUR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to lead this Special Order

for an hour on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus and to have some of my distinguished colleagues join me.

But as we begin the Special Order to call attention to the travesty that the Republican leadership is proposing and the cuts that they will be trying to enact for the balance of this year, I want to say something that begins to put these cuts into a particular perspective.

I'm sure that everyone is aware that today is Valentine's Day, a day in which we supposedly celebrate love. As the Republican leadership begins the onslaught on some very important programs, I want to share with them and all of us something that Dr. Cornel West has been reminding us of as of late, that is, that justice is what love looks like in the public arena.

So on this day when we show those close to us we love them, we should also be showing the American people our commitment to justice. Mr. Speaker, the cuts being proposed with the continuing resolution are anything but just.

With that, I would like to yield first to our distinguished assistant minority leader, Mr. CLYBURN, the gentleman from South Carolina, who has been a leader for his State, for this Congress, and for our country, particularly a leader of high morals who leads this country in making sure that we stay true to the values that this country was founded on and continue to operate in that faith.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the gentle lady for yielding me this time and thank her for her tremendous leadership on this and many other areas that come before this Congress.

I want to take just a few moments to talk about an issue that's very, very important to a significant number of citizens in our great country. The Wharton School of Business recently held a conference named in honor of Whitney Young, a leader and friend in the struggle for social justice, equality, and civil rights. Whitney Young is probably known best for growing and transforming the Urban League from a sleepy little organization into one of the country's biggest and most aggressive crusaders for social justice.

What he is less known for is his call for a "domestic Marshall Plan," a program to eradicate poverty and deprivation in the United States, similar to the Marshall Plan that was launched to reconstruct Europe after World War II. I would like to use that call for a domestic Marshall Plan as a jumping-off point for my remarks this evening.

Some of Whitney Young's ideas were incorporated into President Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty over 40 years ago, yet the scourge is still with us. Before the War on Poverty and the Great Society, we had the New Deal. All of these investments in America helped to move us forward as a Nation. But some communities have been left behind each time, and we have begun to call them "persistent poverty communities," places that have had more

than 20 percent of their populations living beneath the poverty level for more than 30 years.

Approximately 15 percent of all counties in America qualify as persistent poverty counties under this definition. These counties are diverse and spread across the country, including Appalachian communities in Kentucky and West Virginia; Native American communities in South Dakota and Alaska; Latino communities in Arizona and New Mexico; African American communities in Mississippi and South Carolina; and urban communities in Philadelphia, New York, Baltimore, and St. Louis.

□ 1930

Democrats represent 149 of these counties, with a total population of 8.7 million. Republicans represent 311 of these counties, with a total population of 8.3 million. Fourteen, with a total population of 5.3 million, are split between Democrats and Republicans.

A total of 43 Democrats and 84 Republicans represent at least a part of one of these counties. Thirty-five of the 50 states have at least one persistent poverty county. Fifteen of South Carolina's 46 counties meet this ignoble distinction, and seven of them are in the Sixth Congressional District that I proudly represent.

This is not a red state or a blue state issue. That's why in the map beside me the persistent poverty communities are colored in purple because poverty knows no political affiliation. Poverty has never been limited to race, region, or creed.

For many years, counties along the I-95 corridor in South Carolina were passed over for economic development. Federal funds found their way to South Carolina, but mysteriously did not find their way into the Sixth Congressional District.

The I-95 corridor is plagued with health disparities. The Sixth District has the dubious distinction of leading the State in incidents of stroke, heart disease, and diabetes. We lead the State in amputations for both adult and juvenile diabetes. This region is known as the buckle of the stroke belt, and is home to the highest rate of prostate cancer deaths among black males in the South.

Scientists tell me that many of these health problems are directly related to water quality. In some of these places in my district, the water is not fit for human consumption. One particular instance in which my office was involved, the Health Department would not allow a water hookup to a home because of the contamination. Yet, the people still drink the water because they have no choice.

Two years ago I offered a provision in the Rural Development section of the Recovery Act that we called the 10-20-30 formula. It stipulated that at least 10 percent of the funds be targeted to counties where at least a 20 percent poverty rate has persisted for the past 30 years. The formula is working.

Marion County, South Carolina, received a \$3 million loan and a \$4.7 million grant to build 71 miles of water lines, and three water projects in Orangeburg County benefited from this formula, including a \$5.6 million grant to bring potable water to these communities. Citizens in these counties will soon be enjoying their first clean glass of water from the faucet, free of contaminants and pollutants, thanks to this formula.

In the coming days and weeks, I will personally reach out to all 127 Members who represent persistent poverty counties in hopes of bringing together a bipartisan task force to ensure that these areas are not overlooked as we emerge from the recession. Hopefully, this task force will work to build on the success of the 10-20-30 formula in the rural development program by extending it to all Federal departments with grant-making authority going forward.

I thank my friend from the Virgin Islands for allowing me to speak about this important issue today.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Mr. CLYBURN, and we thank you so much for developing that formula that has begun to help communities that have been long distressed with high poverty levels for all that time, and we look forward to the work of your task force. Obviously this is not a Democrat issue or a Republican issue; it's an American issue. And we look forward to supporting that task force and the work that you will be doing.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I'd like to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), who leads the Congressional Black Caucus budget and has led it for all the years that I have been here. And I must say that in all of the budgets that he has helped us prepare and present to this body, they have been thoughtful, they have provided funding to the important areas that our communities and some of the communities that Mr. CLYBURN talked about needed, but still has reduced the deficit in every instance.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and if we're going to be able to address the important matters that our assistant leader has suggested, it's going to depend on our ability to get the budget under control.

When we talk about the budget, we need to put the budget in perspective. I was first elected in 1992, and in 1993 we considered a budget that put an end to fiscal recklessness. We passed a budget that, by the end of the 8 years of the Clinton administration, had not only eliminated the deficit, but had created enough surplus to have paid off the entire national debt held by the public by 2 years ago. That would mean that we'd owe no money to Japan, no money to China, no money to Saudi Arabia. That budget also created a record number of jobs and record economic activity, as noted by the record increase in the Dow Jones Industrial Average. So we

had a good budget. We had fiscal responsibility, but unfortunately, in 2001, that came to an end when we reverted to fiscal irresponsibility.

Under the Bush administration, we passed two tax cuts without paying for them, a prescriptive drug benefit without paying for it, fought two wars in the middle of cutting taxes, and a \$700 billion bailout, all of which put us in the economic ditch.

Now, in order to get these large deficits we now have under control, we're going to have to make some tough choices. Unfortunately, last year we started off in the wrong direction. We considered a huge tax cut bill last year that went in the wrong direction at a total cost, 2-year cost, of \$800 billion. And to put that in perspective, \$800 billion is more than we spent on the TARP program, about the same as the stimulus, about the same as what the health care bill spends in 10 years, that tax cut bill spent in two.

In case people don't really appreciate how big a bill that was, we checked with the National Conference of State Legislatures and ascertained that the total general fund budget, add them up, for 50 states, general fund budget of 50 states was \$650 billion. We, in one vote, cut taxes by \$800 billion.

And before that bill was passed, we asked, well, how are you going to pay for it? One of the ways is that we jeopardize Social Security in the bill, cutting the payroll tax, so money coming into Social Security will have to be subsidized by the general fund. That puts the Social Security program in competition with everything else in the budget. And so we put Social Security in jeopardy.

And we also had tax cuts for dead multimillionaires. I say dead multimillionaires because everybody expected us to have an exemption of \$3.5 million, \$7 million per couple, where you pay no taxes and begin paying taxes after that. Well, we increased that exemption, the amount you can get without paying any estate tax, to \$5 million, and reduced the rate.

□ 1940

That additional assistance to dead multimillionaires cost \$24 billion. Again, how are we going to pay for it?

You can look at the continuing resolution in next year's budget, a budget that the Republicans have already attacked for not cutting enough, and look what it does to the safety net:

LIHEAP, the Low Income Heating and Energy Assistance Program, for those that can't pay their energy bills and risk freezing to death, we cut that by one-half billion dollars to help fund the multimillionaire tax cut;

Women Infants and Children, the WIC program, so that babies can be born healthy and start off on the right track, we cut that program;

Job training and employment services, for those who have lost their jobs and may never return, trying to get a job that will be there, we cut that program;

Community health centers, public housing, at a time of record foreclosures, we're cutting those programs to partially fund that tax cut.

Opportunities:

Head Start, we only address the needs in Head Start for half the eligible children. We are going to cut Head Start to deprive millions of children of that important opportunity of starting off on the right track. We have found that Head Start will increase graduation rates, reduce delinquency, reduce the need for welfare, save more money than it costs. We're cutting that program;

TRIO and GEAR UP, programs that encourage young people to go to college, we're cutting those programs;

Assistance to Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Hispanic-serving institutions by significant amounts. Those deal with a lot of first-generation children;

Funds for improvement of postsecondary education, cut.

Our investments in America's future:

NASA, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, National Science Foundation, Advanced Research Project, all cut. These are investments in our future;

The National Infrastructure Innovation Fund, and rescinding billions in high-speed rail. Other countries are investing in high-speed rail. We're cutting high-speed rail.

Now, we should be more responsible when it comes to balancing the budget, and we can do it. But you can't do it by beginning the discussion with an \$800 billion tax cut without telling people how you are going to pay for it. Cutting critical safety net programs, initiatives to give opportunities for our youth, and initiatives that will invest in our future, these are the things that are being cut to fund that tax cut bill from last year.

We cannot disassociate ourselves from the connection of cuts that we are making today from the tax cut bills that we passed before. People are saying, well, we can't afford it. Well, we could have afforded it had we not passed that tax cut. We need to rescind what we did last year so we do not have to make these draconian cuts this year.

We should have been honest with the people last year. I don't think the people want cuts in Social Security, the safety net, and investments in our future. We can do better, and that's why we are going to be fighting against these draconian cuts that are so important to so many people and make sure that we go off and continue on the right track, as we did in 1993, where we can pass a responsible budget, address the needs of the people, create jobs, economic activity, and we were on course to paying off the national debt.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Mr. SCOTT. And I remember when the tax cuts were being debated and you led us, because we knew that those tax cuts would be paid for by cuts to the pro-

grams that our communities need most and that the American people want. The Pew Foundation did a poll that showed that people don't want cuts in those programs.

It was interesting, Paul Krugman in The New York Times today made a good point. Because the bill doesn't have one of those nice names that are usually attached to Republican bills when they are doing something that would hurt the public, he suggested we call it the Eat the Future bill, because that's what we're doing. We're taking away things now that we need to invest in to build our future.

So thank you, Mr. SCOTT, and thank you for your leadership on the budget.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to our leader, the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, EMANUEL CLEAVER from Missouri.

Mr. CLEAVER. Thank you, Congresswoman.

I think that what Congressman BOBBY SCOTT just said has to be echoed. And as is often said on the floor in this august Chamber is that I would like to associate myself with the comments of the previous speaker.

Congresswoman DONNA CHRISTENSEN has led the discussion on this vital issue that we will not be silent about. Mr. Speaker, in my real life as an ordained United Methodist pastor, I say to our congregation and congregations where I speak that if you want to know what a person is really like, if you want to know who a person really is, look through their checkbook. The checkbook will reveal quite clearly what a person believes in.

The same thing is true of a corporation and a nation, and the budget of the United States is a bold statement about who we are as a Nation. It says clearly what we believe in and the things we don't believe in. It is a statement that paints a picture of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, the picture that is being painted now is a picture that could be used on the chiller channel. It is a picture of a nation that would prefer to move toward deficit and debt reduction by unduly placing pain on the poor or, most appropriately and significantly, on the men and women of this country who are now pushed aside.

Normally, when we talk about the poor, in people's minds they see minorities and the people who are lazy and shiftless and who don't want to work. We are experiencing the greatest economic crisis since October 1929, and the people who we are looking at as being available to be discarded are police officers and teachers and State employees and municipal workers who have been laid off.

Every State in the Union is having financial problems. Every State in the Union is laying off employees. In my hometown, Kansas City, Missouri, we have a \$60 million shortfall. The State government has a \$200 million shortfall, and so State workers are being laid off. What we are saying now is

that the people who are already experiencing pain should get ready to experience some additional pain.

And I have heard over and over and over again, well, everybody must share in the pain. The question that I have asked that nobody has answered, I asked this in our committee last week: Why? Why should everybody end up suffering? Because everybody didn't contribute to this problem, number one. And, on top of that, the individuals who were hurt as a result of the recession we are asking to receive some additional pain. And that is simply not the way I think we want to project ourselves to ourselves, and certainly to the international community.

As Congressman SCOTT mentioned, we had a tax cut and made some major decisions before we went home for Christmas, and nobody stood on the floor and repeatedly asked the question: How are we going to pay for it? Well, now we are going to pay for it by equally, as we like to say, trying to place the pain on everyone.

We are not talking about getting rid of Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae. And the amazing thing is that the people, Wall Street, who caused much of the problems, are now being rewarded for causing the problems. We are going to say, okay, we're going to privatize Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. We're going to do all kinds of things that would accommodate the Wall Street barons who helped cause the crisis.

□ 1950

And the poorest people in this country are going to end up suffering even more so. We even had to fight to continue unemployment benefits. We had a battle on this floor to continue the unemployment benefits for people who, through no fault of their own, lost their jobs, such as police officers and firefighters.

Then we come out with this budget. This budget that we are about to debate is a nervous breakdown on paper. It is not something that we can be proud of as people of the United States, because it shows that we don't think in terms of trying to minimize the pain on the least of these.

Now, to be sure, the United States faces a painful and profound problem with our deficit and our debt. It has to be dealt with. I am on the Financial Services Committee. I asked this question in the committee last week: Are we serious about cutting the debt, when we say we are not going to talk about the entitlements?

We are not going to talk about Social Security, we are not going to talk about Medicare or Medicaid, and we certainly can't do anything with the annual debt service, which is a part of the budget that we can't make decisions on. We have to pay it. So, if we are not seriously trying to reduce the deficit by dealing with the entitlements, then what we are saying is we are going to play with the American public, tell them we are trying to be serious about the debt, when we know we are not.

This is not going to make any kind of substantial reduction in our deficit over the long term. We have got to seriously deal with this problem, and we are not doing it. We are absolutely not dealing with it. Nobody wants to talk about the Social Security issue, because they are thinking about reelection. Not because it shouldn't be dealt with, but they are thinking reelection.

There is criticism, well, the President should have lead the discussion on changing the retirement age on Social Security to a higher number, or somehow creating a new system whereby we have a means test, where individuals who are making \$500,000 a year simply can't also draw their Social Security. We are not even talking about that. And there is nobody on this Hill who can stand up and say we can address this problem very seriously without dealing with the entitlements.

So I am sorry that we are going to hurt so many people in the process of just kind of tinkering around the edges of what is a very serious problem.

My final comment, Congresswoman CHRISTENSEN, is there are a lot of people who ran for office and said we are going to deal with this deficit. But even they are not talking about the only way in which we can change this problem that we are having. Every economist will tell you that that is the only way we are going to deal with the deficit. There is not a single economist who is credible who will say we can deal with this in any other way, yet we are not dealing with it, and it is really a great tragedy.

I do think, as I conclude my comments, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, that the whole issue of what we are doing is so painful that even Ben Bernanke is saying, yes, we have to make cuts. But he is also saying you have to be careful. Look, the United States is the only entity putting money into the economy in any serious way right now, and if we withdraw it there could be economic consequences of withdrawing the kind of money we are talking about withdrawing.

Some of us are going to challenge it at every opportunity, because it is the wrong thing to do.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Congressman CLEAVER. We are certainly fortunate to having you leading the Congressional Black Caucus at this time. I think we need a pastor as leader.

At church yesterday, my minister spoke about our need as Christians. But this would apply to any faith, that we must be on the side of the dispossessed, the helpless, the hopeless, and the marginalized, and the cuts that the Republicans plan would clearly hurt the least of these and are definitely not on their side.

I want to yield at this time to the gentlewoman from Texas, Congresswoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Thank you very much, Congresswoman CHRISTENSEN.

The National Science Foundation was created in 1950; the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, or DARPA, and NASA were created in 1958; and the Department of Energy was established in 1977. Some of the technologies which originated from these Federal investments include the laser, Internet, fiber optics, and nuclear power.

Companies which sprang forth from these efforts include companies like Google, SAS, Cisco Systems, Orbital Sciences, and Sun Microsystems. These five companies alone employ 130,000 people, 130,000 jobs which were created from relatively modest Federal investment. And there are hundreds of companies which had their beginning in Federal research grants.

The equation is clear: Federal investment in research and development leads to new technologies and products which create jobs. And on the other side of the equation, focused investment in STEM education produces a highly-skilled workforce which ensures these high-tech jobs stay in America.

At a Science and Technology Committee last session, Tom Donohue of the United States Chamber of Commerce had this to say: "Research and development is the very lifeblood of our knowledge economy." That just about sums it up. In addition, investments in R&D also help to increase the participation of minorities in the R&D enterprises.

Through the efforts of many in Congress, including those speaking tonight, we have made great progress in expanding the pool of talent that this country can draw on to address the competitiveness challenge that we are facing. However, the CR before us this week would take us back and undo much of the good work that has been done to date.

Let me just quote a few negative impacts of this proposed CR. The CR would severely reduce, by 78 percent, funding for Hispanic-serving colleges and completely eliminate Federal support for several other programs for minority-serving colleges, including tribal colleges and institutions that serve significant numbers of black and Asian students.

The key Education Department program for historically black colleges and universities would lose \$85 million of the \$266 million it received in 2010, or about a third of it. The CR eliminates \$103 million for the Tech-Prep Program for vocational education, which heavily benefits community colleges, and also guts funding for the creation and support of statewide education data systems and eliminates all congressional earmarks for individual institutions, which in 2010 totaled almost \$2 billion for colleges and universities.

Under this proposal, title I would be cut by \$693.5 million. The cut to title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act would mean 2,400 schools that serve nearly 1 million disadvan-

tagged students would lose funding for teachers, tutors, and after-school programs. Nearly 10,000 teacher aides could lose their jobs.

Head Start was targeted for one of the biggest reductions, a \$1 billion cut below fiscal 2010. The massive cuts to the Head Start Program would remove 218,000 low income children and families and close more than 16,000 Head Start and Early Head Start classrooms across the country. It would leave 55,000 teachers, teacher assistants, and related staff without jobs.

The Pell Grant scholarship maximum award would be reduced by \$845, from \$5,550 to \$4,750. Many of the 9.4 million students who are projected to receive a Pell Grant in the 2011–2012 school year would see a lower grant award, requiring them to take on more loans for their college tuition.

□ 2000

In addition, it makes cuts to the programs of the National Science Foundation that would lead to elimination of huge research grants, affecting thousands of researchers, which can only have a negative impact on opportunities for minorities to make contributions in science and technology.

And I can fill up an hour debate time all by myself if I were to list all of the terrible impacts that the proposed cuts to the Department of Energy, NIST, NASA, NOAA, and EPA would have. Each of these agencies is critical to our future competitiveness and each of these agencies is slated for ill-founded cuts.

Unfortunately, our children and our grandchildren will be the ones who ultimately pay the price for misguided cuts when they inherit an America that is no longer the world leader in innovation.

We can do better. I urge my colleagues to reject the cuts being proposed in the Republican CR.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Ms. JOHNSON, a former chair of the CBC and a leader in science for many years.

I now yield to the other gentlelady from Texas, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentlelady for yielding and thank her for leading. As I see my colleagues on the floor, let me just try to focus on one or two points. And maybe on this Valentine's evening—I think a lot of our colleagues who were fortunate enough to have their spouses here rushed off, and we're delighted. Let me wish everyone a happy Valentine's Day. And let me wish my husband in Texas, far away, a happy Valentine's Day. But he might not be having such a good Valentine's Day because he is in higher education. And, frankly, this CR is going to put more than a dent. It is going to put a real bite.

This is an effort to show you what progress we've made. Private sector employment has increased for 12 straight months. Private employers added more than 1.3 million jobs in 2010. But they have to have an educated

workforce. And, as you can see, we're going up. The cup is half full and not half empty. But when you have the numbers that I'm about to relate to you, where you're seeing Pell Grants cut 15 percent—Mr. Speaker, I met with my universities—the University of Houston, Houston Community College, Lone Star, Texas Southern University; and if there was one thing that they emphasized it is the equal opportunity that is provided to all students through a Pell Grant.

If we are to go with the CR as it is, we're talking about a reduction in the middle of the school year of \$5,550 to \$4,705. Do you know what that does to a student? It doesn't tell them, Let me try to ramp up my extra job. It says, I am dropping out. You know what happens to the workforce? It disappears. And so I am concerned that we are in this predicament.

So let me tell you something else. I have been a strong champion of the COPS On the Beat program. And we have seen evidence of the fact that we have gained in the downsizing, or the decreasing, of crime. The proposed CR will cut \$600 million in funding to community-oriented policing. And, of course, what will happen is 3,000 fewer officers. You can be assured Houston, Texas, which got their first COPS grants just a few months ago, that I worked very hard on, will be one of the victims of that.

Let me just conclude by suggesting that one of the points my good friend the assistant leader made, community health clinics is not a partisan issue. It is to give access to all communities, and particularly rural communities. I'm from Texas. One of the reasons I fought so hard for community health clinics, particularly under the Bush administration, I actually talked to former President Bush and one of our encounters was to challenge and to encourage how we could in fact secure, if you will, more funding for Texas for community health centers in the rural areas. I'm glad we worked together, and actually we've seen a ramp-up. And we've seen a ramp-up with the Affordable Care Act, which helps to provide the kind of, if you will, health care for those in faraway communities where there are not enough doctors.

Finally, may I say to you that to cut the National Science Foundation is terrible. It doesn't make any sense. And I would offer to say that this is about work. Health care; cops to make it safe; Pell Grants to train the 21st-century workforce. I know there are colleagues on the other side of the aisle that will work with us to get this CR where it needs to be. I, too, am for a reasoned budget-cutting that we need to do. I did it in years past. We balanced the budget in 1997. We can do it again. I, frankly, believe we should not cut into the very quality of life that is so needed.

Let me thank my good friend and the Congressional Black Caucus, working with my other colleagues to ensure

that we stand for job creation, investing in job creation. Unfortunately, the CR, as it stands today—the continuing resolution, for those who are not sure of what that is—is not going to work. Let's invest in America.

H.R. 1, the Continuing Resolution making appropriations to fund the federal government through September 20, 2011 contains some very deep cuts that will be very hurtful to many Americans, especially those who are the most vulnerable—disadvantaged women and families, children, minorities, and the elderly. The proposed cuts in the CR will have a disproportionate affect the low-income and minority portions of our population.

As we face a large deficit and growing debt, we know that cuts will have to be made. And yes, some of those cuts will be painful. However, we must be careful not to place added burdens and cause greater harm to those Americans who are the most vulnerable in need of our support the most.

The proposed CR calls for a 15% reduction in funding for Pell grants. Such a cut will reduce the maximum Pell grant award from its current level of \$5,550 to \$4,705. This would present a serious problem for institutions of higher learning, but more importantly, it creates a major hardship on students. Current students who receive Pell grants would have to figure out a way to come up with nearly an additional \$1,000 in order to continue their education. Students who have been accepted to school and have received their financial aid packages are also put in a position that would force them to find and secure additional funds for their schooling. Pell Grants provide the basic foundation of federal student aid and help more than 8 million students afford to attend college.

To some of us, \$800–\$1,000 may not seem significant. However, to a student who qualifies for Pell grant assistance, and who relies on those funds, this would be a great hardship, potentially forcing students to take time off from their schooling.

The proposed CR will cut \$1.3 billion of funding previously allocated to support Community Health Centers. These types of facilities are widely utilized in low income areas and oftentimes, are the backbone of health care services in the areas in which they are located. Without them, quality health care for many poor and disadvantaged Americans will be out of reach.

Although my Republican colleagues claim that the proposed CR will not cut precious education funding, there are, in fact, significant cuts that will have a detrimental impact on education—especially higher education. Many fellowships offered at institutions of higher education are funded by competitive and non-competitive grants issued by the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the National Institutes of Health (NIH). Cutting funding to these organizations will impose a great hardship on students striving to educate themselves in order that they can be competitive in a global economy.

Under the proposed CR, NSF funding would be cut by \$139 million.

Under the proposed CR, NIH funding would be cut by \$1 billion.

The proposed CR will cut nearly \$2 million dollars from the Minority Business Development Agency.

The proposed CR would cut \$600 million dollars from the Community Oriented Policing

Services programs (COPS). Such a cut would require a complete elimination of the hiring programs. Over the years, COPS has funded the hiring of more than 122,000 state and local police officers and sheriff's deputies in communities across America. This proposed cut will prevent the hiring and rehiring of over 3,000 fewer law enforcement officers.

The public safety of our communities is important, and during these tough economic times as we recover from one of our country's worse recessions, every job counts. We can not afford cuts that will cost jobs for hard-working American people.

Another instance where the CR disproportionately affects our low-income, minority population is the cut to WIC funding. The current CR calls for a huge cut, \$758 million, to funding for the WIC program, which supplements nutrition for low-income and disadvantaged women and children.

Under the proposed CR, the entire Title X provision, which funds family planning resources such as Planned Parenthood, would be eliminated, a cut of \$327 million. Family planning funding has been an essential tool for many communities, especially in low income areas.

Under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), we set aside funds to help invigorate the economy across various areas. These funds were intended to be used over a number to encourage the continued growth of the economy. However, under the proposed CR, any unobligated or uncommitted stimulus funding would be eliminated.

The cut of \$1.1 billion, or 14% below the FY2010 appropriation (\$7.2 billion in FY2010) and more than \$500 million below FY2008, would translate to a massive loss of comprehensive early childhood services, causing more than 200,000 children across the country to be kicked out of the Head Start program. This further reduction is catastrophic and will also put thousands of Head Start teachers out of work and into the unemployment lines. Additionally, this funding level would mean cuts to research grants, training and technical assistance grants and monitoring activities.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Congresswoman JACKSON LEE. Thank you for your leadership on so many issues. I'm not sure if you mentioned, but there's also some job training programs that would be cut under the CR at a time when jobs are so badly needed across this country.

At this time I would like to yield to the gentleman from Georgia, HANK JOHNSON, who joined me the last time we had a Special Order. Thanks for joining us again this evening.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I thank the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands. I appreciate how much you care about people.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government touches all of us, every single person who lives in America. The Federal budget touches each one of us in some way or another. Whether or not it would be when we call 9/11 for police help or whether or not we call 9/11 for the fire department, or even when we are sending our children to school, the teachers, they are touched by the Federal budget.

What we now have, which has been introduced on Friday by the folks on

the other side of the aisle, my Republican brothers and sisters, is an assault on each one of us. It's an extremist position that they have taken to cut things that are so important to Americans' quality of life. And I just simply don't believe that the majority of the American people are in favor of eliminating the positions of thousands of police officers across this land; of leaving fire departments high and dry, with not enough personnel. And we certainly don't want our schools to have hundreds of kids in one classroom because we don't pay for teachers. Those positions are going to be hurt and severely impacted with these extremist budget cuts that are being recommended by the Republicans.

Certainly, they want to break the backs of the unions that represent these employees because they know that the Federal Government—they know that these workers are protected by moneys that the Federal Government transfers to the States and local governments. In fact, with the recovery bill that was passed out of this very body back in 2009, \$800-some-odd billion, it was the greatest transfer of Federal dollars to the States in the history of this Nation. And what it did, Mr. Speaker, was to save the jobs of police officers, firefighters, municipal workers, and teachers across this land.

But we are now at the point where there is no understanding, no admission that that recovery package actually helped, when in fact it did. Lots of people would not be working right now if it had not been for that recovery package. What we want to do now is exactly the opposite. We want to cut the budget, we want to cut aid and assistance to States and local governments to such a degree that it will force those governments to start laying off workers en masse. And it's not good for America, it's not good for Americans. And certainly there is a better way.

□ 2010

Especially when you think about it, we could pay for it if we eliminate some of these tax breaks for the wealthy and from people who don't need them.

Take the oil companies, for example. Can they afford to lose some of their multibillion dollar tax breaks in that great big, unwieldy Tax Code? Sure, they can. That's going to help us, but there's nothing like that coming from my friends on the other side of the aisle.

They just simply want to balance this budget on the backs of the working people of this country. They want to turn this country into a pink slip nation, and they want to balance the budget on the backs of working people. So I'm going to do everything I can to speak on behalf of the shrinking middle class, who are the people I serve.

Thank you, Congresswoman.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Congressman JOHNSON. Thank you for

your passion on behalf of the middle class and the poor.

As Congressman SCOTT said, throughout this recession, it has been the working people and the poor who have borne the brunt of the recession. Now they're being asked to give more. While those who are wealthier and the corporations did very well, they are being asked to give nothing. So we do need to make sure that our voices are heard and that we do everything we can to make sure that the programs that are so important to this country and to the future of this country, if we are going to win the future, are not lost, beginning with this CR.

I would now like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. DONALD PAYNE, also a former chair of the Congressional Black Caucus. He has been a leader in education as well as in international affairs, and is a senior member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands, Congresswoman DONNA CHRISTENSEN, our distinguished chair of the CBC Health Braintrust, for anchoring this evening's Special Order on the budget. Her leadership and continued diligence in addressing the issues that confront our Nation in general, but African Americans in particular, are imperative to our progress as a Nation.

Recently, Republican House leadership introduced a continuing resolution containing the largest spending cuts in history. Subsequently, President Obama unveiled his FY 2012 budget to support the Nation's competitive growth while making difficult decisions to address our economic deficit.

I rise today to urge my colleagues to remember that, as we consider these spending proposals, in addition to our economic deficit, we have a job deficit, which continues to worsen, in part, by an ever-growing educational deficit. They work together. While we must work to rein in spending, we must not cut funding to the extent that our development and growth in the areas of education and employment will be hampered if we do that.

One of the challenges in addressing unemployment has been the rapid decline in certain occupations and industries and in our labor market's inability to meet the demands of new occupations and industries. More than two-thirds of workers in occupations and industries that are growing have at least some postsecondary education compared to one-third of workers in occupations and industries that are declining. The demand for postsecondary education, as well as the rapid increase in baby boom retirements, is predicted to result in a shortage of more than 14 million college graduates by the year 2020 in this country.

In addition, military recruiters are likely to experience a shortage in traditional high school recruiting due to the high school dropout crisis and low

student proficiency levels. Among high school graduates, about one in five does not meet the minimum standards necessary to enlist in the U.S. Army today.

These facts highlight the reality that our growing education deficit is a greater long-term threat to our Nation's well-being than any other challenge we face today. The 2009 Program for International Student Assessment shows 15-year-old students in the U.S. are performing about average in reading and science and below average in math. Of the 34 developed countries assessed, the U.S. ranked 14th in reading, 17th in science, and 25th in math. While these scores are all higher than those from 2003 and 2006, they are far behind our global competitors, which include South Korea, Finland, Singapore, Hong Kong and Shanghai in China, and Canada.

Our domestic assessment results paint a similar picture. The National Center for Education Statistics reports that as of 2009 only about 33 percent of our Nation's fourth-graders are proficient readers. These low proficiency levels continue to fuel our dropout crisis on the high school and college levels. Nearly 7,000 students drop out of high school in our Nation daily, and about one-third of first-year American college students are required to take at least one remedial course. Unfortunately, a disproportionate number of these students are underrepresented minorities.

Further threatening our global standing is the higher education deficit in the science and technology fields. In 2000, Asian universities produced 1.2 million science and engineering graduates. European universities produced 850,000, and the United States produced 500,000.

In an economy dependent upon an innovative workforce, in addition to addressing our national high school and college graduation rates, we must increase our level of science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) field graduates. To do so, we need an innovative agenda to develop the potential of all students, especially unrepresented minorities, who have represented the bottom of the academic achievement gap in this country for too long.

For this reason, and as I conclude, I commend the President for his proposed investments in education to support early learning, to improve schoolteachers and leaders, to improve science, technology, engineering, and math education, and to promote college access and completion.

However, I strongly oppose the nearly \$5 billion reduction proposal from the Republican House leadership in the area of education. Cuts to teacher and school leadership programs, as well as Head Start, Pell Grants, and 21st Century Community Learning Centers are counterproductive in our effort to strengthen our national competitiveness.

I am also gravely concerned about proposed cuts to programs that stimulate job growth, that assist the working poor, that address health disparities, and that increase diversity. I strongly oppose cuts to the Women, Infants and Children (WIC) program, training and employment services, community health centers, low-income home energy assistance programs, and neighborhood development initiatives. These cuts and others disproportionately impact our most vulnerable population.

While I understand that our economic crisis calls for difficult budgeting constraints, I believe this should be a shared responsibility, not an overhaul of the Nation's economic crisis at the expense of our most vulnerable populations and our global competitiveness as a Nation.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Congressman PAYNE, for joining us this evening and for pointing out those very important issues that could be lost if this CR is passed as proposed.

I want to just talk about a few issues.

On the first day of the 112th Congress and this Republican-led House, the leadership took away the vote, in the Committee of the Whole, from the District of Columbia and the Territories. Apparently, that was not enough. Last week, they moved to impose their will and their conservative ideology on the people of our Nation's capital. Now, in the continuing resolution that is proposed, the assault continues, because the Office of Insular Affairs, which would support our Territories moving to more self-sufficiency, is slated to get cut by almost \$7 million.

My district had a major flood disaster late last year, something that has not happened in recent or even distant memory. A beloved member of our community drowned, and many lost property and suffered damage to property. The proposed CR would cut funding for flood emergencies. I am sure that places like Tennessee and New Orleans and other places that have had floods recently or that are the potential flood areas of our Nation would not want to have flood disaster funding cut.

□ 2020

My district also has the highest concentration of greenhouse gases per square mile, and we're fully dependent on diesel for our power. The cost of electricity in the Virgin Islands is crushing families, closing businesses, and hurting our elderly. But in the Republican-proposed CR, they are planning to cut almost every EPA program that we need to protect the health and safety of communities like mine and almost every program that supports the development of renewable energy.

After the Bush administration turned a surplus into the deficit we're now trying to close, communities across this country experienced a continuing increase in violent crime because of the economic distress that they faced.

And so what do my Republicans want to do? In the CR, they want to cut funding for police programs, for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration, as well as many other health programs, for juvenile delinquency prevention, for job training programs, as well as the community block grant and community development programs, programs that our communities need to address the rising gun violence that this economic crisis is exacerbating.

For years, the Republican caucus has been trying to get their hands on the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities, as well as the Smithsonian funding. So these important programs, which are probably needed more than ever because there's so much pain and suffering across this country, they're also on the chopping block.

As you've heard, WIC has already been cut twice last year, and yet it is proposed to be cut over \$600 million. And if that were not enough, over \$200 million is proposed to be cut from maternal and child health programs. Where is the justice and the love for our country's children?

At this time, I'd like to just yield once again for the remaining time to the Congresswoman from Texas, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, to speak on some of the other areas that the CR would cut and hurt our effort to win the future.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Congresswoman CHRISTENSEN, you don't know now how difficult it is for many of us to accept the assignment or the lack of assignment that this present majority leadership gave to the territories, and I want to thank you for placing this squarely on the record, frankly.

We worked harmoniously with the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands and Samoa and Guam and other places, Puerto Rico. We worked because it was important to have the insight and constructive input on these legislative initiatives but, more importantly, on the floor of the House. So let me just reemphasize in joining you to say that the territories should not suffer. In the CR, they do.

I just want to hold up, this was a letter to my colleagues, a letter to America, a letter to Houstonians. This is the long list of cuts, and let me just cite for you very quickly so that you understand what we're talking about. We have to cut, but can we do it in a manner that is constructive?

Everybody is running from Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, and we frankly understand that, and so they put the pressure on 16 percent, but you're cutting in the middle of the year, when people are dependent on this funding.

Juvenile justice, \$2.3 million. The COPS program, I already mentioned, many cops will be laid off.

NASA, \$379 million, literally stopping NASA, the National Aeronautics

Space Administration, in its tracks, forgetting about human exploration, forgetting about science.

The Legal Services Corporation. No one without counsel can speak for a person who is desperate and cannot access counsel. So, if you have counsel, which really was what I was saying, you cannot speak for someone who does not. Legal Services Corporation is the wedge between justice and being thrown out.

EPA, \$1.6 billion; women and infant children, \$758 million; job training—I just mentioned you have to invest in job training—\$2 billion; and community health centers, \$1.3 billion; high-speed rail, \$1 billion. And of course, all of that is about jobs.

As so, as a member of the Congressional Black Caucus, as a Member of the larger body of Members, Republicans and Democrats, this CR is going to be a bite that is so stiff and so tough, I am hoping that some will view it not as a political prize, not as "I did it. They told me to go here and do it." When you come inside this august body, you drop your partisan politics and you ask the question: What is good for America? You're not a partisan Democrat, a partisan Republican, or a partisan tea party. What you are is "Can we come together?"

Now, I know I am not going to agree with all these cuts, but I didn't mention all these cuts. I know some of these things have to be. I didn't mention GSA. I think we're cutting them too much, but I believe we have some common ground, but how can you cut Pell grants? Students are in, if you will, they're actually in school and you are cutting them.

Let me just say to the gentlelady as I yield back, thank you. Let's come together as Americans. And I thank you for leading this hour on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus.

President Clinton left President Bush with a ten year projected surplus of \$5.6 trillion in 2001. Whereas, President Bush on January 20, 2009 left President Obama with a \$1.2 trillion deficit. Keep in mind that this was the deficit on day one of the Obama Administration, weeks before the President enacted a single piece of legislation and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

The failed economic policies of the Bush Administration led to this enormous deficit—the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts totaled \$1.3 trillion over ten years, in which most of the tax relief went to the top 1% of income earners; a Medicare Prescription Drug benefit with a ten year cost of nearly \$1 trillion that was not offset; two overseas wars that are nearing a cost of \$1 trillion; a \$700 billion bailout of Wall Street banks; and all these unpaid for policies were compounded by the worst economic recession in 70 years that began in 2007 which led to huge shortfalls in federal tax revenue and increased reliance on unemployment insurance and other federal social safety net programs.

In order to get these large deficits under control, we have some tough choices to make.

How much longer can we afford to extend the Bush-era tax cuts?

The President and Congress extended all of them through 2012 at a two year cost of \$800 billion.

A ten year extension of all these tax cuts will cost \$3.8 trillion—\$3 trillion of which are the popular middle-class tax cuts.

Earlier this week, the Congressional Budget Office released its latest projections of the Social Security Trust Fund. It was previously projected to go into a cash deficit in 2017, but now CBO has projected that the trust fund is now running a deficit. The trust is expected to be exhausted in 2037.

We can no longer operate under the assumption of the last decade, that we can increase spending and reduce taxes without having to pay for it.

The last Congress took important steps to restore some important tools that were used to produce the first budget surplus in more than a generation in the late 1990s, such as Statutory Pay-As-You-Go—meaning if Congress wants to increase mandatory spending, we have to offset it by reducing spending elsewhere in the budget or increase taxes to cover the increase.

Unfortunately, the new Republican majority has changed House rules gutting PAY-GO's effectiveness in the congressional budget process. The so-called CUT-GO rule prohibits offsetting any new mandatory spending with a revenue increase. This makes it nearly impossible to offset any new spending or tax cuts with revenue increases and will require only spending cuts.

In another unprecedented change, the House voted to give the House Budget Committee Chairman the sole responsibility for setting discretionary spending levels for the remainder of Fiscal Year 2011. The House of Representatives as a whole will be deprived of the right to vote up or down the Budget Chairman's levels.

We have to remember that what we do with the Federal budget touches everyone. Our fiscal problems are very complex and they need to be addressed, but there is no simple, one-size-fits-all solution.

H.R. 1, the Continuing Resolution making appropriations to fund the federal government through September 20, 2011 contains some very deep cuts that will be very hurtful to many Americans, especially those who are the most vulnerable—disadvantaged women and families, children, minorities, and the elderly.

As we face a large deficit and growing debt, we know that cuts will have to be made. And yes, some of those cuts will be painful. However, we must be careful not to place added burdens and cause greater harms to those Americans who are the most vulnerable in need of our support the most.

The proposed CR will cut funding allocated to support Community Health Centers. These types of facilities are widely utilized in low income areas and oftentimes, are the backbone of healthcare services in the areas in which they are located. Without them, quality health care for many poor and disadvantaged Americans will be out of reach.

Although my Republican colleagues claim that the proposed CR will not cut precious education funding, there are, in fact, significant cuts that will have a detrimental impact on education—especially higher education. Many fellowships offered at institutions of higher education are funded by competitive and non-competitive grants issued by the National

Science Foundation (NSF) and the National Institutes of Health (NIH). Cutting funding to these organizations will impose a great hardship on students striving to educate themselves in order that they can be competitive in a global economy.

Under the proposed CR, NSF funding would be cut by \$139 million.

Under the proposed CR, NIH funding would be cut by \$1 billion.

The proposed CR will cut nearly \$2 million dollars from the Minority Business Development Agency.

The proposed CR would cut \$600 million dollars from the Community Oriented Policing Services programs (COPS). Such a cut would require a complete elimination of the hiring programs. Over the years, COPS has funded the hiring of more than 122,000 state and local police officers and sheriffs deputies in communities across America. This proposed cut will prevent the hiring and rehiring of over 3,000 fewer law enforcement officers.

The public safety of our communities is important, and during these tough economic times as we recover from one of our country's worse recessions, every job counts. We can not afford cuts that will cost jobs for hard-working American people.

Another instance where the CR disproportionately effects our low-income, minority population is the cut to WIC funding. The current CR calls for a huge cut, \$758 million, to funding for the WIC program, which supplements nutrition for low-income and disadvantaged women and children.

Under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), we set aside funds to help invigorate the economy across various areas. These funds were intended to be used over a number to encourage the continued growth of the economy. However, under the proposed CR, any unobligated or uncommitted stimulus funding would be eliminated.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I just want to assure you that the Congressional Black Caucus will work with all of our colleagues to craft a budget that's fair and yet reduces the deficit, as we've done every year.

THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a treat to be able to join my colleagues here this evening and to consider this great discussion and debate that is taking place over the past months, but particularly during this week as we approach the question about what are we going to do with funding the remainder of this year. There, of course, was no budget decided on last year, and so they do a thing called a continuing resolution. So there's a lot of discussion as to how much can we be affording to spend of the taxpayers' dollar.

And I thought that it might be appropriate this evening to take a look at that, not so much in a lot of minuscule detail, but at the magnitude of the overall question that's before us and how the math just doesn't work. I will

also try, as we have a chance to get into a discussion this evening, to connect it to the problem of unemployment, because all of these things are connected, and still I think it's helpful to look from an overall perspective.

So what I have here is one of those—we always have these pie charts. I particularly like pie. And this particular pie chart here shows some different areas of the Federal budget. Now, this is the total of Federal spending here and the pieces of pie are roughly proportional.

What I would like to start with this evening, so we have a big picture of how serious the excessive spending in the Federal Government is, is to start by making a distinction between a couple of types of spending. The first kind of spending—and maybe to some people this sounds like sort of Washington, D.C., talk but they call it mandatory spending or entitlements. And mandatory spending may be not necessarily mandatory, but what that means is that legislators, maybe as much as 50 years ago, passed a series of laws, and those laws then automatically spit out dollar bills out of the Treasury. So anytime somebody who happens to be the right person waves their hand in front of the little machine, out pops a dollar bill.

And so we have these things, and they're called entitlements or mandatory spending. So these are places where the Federal Government just is automatically spending money, and there are some of them that are very familiar with most people: Social Security here, Medicare, and Medicaid. Those are the three big, as they call it, entitlements or mandatory spending.

There are other entitlements that are smaller, and that's in this category over here, the other quote, mandatory spending. So these are not Medicare or Medicaid, Social Security, but they are the other mandatory.

And then there's another thing that acts just about like mandatory spending, and that is the interest on our debt. When the Treasury decides to sell a Treasury bill, the reason people buy a Treasury bill is because it is going to pay some interest to them. So we have to pay the interest on our debt, and in that sense, when we decide to spend money that we don't have, we are creating what is, in essence, like a little machine that spits out dollar bills.

□ 2030

Let's say that you take all of this mandatory spending, or entitlement spending, and add it to the interest on the debt, how much does that add up to? It adds up to about \$2.3 trillion for this year. Now what in the world does \$2.3 trillion mean? Most of us don't have a good sense of perspective. Well, \$2.3 trillion happens to be the revenue that the Federal Government collects this year. In other words, what we're saying is, if you take this purple and this aqua color and this gold color and light and dark blue here, you add this