

Note: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted (see footnote 1) .....	12,042	21,040	-4,475
Temporary Extension Act of 2010 (P.L. 111-144) .....	7,942	7,901	-704
Continuing Extension Act of 2010 (P.L. 111-157) .....	14,401	14,337	-1,292
Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2010 (P.L. 111-205) .....	8,545	8,545	0
Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2010 (P.L. 111-212) .....	45,615	5,419	0
An act to modernize the air traffic control system . . . and for other purposes (P.L. 111-226) .....	-2,604	-17	0
An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for border security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes (P.L. 111-230) .....	600	0	0
Total, amounts designated as emergency requirements .....	86,541	57,225	-6,471

<sup>3</sup> For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the Senate, the budget resolution does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level excludes these items.

<sup>4</sup> Periodically, the Senate Committee on the Budget revises the totals in S. Con. Res. 13, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution. Those revisions are as follows:

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Original Budget Resolution Totals .....	2,888	3,001,311	1,653,682
Revisions:			
For the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (section 401(c)(4)) .....	5	2,004	0
For an act to protect the public health by providing the Food and Drug Administration with certain authority to regulate tobacco products . . . and for other purposes (sections 311(a) and 307) .....	0	0	40
For the Congressional Budget Office's reestimate of the President's request for discretionary appropriations (section 401(c)(5)) .....	3,766	2,355	0
For further revisions to a bill to protect the public health by providing the Food and Drug Administration with certain authority to regulate tobacco products . . . and for other purposes (sections 311(a) and 307) .....	10	13	6
For further revisions to the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (section 401(c)(4)) .....	6	-1,175	0
For an act to make technical corrections to the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes (section 303) .....	32	36	0
For further revisions to the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (section 401(c)(4)) .....	-11	-11	0
For an amendment in the nature of substitute to H.R. 3548, the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2009 (sections 306(f) and 306(g)) .....	5,708	5,708	-38,940
For the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2009 (section 301(a)) .....	12,500	11,500	9,100
For the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2010 (section 401(c)(4)) .....	0	1,950	0
For further revisions to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2009 (section 301(a)) .....	-5,220	-6,670	-9,630
For further revisions to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2009 (section 301(a)) .....	-7,280	-4,830	530
For further revisions to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2009 (section 301(a)) .....	8,500	3,130	-580
For the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (section 301(a)) .....	1,130	220	-1,930
Revised Budget Resolution Totals .....	2,907,837	3,015,541	1,612,278

<sup>5</sup> S. Con. Res. 13 includes \$10,350 million in budget authority and \$5,448 million in outlays as an allowance to recognize the potential cost of disasters; those funds will never be allocated to a committee. At the discretion of the Senate Committee on the Budget, the budget resolution totals have been revised to exclude those amounts.

## RECOGNIZING HELMETS TO HARDHATS PROGRAM

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, today I want to recognize and thank the Helmets to Hardhats program for its important work on behalf of our Nation's veterans.

In these tough economic times, unemployment among recent veterans is a growing concern. Recent statistics indicate that the jobless rate among Iraq and Afghanistan veterans tracks a full five points higher than the rate for the Nation as a whole. It is clear that we must take serious steps to address this issue.

The Helmets to Hardhats program has helped tens of thousands of veterans find work in the construction industry by evaluating recently separated servicemembers to identify their strengths and experience and match them with employers within the construction industry. The long-term partnerships that result benefit veterans, construction firms, and the Nation as a whole.

In times of crisis, it is our best and bravest that step forward in defense of our Nation. We owe our servicemembers a debt of gratitude for their sacrifice that we can never fully repay. The least that a grateful nation can do is to give them assistance in finding good jobs when they return from service.

Though the Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs do excellent work with their transition programs, organizations like Helmets to Hardhats serve as the "boots on the ground" forces needed to help our veterans realize the American dream. I thank all of those involved in this important organization for their work across the country,

and look forward to partnering with them to help veterans in North Dakota.

## ECONOMIC RECOVERY

Mr. REED. Mr. President, yesterday we were again thwarted in our attempts to take another important step in supporting our Nation's economic recovery.

In 2009, we passed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, which provided a much needed jump-start to get our economy going again, save and create jobs, and make critical investments in our infrastructure.

In March of this year, we passed the HIRE Act, which has been providing businesses with tax incentives to hire out-of-work Americans.

Just Monday, President Obama signed the Small Business Jobs Act into law, which will provide support and relief to small businesses and lay the groundwork to help these businesses create up to 500,000 jobs.

Yesterday, Republicans blocked consideration of the Creating American Jobs and Ending Offshoring Act, which would have supported our Nation's manufacturing sector by encouraging American companies to bring jobs back to America. Even though we have been witnessing a growth in private sector jobs, we are still struggling to prevent the loss of good jobs.

The Creating American Jobs and Ending Offshoring Act would provide a tax break to companies that bring jobs back to the United States, in the form of relief from the employer share of the Social Security payroll tax.

Additionally, this legislation would discourage firms from eliminating

American jobs and moving facilities offshore by prohibiting firms from taking any deduction, loss, or credit for amounts paid to reduce operations in the United States and start or expand similar operations overseas.

It would also end the Federal tax subsidy—known as deferral—that rewards firms that move their production overseas by allowing them to defer paying tax on income earned by their foreign subsidiaries until that income is brought back to the United States.

The Creating American Jobs and Ending Offshoring Act would encourage American companies to get back in the business of hiring American workers. Nonfinancial companies in the United States are reportedly sitting on \$1.8 trillion of capital. With these reserves, it should not be prohibitive to bring new American workers on the payroll. This legislation would ensure that these companies are using their resources to create new American jobs instead of sending those jobs overseas.

I am disappointed that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle failed to join with us to support this common-sense legislation, which would provide desperately needed jobs to out-of-work Americans and support America's manufacturing sector. Instead, they have voted to preserve tax breaks that reward companies who ship jobs overseas.

I am also disappointed that we have failed to extend the TANF Emergency Contingency Fund, which is set to expire on Thursday. I joined with a number of my colleagues to introduce and press for legislation to extend the fund for 3 months.

The TANF Emergency Contingency Fund has been used to support the successful Jobs Now program in Rhode Island, which has provided local businesses with subsidies to hire workers from struggling families. In addition to providing jobs to out-of-work Americans, this program is a win for businesses that could not otherwise bring new workers on board. Without this fund, these businesses will be hard-pressed to keep these new employees on the payroll. Unfortunately, in outcome that has become all too common, this extension was subject to an objection from the other side of the aisle.

I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will recognize what is at stake and join us in the effort to give American workers and businesses the help they need. I remain committed to pressing for innovative and commonsense efforts that will bolster the economy, create jobs, and help the middle class.

#### EDUCATION JOBS AND MEDICAID FUNDING

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I want colleagues and those who read the RECORD to know that the nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation has made available to the public the document entitled "Technical Explanation of the Revenue Provisions of the Senate Amendment to the House Amendment to the Senate Amendment to H.R. 1586, Scheduled for Consideration by the House of Representatives on August 10, 2010." This document is an explanation of the education jobs and Medicaid funding bill that the Senate passed last month. This explanation reflects the intentions of the Senate and its understanding of the legislative text. It is available on the Joint Committee's Web site at <http://www.jct.gov/publications.html>?

func=startdown&id=3702 and is listed as document number JCX-46-10.

In addition, I would like to comment on the Secretary's grant of authority to issue regulations in section 211 of the legislation, which adds new section 909 to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. I note that this grant of authority allows the Secretary to provide exceptions, as appropriate, from the application of the provision to certain foreign tax credit splitting events resulting from foreign consolidation regimes, group relief, or similar loss-sharing arrangements.

#### DEFENSE MODERNIZATION

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I read an article from the October 2010 edition of the Defense Technology International this morning that discussed military and other technology advances. Entitled "Big Guns: China muscles up artillery punch," this article details China's efforts in the development of artillery and rocket systems and the associated doctrine they have created. Specifically, it addresses Chinese efforts in

research and development in areas such as computer-based fire control, digital communication, and command capabilities, use of sophisticated radars and jammers, and the development of ramjet powered and stealth coated artillery shells, to name a few key areas. Though not necessarily new items of research and development for the United States, China's efforts in these areas tells me one thing: China is pursuing modernization and development initiatives that, based on our recent history of research and development specific to artillery and rockets, may be superior if they are not at least equal to our efforts.

Now let me shift same gears to another potential peer country: Russia and its fifth-generation fighter development. In the same context as China's efforts in artillery and rocket capability, Russia is pursuing the deployment of a fifth-generation fighter, known as the PAK FA advanced tactical frontline fighter. Russia has publicly stated that this aircraft is the peer to the F-22. This aircraft, together with upgraded fourth-generation fighters, will define Russian Air Force potential for the next several decades and will challenge our aviation efforts without question. And don't think that China isn't developing their own fifth-generation aircraft; they are. It is called the JA-12 it is also going to go head to head with our F-22.

The point to this is not a comparison of capabilities or numbers but a public reinforcement of an assessment I have maintained for a long time. We, the United States of America, are not taking our future national security seriously, because we are failing to focus on maintaining the edge that we have had for the last several decades.

So where is the United States in terms of future military hardware necessary to maintain that edge? Did you know that the oldest combat vehicle in the Army inventory is the M109A6 Paladin howitzer and we are on the sixth version of this vehicle which is built around a refurbished chassis circa 1963? The Army's answer to artillery modernization has been the Crusader, which was supposed to replace the Paladin, the Non-Line-of-Sight Cannon as part of FCS, the Non-Line-of-Sight Launch System, another FCS related system, and now the Paladin Integrated Management, or PIM program, which is a modification of the Paladin to a Bradley chassis. All but the PIM program have been cancelled in the last 8 years or so, and the PIM program has been delayed in production.

Current Army fleets of armored personnel carriers, tanks, wheeled vehicles, and helicopters were developed and procured 30 to 60 years ago. DOD and the President's answer to that: cancel FCS, with no viable replacement options, and continue to "upgrade" current fleets of Bradleys and Abrams tanks until the next-generation ground combat vehicle can be figured out.

Our strategic bomber fleet of B-52s, B-1s and B-2s vary in age from 10 to 30 years. The SECDEF has publicly stated in the press and in Congress that 2020 will be the first time we see a new bomber, which means that current airframes will have to remain in service until at least 2040.

One of our two fifth-generation aircraft, the F-22, the peer to the Russian's PAK FA and Chinese JA-12, has had the production line cancelled with only 187 aircraft built out of a requested 750, pulling us in a "high risk" state for air dominance. The other fifth-generation aircraft, the F-35, will not be ready until at least 2015, has suffered significant cost and timing problems, and will be 250 aircraft less than the requested 1,240.

Our Ohio class Trident submarines, the ones that deliver ballistic missiles from the sea, are an average of 20 years old. Replacement builds don't start till 2019 and won't be finished until 2028. As well, the administration remains opaque about plans for replacement of the 30-year-old air-launched cruise missile which is a critical component of our nuclear and long-range conventional strike capability. This is the same for our Minuteman ICBM, which is decades old as well.

I am convinced well beyond any reasonable doubt that we are heading down a slippery slope due to a short-sighted and dangerous strategy from our current administration. The litany of programs cancelled, modified, or mismanaged over the last two budget periods is mind-boggling—FCS, F-22, F-35, NLOS-C and LS, PIM, missile defense, nuclear stockpile, surface and submarine ships, strategic bombers—the list is overwhelming.

I, for one, will not let this happen. I will continue to voice my concerns over this issue. I will continue to fight for a flat expenditure of at least 4 percent of GDP spent on defense to ensure that this country continues to have the best military in the world. I will continue to press the administration to do more for the future of our national security.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article "Big Guns" to which I referred.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Defense Technology International, Oct. 2010]

BIG GUNS—CHINA MUSCLES UP ARTILLERY PUNCH

(By Richard D. Fisher, Jr.)

The International Institute for Strategic Studies' Military Balance 2010 report places China third in the number of artillery systems it fields, after Russia and North Korea. But China doubtless exceeds both in resource commitment and breadth of artillery investments. Credited with an estimated 17,700-plus towed, self-propelled and rocket systems, the People's Liberation Army (PLA) has at least 56 artillery systems in use, development or available for export. The U.S. Army and Marine Corps, by contrast, have 8,187-plus artillery pieces of roughly 10 types.