



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2011

No. 25

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 16, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ALAN NUNNELEE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

TYRANT FROM THE DESERT

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the aftershocks of the Egyptian revolution are being felt throughout the Middle East. The hunger for freedom has gone viral and reenergized the movement for freedom in the country of Iran. No country in that region presents more of a threat to the national security of the United States, Israel, and the world than the "tyrant from the desert" and his regime in Iran, Ahmadinejad.

Ahmadinejad says that his first nuclear missile will be sent to Tel Aviv,

Israel. He hates the United States; he hates Israel, and he has been determined to destroy the both of us. We must believe his words are more than just rhetoric. For decades, the regime has managed to quash but not eliminate a vibrant opposition movement.

In 2009, that frustration erupted for the whole world to see. Thousands of people, mainly young people, marched defiantly in the streets, protesting the fraudulent election of Ahmadinejad. The "little tyrant" is a rogue President and an illegitimate President, and the response from the regime was brutal. Police on motorbikes ran over protestors, fired tear gas, beat them with batons, tortured them, shot them, and over a hundred protestors were murdered in the 2 weeks that followed the election. But to the surprise of the world and the little tyrant from the desert, the flame of freedom was not quashed in Iran.

During that fight for self-determination, our administration was somewhat passive, believing we could work with that tyrant. But Ahmadinejad does not want peace. He's already declared war on his own people and wants war with the West. In Iran there's no freedom of expression and association, no freedom from arrest, detention or torture, and women are denied basic human rights. But there's a remarkable thing, Mr. Speaker, about repression: The more a tyrant tries to hold on to power by cracking down on the people, the faster he loses grip on that society.

So, inspired by the events in Egypt, tens of thousands of young people once again took to the streets in Iran on Monday to protest the rogue government. But the dictator is fighting back, and he will continue to do so. But the protestors want freedom in their country. Communication has been cut. However, we are seeing communication from Iran through videos and YouTube and tweets from those Iranian people. The judiciary in Iran

has already arrested 1,500 people. Two nonviolent protestors have been murdered, and the rogue parliament, along with the henchman Ahmadinejad has called for the hanging of corrupt opposition leaders. But the people of Iran still continue to protest.

The Iranian people—the Iranian resistance movement—is here to stay, whether Ahmadinejad likes it or not, and they deserve the same chance as every other freedom-loving people to rule their own country. The Iranians are freedom-loving people, and they deserve that basic human right that all peoples have of self-determination.

Today, we support—I support—the Iranians in Iran to take over their own country and to remove the dictator that is oppressing them. This fight will be difficult, but we hear the cries of the Iranian people. And those of us in Congress that support them, we are not going away any more than the Iranian people are going away, because they have the basic right of self-determination in their country.

And that's just the way it is.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. If our country continues on a course of fiscal irresponsibility and continues to pile debt on our children, we will all feel the consequences, no matter our party. It is vital that our two parties work together, Mr. Speaker, to put our fiscal house in order. So when I tell the House how disappointed I am in the proposal that is on the floor on spending for the rest of the fiscal year, I'm coming from a perspective of real worry about our debt, a defining challenge that must be seriously met. Sadly, that's not the seriousness we see in the Republicans' spending bills for the rest of this fiscal year.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H937

Republicans began the new Congress by passing a rules package that paves the way to add nearly \$5 trillion to the deficit. Why do I say that? Because the Republican rules provide for \$4.7 trillion, to be exact, in additional spending that is not paid for over the next 10 years, while at the same time suggesting reductions in spending, which I think we need to effect. I may disagree with the specifics, but we need to effect reductions in spending. However, if you project \$1 trillion in reduced spending and \$5 trillion in additional unpaid-for expenditure, it doesn't take much of a mathematician to get you to \$4 trillion of additional deficits. This is in the context of the \$5 trillion they've authorized themselves to borrow from our children and in the context of the Republican record of fiscal irresponsibility in the past where, as I pointed out, every Republican administration with which I've served has run over a trillion dollars of deficit—\$1.4 trillion for Mr. Reagan, about \$1.1 trillion for the first President Bush, and \$3.6 trillion or \$3.7 trillion for the second President Bush—as contrasted with a \$62.9 billion surplus under the Clinton administration.

Time and again, Republicans have used the rhetoric of spending cuts as a cover for massive borrowing, for record surplus to turn into record deficits—a \$5.6 trillion projected surplus in 2001 turned into about a \$5 trillion projected deficit in the following 8 years under President Bush—and for budgets that year after year did far more fiscal damage than they promised. This time, unfortunately, is no different.

But let's look at the actual cuts proposed in this spending bill. They're shortsighted and indiscriminate. Even as they fail to change our long-term fiscal picture for the better, these cuts recklessly damage programs essential to America's competitive edge. I agree that reducing spending is and must be a part of the fiscal solution, but let's reduce spending wisely instead of doing it in such a way that costs America jobs.

When we talk about cutting investments in education, in innovation, and in infrastructure, we are talking about cutting tomorrow's jobs, because those are exactly the investments that will build the technologies and industries of the future and help American workers stay competitive in a global economy. The Association of General Contractors said that just yesterday in USA Today.

The spending bill on the floor today would make it harder for deserving students to afford college, meaning a less educated, less competitive workforce. Every businessperson that I've talked to says that's not the way to go.

□ 1010

It would cut 20,000 researchers supported by the National Science Foundation and \$2.5 billion in cancer and other disease research at the National Institutes of Health, meaning an America in danger of losing its place as the

world's innovation leader. If we do that, we will not be the kind of country Americans want to be.

It would lead to the loss of 25,000 construction jobs and leave our air traffic control system stuck in the last century, meaning an America with an infrastructure falling further and further behind our competitors.

We need spending discipline. Everyone in America knows that, and everyone in this House knows that—but not at the cost of our future and our jobs. I suggest to you that the rules adopted in this House not only did not effect discipline; they ignored and threw out the door discipline, and said that they could borrow \$4.7 trillion and not pay for it.

I can't sum up the central issue any better than Jack Lew, our Director of OMB, who said this: "We must take care to avoid indiscriminate cuts in areas critical to long-term growth, like education, innovation, and infrastructure, cuts that would stifle the economy just as it begins to recover." Now, who was making a similar statement like that? Richard Trumka, the president of the AFL-CIO. Who was he doing it with? Mr. Tom Donohue, the president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. "That, in turn, would deprive us of one of the most powerful drivers of deficit reduction, a growing economy," concluded Jack Lew.

The President's bipartisan fiscal commission agrees. It found that indiscriminate cuts to investments in growth would "interfere with the ongoing economic recovery." Both commissions concluded that short-term substantial cuts in research, education, and innovation would be harmful to bringing this economy back to where we want it to be.

Therefore, I urge my Republican friends: Listen to the economic and business leaders who understand the value of public investment, not as a replacement for the private sector, but in partnership with the private sector. That's the partnership that Democrats are striving for with our Make It in America agenda. "Make it in America," of course, means two things:

Number one, you're going to make it. You're going to succeed. You're going to have the opportunity to get opportunities. Of course, "make it in America" also means that we are going to make "it" in America. We are going to manufacture and grow it in America and sell it here and around the world. The President wants to double our exports over the next 5 years. We can do that; we should do that, and Americans believe that, if we do that, we will remain the great economic engine that they believe our country needs to be.

We have a set of bills that helps create an environment for American companies to create jobs here and to manufacture more goods here in America so that more middle class families will be able to make it in America. Let's cut needless spending but preserve our investments in growth, and let's work to-

gether to build the bipartisan support that is essential to the hard choices our long-term fiscal problems demand.

I tell my friends on the other side of the aisle, when you look at your rules package and when you contemplate the fact that you have provided for an additional \$4.7 trillion of spending without paying for it and at the same time you project a \$100 billion cut per year over 10 years, \$1 trillion, it is quite obvious that there is a \$4 trillion hole that you have created.

Reforming the Tax Code to grow our economy and reduce the deficit is absolutely essential, in my view, eliminating wasteful defense spending that doesn't keep us safer, and keeping our entitlement programs solvent for generations to come.

Those are the challenges that both Republicans and Democrats need to face together: to cooperate, to make common cause, to make sure that our children and grandchildren inherit a fiscally sound Nation and not a Nation deeply mired in debt, not a Nation that has \$4.7 trillion in expenditures without paying for them, as the Republican rules suggest.

THE COURAGE TO CONTROL GOVERNMENT SPENDING AND RETURN POWER TO THE PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. HAYWORTH) for 5 minutes.

Ms. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on January 24, I received a letter from Jeremy Vaitas, who lives in Middletown, New York.

He wrote: "As a 13-year-old boy in seventh grade, I am concerned about my future. Currently, the national debt is 14 trillion, 16 billion, 110 million, 552 thousand, 952 dollars, and five cents. Myself and every other citizen will have to pay \$45,241.77 to eliminate this debt. My parents struggle with money, and I'm afraid that I will struggle even more and not be able to own a home, buy a car, or provide for a family someday."

"I feel the only way to reduce the national debt is to reduce the amount of money the government is spending. There are many ways to do this, but I believe increasing taxes is not one of them. To reduce the national debt, I would like to see you vote against any further bailouts or any other wasteful spending programs that give money to people or businesses that make bad decisions. Furthermore, I think you should concentrate on fraud and misuse of government funds."

Here is a 13-year-old who has the common sense to recognize that our Federal Government has been committing intergenerational theft and to call for it to stop. Our national debt is increasing at a rate of more than \$4 billion per day.

We are hearing a lot about the people who would be deprived of some form of benefit through spending cuts, but