violations in occupied northern Cyprus. Today is the 37th anniversary of the illegal 1974 invasion—a terrible tragedy, and an ongoing one, as the continued occupation of that country by tens of thousands of Turkish troops continues to deprive of their homes all those forced to flee the north—estimated to number approximately 200,000. Many Greek Cypriots escaped the north with little more than the clothes on their backs. While some have returned to visit their own homes or ancestral villages, none have been allowed to take back their rightful property—those despoiled include an estimated 5,000 Americans of Cypriot descent. Several hundred courageous Greek Cypriots, mainly elderly people, refused to be uprooted and today live in enclaves, the remnant of once-thriving Greek Cypriot communities which have effectively been ethnically cleansed.

Hundreds of churches, chapels and monasteries once dotted the rugged landscape of the region, part of Cyprus's rich religious cultural heritage. Indeed, St. Paul visited the island nation on one of his early missionary journeys, and St. Barnabas, a native of the Cypriot city of Salamis, was martyred nearby for his defense of Christianity. The Helsinki Commission, of which I am the Chairman in this Congress, has documented the desecration and destruction of some of the over 500 religious sites in the occupied area looted of their priceless icons, mosaics and frescoes once revered by the faithful. Many of these sacred objects, stolen from churches inside or adjoining Turkish military bases, have landed on the international art market. Even the dead are not allowed to rest in peace with destruction of cemeteries rampant throughout the region. Cypriot authorities interdicted a container originating in the occupied area filled with metal destined for a recycling facility in Asia. Upon inspection agents found that the unit consisted of metal crosses and stolen grave markers.

Mr. Speaker, I remain deeply concerned over ongoing violations of freedom of religion and other rights in northern Cyprus. Let there be no mistake, the Turkish government is responsible for what happens in the occupied part of the island. Last Christmas, a small group of Orthodox believers gathered in the village of Rizokarpaso to celebrate the divine liturgy—only to have their worship disrupted by Turkish security forces, who ordered them to disperse. The Helsinki Commission continues to receive reports of the demolition of churches in the region even as others are converted to commercial use as warehouses, barns, or casinos.

Mr. Speaker, the nearly four-decade-long illegal occupation of northern Cyprus by Turkey is an affront to the principles enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act and an encroachment on the fundamental freedoms and human rights of Greek Cypriots living in the region's enclaves and those forced to flee the area following the 1974 invasion. Our government must continue to engage on behalf of the human rights of Greek Cypriots.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE POMPEO

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, on July 18th, I missed rollcall votes numbered 601 and 602 because I was in Kansas on official business.

Rollcall No. 601 was a vote on passage of H.R. 33, to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to specify when certain securities issued in connection with church plans are treated as exempted securities. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Rollcall No. 602 was a vote on the Approval of the Journal. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 229, I was delayed in leaving a Members meeting and was unable to reach the House floor to cast my vote before the vote was closed.

Had I been present, I would have voted, "no".

CUT, CAP, AND BALANCE ACT OF 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 2011

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against H.R. 2560, the Cut, Cap, and Balance Act. This bill only serves to sanction the status quo by putting forth a $1 trillion budget deficit and authorizing a $2.4 trillion increase in the debt limit.

When I say this bill sanctions the status quo, I mean it quite literally.

First, it purports to eventually balance the budget without cutting military spending, Social Security, or Medicare. This is impossible. These three budget items already cost nearly $1 trillion apiece annually. This means we can cut every other area of Federal spending to zero and still have a $3 trillion budget. Since annual Federal tax revenues almost certainly will not exceed $2.5 trillion for several years, this Act cannot balance the budget under any plausible scenario.

Second, it further entrenches the ludicrous beltway concept of discretionary vs. nondiscretionary spending. America faces a fiscal crisis, and we must seize the opportunity once and for all to slay Washington's sacred cows—including defense contractors and entitlements. All spending must be deemed discretionary and reexamined by Congress each year. To allow otherwise is pure cowardice.

Third, the Act applies the nonsensical narrative about a "Global War on Terror" to justify exceptions to its spending caps. Since this war is undeclared, has no definite enemies, no clear objectives, and no metric to determine victory, it is by definition endless. Congress will never balance the budget until we reject the concept of endless wars.

Finally, and most egregiously, this Act ignores the real issue: total spending by government. As Milton Friedman famously argued, what we really need is a constitutional amendment to limit taxes and spending, not simply to balance the budget. What we need is a dramatically smaller Federal Government; if we achieve this a balanced budget will take care of itself.

We do need to cut spending, and by a significant amount. Going back to 2008 levels of spending is not enough. We need to cut back at least to where spending was a decade ago. A recent news article stated that we pay 35 percent more for our military today than we did 10 years ago, for the exact same capabilities. The same could be said for the rest of the government. Why has our budget doubled in 10 years? This country doesn't have double the population, or double the land area, or double anything that would require the Federal Government to grow by such an obscene amount.

We need to cap spending, and then continue decreasing that cap so that the Federal Government grows smaller and smaller. Allowing government to spend up to a certain percentage of GDP is insufficient. It doesn't matter that the recent historical average of government outlays is 18 percent of GDP, because in recent history the government has way overstepped its constitutional mandates. All we need to know about spending caps is that they need to decrease year after year.

We need to balance the budget, but a balanced budget amendment by itself will not do the trick. A $4 trillion balanced budget is most certainly worse than a $2 trillion unbalanced budget. Again, we should focus on the total size of the budget more than outlays vs. revenues.

What we have been asked to do here is support a budget that only cuts relative to the President's proposed budget. It still maintains a $1 trillion budget deficit for FY 2012, and spends even more money over the next 10 years than the Paul Ryan budget which already passed the House.

By capping spending at a certain constant percentage of GDP, it allows for Federal spending to continue to grow. Tying spending to GDP creates an incentive to manipulate the GDP figure, especially since the bill delegates the calculation of this figure to the Office of Management and Budget, an agency which is responsible to the President and not to Congress. In the worst case, it would even reward further inflation of the money supply, as increases in nominal GDP through pure inflation would allow for larger Federal budgets.

Finally, this bill authorizes a $2.4 trillion rise in the debt limit. I have never voted for a debt ceiling increase and I never will. Increasing the debt ceiling is an endorsement of business as usual in Washington. It delays the inevitable, the day that one day will come when we cannot continue to run up enormous deficits and will be forced to pay our bills.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, while I sympathize with the aims of this bill's sponsors, I must vote against H.R. 2560. It is my hope, however, that the looming debt ceiling deadline and the discussion surrounding the budget will further motivate us to consider legislation