

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

Jeremy's voice reminds us that Americans everywhere, and especially those who are most vulnerable by virtue of their youth, are being deprived of opportunity by the government's profligacy. We can help them best by returning taxpayer dollars to American pockets to buy, build, invest, and hire.

That is our most urgent task.

Jeremy Vaitas is only 13, but he gets it.

He needs us in Congress to be adults, to accept that we must say "no" to what has been all too easy to do in the past—to spend taxpayer dollars to grow the Federal Government far beyond its constitutional bounds. We must say "no" in order to say "yes" to the opportunity and prosperity that come only with American enterprise, entrepreneurship, and ingenuity. We must say "yes" to the future that Jeremy and all of the members of his generation and of generations to come deserve as the heirs to the American Dream.

Our Nation is exceptional in all of history and in all the world. It has always taken courage to defend it. The continuing resolution we will pass this week must show that we have the courage to take control of our government's spending and return power to the people.

THE FIGHT OF AMERICA'S VETERANS FOR ECONOMIC SECURITY HERE AT HOME

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, with all of this talk about the CR and where money is being spent and where taxpayer dollars should be spent, I want to remind Americans that there are 1.4 million Americans on active duty in our U.S. military. Another 718,000 civilian personnel support our men and women in uniform, and 1.1 million are in the Reserves or in the National Guard.

The military is our Nation's largest employer, and it is honorable work. Our fighting men and women are the best and the brightest, the bravest and the most battle-tested. They serve with distinction whether they are on bases here at home or in combat abroad, whether they are in the infantry or in military information technology.

But once our soldiers, airmen, sailors, and marines leave the service, shouldn't they be assured of jobs right here in America? Is that too much to ask of Congress? Is it too much to ask of America? Shouldn't their families know that they will have roofs over their heads, food on their tables, and clothes on their backs? That's the least we can do for our veterans, but for too many veterans, unemployment and economic insecurity is what they are finding in civilian life.

□ 1020

Recently, I asked unemployed veterans to send me their resumes and

their stories so that I can submit them for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to put their struggles front and center before our government. I heard from a number of veterans who sent their resumes to me at Resumes From Veterans @mail.house.gov.

I heard from Charles Diver of Plantation, Florida, who served for 4 years in the U.S. Coast Guard. He wrote that, "In addition to being unemployed, many of us feel the government has been less than forthcoming about the scope of the problem."

I couldn't agree more. Mr. Diver has been unemployed since June of 2009. I think we owe him more than that for the service that he's given to our country.

Vincent Torrez of Las Vegas, Nevada, told me, "It has been a year since I have been discharged from the Army, and it has virtually been impossible for me to find work that matches my skillset in the civilian market. I believe within the next few years unemployed veterans will be a bigger problem than it is now with the wars coming to a close."

Mr. Torrez last served in the Army's 1st Airborne Division, 509th Infantry Regiment Opposing Force. We should see to it that veterans like him can find meaningful work when they're back at home.

I heard from Mr. Jay Magan of Taylorsville, Kentucky, who wrote simply and poignantly, "Out of work for 1½ years. Desperate for a job." He signed that short e-mail, "Respectfully, Jay G. Magan."

We owe him more respect than unemployment for his 20 years of service in the United States Navy.

I heard from Evelyn Thomas. She is a veteran of the Army National Guard and the Marine Corps and lives in Carlsbad, California. She enlisted in the military on the Montgomery G.I. Bill in order to earn money for college. She then obtained a master's degree in teaching, learning, and leadership. She told me, "We need to create jobs. We need to provide avenues and opportunities for manufacturing and production companies to exist in this global economy. Now I am at a crossroads, in which I must utilize my activism work to create a job. I must work to support my family. I want to work. Surely, there is a position for a honorably discharged veteran with a master's degree."

Indeed, there should be.

But then, Mr. Speaker, I received what I think is the most striking e-mail. It was from Tonya Batson, the wife of a 12-year Navy veteran named Billy Batson. She didn't write much, just that Mr. Batson had been out of work since December of 2009, over a year, after his military service ended. But imagine the anguish that Mr. and Mrs. Batson must be feeling. Imagine the uncertainty. I refuse to accept that any military spouse should feel that. No husband or wife, who after supporting their partner through military

service, deployment, travel, and battle, should feel like they have to fight another battle right here at home to find a job, to provide for their family, to be financially secure.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better. We can create an economy that employs all of our veterans. We need a jobs program that will put Americans back to work doing productive things for society—teachers aides in classrooms across the country, health clinic workers, home energy technicians, food pantry workers. We can create jobs that pay benefits to workers and the country without the kind of overhead of infrastructure and other projects.

But, Mr. Speaker, we can do even better than creating jobs. We can eliminate unemployment as a factor in American life. In order to do that, I need to hear more stories like those of Mr. Diver, Mr. Torrez, Mr. Magan, Ms. Thomas, and Mr. and Mrs. Batson. I know they are out there, so I'm calling on unemployed veterans to send me their resumes and stories to Resumes From Veterans @mail.house.gov.

As I've said before, sending me your resume will not get you a job, or put you into consideration for a job. But it can help keep the unemployed problem front and center here in Washington.

We need to do something, Mr. Speaker, so that all Americans, veterans and nonveterans alike, have work. We can do so much better.

VETERAN'S RESUME FOR THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

From: Chuck Diver

[chuckdiver@comcast.net]

Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2011 8:25 AM

To: Veterans, Resumes from

DEAR REP. JESSE JACKSON JR.: Thank you for your work. Providing veterans with recognition is an important contribution, because in addition to being unemployed, many of us feel the government has been less than forthcoming about the scope of the problem. I served four years in the U.S. Coast Guard.

RESPECTFULLY, CHARLES E. DIVER.

CHARLES E. DIVER

AIRCRAFT DISPATCHER

Nine years experience dispatching aircraft under Part 121 and Part 135 operations both domestically and internationally, of which the last one and one half years were as the manager of the flight control department.

Professional Strengths

Use of aviation software programs; attention to detail while multitasking; composure in stressful situations; excellent communications skills; respectful of cultural diversity; ability to prioritize dynamically; ability to teach and supervise; management experience; private pilot (SEL).

Key Achievements

Los prevention by audit control of APIS and E-APIS reports and required passenger travel documentation.

Designated as dispatch ground instructor.

Contributed to and assisted with GOM and OPSPEC revisions.

Poet of contact for U.S. Customs, Immigration, TSA and FAA Inspectors.

Professional Experience

Manager of Flight Control Lynx Air International—11-2007 to 6-2009

Dispatched company aircraft on charters and scheduled domestic and international flights.