FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011—Continuing

Mr. REHBERG. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Madam Chair, first, let me just say that I offer this amendment in support of unemployed workers across the country who are truly living in a state of emergency and who desperately need our assistance like right now.

This CR really reminds me of a CR that reflects survival of the fittest. Of the nearly 600 amendments to the continuing resolution that have been proposed or considered so far, this amendment is the only one, mind you, that deals with the problem of the unemployed directly. Nowhere in the proposed continuing resolution does the majority try to address the needs of the unemployed, whether to provide benefits or to help create jobs. In fact, the underlying resolution is estimated to cost more than 800,000 private and public sector jobs. The proposal before us would even cut $2.5 billion from job training programs that directly assist the unemployed in getting the skills that they need to find new jobs and get back to work.

The national unemployment rate stands at 9 percent. In California, in my home State, it’s 12.5 percent. In Ohio, where the Speaker is from, it’s 9.6 percent. And of course, African Americans and Latinos and teenagers have far higher unemployment rates of 15.5, 11.5, and 25.7 percent respectively. Altogether, 13.9 million people are looking for work across the country. 6.2 million of them are classified as long-term unemployed, and yet the Republican response is to cut job training programs. Just think about that for a moment. How in the world does cutting programs. Just think about that for a moment.

The national unemployment rate is the only one, mind you, that deals with the problem of the unemployed directly. Nowhere in the proposed continuing resolution does the majority try to address the needs of the unemployed, whether to provide benefits or to help create jobs. In fact, the underlying resolution is estimated to cost more than 800,000 private and public sector jobs. The proposal before us would even cut $2.5 billion from job training programs that directly assist the unemployed in getting the skills that they need to find new jobs and get back to work.

Mr. REHBERG. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve my point of order.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. REHBERG. I continue to reserve my point of order.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. The response to the bill and my amendment has been, quite frankly, overwhelming. People from my district and also people from your districts have been calling my office nonstop in support of this bill, wanting to know when the Republican majority will finally deal with the problem of the long-term unemployed. They want to see a real plan from Republicans and Democrats that will create jobs and jump-start the economy. They don’t want to hear the Speaker casually dismiss job loss by saying, “So be it.” In fact, in 7 weeks, we haven’t seen one single effort to create a job. We haven’t seen any legislation that would do that.

Now it’s your chance to step up to the plate and prove to them that your priorities don’t just lie with the rich and the well connected. Many of the unemployed are experiencing poverty for the first time as they literally try to make a dollar out of 15 cents. If we don’t act now, many of them will fall into poverty.

So I ask my Republican colleagues: If you can insist on giveaways to the wealthy, why can’t you stand up for the unemployed who need our help the most? Extending unemployment benefits is not only the right thing to do, but it also creates and contributes economic growth and job creation, because unemployed workers put what little money they have back into the economy as they just try to get by day by day.

I know my colleagues have reserved a point of order. And I urge you, don’t resort to parliamentary maneuvers to block help for the unemployed. Join me and our 66 cosponsors, and let’s provide an additional 14 weeks of benefits for those who have hit the wall.

Mr. REHBERG. I continue to reserve my point of order.

Mr. SCOTT. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.
Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, we must acknowledge that passing a continuing resolution will do nothing to create jobs. We are stuck with an unemployment rate of 9 percent and have left the long-term unemployed who have exhausted their unemployment benefits. In the case of Representative LEE’s amendment makes it clear that some of our have not forgotten about these individuals and their families. The amendment will ensure that those hardworking Americans will have access to unemployment benefits during this historic economic recession. It’s not only the right thing to do, but it will also help our economy.

Economists estimate that the U.S. economy grows by over $1.60 for every $1 the government spends on unemployment compensation because unemployed persons usually spend all of their benefits quickly. This $1.60 is in stark contrast to the 20 cents in economic activity generated by some of the tax cuts we passed last month. Put simply, unemployment compensation is one of the most efficient and effective ways to stimulate the economy. But extending benefits is only one part of a comprehensive approach needed to get the long-term unemployed back to work.

Many of the Americans who have lost their jobs have lost jobs that are not coming back. Jobs that have been shipped overseas or jobs that now require new skills. So while unemployment compensation is the temporary solution, we need to simultaneously be providing job training programs and educational training to help American workers develop the new in-demand skills. Unfortunately, this resolution actually cuts job training programs.

We face very difficult choices when it comes to the Federal budget, and there’s no easy solution to solve our budget problem. When I first came to Congress 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, would not only have eliminated the deficit but had a projected surplus large enough to have paid off the entire national debt held by the public 2 years ago. That means we would have owed no money to Japan, China, and Saudi Arabia. That budget also led to real job growth, but it required tough choices; and in fact, dozens of Members who voted for that budget lost their seats in the next election.

In contrast, under the Bush administration, we passed popular but big tax cuts without paying for them, a prescription drug benefit without paying for it, a $700 billion bailout without paying for it, and cut taxes in the middle of two wars, all of which put us in the economic ditch. Now, in order to get us out of the ditch we are going to have to make some tough choices. Unfortunately, at the end of last year, we made a move in the wrong direction when Congress passed a huge tax cut bill, at a total 2-year cost of $800 billion, without paying for it. To put that number in perspective, $800 billion exceeds the general fund budget of all 50 States. That’s right. Add it up. If you add up all the general fund state budget of all 50 States, it comes up to a total of $650 billion, less than the cost of the $800 billion tax cut bill.

Before that bill was passed, many of us asked how we’re going to pay for it, but nobody wanted to answer it. Everybody who supported the bill focused solely on the nice tax cuts. But now we’re going to debate a long list of spending cuts in the proposed resolution to show how we’re paying for it.

Last year we passed the tax cuts that gave great multinationalaires, and now we’re paying for it by inflicting pain on vulnerable portions of our population. We can do better, and that’s why we need to fight against these draconian cuts and programs that are so important to so many people and, instead, provide assistance where it helps not only individuals but helps the economy, as the Lee amendment does.

The American people deserve better than this resolution. We should support the Lee amendment but oppose the underlying legislation, and I urge my colleagues to do just that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REHBERG. I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule states in pertinent part: “An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.”

The amendment directly amends existing law.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) was not made in order.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. REHBERG. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chair, I rise in disappointment that the amendment offered to this continuing resolution from California (Ms. LEE) was not made in order. While the Republicans cut the heart out of necessary, needed programs that would help the people who have lost their jobs—and they’ve lost these jobs through no fault of their own—it actually stuns me how unaware they are that it is our very obligation in this House to help make families whole again, to help them do what they have to do when they can’t find work. But of course it’s up to the BARBARA LEES and the BOBBY SCOTTS of this Congress to insist that we provide a lifeline for hardworking families who have exhausted all of their benefits. It is particularly shameful, Madam Chair, that this is something we’re even questioning after giving billions of dollars in deficit-busting tax cuts to the very wealthiest.

After extending those tax breaks for the affluent, how can they say that we can’t afford to extend unemployment insurance for families struggling to find jobs in this economy? The Republican leadership has given a lot of lip service to creating jobs, but they’ve yet to bring even one jobs bill to the floor. Now they have a chance to support emergency relief to millions of working families, a chance to extend unemployment benefits to help struggling families which will also help end the recession because, as the Lee amendment does.

Actually, unemployment insurance is a proven economic booster. According to the Congressional Budget Office, for every $1 spent on unemployment insurance, economic activity increases by $2.

In fact, the CBO has found unemployment insurance to be one of the most effective and cost-effective ways to stimulate the economy.

There’s no shortage of work ethic in America, Madam Chair. There is a shortage of work, however. So where is the majority party’s jobs bill? Where is the support for those people who have exhausted all their emergency unemployment benefits and are desperately looking for employment?

I urge my colleagues, provide additional unemployment benefits. It is for those whose benefits have run out. And I suggest that the best thing you could do right now is help create jobs for America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Madam Chair, let me just say, providing unemployment benefits for people struggling to survive, it really should not be subject to any parliamentary point of order. I just wanted to say that’s really a shame and disgrace.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. I move to strike the last word, Madam Chairman.
The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. I won't speak for 5 minutes. I've been sitting here waiting for my amendment to come up, which it will in a couple of hours probably. But I have to make one comment on everything I'm hearing on the floor.

We hear amendment after amendment to extend unemployment benefits to the unemployed in a time when we have 9 percent unemployment, and they're struck down because there's no pay-for. The amendment provides no other means of paying for the unemployment insurance.

For the last 50 or 60 years it was never considered necessary, in a time of recession and high unemployment, that in order to extend unemployment benefits you had to find somewhere else to pay for it. It was automatic emergency spending until this Republican Congress.

The amendment after amendment that's denied. We can't even formulate certain amendments because we can only increase, not even increase spending, we can only restore draconian spending cuts on human services that are near and dear to us if we reduce other human services.

But the tax cuts that we've seen, the huge tax cuts of hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars for our wealthiest citizens at a time when the top 1 percent of the richest 1 percent of our people have 24 percent of the income and almost half of the wealth in the country, we can't talk about increasing or reducing those tax cuts. Those tax cuts are a given.

Madam Chairman, this is the culmination when we see $100 billion of cuts in spending, in non-defense discretionary spending, spending on transportation that is necessary if our economy is to be competitive, spending on research and development that is necessary if we're going to be able to create jobs, spending on schools and education and housing that is necessary for our people, spending on job training so our people can work, spending on unemployment insurance so they can eat. All of these things must be cut in order that the wealthiest people have tax cuts, in order that the tax cuts for the oil companies not be disturbed.

All of this is the culmination of a 30-year campaign by the Republican Party to starve the beast. Ronald Reagan’s Budget Director, David Stockman, I believe coined the phrase “starve the beast.” He said, he pointed out that if you come to the American people and you say, We want to reduce certain services, we want less money for transportation, the voters don’t go along with that. If you say, We want less money for education, the voters don’t go along with that. And if you say, We want less money for most things that are necessary, the voters won’t say yes.

But if you deliberately create a crisis, if you deliberately create a situation where there is no money, by cutting taxes of the rich so that they don’t pay their fair share, you can create a crisis, and then you come and say we can’t afford this. We’ve got a budget deficit. We must reduce unemployment insurance. We must reduce schools and housing and transportation and the competitiveness of our economy and the jobs available for our people. We must reduce them because there is no money. Then you can get away with it. And that is the plot that the Republican Party has been advancing for 30 years, and today we are seeing the culmination of that. Today and in this Congress.

But remember what creates this necessity for these drastic cuts: The fact that we are unwilling to restore the tax cuts for the richest portion of our population. We are unwilling to take away the tax breaks for the oil companies. We are unwilling to tax the large corporations as we used to. We are unwilling to pay as high a percentage of their income in taxes as their secretaries. That’s what’s really at stake here.

But this debate is structured by the rules which have been imposed on us. We are constrained to bring this all together in one debate. Unfortunately, it is not in order. The chairman ruled it’s out of order if someone proposes to pay for a restoration of unemployment insurance by increasing a tax or by cutting war funding because it’s not in the same bill. It’s not in the same section of the bill.

So the American people’s representatives have our hands tied because we are prisoners of the construct constructed by the Republican Party that says, let the rich have their tax cuts, let the oil companies have their tax breaks, let the multinational companies export the jobs overseas and pay no taxes. We’ll pay for it by robbing the American people of job creation, of health care insurance, of job creation, of education, that’s what’s really at stake here.

But the tax cuts that we’ve seen, the huge tax cuts of hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars for our wealthiest citizens at a time when the top 1 percent of the richest 1 percent of our people have 24 percent of the income and almost half of the wealth in the country, we can’t talk about increasing or reducing those tax cuts. Those tax cuts are a given.

Madam Chairman, this is the culmination when we see $100 billion of cuts in spending, in non-defense discretionary spending, spending on transportation that is necessary if our economy is to be competitive, spending on research and development that is necessary if we’re going to be able to create jobs, spending on schools and education and housing that is necessary for our people, spending on job training so our people can work, spending on unemployment insurance so they can eat. All of these things must be cut in order that the wealthiest people have tax cuts, in order that the tax cuts for the oil companies not be disturbed.

All of this is the culmination of a 30-year campaign by the Republican Party to starve the beast. Ronald Reagan’s Budget Director, David Stockman, I believe coined the phrase “starve the beast.” He said, he pointed out that if you come to the American people and you say, We want to reduce certain services, we want less money for transportation, the voters don’t go along with that. If you say, We want less money for education, the voters don’t go along with that. And if you say, We want less money for most things that are necessary, the voters won’t say yes.

But if you deliberately create a crisis, if you deliberately create a situation where there is no money, by cutting taxes of the rich so that they don’t pay their fair share, you can create a crisis, and then you come and say we can’t afford this. We’ve got a budget deficit. We must reduce unemployment insurance. We must reduce schools and housing and transportation and the competitiveness of our economy and the jobs available for our people. We must reduce them because there is no money. Then you can get away with it. And that is the plot that the Republican Party has been advancing for 30 years, and today we are seeing the culmination of that. Today and in this Congress.

But remember what creates this necessity for these drastic cuts: The fact that we are unwilling to restore the tax cuts for the richest portion of our population. We are unwilling to take away the tax breaks for the oil companies. We are unwilling to tax the large corporations as we used to. We are unwilling to pay as high a percentage of their income in taxes as their secretaries. That’s what’s really at stake here.

But this debate is structured by the rules which have been imposed on us. We are constrained to bring this all together in one debate. Unfortunately, it is not in order. The chairman ruled it’s out of order if someone proposes to pay for a restoration of unemployment insurance by increasing a tax or by cutting war funding because it’s not in the same bill. It’s not in the same section of the bill.

So the American people’s representatives have our hands tied because we are prisoners of the construct constructed by the Republican Party that says, let the rich have their tax cuts, let the oil companies have their tax breaks, let the multinational companies export the jobs overseas and pay no taxes. We’ll pay for it by robbing the American people of job creation, of health care insurance, of job creation, of education, that’s what’s really at stake here.

But this debate is structured by the rules which have been imposed on us. We are constrained to bring this all together in one debate. Unfortunately, it is not in order. The chairman ruled it’s out of order if someone proposes to pay for a restoration of unemployment insurance by increasing a tax or by cutting war funding because it’s not in the same bill. It’s not in the same section of the bill.

So the American people’s representatives have our hands tied because we are prisoners of the construct constructed by the Republican Party that says, let the rich have their tax cuts, let the oil companies have their tax breaks, let the multinational companies export the jobs overseas and pay no taxes. We’ll pay for it by robbing the American people of job creation, of health care insurance, of job creation, of education, that’s what’s really at stake here.

But this debate is structured by the rules which have been imposed on us. We are constrained to bring this all together in one debate. Unfortunately, it is not in order. The chairman ruled it’s out of order if someone proposes to pay for a restoration of unemployment insurance by increasing a tax or by cutting war funding because it’s not in the same bill. It’s not in the same section of the bill.

So the American people’s representatives have our hands tied because we are prisoners of the construct constructed by the Republican Party that says, let the rich have their tax cuts, let the oil companies have their tax breaks, let the multinational companies export the jobs overseas and pay no taxes. We’ll pay for it by robbing the American people of job creation, of health care insurance, of job creation, of education, that’s what’s really at stake here.
debts by $1.5 million. The Greening of the Capitol program is basically over with. In fact, the only thing they are doing now, according to the information I have, is they are calling around to congressional district offices to go down there to see about buying more up-to-date light bulbs. So I would respectfully request that the Members support this amendment.

**House of Representatives,**


Mr. **STEVE AYERS,**

**Acting Architect of the Capitol,**

**Washington, DC.**

**Dear Mr. Ayers:** There have been several articles written about the Capitol Power Plant in recent weeks and I have had several groups in my office lobbying to stop using coal at the plant. I would appreciate your providing me some basic facts about the plant.

1. When was it constructed, what was its initial cost, and when did it begin operations?
2. What was/is the rated electrical capacity of the plant?
3. How much coal was burned at the plant during its peak years of operation?
4. What was natural gas first used as a fuel in the plant, and what was the cost to convert the plant to natural gas for the Capitol complex?
5. What is the mix of fuel used today at the plant, in percentages?
6. What has been the additional cost or cost-saving associated with the use of a mix of natural gas and coal, instead of coal only?
7. What is the timeline for converting the plant to natural gas only, and what will be the cost of the conversion?
8. What is the projected additional cost or cost-saving over the next five years, by converting the plant to operate only on natural gas?
9. What type of coal is presently burned at the plant, and where is it produced?
10. Does the plant produce electricity, or only steam and cooled water for the Capitol complex?
11. If electricity is produced, what amount of income does the sale of the electricity produce annually?
12. If electricity is not produced, why not?
13. If electricity is not produced, what would be the cost of converting the plant so that electricity could be produced and sold, and what would be the projected annual income from those sales?
14. What emissions controls are in place at the plant, when were they added, and at what cost?
15. Is the plant presently in compliance with the Clean Air Act regulations?
16. If the plant is not in compliance with emissions limitations, what additional controls might be needed to continue to use coal or a mixture of coal and natural gas, and what are the estimated capital costs of those additional controls?

Thank you very much for your attention to this request. I will look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

**Ed Whitfield,**

**Member of Congress,**

**The Architect of the Capitol,**


Hon. Ed Whitfield,

**House of Representatives,**

**Washington, DC.**

**Dear Congressman Whitfield:** Thank you for your article about the Capitol Power Plant. As a matter of background, Congress authorized $1,545,975.65 for the design and construction of the Capitol Power Plant on April 28, 1904, and it was completed and began operations in 1910. Originally, the plant was constructed to produce electricity. However, since it has not produced electricity and only generates steam and chilled water for the Capitol Complex.

The Capitol Power Plant is currently capable of using three fuels: coal, natural gas, and fuel oil. In a series of projects starting in 1989, individual boilers within the plant have been modified to be capable of burning natural gas. In Fiscal Year 2008, the fuel consumed by the plant was 65% natural gas and 35% coal. The largest amount of coal burned during the last 20 years was in 1993, when the plant used 47,300 short tons. The plant currently burns low sulfur bituminous coal, which is purchased through the General Services Administration and the Defense Energy Support Center. The following table provides details on the fuel usage and costs for Fiscal Year 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility type</th>
<th>Energy (MMBtu)</th>
<th>Cost ($1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>975,046</td>
<td>$12,653,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>528,489</td>
<td>2,444,511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Capitol Power Plant operates in compliance with current Federal Clean Air Act regulations. The plant utilizes two reverse air bag houses, installed in the early 1980s, for particulate emissions. Emissions are further controlled via fuel specifications and combustion controls.

On February 26, 2009, the Office of Architect of the Capitol (AOC) received a letter signed by the Speaker of the House and the Senate Majority Leader directing a reduction in the use of coal at the plant, in favor of natural gas. Our preliminary estimates indicate that operating the plant using 100% natural gas will cost an additional $3-$7 million annually in fuel costs and will require a one-time capital investment needed to equip the plant. We are currently preparing preliminary designs with cost estimates for the capital investment requirement.

The AOC has undertaken a comprehensive strategic planning process for the Capitol Power Plant. Leveraging the skills of expert consultants and in-house staff, the AOC is analyzing a number of options for the plant, including several scenarios which utilize cogeneration systems to generate electricity. Those options will be reviewed by the National Academy of Sciences and later will be reviewed by the Department of Energy. We expect to publish a final report in Summer 2009.

Should you have further questions about the Capitol Power Plant or any of AOC’s activities, please do not hesitate to contact me at 224-7163.

Sincerely,

**Stephen T. Ayers, AIA,**

**Acting Architect of the Capitol,**

**February 26, 2009.**

We expect to publish a final report in Summer 2009. The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. **Weiner.** Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. **Weiner.** I’m a big fan of Mr. Whitfield, but he misses the big thing here; and that is that we’re in the portfolio of this budget where the legislative branch is funded. Isn’t this the opportunity to end the funding for the health care plans that so many Members of Congress get? So many Members of Congress get health care plans, and their workers where they get a booklet twice a year with different choices. And since there’s so many workers, they are aggregated together to be able to hold down costs for all of them. This is exactly what the new health care plan that is going into effect for the American people seeks to do.

Now, the Democrats have said let’s extend that to all Americans. Let’s give everyone that opportunity. And my Republican friends say, no, that’s not the American way, a government health care. This is your chance. Don’t blow it.

Mr. **Whitfield.** I am an important, prominent member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, one of the most learned members of that committee. This is our chance to say, you know what, we’re so against government-run health care that we want to get rid of the Federal Employees Health Benefit Plan. This is your moment. This is the time. Let’s do it. Come on. Let’s put your money where your mouth is, Madam Chair.

I mean, the problem here is that if you think about what is going on, with all of the debate about health care and the Big Government-run health care plan, no one really notes that. It’s taking the number of uninsured people, giving them subsidies and incentives to go out and get private insurance. And then, since more people are going to have it, all of our costs come down. The aggregation that happens on in insurance markets, the automobile insurance, for example, and Members of Congress take advantage of that.

Now, I should point out the mythology that there is some fancy health care plan. No. We’re in the Federal Employees Health Benefit Plan. We get this booklet every 6 months. We choose the plan that’s best. It’s like the exchange is going to be in 2013 and 2014.

So here it is. We’re on the floor. This is our moment. Mr. Whitfield, I don’t know much about this provision of what coal-powered plants there are here, but I do know that’s here. Why don’t you step up and say, We’re opposed to government-run health care for Members of Congress?

You know, it’s funny. There was actually a Member of Congress on the Republican side—and I forget his name, you will forgive me—who campaigned all summer and fall against what they call ObamaCare and how outrageous it is. And he is going to get to work on doing away with it. They had orientation for the new Members of Congress, and he stands up and says, When do I get my government health care plan?

And when we started looking and we started asking questions, it turned out that there are a lot of Members of Congress who railed against other people getting health coverage but really like that they get it. As they should. No one should give up their health care plan. People should get it.

There was even a member of the New York delegation, when asked about it. Are you going to take the government...
health care plan since you campaigned so hard against it? And he said, Of course. What happens if I have an accident and I need health care? Where am I going to get it? Exactly.

The same is true for a citizen who works here. But, the way of the uninsured, 75 percent of them have full-time jobs. It’s not like they are slack- ing. They are hardworking Americans. And so the health care plan that we provided, like the Members of Congress funded, government-run health care can come down here. And while you’re at it, I guess you are going to de-fund Medicare, I read that in the paper today. That’s the next thing. Government-run health care. Well, this is kind of your moment to do it.

And Mr. WHITFIELD may be right, I don’t know. I will have to figure out how to vote on that. I’m not up on the coal-burning plants. But I’m certainly that opportunity. I would hope all of those people who deride government-funded, government-run health care can come down here. And while you’re at it, I guess you are going to de-fund Medicare, I read that in the paper today. That’s the next thing. Government-run health care. Well, this is kind of your moment to do it.

Be consistent. Be honest. What this is really about is that we took a plan that is basically founded on free-market principles and said, you know what, the employer-based model, we’re going to try to have more people get employer-based insurance.

But if you are really honest and consistent, you are in the moment in the bill that I would hope our Republican colleagues come down 5 minutes at a time and say, Let’s get rid of that dastardly Federal Employee Health Benefits Plan that the legislative branch benefits from. Come down and say, I’m taking it and here is why I’m contradicting what I said in the campaign. This is our time to do it, and I would hope we would.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. In the interest of time, Madam Chair, I just want to rise in support of the amendment by the gentleman from Kentucky. I think it’s a good amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HONDA. Madam Chair, just a word against the amendment.

The amendment really actually reduces the House of Representatives’ budget by $1.5 million, which will bring the total reduction to $82 million from fiscal year 2010.

The gentleman purports that this amendment cuts energy reduction programs when in actuality that is not true. What he is doing is that he makes a general cut that will affect office budgets and the services of the House.

So I just want to be clear on this. It is a shortsighted strategy to handicap the legislative branch of government by reducing our own staffs here. We are an equal branch of government and must effectively serve our own constituents.

Not only is the gentleman’s amendment flawed, but the motive of his amendment is flawed. Energy reduction programs save the government and taxpayers money. For example, the House has installed nearly 13,000 energy saving compact fluorescent light bulbs, or CFLs, throughout the House complex, saving more than 1.1 million kilowatt hours annually. This project has already saved taxpayers up to now $446,000 and is projected to produce an annual savings of $178,000 annually into the future. We are getting a return on our investments.

Furthermore, consolidating Member office computer services has dramati-
cally saved energy and taxpayer money. This project has already saved taxpayers over $1 million and is pro-
jected to save nearly $800,000 annually, returning back to us a return on in-
vestments. All told, energy reduction programs for the House have already saved taxpayers $3.2 million and is projected to save nearly $9 million annually once it is completed.

While I know that cuts are needed, Madam Chair, I would prefer if the Congress focused its time on policies that are truly accomplishing deficit reduction. Now, if the gentleman wants to cut energy funding and we’re looking at our budget, it’s really the Architect of the Capitol’s budget. So there is a misfocus on the target. But if the gentleman wants to really cut energy funding, he should join this side of the aisle and call for the end of the Big Oil subsidies.

Let’s stop the message amendments and work towards real deficit reduc-
tion.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gent-
leman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1902. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for “House of Representatives, Members’ Representation Allocations” shall be $613,602,000.

SEC. 1903. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for “House of Representatives, Members’ Representation Allocations” shall be $614,459,000.

SEC. 1904. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for “House of Representatives, Committee Employees, Standing Committees, Special and Select” shall be $132,491,103, the period of applicability referred to in the proviso under that heading shall be December 31, 2011, and none of the funds made available under that heading may be used for committee room upgrading.

SEC. 1905. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for “House of Representatives, Committee on Appropriations” shall be $28,583,000, and the period of applicability referred to in the proviso under that heading shall be December 31, 2012.

SEC. 1906. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for “House of Representatives, Salaries, Officers and Employees” shall be $184,386,000, and the level under that heading—

(1) for the Office of the Clerk shall be $25,668,000;
(2) for the Office of the Sergeant at Arms shall be $8,321,000; and
(3) for the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer shall be $121,676,000.

SEC. 1907. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for “House of Representatives, Allowances and Expenses” shall be $305,067,000, and the level under that heading—

(1) for employee tuition assistance benefit payments shall be $0;
(2) for employee child care benefit payments shall be $0;
(3) for Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery shall be $17,000,000, of which $5,000,000 shall remain available until expended;
(4) for the Wounded Warrior Program shall be $2,000,000; and
(5) for Energy Demonstration Projects shall be $0.

SEC. 1908. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for “Joint Items, Joint Economic Committee” shall be $1,679,970.

SEC. 1909. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for “Capitol Police, Salaries” shall be $477,469.

SEC. 1910. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for “Capitol Police, Taxes” shall be $1,487,455.

SEC. 1911. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for “Congressional Budget Office, Salaries and Expenses” shall be $477,469.

SEC. 1912. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for “Government Accountability and Oversight” shall be $4,087,510.

SEC. 1913. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for “Government Accountability and Oversight” shall be $4,087,510.
shall be determined in accordance with an allocation plan submitted by the Architect of the Capitol and approved by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate, except that:

(1) the aggregate level for all items under that heading may not exceed $398,491,000; and

(2) no amounts may remain available for any item under such plan beyond September 30, 2015.

(b) Subsection (a) does not apply to—

(1) the level for “Library of Congress, Copyright Office, Salaries and Expenses” shall be $52,914,670, of which not more than $337,751,000, to remain available until expended, shall be derived from collections credited to such appropriation during fiscal year 2011 and from cash on hand on October 1, 2010, appropriated by this division.

(2) the level for the four provisos under that heading shall be $4,815,000, and the amount applicable under the fifth and seventh provisos under that heading shall be $0.

Sect. 1915. Notwithstanding section 1911, the level for “Library of Congress, Copyright Office, Salaries and Expenses” shall be $52,914,670, of which not more than $337,751,000, to remain available until expended, shall be derived from collections credited to such appropriation during fiscal year 2011 and from cash on hand on October 1, 2010, appropriated by this division.

Sect. 1914. Notwithstanding section 1911, the level for “Library of Congress, Salaries and Expenses” shall be $417,189,000, the amount applicable under the proviso for the Architect of the Capitol, the amount applicable under the proviso for the Library of Congress, the amount applicable under the proviso for the Senate, the amount applicable under the proviso for the House, the amount applicable under the proviso for the Capitol Police, and the amount applicable under the proviso for the House of Representatives shall be $4,815,000, and the amount applicable under the proviso for the Senate shall be $0.

Sect. 1913. Notwithstanding section 1911, the level for “Library of Congress, Research Service, Salaries and Expenses” shall be $121,000,000.

Sect. 1912. Notwithstanding section 1911, the level for “Library of Congress, Books for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, Salaries and Expenses” shall be $66,124,000.

Sect. 1911. Notwithstanding section 1911, the level for “Government Printing Office, Government Printing Office Revolving Fund” shall be $85,000,000.

Sect. 1910. Notwithstanding section 1911, the level for “Government Printing Office, Office of Superintendent of Documents, Salaries and Expenses” shall be $39,911,000.

Sect. 1909. (a) Section 309(c) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1999 (44 U.S.C. 305 note) is amended by striking paragraph (5):

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1999.

Sect. 1908. Notwithstanding section 1911, the level for “Government Accountability Office, Salaries and Expenses” shall be $92,188,000, the amount applicable under the first proviso under that heading shall be $9,400,000, the amount applicable under the second proviso under that heading shall be $3,100,000, and the amount applicable under the third proviso under that heading shall be $7,000,000.

Sect. 1907. Notwithstanding section 1911, the level for “Office of the Architect of the Capitol, Trust Fund” shall be $5,100,000.

Sect. 1906. Notwithstanding section 1911, the level for “John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development” shall be $0.

Mr. CRENSHAW (during the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through page 312, line 9, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

Mr. CRENSHAW (closing the reading). The Clerk will read.
Mr. BERMAN. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Chairman, it seems to me that in this frenzied competition to see who can cut the most and the fastest, we are losing all sense of reason and rationality. I am deeply concerned by what I see happening to the international affairs budget which is contained in this title XI of the bill before us.

In the past, the State Department and foreign appropriations bill has passed with strong bipartisan support, often by an overwhelming margin. Members of both parties have understood how important diplomacy and development are, not only to U.S. standing in the world, but to our country’s own economic growth, to American jobs and to American national security.

They recognize that problems such as terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the spread of deadly disease cannot be resolved unilaterally. That is why, over the long term, the best way to create more jobs at home is to build more export markets overseas. They understand that we cannot defeat violent extremism by military means alone and that, as Secretary Gates said last fall, “Development is a lot cheaper than Sending soldiers.”

Yet the process by which this CR has been produced makes a mockery of the responsibilities we have as Members of Congress to advance our economy and protect our national security.

First, the Republican leadership announced a plan to make $44 billion in cuts. Then we started hearing other numbers: $58 billion, $74 billion, $100 billion. But the cuts are not made in a systematic way, nor are the numbers: $58 billion, $74 billion, $100 billion, each presented as a different sum, under a different baseline. And no matter how high the number goes, there are proposals to cut even deeper.

These numbers weren’t chosen because they looked at programs and what those programs mean to us and to America. They were chosen because they are easy to cut. It is not just disaster aid that is affected. Every other program that protects the poorest and most vulnerable people is savaged: refugee aid, food aid, day care, water and sanitation projects in international efforts to fight AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis.

Meanwhile, funding for the diplomats and aid workers who carry out these programs is also slashed. If there is anything we have learned over the past few years, it ought to be that we just don’t hand over money to contractors and governments without adequate oversight and accountability.

So far, the amendments to remove aid from countries that might not like us, that don’t vote with us in the United Nations, that we disagree with in helping peaceful democratic movements and human rights activists under other authoritarian regimes.

Somehow, the draconian cuts in this bill were not enough for many in this body. Added on top of all these cuts, we have amendments to remove ourselves completely from the United Nations, to eliminate funding for the National Endowment for Democracy and the Millennium Challenge Corporation and the U.S. Institute of Peace. They would cut aid to countries whose support is essential to us in the areas of counterterrorism, intelligence and nonproliferation just because they don’t vote with us in the United Nations.

There is one thing the authors of these amendments don’t seem to understand: Aid is not a gift. The United States provides foreign assistance because it serves our interests. Helping countries become more democratic, more stable, more capable of defending themselves and better at pulling themselves out of poverty is just as important for us as it is for them.

Madam Chairman, the cuts to international spending in this bill will not create a single U.S. job. In fact, they will cost jobs.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chairman, I rise to strike the last word.
The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chairwoman, as chair of the State and Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee for the last 4 years, I worked on a bipartisan manner with my friend, Chairwoman KAY GRANGER, to ensure our bill protects our national security, and I do appreciate her efforts to sustain our successes and note the inclusion of $3 billion pursuant to the MOU between the United States and Israel and continued commitments to Egypt and Jordan in the bill we consider today. I am also pleased the bill continues robust investment in basic education, which is the cornerstone of free, healthy and economically stable societies.

Tough measures we authored to hold accountable recipients of U.S. assistance in Afghanistan are also preserved in this bill to ensure that taxpayer dollars are spent efficiently and effectively. The spread of disease in the developing world is linked to instability around the world, this bill undermines our efforts aimed at democratically engineered and alternative development options, our support of international financial institutions, conflict mitigation and reconciliation, disaster assistance, and global health priorities.

In addition, the Republican leadership has taken a decisive approach by including reinstatement of the global gag rule and a prohibition on funds for the United Nations Population Fund in our first spending bill in the new majority.

During my 4 years as chair of the subcommittee, I refrained from including any women’s health priorities I fought for throughout my career so that we could work together to advance America’s best interests. This CR would deny millions of women abroad family planning and basic health services, and I’m deeply disappointed that my colleagues refuse to work with us to bolster our efforts to prevent unintended pregnancies and the spread of disease in the developing world.

Finally, these measures are brought to the floor under the guise of fiscal responsibility. Let me be clear: This bill puts an end to that practice and further corrects course by making unprecedented cuts to the federal budget.

As chair of the State-Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I know the difficult tradeoffs that have to be made to achieve these levels of cuts, but we cannot continue to ignore our skyrocketing deficits and debt.

We are taking our pledge to cut spending seriously. Since fiscal year 2010, the state-foreign operations budget has had dramatic increases, and this bill begins to rein in the growth of many programs.

To give you one example, right now Egypt is under military law. We have a decades-long relationship with the Egyptian military by virtue of our FMF funding, by virtue of our IMET funding, and we need to engage in this potentially new world.

I am very much afraid that some of the crippling cuts to our foreign assistance budget that are contemplated in this CR will undermine our ability to react and respond in this fast-changing situation. Some of the further cuts that are contemplated in the amendments that we’ll hear tonight which will even go beyond what is in this CR would, again, be extraordinarily detrimental to our ability to help shape in a positive way the events that are taking place.

To give you another example, right now Syria is under military law. We have a decades-long relationship with the Syrian military by virtue of our FMF funding, by virtue of our IMET funding, and we need to engage in this potentially new world.

Some of the root causes of that terrorism are eliminated. We cannot continue to spend taxpayers’ dollars at the level that is contemplated in the amendments.

We have an opportunity here to help make decisions that make a difference. We have an opportunity to prevent some of the root causes of that terrorism. The lack of opportunity, suffering under authoritarian regimes, and we need to engage in this potentially new world.

The acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chair, over the last several weeks we’ve seen some of the most dramatic and potentially promising events in the Arab world in perhaps a generation. We saw what began with the actions of a fruit vendor in Tunisia spiral and take down not only its government in that country but in Egypt in a way that carries on and whose consequences we have yet to fully comprehend.

In this environment where we have a potential game-changing situation in the Arab world, where people not only are like them. I hope to restore some of the confidence that has been taken out in the CR and to defeat some of the amendments that will further undercut these vital international efforts.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 1.

Chairman ROGERS, it’s been a pleasure working with you and the other members of the committee on this important piece of legislation that begins to address our country’s fiscal crisis. For too long we have seen unsustainable increases in spending. This bill puts an end to that practice and further corrects course by making unprecedented cuts to the federal budget.

As chair of the State-Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I know the difficult tradeoffs that have to be made to achieve these levels of cuts, but we cannot continue to ignore our skyrocketing deficits and debt.

We are taking our pledge to cut spending seriously. Since fiscal year 2010, the state-foreign operations budget has had dramatic increases, and this bill begins to rein in the growth of many programs.

The state-foreign operations title of the bill before us is $44.9 billion. This represents—according to the president’s fiscal year 2011 request; A $3.8 billion, or 8%, reduction from the fiscal year 2010 enacted level, and $9.9 billion, or 18%, reduction from the fiscal year 2010 level with supplemental appropriations.

Let me be clear—while these are dramatic cuts, I support the goals and objectives of using civilian power to achieve our national security goals. But the state of our economy does not afford us the luxury of continuing all the programs we’re currently supporting around the world, particularly at a time when domestic programs are being significantly reduced.

To achieve the level of savings included for the remainder of FY11, reductions were made in a number of areas, but one of the most important efforts and priorities. For example, the bill before us supports top national security priorities, maintains momentum in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan, fully funds the United States Department of Treasury program of understanding at $3 billion, and continues the fight against illegal drug trafficking in Mexico, Central America, and Colombia.

In order to do all of these things, in this bill:

New activities are paused so we can take a closer look at our current investments to ensure they are working before we expand them.

Many programs that are well-liked and supported are scaled back. Our country simply cannot afford the growth of some of these programs.

Underperforming, wasteful, and duplicative programs are significantly reduced, and many are eliminated. We cannot continue to spend simply because we have done so in the past.

Large administration commitments—like climate change—are shelved. We must be sure our domestic problems are addressed before we consider these large investments abroad.

While these changes were difficult, they must be made in order to preserve our national security priorities.
intended and not falling into the wrong hands. For that reason I have included language which provides additional oversight for countries like Afghanistan and Lebanon.

I would like to thank ranking member LOWEY for her dedication to the subcommittee as chair, to her staff, and to the members of the minority staff: Steve Marchese.

Adams, Celia Alvarado, and Jamie Guinn. On Chotvacs, Craig Higgins, Alice Hogans, Susan sides. On the majority staff Anne Marie of our team. And new members who are ready to be a part of the aisle deserve to be heard on the important foreign policy matters that come before our subcommittee. We have members who are returning this year to the subcommittee and new members who are ready to be a part of our team.

I would also like to thank the staff on both sides. On the majority staff: Anne Marie Chotvacs, Craig Higgins, Alice Hogans, Susan Adams, Celia Alvarado, and Jamie Guinn. On the minority staff: Steve Marchese. I know Mrs. LOWEY and I both appreciate the work of our personal office staff: Aaron Ranck, Johnnie Kaberle, and Talia Dubovi. I also want to recognize Jeff Shockey. This will be the last appropriations bill on the floor before the subcommittees consider appropriations committee so I want take this opportunity to thank him for his years of dedication and hard work. Jeff has been a significant asset to this committee, and to the house, and he will be missed.

We all benefit from these highly professional staff and I thank them for their work to help bring the fiscal year 2011 process to a close.

I hope this bill will move forward quickly to ensure important government operations are continued in a manner that is fiscally responsible and meets our foreign policy challenges around the world.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2102. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: "Administration of Foreign Affairs, Diplomatic and Consular Programs", $8,383,460,000, of which $1,491,041,000 is for Worldwide Security Protection (to be available until expended); "Administration of Foreign Affairs, Office of Inspector General", $94,000,000; "Administration of Foreign Affairs, Capital Investment Fund", $59,576,000; "Administration of Foreign Affairs, Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service", $9,400,000; "Administration of Foreign Affairs, Representation Allowances", $7,685,000; "Administration of Foreign Affairs, Payment to the American Institute in Taiwan", $19,904,000; "Administration of Foreign Affairs, Civilian Stabilization Initiative", $40,000,000; and "Administration of Foreign Affairs, Protection of Foreign Missions and Officials", $28,320,000.

SEC. 2103. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: "International Organizations, Contributions to International Organizations", $2,067,000,000; "International Organizations, Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities", $1,896,511,000; "Related Programs, United States Institute of Peace", $22,676,000, which shall not be used for construction activities; "Related Programs, East-West Center", $10,716,000; and "International Commissions, International Fisheries Commissions", $44,627,000.

AMENDED BY MR. WEINER

Mr. WEINER, Madam Chair. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 321, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $42,676,000)".

Page 399, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $42,676,000)"

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WEINER. Madam Chair, this amendment is a simple one. It strikes funding for the United States Institute of Peace. I'm going to direct most of my remarks today to my colleagues on the Democratic side, because I think this does insist upon bipartisan support.

I think the United States Institute of Peace is a great organization. I think they do great work. If you're going to rise today to say continue funding them because of all the great things they do, you don't need to bother. I agree with you.

The simple question is: After spending $720 million in taxpayer funds adjusted for inflation since 1985 not through a grant program but through a congressional earmark that has been dropped in year after year, the tax-payers have built this glorious new building.

By the way, this one right here is the State Department. That does many of the same things.

I can tell you that the Council on Foreign Relations hasn't gotten $721 million, the Foreign Policy Research Institute, the Brookings Institute, Cato, Roosevelt Institute, Council on Hemispheric Affairs, or none of the nearly 151 peace studies organizations at universities around the country.

I say to my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle, if for a moment we can focus on this, it is incumbent on all of us to also be seeing opportunities where we can find things in the budget that perhaps we can do without. Just like I do this with the think tanks were so many of the programs we felt important to us came under attack during the Reagan years, it sharpened our focus and it made us come up with better and better programs that dealt with some of the critique of our opponents. We need to do that now as well.

The idea of weeding out government waste is a Democratic progressive ideal. We want to do that.

This is a very, very good program. But should we spend $100 million of taxpayer money to build a think tank, a giant headquarters a stone's throw from the State Department? Should we be providing them money through grants from the Department of Defense or State Department? Maybe. They get those, too. But they get a different program.

Should we be providing them money through grants from the Department of Defense or State Department? Maybe. They get those, too. But they get a different program. They get those, too. But they get a different program.

The idea of weeding out government waste is a Democratic progressive ideal. We want to do that.

This is a very, very good program. But should we spend $100 million of taxpayer money to build a think tank, a giant headquarters a stone's throw from the State Department? Should we be providing them money through grants from the Department of Defense or State Department? Maybe. They get those, too. But they get a different program.

By the way, this one right here is the United States Institute of Peace. It's a good program. It does worthy projects. But it's a $100 million of U.S. tax-payer dollars. Go out and raise it like every other think tank.
General Petraeus is right. Let's keep the United States Institute of Peace, but let's stop paying for it in this way. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Chair, Congress created the U.S. Institute of Peace under the Defense Authorization Act of 1985. Since that time, USIP has been active on the ground in diverse conflict zones around the world, among them the Balkans, Afghanistan, Colombia, Iraq, Kashmir, Liberia, Nepal, Pakistan, the Palestinian Territories, Nigeria, Sudan, Uganda, and the Philippines.

With conflicts continuing around the globe, the institute's expertise and independence is an important resource for both the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense to utilize in protecting our national security and in promoting our values of liberty and democracy.

General David Petraeus stated it well in a 2009 letter to OMB: "I write to underscore the importance of the U.S. Institute of Peace to the missions the United States is currently pursuing in Iraq and Afghanistan. While I have long been an avid reader of USIP's analytical products, which are second to none in tracking the challenges we face in both countries and in outlining policy options, I have more recently been impressed with USIP's on-the-ground peacebuilders. USIP's experience working closely with the U.S. military will be a great asset in developing stronger unity of effort between civilian and military elements of government."

Former Secretary of State George Schultz, in a February 15, 2011, letter to the institute's President, echoed the comments of General Petraeus by saying: "We are in the most profound period of change in international affairs since the end of the Cold War; and the institute, as a small and agile operation, has demonstrated a unique capacity to innovate in approaches to managing conflicts abroad that affect U.S. interests."

Madam Chair, I have great respect for both General Petraeus and former Secretary of State George Schultz. The CR already reduces USIP's appropriation by over 6 percent. I cannot support further cuts, and I urge a "no" vote on the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Madam Chair, the U.S. Government simply must have options for solving international conflict other than military action. We are uniquely equipped to innovate in ways that provide access to civilian sectors in society and in outlining policy options, I have more recently been impressed with USIP's on-the-ground peacemaking efforts. General Petraeus called USIP's reconciliation work in Iraq "a striking success."

Here are several examples of what the Department of Defense, the Regional Command Commands and other components of the military have asked USIP to do, just in the past year, to help them deal with challenges:

- A joint program with the U.S. Army Combined Arms Center in Fort Leavenworth to convene multiple U.S. agencies and extract key lessons from the U.S. military to civilian transition in Iraq to help those confronting another massive handoff in Afghanistan.
- Comprehensive training for the U.S. Department of Defense's Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Office of the Secretary of Defense.
- USIP, Madam Chair, is a small, agile center of innovation in support of America's national security. Funding for it, obviously, should not be eliminated today.
- I want to draw from a letter that General Petraeus, the General of the United States Army Commanding Forces in Afghanistan, most recently wrote to Rob Goldberg, the Director of International Affairs at NSP:
- He says—and I extrapolate—"USIP's experience working closely with the U.S. military will be a great asset in developing stronger unity of effort between civilian and military elements of government. In fact, I hope soon to see U.S. military officers training alongside civilian and non-governmental counterparts in USIP's headquarters at 23rd and Constitution," the wonderful building that my colleague Mr. WEINER, one of the foremost leaders of this institution, pointed out to us just moments ago.
- "Their facility is not just an important symbol of our Nation's commitment to peace; it is also home to a wonderful training center that we hope to leverage to increase understanding and unity of effort in today's complex operations."
- The USIP is across the street, or just across the river, from the Pentagon, therefore giving access to our military leadership who are fighting abroad.

Mr. WEINER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. The gentleman correctly points out some of the great things they're doing on behalf of the Department of Defense. Is the gentleman aware that the United States Institute of Peace gets, in addition to the money that I've identified here, $135 million in transfer from DoD, USAID and the State Department? Is the gentleman aware that they already get grants to do that work and that the money that I am seeking to cut is above and beyond that work? Is the gentleman aware of that?

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I am aware of that.

That notwithstanding, the fact of the matter is this money is not wasted money. This money is dedicated to providing our military officers and civilian sectors of various combatant war zones in both Afghanistan and Iraq with an opportunity to interact.

This is not the responsibility of the Pentagon. This is not what the Pentagon does. So, with our military personnel on the ground, either as combatants or as noncombatants, having access to civilian sectors in society and helping them transition to peaceful forms of government and having conflict resolution at both levels are critical parts of our long-going mission in Afghanistan.

I would be happy to continue to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. Does the gentleman not believe that the Council on Foreign Relations is good or the Foreign Policy Research Institute or the Brookings Institution or all of the other institutes that do similar work but that don't live in this gilded building and that don't do so with government?

I mean, the question is not whether they're good. It's whether they should have this wondrous status that puts them primary among all think tanks that are doing very good work.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. In reclaiming the balance of my time, let me say that, while I recognize the importance of the other think tanks and the work that they do in achieving and working toward peace, the United States Government also has an obligation to work directly with civilian sectors in various combatant zones.

What is the United States Government's commitment to peace? Well, that commitment to peace manifests itself through the United States Institute for Peace, USIP, not through other foundations or through other means by which peace may be maintained.

I thank the gentleman for engaging in the debate.

Mr. ROB GOLDBERG, Director, International Affairs Division, National Security Programs, The Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC.

Mr. GOLDBERG. Madam Chair, I would like to underscore the importance of the US Institute for Peace (USIP) to the missions the United States is currently pursuing in Iraq and Afghanistan. While I have long been an avid reader of USIP's analytical products, which are second to none in tracking the challenges we face in both countries and in outlining policy options, I have more recently been impressed with USIP's on-the-ground peacebuilding efforts.
In Iraq, the Institute stepped up to the plate beginning in August 2007 to assist the 10th Mountain Division in a reconciliation effort in Mahmoudiya, a community on the south outskirts of Baghdad that was once known as the "Triangle of Death." Since then, General Odierno and I have often cited Mahmoudiya as a striking success story of USIP’s continuing reconciliation efforts at the community level, especially in Diyala and Ninewa, as well as at the national level in Baghdad, hold great promise for the future.

In Afghanistan, USIP’s work on the informal justice system has been invaluable as we work to establish the rule of law at the provincial level. Their plans for reconciliation efforts at the community level on the Afghanistan/Pakistan border are likewise a potential key to success in the enormous challenges we face.

USIP’s experience working closely with the US military will be a great asset in developing stronger unity of effort between civilian and military elements of government. In fact, I hope soon to see US military officers training alongside civilian governmental and nongovernmental counterparts in USIP’s headquarters at 23rd and Constitution. Their facility is not just an important symbol of USIP’s commitment to peace; it is also home to a wonderful training center that we hope to leverage to increase understanding and unity of effort in today’s complex world.

We can be proud of what USIP has done in the past, and I look forward with confidence to the contributions the Institute will make in the future. Sincerely,

David H. Petraeus,
General, United States Army, Commanding.

Mr. CRAVAACK. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAVAACK. I rise today in support of the amendment, and I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) for working across party lines to include us in this continuing resolution.

Madam Chair, after years of massive deficit spending and with a ballooning national debt, we must look for ways to rein in Washington’s out-of-control spending and begin the process of getting our fiscal house back in order.

That begins by cutting unnecessary and repetitive programs like the U.S. Institute of Peace. Make no mistake, I believe that the institute’s goals are also important and they are honorable. Who among us does not wish for peace, both for ourselves and for future generations of Americans?

But given our current fiscal constraints, I cannot justify spending over $42 million to pay for an organization whose role could be fulfilled by existing departments, agencies, or nonprofit organizations, many of which do not depend on the Federal Government for funding.

This program has essentially been on autopilot with no real congressional oversight since it was created over 25 years ago. Over that time, the taxpayers have spent over $700 million to fund this redundant organization. Enough is enough.

The people of northeast Minnesota sent me, like many of my freshman colleagues, to Washington because they are tired of unaccountable government wasting their hard-earned dollars and borrowing against their children’s future.

I am proud to note that this amendment is supported by Citizens Against Government Waste, a nonpartisan group whose mission is to eliminate waste, mismanagement, and inefficiency in the Federal Government.

They have an unnecessary program when they see it.

For example, in the building for the Institute of Peace—and this is from their Web site—there will be a contemplation area that will provide a quiet, meditative setting where visitors can reflect on their journey through the Global Peacebuilding Center. Enveloped in a spare, yet evocative, space combining a soothing water element with a generous gathering area, visitors will be encouraged to take time to consider the meaning of their recent experience.

Preliminary thoughts for the water feature suggest a piece of cantilevered, honed slate across which flows a thin sheet of water that spills off the table into a pool below.

Included in these areas is an immersion theater and paths to peace building. A culminating game will illustrate the winding path to peace, filled with challenges along the way. Visitors will determine the best route to take to reach a peaceful solution to a conflict. Signs along the way will flag obstacles to peace, opportunities for moving the peace process forward, and dangers of backsliding or losing ground.

In response to President Reagan signing this into existence, what actually occurred is former Representative Dante Fascell had a provision inserted at the last minute to title 17 of the Defense Authorization Act which then-President Reagan signed. General Petraeus, and I also agree, signed it in 2007 commending this organization but that was several years ago, and since then, we have had no oversight.

In closing, this is a real, tangible cut we can make today. Eliminating this funding and returning the money to the taxpayers is just one way we can show we are serious about getting down to business and righting our fiscal ship.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Chair, one of the great urgencies that we have in this country is to get our fiscal house in order. We’re paying more than $600 million a day in interest on our debt. Our national debt is now accumulated to something like $14 trillion; and when we have an opportunity, really an obligation to point out redundancies with-in our government, we have to take that obligation and act upon it.

The United States Institute of Peace is clearly one of those opportunities where we cite redundancy and we say we don’t need somebody competing, in essence, to do what is pursuant to the sentiment. Yes, they do great work in many different areas. They have been able to raise literally millions and millions of dollars from grants but, also, more importantly, from the outside world; and this is an opportunity for us to actually scale this back and allow that transition to happen.

Now, some will say, well, it is just another $40 million; that’s not going to be a big enough dent in the debt. The reality is, we have to start small. We have to see small things add up over the course of time. These appropriations that have happened year after year after year really on autopilot have now cost the taxpayers in excess of $700 million. We’re about to approach $1 billion, right in the shadows of the State Department.

Their primary mission is to do what the United States Institute of Peace is everything to do: to raise the money and be able to add to the equation, then they surely, with the letters that they get from General Petraeus and the former Secretary of State, can go out and use that in a fund-raising mechanism to continue in that effort. But for us to go back into the taxpayers’ wallet and pull money out and give it in favor of this particular institution, in contrast to what CATO and Heritage and all these other organizations that have been identified previously, is not fair, it’s not right, and in this case, I would urge my colleagues to understand the redundancy that is going on here and say, please, this is an opportunity where we can truly make a cut.

I appreciate the great work that the Representative from New York (Mr. WEINER) has done and the gentleman from Minnesota who has spoken to this. I concur with that.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There seems to be some confusion about the role of the State Department and the role of the Institute of Peace. We know that the State Department is responsible for diplomacy, and the Institute of Peace is the only institute that the United States of America has on the ground that advances peace in conflict areas, sustainable peace.

Would the gentleman please comment for us on the difference between diplomacy at the State Department peace? Peace and responsibility of the State Department.

Mr. WEINER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. I appreciate you yielding. Peace is not the job of the State Department? That is exactly—
Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Diplomacy is the responsibility of the State Department.

Mr. WEINER. Diplomacy and not towards making a grilled cheese sandwich; diplomacy towards making peace.

Look, we're parsing here. The fact of the matter is it's a nonprofit think tank that does a great job. Pursuing peace is a good thing. I don't believe Mr. CHAFFETZ and I are against pursuing peace.

Their only question is, when we are apportioning Federal dollars in the budget, do we say to one institute that tries to foster peace, you're going to get money, and another, you're not? Do we say to one, you're going to get a building, and the other, you're not? Do we say, one, you're going to go through competitive grants; the other is not?

That's the only question. The idea there's only one—maybe Mr. CHAFFETZ can speak to this. The idea there's only one role, that role is to build peace. I believe, Mr. JACKSON, you know that that's not the case.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Reclaiming my time, I would state that it is the overarching goal of the United States of America to pursue peace. I think we are a very peaceful Nation. I think to the President, the Congress, the State Department, the Department of Defense, the overall goal of the United States of America is to achieve peace; and if we have anybody who is trying to pursue anything other than peace, I would take issue with that.

Mr. WEINER. If the gentleman would yield, I also think we need to change the way we think here. A lot of us are, like, why would you want to defund anything with peace in its name?

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Reclaiming my time, I am not going to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Once the conflict in Afghanistan is over, once the conflict in Iraq is over and we have an embassy in Iraq and Afghanistan, it is not the responsibility of the embassy in Afghanistan or Iraq to be responsible for conflict resolution in various provinces as a result of conflict.

The Institute of Peace has a very different role than that of the State Department in a combat zone. There's a very, very different role for the Institute of Peace.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. BERMAN. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Chairman, I plan to vote against this amendment. I want to just make two points: one, the argument from New York is very good if, in fact, U.S. Institute of Peace was simply another think tank. If it were, then why shouldn't they compete like other think tanks do for projects and contracts through the discretionary funds of the appropriate agencies and decided on that basis?

But the U.S. Institute of Peace is not just the Brookings Institute or the Heritage Foundation. It's really more of a "do" tank than a think tank. It engages very specifically in projects, implementing projects that have direct benefits for our forces and for our diplomats based on their charter.

Secondly, if we're going to zero out the U.S. Institute of Peace because it's no longer necessary because it isn't worthy of a direct earmark, then repeal the legislation that created it. There wasn't legislation that created Heritage or Brookings or American Enterprise Institute. These were private enterprises; the Institute of Peace was created by legislation, passed by both Houses. This wasn't dropped in in some committee. This was a piece of legislation that authorized and created that institute. And what happened every year is decide what appropriation should come, as the gentlelady from Texas said in her opening remarks.

They've already taken a whack out of the Institute of Peace for this particular year because—in some cases, they took a bigger whack out of some programs that I wish they hadn't done, but they have cut this. But then to come back with legislation to repeal the authorizing legislation, and then there will be nothing to earmark for, nothing to fund.

The fact is, yeah, it's a nice building and it's right next door to a pretty drab building, the State Department. The State Department may not like the building they're in, but they sure like to use the U.S. Institute of Peace for a whole variety of activities that they think they're able to get value added from, and they choose to direct recommend contracts with and partner with the U.S. Institute of Peace on a whole variety of projects, as does the Pentagon.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. WEINER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. I just want to make sure that it's clear what we're saying. Mr. CHAFFETZ doesn't think this amendment believes they should cease to exist. You can go to their Web site. They also have the benefit of being a beneficiary of private funds that they raise in large amounts. They can raise $70 million a year.

And it was Mr. JACKSON who suggested that somehow no one else can do this work. And the State Department has an Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction Stabilization. The Defense Department has an Arts Control and Disarmament Agency. These functions exist within the agencies. No one is saying it should not exist. It should exist, just not in this way.

Mr. BERNIE. I respect that the gentleman is not saying they shouldn't exist. But this isn't a matter of whether or not they should exist. It's that we, by statute, decided to create them for very specific purposes. If you don't think this is worthy of Federal funds, then come back with legislation to repeal the authorization and the creation of this institute. Don't keep a statute on the books that creates an institution which we're now going to take away the direct appropriation for.

Mr. WEINER. I move to strike the last word.

Mr. CANSECO. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. CRAVAACK. Madam Chair, just to discuss a point about the Institute of Peace being not like any other organization, actually, they are.

The Afghan Study Center, where they will go in to conduct 2-day, 1-day seminars in Kabul province on national unity, peace, and stability.

The Cooperation for Peace and Unity organization, resolve longstanding conflicts on Pashtun Sunnis over disputed government wells. They got their respective community stakeholders on peaceful approaches to resolve their disputes.

Another organization, Cooperation Center Afghanistan. The CCA will map ethnic-based conflicts in central Afghanistan, train local members and civil society leaders on conflict resolution, and conduct community outreach to promote nonviolent practices in conflict situations.

These, dear colleagues, are in-country. This is the point that the Institute of Peace does.

Now, the bottom line for this is we are $14.1 trillion in debt. We are selling
Mr. WEINER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANSECO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. I just want to also make something else clear. You know, one of the ironies of the way the U.S. Institute of Peace operates is that they are also in the grant-making business with our taxpayer dollars, about $50 million. They actually use this as a defense for their practice. They say, oh, wait a minute, Congressman. We pass along some of our money to other institutions. We understand there are other people that do our business. That's not their job. That should be the job either of an agency that they're contracted with, the Department of Defense or State, or Congress.

Now we find that we need them to give money to other institutions. They, themselves, rebut what Mr. JACKSON and what Mr. BERMAN were saying because they've identified universities and nonprofits.

The gentleman from Minnesota is exactly right, that there are institutions that do this. According to—this was just a very cursory search. 151 peace study programs are underway now in colleges around the United States. Just maybe one of them can do this as well. Maybe the competition will help some. Maybe a couple of them can work together to maybe figure out ways to do this same work. The presumption that we have here on this floor, that there's something magical about the U.S. Institute of Peace's ability to do it, is what the gentleman from Minnesota is referring to. I even heard that introduced by the gentleman from California last year. And if I went to the transcripts since 1985 of oversight hearings, I would have very little reading to do because we didn't have any. So what we're really relying upon is the benevolence of this organization to say, yes, give us more than the $50 million we've gotten, we'll do good things with it.

The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. CRAVAACK. I thank the gentleman from New York, and thank the gentleman from Texas for the time.

Mr. CANSECO. I yield back the balance of my time, Madam Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The questions is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. CANSECO

Mr. CANSECO. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 321, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $10,716,000)".

Page 359, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $10,716,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CANSECO. Madam Chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. McLINTOCK), and I have introduced a very simple amendment. Specifically, the amendment would eliminate the $10.716 million in funding for the East-West Center.

The East-West Center was established in 1960, according to its Web site, "to foster better relations and understanding among the peoples of the United States, Asia, and the Pacific Islands through programs of cooperative study, training, and research." Last year, the Federal Government appropriated $23 million to the East-West Center. On top of the Federal funds it received, the East-West Center raises money from private sources.

I'm not here to debate the merits of the East-West Center. I'm not here to question whether or not the money has been used to do good things. What I'm here to do today is to debate and question why this program should be considered a priority and receive taxpayer funding when we're in a fiscal crisis.

Let me no set the record straight—let me no set the record straight. We are in a fiscal crisis that threatens not only our economic security but our national security. However, you don't have to take my word for it. Admiral Mike Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has said, "I think the biggest threat we have to our national security is our debt."

Fiscal adjustments will come as a rapid and painful response to a looming or actual fiscal crisis. No doubt we are making tough decisions here today to begin putting our budget back on a sustainable fiscal path. Yet, as painful as some of these decisions are, it will be more painful for our children and grandchildren if we do not get our fiscal house in order.

Is that the legacy we want to leave our children and grandchildren? I think not.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CHAFFETZ). The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GRANGER. I rise to address the gentleman's amendment to eliminate funding for the East-West Center. Historically the House has not included funding for the center in the subcommittee bill, not because the center's work is not useful or is wasteful but because of the need to address other more important diplomatic and development priorities.

Strong advocates have urged the House to continue funding in conference negotiations. The committee again considered eliminating funding in the CR. But were we advised by the center that their projected obligations through March of this year exceeded $8 million. As a result, the decision was made to continue the center's funding, but at half of last year's level to adjust for what was planned to be spent.

Having said that, I share the gentleman's objective, and I'm prepared to accept the amendment with the understanding that the $8 million in obligations during the CR period will preclude us from eliminating the agency entirely.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from American Samoa is recognized for 5 minutes.

(MR. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Royce, Canseco, and McClintock amendments which seek to eliminate all together any and all funding for the East-West Center.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1, the base bill put forward by the Republicans, already cuts the East-West Center from the current $23 million to $10.7 million. But my friends across the aisle want to eliminate any and all funding for this institution.

While I will agree that we need to cut the Federal budget, I do not believe we...
should carelessly use a machete, a samurai sword or a sledgehammer to discard programs that are necessary to protecting U.S. interests in this region of the world. The East-West Center was established by Federal law of the U.S. Congress in 1960. President Eisenhower signed the East-West Education and Cultural Exchange Act of 1960 which authorized its creation only after the State Department conducted a study and reported back to Congress about the relevance of establishing the East-West Center.

President John F. Kennedy also signed an act which appropriated additional funding, and every President since then, both Republican and Democrat, have done the same. Why? Because the East-West Center promotes a better understanding among the peoples and nations of the United States, Asia, and the Pacific region, and this understanding is critical to our own economic, political, and social interests, especially our strategic and military interests as a reflection of the world's power distribution.

The Asia Pacific region is the world's most populous region, where more than 4 billion people live, currently more than 60 percent of the world's population. Two of the three largest economies in the world are in the Asia Pacific region.

Our trade and commercial relations with the Asia Pacific region are critical to our own economic interests in this important region. Since the East-West Center is not solely funded by the Federal Government but also receives the majority of its funding from private agencies, individuals, foundations, and corporations, I agree that the Federal support can be scaled back, and this has already been done by the committee's mark of 50 percent deductions at the urging of this institution.

My friends on the other side want to go further than their own party by a total Federal funding cut to help in the operations of this institution. For the information of my colleagues here, more than 50,000 people from the Asia Pacific region have participated in East-West Center programs, including many who currently hold high positions of leadership, including heads of government, cabinet members, universities, NGO presidents, corporate and media leaders coming as eminently as they were participants in this important institution.

Mr. Chairman, I think the U.S. would do well to keep its seat at this table, and for this reason, I ask my colleagues to support the base bill and the committee's mark concerning this important institution.

And I do want to say that while I have the utmost respect for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, they wanted to eliminate this institution. We do have an authorizing law that continues to provide for the continued support of the activities of this important institution that has done many things in promoting and to enhance a better relationship between our country and the countries of the Asia Pacific region.

I respectfully request that these amendments not be approved. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have the majority.

Mr. CANSECO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting Chair. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk reads as follows:

S. 2104. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: “International Commissions, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, Salaries and Expenses”, $11,852,000; “International Commissions, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, Construction”, $23,286,000; “International Commissions, Authorization for Appropriations, the Americas Section”, $11,852,000; “Related Programs, The Asia Foundation”, $14,749,000; “Other Commissions, Commission for the Preservation and Development of the World Heritage Sites in America, Salaries and Expenses”, $597,000; “Other Commissions, United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, Salaries and Expenses”, $1,042,000; “Other Commissions, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, Salaries and Expenses”, $2,453,000; “Other Commissions, Congressional-Executive Commission on China, Salaries and Expenses”, $1,880,000; and “Other Commissions, United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission”, $2,920,000.

S. 2105. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: “Related Agency, Broadcasting Board of Governors, International Broadcasting Operations”, $689,761,000; and “Related Agency, Broadcasting Board of Governors, Broadcasting Capital Improvement”, $5,785,000.

S. 2106. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: “Related Programs, Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs”, $501,347,000; “Related Programs, National Endowment for Democracy”, $110,920,000, of which $100,000,000 shall be allocated in the traditional and customary manner, including for the core institutes: “Bilateral Economic Assistance, Independent Agencies, Africa, Peace Corps, Pakistan, Independent Agencies, Peace Corps, Africa”, $20,380,000; and “Bilateral Economic Assistance, Independent Agencies, African Development Foundation”, $29,757,000.

S. 2107. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: “United States Agency for International Development, Funds Appropriated to the President, Operating Expenses”, $1,267,872,000; “United States Agency for International Development, Funds Appropriated to the President, Capital Investment Account”, $120,777,000; and “United States Agency for International Development, Funds Appropriated to the President, Office of Inspector General”, $48,710,000.

S. 2108. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: “Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Development Assistance”, $1,773,780,000; “Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia”, $697,134,000; and “Bilateral Economic Assistance, Independent Agencies, Millennium Challenge Account”, $112,800,000.

SEC. 2109. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: “Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Economic Support Fund”, $5,706,552,000; “Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Democracy Fund”, $312,800,000; “Department of the Treasury, International Affairs Technical Assistance”, $20,235,000; and “Department of the Treasury, Debt Restructuring”, $39,055,000.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 324, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by $20,000,000)”.

Page 359, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by $20,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, the Tropical Forest Conservation Act is a $20 million-a-year program, and perhaps one of the more successful of any that I have seen so far. It calls into question any of the claims that we can’t possibly spare a dollar from this section of the budget.

Under this program, the United States, staggering under the biggest peacetime debt in the Nation’s history, a debt so large that the United States of America would now be denied entry into the European Union because of our excessive debt, nevertheless is paying down the debts of developing countries if they do restoration and conservation work in their own rainforests. Really? The deficit this year alone puts an average family of four on the hook for about $20,000 of additional debt that they must repay through their future taxes just as surely as if it appeared on their credit card, and part of that debt will be used to pay down the debt of developing countries if they develop their rainforests.

Of course if they cut down their rainforests to grow corn, they can get American ethanol subsidies, but that’s a subject for another day.

History is screaming this warning at us, that countries that bankrupt themselves aren’t around very long.

Before we pay down the debt of developing countries, I would like to make this modest suggestion: perhaps we ought to tend to our own.

I yield back the balance of my time.
The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2110. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: "Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Independent Agencies, Peace Corps" shall be $330,789,000.

SEC. 2112. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for "Bilateral Economic Assistance, Independent Agencies, Peace Corps" shall be $330,789,000.

SEC. 2114. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: "International Security Assistance, Department of State, Peacekeeping Operations", $305,000,000.

SEC. 2115. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: "International Security Assistance, Department of State, Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Programs", $740,000,000; and "International Security Assistance, Department of State, Peacekeeping Operations", $305,000,000.

SEC. 2116. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: "Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Pakistan Countermisadny, Capability Fund", $1,000,000,000, which shall remain available until September 30, 2012, and shall be available to the Secretary of State under the terms and conditions provided for this Fund in Public Law 111–12; and "International Security Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Foreign Military Financing Program", $3,385,000,000, of which not less than $3,000,000,000 shall be available for grants and $1,000,000 shall be available for grants only for Egypt and $300,000,000 shall be available for assistance for Jordan: Provided, That the dollar amount provided under this heading for "International Security Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Foreign Military Financing Program" in division B of Public Law 111–117 shall be deemed to be $789,000,000 for the purpose of applying funds appropriated under such heading by this division.

SEC. 2117. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: "Multilateral Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, International Financial Institutions, Global Environment Facility", $2,230,000,000; "Multilateral Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, International Financial Institutions, Global Environmental Facility", $2,230,000,000; "Multilateral Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, International Development Association", $20,127,000; "Multilateral Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, International Financial Institutions, Contribution to the Africa Transition Initiatives", $154,585,000; and "Multilateral Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, International Financial Institutions, International Fund for Agricultural Development", $17,926,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. HELLER

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 326, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $2,599,270)".

Page 326, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $2,918,415)".

Page 326, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $4,642,900)".

Page 326, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $44,935,065)".

Page 359, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $211,244,700)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Nevada is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

Earlier this evening, or I should say last night, I had a tele-town hall meeting. I did this once a week. Generally what we do in this town is we talk about what we're doing on the floor today: trying to create jobs to reducing the size of our Federal Government. So I open it up and I ask people, What would you cut? Or, send me an email. Go to the website and hit the appropriate button to send me an email. Tell me what you would cut out of this Federal Government. And I got, obviously, numerous responses, as I'm sure most people in this audience would.

But I have to tell you, at the top of everybody's list, frankly, if it's not the top two or three, it's always in the top five, is to cut foreign aid. So we have an opportunity to do that today. So what my amendment does is it cuts $211,244,700 from the Multilateral Economic Assistance Account in the State Foreign Operations section.

This number is 14.5 percent of the account. And I am asked, What is the purpose of the 14.5 percent of this particular account? Well, 14.5 percent happens to match the State with the highest unemployment in the country, and that State happens to be the State of Nevada, the State that I am from.

This money is going to go to debt reduction. And I would like to talk about what frankly is being cut in this particular amendment. Some of us have heard of these organizations. Most of us haven't.

For example, we can go to the Global Environmental Facility, GEF. They make grants to help developing countries deal with global environmental problems.

We're going to cut the International Development Association from the World Bank. IIDA lends concessional rates to low-income countries. What is a concessional rate? That means we're just going to take your tax dollars, and World Bank is going to actually lend it for less than you can go to your own bank to get a loan. So it is kind of a double whammy: we're going to take your money, and then we're going to loan it for less than you can actually get the loan yourself.

The Clean Technology Fund seeks to reduce the growth of greenhouse gas emissions in developing countries.

The Strategic Climate Fund seeks to address climate change under the auspices of the World Bank.

We can go through the list, some of them actually quite interesting. The International American Development Bank, Enterprise for the American Multilateral Investment Fund. I don't know how many people have heard of many of these, but this is where your tax dollars go in this foreign aid.

How about the Asian Development Fund? I wonder if some Asian country gets a concessional rate, China perhaps, to buy our own government securities with.


My point here, Mr. Chairman, is it is not our responsibility to create jobs in foreign countries. Our responsibility is to create jobs right here at home. And I choose America first. I think that's what our constituents are asking: In this process, do you choose America first over foreign aid to some of these other countries?

I choose America first. I choose Nevada first. And I think when our Nation is facing some significant budget crisis and many Americans needs are still unmet, the fact that Congress continues sending so much money overseas is unconscionable, and I believe the Federal Government is responsible to Americans before any other country. I support reducing foreign spending, and I strongly urge all my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. I understand that it is quite easy in a time of fiscal belt tightening to offer an amendment to reduce funding for international financial institutions, but I would encourage my colleagues to recognize that voting in favor of this amendment has serious consequences for U.S. interests.

The amendment would cut funding to the Asian Development Fund, which provides loans and grants to support basic health care, education, infrastructure, and economic development resources to frontline countries such as Pakistan and Afghanistan.
developing countries and is supporting an integrated agricultural initiative to address the global food crisis.

The Global Environment Facility, which provides grants and loans to preserve some of the most vulnerable habitats on the planet. The International Fund for Agricultural Development, which provides grants and loans to the poorest of the poor to support food security programs as a compliment to U.S. Government-funded programs.

The amendment would undermine the ability of the United States to meet its commitment to global debt relief efforts and to countries around the world that rely on grants and loans from these institutions to stabilize their economies.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce strongly opposes this amendment. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce strongly opposes this amendment because it would impair the ability of U.S. companies to access developing markets. The Chamber recognizes that these programs help build reliable trading partners for the United States, which in turn creates jobs here at home and strengthens our own economy. In light of that fact, it is puzzling why the majority would propose these cuts.

With regard to international organizations, the CR cuts the request to below levels enacted under President Bush. This level would result in draconian cuts to our contributions to UNICEF, the United Nations Development Program, the Montreal Protocol to prevent ozone-depleting substances, and a wide range of programs that address counterterrorism and security activities, sustainable development, humanitarian needs, reduce violence against women, human rights, scientific, environmental, and international trade development. This would represent a major step back from U.S. engagement in these organizations and would dramatically impact U.S. national security.

This cut would harm U.S. support for efforts in international development, human rights and environmental areas, as well as send the wrong signal to our partners and allies.

I urge a no vote on this amendment.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I raise in opposition to this amendment.

As my ranking member, Mrs. LOWEY from New York pointed out, the funding for international operations and programs in the CR is already below levels enacted under President Bush. This would cut it further. It means redirection to a fund for victims of terrorism. In Yemen, an NGO is working through a combination of youth chat radio series, youth leadership trainings, and public roundtables and forums to increase public awareness and understanding of religious freedom and tolerance.

In the West Bank, the funding has helped promote tolerance among youth by working with teachers and administrators.

And in the Sudan, in response to widespread violence against women in Darfur, the fund supported critical services and public outreach to survivors of gender-based violence.

Without the Democracy Fund, DRL and the State Department would be unable to support efforts to push the Chinese government to more actively disengage in gender-based violence.

These are just a few of the essential programs that are covered and are cut in the CR and that will be cut further by this amendment. For all these reasons, I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) are postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk reads as follows:

S. 1102.

Amending Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting "$668,000" for "$711,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$668,000" for "$711,000" in the second paragraph.

Amending Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting "$876,850,000" in the first paragraph; and by substituting "$876,850,000" in the first paragraph; and by substituting "$876,850,000" in the first paragraph; and by substituting "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph.

Amending Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting "$824,239,000" for "$876,850,000" in the first paragraph; and by substituting "$796,462,000" for "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$796,462,000" for "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$796,462,000" for "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph; and by substituting "$847,300,000" in the second paragraph.
(c) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level in the second paragraph under the heading “Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Development Credit Account” shall be $2,149,780,000.

SEC. 2118. Notwithstanding section 1101, the amounts included under the heading “Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Global Emergency Humanitarian Aid, Child Survival” in division F of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting in the second paragraph “$2,420,000,000” for “$2,420,000,000” and “$3,595,000,000” for “$3,485,000,000”.

SEC. 2119. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be $0: “Administration of Foreign Affairs, Buying Power Maintenance Account”; “Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Complex Crises Fund”; “Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, International Fund for Ireland”; “Multilateral Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Contribution to the Clean Technology Development Fund”; “Multilateral Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Contribution to the Strategic Climate Fund”.

SEC. 2120. (a) Of the unobligated balances available from funds appropriated under the heading “Development Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Export-Import Bank of the United States, Subsidy Appropriation” in the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, Appropriations Act, 2009 (division H of Public Law 111–8) and under such heading in prior acts making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs, $150,000,000 are rescinded.

(b) Of the unobligated balances from funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the Buy Washington Post, $13,960,000 are rescinded.

(c) Of the unobligated balances available for the Development Assistance Account, as identified by Treasury Appropriation Fund Symbols 7206/111021, $1,000,000 are rescinded.

(d) Of the unobligated balances available for the Fund for the Independence of the Former Soviet Union account, as identified by Treasury Appropriation Fund Symbols 7206/111093, 7207/121093, and 72X1093, $17,000,000 are rescinded.

(e) Of the unobligated balances available for the International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement account, as identified by Treasury Appropriation Fund Symbols, 11X1022, 1106/121022, and 191105/11022, $7,183,000 are rescinded.

SEC. 2121. (a) Notwithstanding section 65(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2421(b)), the President shall transmit to Congress the report required under section 65 with respect to funds appropriately made available by this division for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs, and such report shall include a comparison of amounts, by category of assistance, provided or intended to be provided from funds appropriated for fiscal years 2010 and 2011, for each foreign country and international organization.

(b) Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this division, each department, agency, or instrumentality funded by this division or by division F of Public Law 111–117 shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations an operating plan for such funds that provides for the achievement of specific and measurable performance capabilities, including the availability of funding, such that the report required under subsection (a) shall be considered to have met the requirements of this subsection with respect to funds made available to carry out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act: Provided, That the report required under this paragraph shall be—(i) required to be provided from funds appropriated in division F of Public Law 111–117 for assistance for Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq, the Caribbean Basin, Lebanon, Mexico, and the Middle East and North Africa; (ii) required under the headings “Diplomatic and Consular Programs”, “Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance”, “International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement”, “Civilians Stabilization Initiative”, and “Peace Corps” shall be consistent with the requirements of this subsection.

(c) The reports required under subsection (b) shall not be considered as meeting the notification requirements under section 7054 ofdivision F of Public Law 111–117 or under section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

SEC. 2122. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the dollar amounts under paragraphs (1) through (4) under the heading “Administration of Foreign Affairs, Diplomatic and Consular Programs” in division F of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division: Provided, That the dollar amounts to be derived from the second and third sentences of section 50(a) under such heading shall be “$1,792,904” and “$350,000” respectively: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated by this division shall be used for the United States Ambassador’s Fund for Cultural Preservation.

(b) Division F of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division under the heading “Development Assistance” by substituting “shall” for “should” in each place it appears in the fourth and sixteenth provisos.

(c) Division F of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division under the heading “Economic Support Fund” by substituting “shall” for “should” in each place it appears in the fourth and sixteenth provisos.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the following provisions in division F of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division:

(1) Section 7045.

(2) Section 7042(a), (b)(1), (c), and (d)(1).

(3) Section 7045:

(A) Subsections (a) and (b)(2).

(B) The first sentence of subsection (e).

(C) The first sentence of subsection (e)(1).

(D) The first sentence of subsection (f).

(E) Subsection (h).

(4) Section 7070(b).

(5) Section 7071(g)(3).

(6) The third proviso under the heading “Administration of Foreign Affairs, Diplomatic and Consular Programs”.

(7) The fourth proviso under the heading “Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia”.

(e)(1) Notwithstanding the proviso in section 7060 in division F of Public Law 111–117, of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this division for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs, not more than $440,000,000 may be made available for family planning and reproductive health activities or other population assistance made available by this division for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the period beginning on October 1, 2010, and ending on September 30, 2011, to the International Organizations for Food and Agriculture, the United Nations Population Fund: Provided further, That section 7068 of division F of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

(2) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this division for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for population planning activities or other population assistance may be made available to any foreign nongovernmental organization when the life of the mother would not be endangered if the fetus were carried to term.

(3) Notwithstanding section 7063(4)(d) of division F of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting “shall” for “should” in each place it appears in the fourth provisos.

(g) Section 7061 of division F of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division: Provided, That the second proviso under the heading “Peace Corps” in division F of Public Law 111–117 is repealed.

(h) Section 7042 of division F of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting “$655,900,000” for the dollar amount in subsection (c)(1).

SEC. 2123. (a) The first proviso under the heading “Economic Support Fund” in division F of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting the following for “Provided, That of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this division, up to $250,000,000 may be provided for assistance for Egypt: Provided further, That any assistance made available to the Government of Egypt shall be provided with the understanding that the Government of Egypt shall proceed with the under- taking of significant economic and democratic reforms that are additional to those that were undertaken in previous fiscal years.”:

(b) The tenth proviso under the heading “Economic Support Fund” in division F of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting the following for “Provided further, That funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this division for assistance for Afghanistan and Pakistan may not be made available for direct government-to-government assistance unless the Secretary of State certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that the relevant implementing agency has been assessed and considered qualified to manage such funds and that the Government of the United States and the government of the recipient country have agreed, in writing, that such funds are used for the purposes for which they were intended.”:

(c) The second proviso under the heading “International Security Assistance, Department of State, Peacekeeping Operations” in division F of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied by substituting the following: “Provided further, That not to exceed $55,918,000 may be used to pay assessments to the International Peacekeeping activities in Somalia, except that up to an additional $35,000,000 may be made available for such purpose subject to donor consultation, and the regular notification procedures of the, Committees on Appropriations”:

(d) Section 7034(n) of division F of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by adding at the end before the period the following: “Provided, That not less than $10,000,000 shall be..."
Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. My Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 334, line 23, insert before the colon 

(2) or (3) of section 5(a) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172).

(3) Section 7061(b) of division F of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ‘‘shall” for ‘‘should” each place it appears.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. My Chairman, there are now reports that Iranian ships are passing unimpeded through the Suez Canal this very night.

The Obama administration recently said the Muslim Brotherhood is largely a secular group which has eschewed violence and has decried al Qaeda as a perversion of Islam, and that they have pursued social ends and a betterment of the political order in Egypt, and decried the agenda, particularly in pursuit of violence. Mr. Chairman, what a preposterous and expressively dangerous statement to make. The terrorist group Hamas is an offshoot of the Muslim Brotherhood, and al Qaeda itself was catalyzed by the Muslim Brotherhood. Mohamed Badi, the Brotherhood’s Supreme Guide, recently pledged the Brotherhood would “continue to raise the banner of jihad” against the Jews. He called the Jews the Brotherhood’s “first and foremost enemies.”

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. My Chairman, there is no question that America recognizes for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. My Chairman, there is no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. My Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. My Chairman, there is no objection.
fees” on any woman who lacks permission to give birth or evades detection. Many women have their children on the run. Ruinous fines—from 1 to 10 times the combined annual salaries of both parents, plus jail, torture, property confiscation, loss of employment, loss of annual birth permits, house arrest, and high-pressure family planning cadres—are all weapons routinely employed by the so-called family planning cadres to ensure compliance with the one child per couple policy.

In denying U.S. funds to the UNFPA in 2006, Deputy Secretary of State John Negroponte wrote, “China’s birth limitation program retains harshly coercive elements in law and practice, including coercive abortion and involuntary sterilization.” The number two at the State Department said it is illegal in almost all provinces for a single mom to bear a child. The State Department noted that Chinese law is “the foundation of its coercive policies and practices” and that the UNFPA complies with and adheres to that Chinese law.

Mr. Chairman, the UNFPA-supported one child per couple policy has led to the worst gender disparity in any nation in all of human history. Where are the missing girls in China? Dead, Mr. Chairman. Murdered because they were female. Systematically destroyed over 30 years by sex-selective abortion.

Today, there are as many as 100 million missing girls in China—gendercide, the evil twin of genocide.

The social implications of the UNFPA-supported one child per couple policy are absolutely staggering. According to the World Health Organization, about 500 Chinese women commit suicide every single day. China has become a magnet for sex trafficking in large measure because of the “missing girls.” An estimated 40 million men won’t be able to find wives by 2020 because for 30 years and counting girls have suffered the ultimate gender discrimination—sex-selective abortion.

A little over a year ago, Mr. Chairman, I convened a congressional hearing on China’s one-child-per-couple policy—the 27th hearing on human rights violations in the PRC that I’ve chaired.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. I had not intended to speak to my colleagues on this issue, but I do feel that my friend, the gentleman, does deserve a response to clarify the facts and to talk to this body about why funding for UNFPA is so important.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I fervently believe that UNFPA is essential to achieving our global health goals. UNFPA’s family planning and reproductive health activities are key elements of global health, and they contribute to the comprehensive strategy of the U.S. for sustainable development. The UNFPA improves the reproductive and maternal health of women around the world through the implementation of effective voluntary—voluntary—voluntary—voluntary—voluntary!—voluntary... the list goes on. It is the largest multilateral provider of family planning and reproductive health information and services with programs in nearly 150 countries.

The U.S. Government’s partnership with the UNFPA leverages funds for these health programs, including the reduction of maternal mortality, the promotion of the human rights of women, including those affected by conflict and natural disasters, and it extends the reach of U.S. Government support to a number of countries where USAID does not have programs.

UNFPA works with governments to develop and strengthen laws and national policies to promote the equality, the prevention of gender-based violence, including in refugee and conflict situations. Improving the health and well-being of populations in other countries, especially those of women and children, promotes internal stability and social and economic progress.

I would like to remind my colleagues that the Kemp-Kasten amendment prohibits funding for any organization or program which, as determined by the President of the United States, supports or participates in the management of a program of coercive abortion or involuntarily sterilization.

We oppose China’s coercive birth limitation policies. The facts show that UNFPA does not support or participate in the management of any program of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization. In fact, UNFPA works to eliminate them.

In 2008, the department concluded, based on the review of available facts, that the UNFPA does not engage in these activities. We continue to monitor UNFPA’s programs. We continue to believe that UNFPA’s activities in China do not implicate Kemp-Kasten. As part of our due diligence, the department sent a team to China to review UNFPA’s program in June 2010 prior to the UNFPA executive board’s renewal of the China Country Program.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUELKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUELKAMP. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I will just take a minute, Mr. Chairman, because the hour is late.

The problem with the United Nations Population Fund activities in China is not that it is not adhering to Chinese law. Chinese law is a one-child-per-couple policy, and it has a direct result in the clinics and in the programs that are run in the approximately 30 counties that UNFPA oversees or has programs in or projects. Each and every one of those adhere to this one-child-per-couple policy. Yes, they may say you can choose to be sterilized or have an IUD implant, but one of the very things that women are forced to have it. It is compulsory. It is involuntary. So they enforce the involuntariness, the compulsory nature, but they may give a choice as to what method a person may be able to follow. That is not voluntary.

I would also point out that, for 30 years, representatives of the UNFPA have said publicly again and again and again that the Chinese program is “totally voluntary.” Nothing I would submit to my good friend and colleague from New York could be further from the truth. There was nothing voluntary about this horrific program where women are treated like chattel.

As a Member of Congress, I have held 27 hearings as chair of the Human Rights Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee—27 hearings just on China. We heard from numerous women who were forcibly aborting. They told us about how they were forced to abort after being rounded up—that this was a voluntary abortion. They were coerced. They had sessions with cadres who wore them down; them—that this was a voluntary abortion. They were coerced. They had sessions with cadres who wore them down; and over time, they submitted, feeling they had no way to fight back.

I had a woman testify. Her name is Wujuan. She recently got asylum right here in the United States. She had a well-founded fear of persecution based on the forced abortion policy. A student at a major university here, she testified through a Chinese translator that she was forced to abort after being rounded up with other women.

She said, at the clinic, which was voluntary—all of this is voluntary according to the UNFPA—that there were moms crying, rolling on the floor. She said, when they killed her baby and severed the baby’s limbs with scissors and a cure that the nurse actually put a foot on, near the top of her lapel. She looked at the bloody foot and broke down, crying. She could not finish her testimony.

I will provide that to the gentlelady if she would like to see it.

The UNFPA has enabled these crimes, and they are crimes against humanity. At the Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal, forced abortion was properly construed to be a crime against humanity because it was employed by the Nazis against Polish women.

People like Wei Jingsheng and Harry Wu—the great human rights activists—have all been very clear that the one-child-per-couple policy is one of the worst violations, if not the worst violations, of human rights in scope, in magnitude directed against women and, of course, against the dead children who are the result.

The UNFPA is a part of that. They defend it.

With all due respect to my good friend, this funding of an organization that says that this is a voluntary program must cease, because they give
So I would like to say to the gentleman, as we are closing this debate, thank you for your good work. We can agree to disagree on this issue, but I think this is such an important program and we have provided such invaluable help to women that I would hope that at some point we could agree on that.

I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding, and I thank our chairwoman for your important work on this issue.

Mr. NADLER. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2124. (a) In General.—Subsections (b) through (d) of this section shall apply to funds appropriated by this division in lieu of section 7067 of division F of Public Law 111–117.

(b) Limitation.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this division under the headings “Economic Support Fund” and “International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement” may be obligated for assistance for Afghanistan until the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), certifies to the Committees on Appropriations the following:

(1) The Government of Afghanistan is demonstrating a commitment to reduce corruption and improve governance, including by investigating, prosecuting, and sanctioning serious and corrupt officials;

(2) Funds appropriated under the headings “Economic Support Fund” and “International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement” may be obligated for assistance for Afghanistan until the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), certifies to the Committees on Appropriations on October 26, 2010 (CN 10–298),

(3) Funds will be programmed to support and strengthen the capacity of Afghan public and private institutions to reduce corruption and to improve transparency and accountability of national, provincial, and local governments, as outlined in the spending plan submitted to the Committees on Appropriations on October 26, 2010 (CN 10–298),

(4) Representatives of Afghan national, provincial, and local governments, local communities and civil society organizations, as appropriate, will be consulted and participate in the design of programs, projects, and activities that will participate in implementation and oversight, and the development of specific benchmarks to measure progress and outcomes;

(5) Funds will be used to train and deploy additional United States Government direct-hire personnel to improve monitoring and control of assistance;

(6) A framework and methodology is being utilized to assess national, provincial, local, and sector level fiduciary risks relating to public financial management of United States Government funds. Specific benchmarks and milestones shall be consulted on the use of all United States funds. United States Government personnel shall address, where appropriate, will be consulted on the use of all United States funds. United States Government personnel shall address, where appropriate, will be consulted on the use of all United States funds.

(c) Assistance and Operations.—

(1) Funds appropriated under the headings “Economic Support Fund” and “International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement” by this division that are available for assistance for Afghanistan—

(A) shall be made available, to the maximum extent practicable, in a manner that emphasizes the participation of Afghan women and girls, and directly improves the security, economic and social well-being, and political status, and protects the rights of, Afghan women and girls and complies with sections 7062 and 7063 of division F of Public Law 111–117.

(B) The Secretary of State, in consultation with the Department of State, shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations a spending plan for such assistance which shall include clear and achievable goals, benchmarks for measuring progress, and expected results. Provided, That such plan may be submitted at any time, without regard to the notification requirements under section 7015 of division F of Public Law 111–117 or under
December 31, 2009; and''.
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$10 million in capital investment in
public transportation yields $30
million, three times, in increased business
sales. The Texas Transportation Insti-
tute’s 2010 Urban Mobility Report
showed that worsening road congestion
across the Nation, $134 billion, $134 bil-
lion a year costs in loss productivity.
And when it comes to transit alone, every
$1 billion invested creates or supports
36,000 jobs.

despite the clear link between trans-
portation funding and economic recovery,
this continuing resolution cuts bil-
lions for transit, high-speed railroads,
and other key infrastructure projects. The CR
cuts over $8 billion from cur-
rent infrastructure formula programs and
already-awarded projects, resulting in
the loss of over 280,000 jobs from the
current budget funding levels.

These proposed cuts to transpor-
tation include $4.975 billion in high-
speed and intercity passenger rail grants; $710 million in transit capital
investment grants; $262 million in
FHWA surface transportation prior-
ities; $150 million in grants to Amtrak;
and $100 million in Federal Rail Admin-
istration rail safety technology grants.

This amendment eliminates these
cuts and restores transportation
funding to their current levels, not any
increase for inflation, no increase for
increased population, no increase for
increased work, but simply to restore
the current levels. We must restore
these current levels because every dol-
lar we cut reduces $3 in business activ-
ity, and every $1 billion we cut costs
36,000 jobs in an economy which cannot
afford to lose tens of thousands of jobs.

Unfortunately, the underlying bill
cuts transportation so dra-
matically and other funding so dra-
matically that it is virtually impos-
sible to write an amendment to restore
transportation funding to current lev-
els even that would be in order under
the rules the House has adopted with-
out causing great harm to other crit-
cial programs. This is particularly true
since all the transportation funding programs and all the Housing and Urban Development programs which
are in this title are underfunded. So
it’s almost impossible to say let’s re-
store these transportation funds but
eliminate other transportation or
housing funds.

In this CR is such an irresponsible
and reckless document that it is
almost not worth trying to fix it. The
Republicans have seized on this idea to
cut $100 billion from the current budg-
et, pulling that figure arbitrarily out of
thin air and without any regard to
what it could mean for our economy or
the services that it prevents. It is a
dangerous overreach that would be dev-
astating for middle- and working class
Americans. It would destroy tens, in
fact, hundreds of thousands of jobs
and would threaten national security.
The transportation cuts are a small
part of these irresponsible cuts. This
amendment is a small part of opposing
this dangerous continuing resolution,
and I anticipate unfortunately that my
amendment is going to be ruled out of
order. I hope that’s not the case. In
a rational House, it would not be the
case, but I urge my colleagues to sup-
port the amendment if they have the
opportunity to do so, and in order to
vote for reasonable transportation
funding so as not to decimate this
economy. If necessary, I urge them to
vote against the entire CR.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to
strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman
from Massachusetts is recognized for 5
minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I want to
congratulate and thank the gentleman
from New York for the statement that
he has just made because I think it rep-
resents the most rational thing that we
could do with the transportation sec-
tion of this legislation. But given the
hour and understanding that we are
not operating under rational rules on
this issue, I will say only that, that I
do congratulate and commend you for
the statement that you have made, in
which I virtually totally concur. I
might find a word or two to disagree
with in the usage there, but I concur
with it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, the
amendment proposing the increase in
budget authority in the bill.

The amendment is not in order under
section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5,
112th Congress, which states:
"It shall not be in order in consideration of an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XLI."

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section. I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair will rule.

The gentleman from Iowa makes a point of order. Amended the gentleman from New York violates section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(j)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

The Chair has been persuasively guided by an estimate from the chair of the Committee on the Budget that the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk reads as follows:

S. Clerk. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be $0: "Department of Transportation, Office of the Secretary, National Infrastructure Investment Programs"; "Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Surface Transportation Priorities"; "Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration, Grants for Energy Efficiency and Greenhouse Gas Reductions"; "Department of Transportation, Federal Railroad Administration, Research, Development, and Technology Programs"; "Department of Transportation, Federal Railroad Administration, National Railroad Passenger Corporation"; "Department of Transportation, Federal Railroad Administration, Capital and Debt Service Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation" shall be $850,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR . SESSIONS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 348, line 2, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by $446,900,000)".

Page 359, line 22, after the dollar amount insert "(increased)"

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise this morning to offer an amendment to H.R. 1 which would decrease the amount the Federal Government subsidizes Amtrak by $446,900,000.

In 2008, the Pew Charitable Trusts Foundation performed a study of Amtrak's services. According to that study, the 20 most egregiously inefficient train lines run annual deficits between $4.9 million and $58.4 million per year, with many operating at a 100 percent loss. My amendment would decrease the spending authority to Amtrak by the amount equal to those lines' losses.

Mr. Chairman, in 1997, Congress passed what was referred to as the Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act which required that Amtrak operate without any Federal assistance after 2002. By the way, that was 8 years ago. Mr. Chairman, it has never reached the intended level of self-sufficiency. It is long past time that Congress stop supporting these failed rail lines. It is important to the taxpayers of this country, Mr. Chairman.

Instead, by eliminating these very inefficient and seldom used lines, Amtrak can focus on its core competency of urban and suburban transportation. For example, the Acela line which operates along the northeast corridor continually operates in a self-sufficient manner. We need to shift Amtrak's focus to the things that it does well, not the extremely inefficient long-distance line it fails to operate within the budget.

Mr. Chairman, Amtrak has proven to be a massive drain on the government that can no longer sustain and support. In 2008 alone, Amtrak lost $1.1 billion. At a time of record debt and deficit, this amendment stops wasteful spending and directs the entire $446,900,000 to the spending reduction account to help pay down the debt. We must operate within some sense of business operation of common sense. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment to reduce Federal spending.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, the underlying bill that we have before us profoundly limits the transportation options that are available for the American people and imposes deep cuts upon the very programs with the greatest potential for creating jobs and providing the necessary foundation on which a strong economic recovery depends.

The underlying bill terminates, completely defunds the High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail program that was authorized under the PRIIA rail safety bill in the fall of 2008 and signed by then President Bush. That's 28 months ago. It rescinds those items that were put in the Recovery Act. In the legislation that was passed in February of 2009, the Recovery Act, it rescinds all of the unobligated funds from that Recovery Act, and it rescinds in the high-speed rail program the $2.5 billion of grants that were awarded last year that were passed in the December '09 appropriations bill. Those grants were awarded but have not yet been obligated.

It also happens to close down all of the new funding for light rail and commuter rail and bus rapid transit, only providing money for those projects already in place that have received full funding grant agreements. They have contracts of that sort. There is funding remaining in the underlying legislation that that was awarded in the area of the Federal Transit Administration. It also cancels all of the so-called TIGER grants which were part of the fiscal year 2010 legislation, some 5600 million, over 76 projects in 40 different States which were awarded money from among 1,000 projects that was advertised for $20 billion, showing the enormous need that was perceived on the part of the country. All of that in the TIGER grants in the 2010 budget are matched by local funds. It's not all Federal funds, where the ARRA monies. But it has to be matched at the local level. It's not cookie cutter. It is not ordered by Beltway bureaucrats or anything like that. It's projects that grew out of the planning and the intent on the part of the States or the cities or the regional transit agencies to get good projects done.

All of these, all of these are job-killers, cuts, terminations, and rescissions, every one that I have mentioned that is in the underlying legislation. All of these are part of the $7 billion reduction in transportation construction for transportation and infrastructure that have been removed—terminated, rescission, cuts—that have been removed from our construction industry, which is suffering from 30 to 40 percent unemployment. They represent at least 280,000 jobs, 280,000 man years of work for that construction industry suffering from 30 to 40 percent unemployment. And this is at a time when bids are coming in at 20 percent below the engineering estimates for what they would cost. Exactly the time that we should be doing those construction projects, putting those construction projects out to bid.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.
Mr. OLVER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Now I have finally gotten to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas. The underlying bill before us actually provides $850 million which covers both the debt service for the bonded debt of Amtrak and covers capital improvements.

Now, we also have Amtrak, which was authorized for funding in the legislation, the rail safety legislation as signed by President Bush in September or October of 2008. For the fiscal year 2011, the need for debt service and for capital grants, that authorization is over $1.3 billion. So the amount that is in this bill, which happens to be at $850 million, is $450 million plus, below the authorized amount for those items, and actually comes right on the enacted number for Amtrak for the same purposes, the debt service and the capital grants for new improvements and for improvements to whatever it is that is needed for state of good repair and safe work, mostly which is spent on the Northeast Corridor, which is where Amtrak owns all the trackage.

Most of that capital money is used in that kind of a way. That money already leads to 1,500 jobs, which will be terminated at Amtrak at the $850 million level, and the gentleman’s proposal is to cut another $446 million below that. That happens to leave us in a situation where there is almost no money left for Amtrak to operate, to do any capital program for the rest of the year, because they are committed to $270 million plus of debt service.

Therefore, if the gentleman’s amendment were adopted, it would take $446 million out, leaving only $403 million left in the program. 270 is needed for the debt service, and 127 or $128 million has already—it changes as the days go on—has already been expended on state of good service and improvements in this fiscal year as allowed under the CR that we’ve worked under for now already 5 months, so that there would be virtually no money, less than $5 million left for doing any of the kind of improvements, maintenance, the track work, if there are bridges that need to be done or anything of that sort.

So it virtually ends up with leaving them nothing to do for the kind of emergencies and anything that would be otherwise planned for the rest of the year. Now that, in fact, means then that Amtrak will in fact terminate another 1,000 jobs.

Mr. SESSIONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. I find it very interesting that we are going to continue operating the service which costs the money, but if I took the money and stopped the service we all of a sudden can’t fix all the things that you want to fix.

My gosh, the bottom line is they need to quit operating the service and then use it for what the gentleman says they should use the money for, of the bridges and the operating of the infrastructure.

Mr. OLVER. Reclaiming—it wasn’t my time. I think we should have been trading it through Mr. NADLER.

But the money is assigned to be used either for the payment for the service, the contract for the service itself, or for some need for some subsidy on the service, which is a very small one, on the operation for the Northeast Corridor, if any at all. And the rest of it is assigned clearly for debt service and for the capital program which necessarily goes on, because if you don’t do it and keep up with repairs when they are needed, then you end up with ever-growing repairs that put you out of business.

Mr. NADLER. Reclaiming my time, I’d like to just point out, of course what the gentleman from Massachusetts says is absolutely correct.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2208. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for “Maritime Administration, Operations and Training” shall be $155,758,000, of which $11,240,000 shall remain available until expended for maintenance and repair of training ships at State Maritime Academies; of which $15,000,000 shall remain available until expended for capital improvements at the United States Merchant Marine Academy; of which $59,067,000 shall be available for operations at the United States Merchant Marine Academy; of which $30,000,000 shall remain available until expended for the reimbursement of overcharged midshipmen fees for academic years 2003-2004 through 2008-2009, and such reimbursement shall be the final and conclusive disposition of claims for such overcharges.

Mr. POLIS. I object.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POLIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. I won’t take the 5 minutes. I just wanted to make a couple of comments on Amtrak from the discussion of the last amendment.

That amendment, which has now been passed—I thought it wasn’t—on a voice vote, but which has been passed subject to a vote on the floor presumably tomorrow, if adopted, will, as Mr. OLVER said, essentially eliminate all capital funding for Amtrak after debt service is taken care of, all capital funding.

Now, the question is raised: Why should we spend money on Amtrak for capital funding when it loses money? The gentleman asked that. Well, the answer is almost no transportation modality in this country makes money. That’s why we had to form Amtrak in the first place.

You look at trucking, for instance. You look at trucking. We support the interstate highway system without which the trucks couldn’t operate. Someone may say, well, the trucks pay down fuel taxes, they support the highway system. Not really. One 18-wheeler of 70,000 pounds does 10,000 times the damage, the wear and tear, the vibration damage to a highway as an automobile, yet the trucks don’t pay 10,000 times the gasoline tax as the automobile driver does. If we asked them to do so, trucking would be un-economic. I’m not suggesting we should, obviously, because we need a trucking industry.

By the same token, we need rail transportation because rail is three times as energy efficient per ton mile for freight. It’s far more energy efficient. I don’t have the figure, per passenger. We want to decrease our dependency on the petroleum, on Middle Eastern oil. We want to have less of borrowing money from China to give it to the Middle Eastern potentates who help fund the other side on the war on terror. So we need more rail.

The only way we do that is by funding Amtrak, and Amtrak has to put money into capital improvements, to a large extent, because for 50 years there were no capital improvements on the passenger rail system.

So an amendment like this is totally destructive, because we must have in this country a choice, a choice for shippers, a choice for people of the modalities of transportation, to make our economy more efficient and to make people’s lives better so they don’t sit on the highways in congestion all the time.

So Amtrak is cheap enough. And for $850 million for the entire country, which is much too small, it should have been the $1.3 billion, which was the authorized level, we should maintain that level and certainly not go—well, we shouldn’t have that level. We should have $1.3 billion, but the CR is bad enough taking it to 850, which only
allows a couple hundred million for capital for the balance of the year. We certainly shouldn’t bring it down essentially to zero by adopting the amendment that we just voted which will come up to a vote on the floor tomorrow.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

SEC. 2210. Of the prior year unobligated balances available for “Department of Transportation, Federal Railroad Administration, Railroad Safety Technology Program”, $50,000,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 2211. Of the funds made available for “Department of Transportation, Federal Railroad Administration, Capital Assistance to States—Intercity Passenger Rail Service”, $78,423,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 2212. Of the prior year unobligated balances available for “Department of Transportation, Federal Railroad Administration, Capital Assistance to States—High Speed Rail Services” shall be $500,000,000.

SEC. 2213. Of the prior year unobligated balances available for “Department of Transportation, Federal Railroad Administration, Capital Assistance to States—Highway Bridge Program authorized under section 147(d) of title 23, United States Code; Provided, That the Secretary of Transportation shall distribute the obligation limitation under subsection (a) of this section to each State in the ratio in which such State is apportioned contract authority for such programs for fiscal year 2011 under section 104 and section 144 of title 23, United States Code.

SEC. 2214. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for “Department of Housing and Urban Development, Public and Indian Housing, Tenants’ Rights-Based Rental Assistance” shall be $14,080,098,711, to remain available through September 30, 2012, to be available on October 1, 2011, and an additional $4,000,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2013, shall be available on October 1, 2011, Provided, That of the amounts available for such heading, $15,702,668,117 shall be for activities specified in paragraph (1) under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–17, $110,000,000 shall be for activities specified in paragraph (2) under such heading in such Public Law, $198,000,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 2215. Notwithstanding section 1101, no funds are provided for activities described in section 122 of title I of division A of Public Law 111–17.

SEC. 2216. Notwithstanding section 1101, section 172 of title I of division A of Public Law 111–17 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.


SEC. 2218. Notwithstanding section 1101, no funds are provided for activities described in section 195 of title I of division A of Public Law 111–17.

SEC. 2219. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101 of this division and section 123(a) of this division, the level for division A of Public Law 111–17, no obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways for fiscal year 2011 shall be distributed to the following programs: the interstate maintenance discretionary program under section 138(c) of title 23, United States Code; the Transportation, Community, and Tourism Preservation program under section 1117 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users. The highest discretionary program under sections 128(c) and 147 of title 23, United States Code (except for the funds set aside under section 147(d) of title 23, United States Code) that is in the Dakota State region transportation development program under section 1308 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users.

(b) The obligation limitation reserved under subsection (a) of this section shall be instead distributed as follows: 20 percent to the interstate maintenance program authorized under section 119 of title 23, United States Code; 26 percent to the surface transportation program authorized under section 1303 of title 23, United States Code; 17 percent to the highway bridge program authorized under section 144 of title 23, United States Code; 5 percent to the highway safety improvement program authorized under section 148 of title 23, United States Code; 7 percent to the congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program authorized under section 149 of title 23, United States Code, Provided, That the Secretary of Transportation shall distribute the obligation limitation under subsection (a) of this section to each State in the ratio in which such State is apportioned contract authority for such programs for fiscal year 2011 under section 104 and section 144 of title 23, United States Code.

SEC. 2220. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for “Department of Housing and Urban Development, Public and Indian Housing, Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grants” shall be $4,000,000,000 previously appropriated under such heading that became available on October 1, 2010, and an additional $4,000,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2013, shall be available on October 1, 2011, Provided, That of the prior year unobligated balances available for the “Department of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Railroad Administration, Capital Assistance to States—Highway Bridge Program authorized under section 147(d) of title 23, United States Code; 7 percent to the highway safety improvement program authorized under section 148 of title 23, United States Code; 5 percent to the highway safety improvement program authorized under section 149 of title 23, United States Code, Provided, That the Secretary of Transportation shall distribute the obligation limitation under subsection (a) of this section to each State in the ratio in which such State is apportioned contract authority for such programs for fiscal year 2011 under section 104 and section 144 of title 23, United States Code.

SEC. 2221. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for “Department of Housing and Urban Development, Public and Indian Housing, Tenants’ Rights-Based Rental Assistance” shall be $14,080,098,711, to remain available through September 30, 2012, to be available on October 1, 2011, and an additional $4,000,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2013, shall be available on October 1, 2011, Provided, That of the amounts available for such heading, $15,702,668,117 shall be for activities specified in paragraph (1) under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–17, $110,000,000 shall be for activities specified in paragraph (2) under such heading in such Public Law, $198,000,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 2222. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for “Department of Housing and Urban Development, Public and Indian Housing, Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grants” shall be $4,000,000,000 previously appropriated under such heading that became available on October 1, 2010, and an additional $4,000,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2013, shall be available on October 1, 2011, Provided, That of the amounts available for such heading, $8,950,000,000 shall be for activities specified in paragraph (1) under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–17 and $326,000,000 shall be for activities specified in paragraph (2) under such heading in such Public Law.

SEC. 2223. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for “Department of Housing and Urban Development, Public and Indian Housing, Tenants’ Rights-Based Rental Assistance” shall be $14,080,098,711, to remain available through September 30, 2012, to be available on October 1, 2011, and an additional $4,000,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2013, shall be available on October 1, 2011, Provided, That of the amounts available for such heading, $8,950,000,000 shall be for activities specified in paragraph (1) under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–17 and $326,000,000 shall be for activities specified in paragraph (2) under such heading in such Public Law.
Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the amendment be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DIVISION C—STIMULUS RESCSSIONS

SEC. 3001. (a) There are hereby rescinded all unexpended balances of the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 3237. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for “Department of Housing and Urban Development, Housing Programs, Housing for the Elderly” shall be $237,700,000: Provided, That none of the funds made available under this heading shall be used for capital advances or project rental assistance contracts.

SEC. 2238. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for “Department of Housing and Urban Development, Housing Programs, Housing for Persons with Disabilities” shall be $90,036,817: Provided, That none of the funds made available under this heading shall be used for capital advances or project rental assistance contracts: Provided further, That none of the funds shall be used for amendments or renewals of tenant-based assistance contracts entered into prior to fiscal year 2005.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the amendment be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 357, beginning on line 25, strike “February 11, 2011” and insert “September 30, 2011”.

The process to leverage $10 million into $305 million takes time. Colorado was awarded the TIGER/TIFIA Challenge grant through the Recovery Act that expands one of the most heavily used and heavily congested highways in our State, creating jobs, growing our economic development, multi-modal transportation, the lifeblood of my congressional district and the greater State of Colorado. This $10 million investment helps leverage additional funds in the area, creating 2,776 million in employment income and over 7,200 jobs.

To date, only $900,000 has been obligated. And because the CR rescinds all unobligated funding across the board, without the death of individual projects, we risk never seeing the remaining $9.1 million that they were promised. And because of that, they could lose $300 million in local funding contingent on the stability provided by the TIGER grant.

For the businesses and residents in Colorado, this is simply ridiculous and just doesn’t make sense. How could we rescind a small government grant—not an earmark. We have moved away from earmarks, and that that. But what they get replaced by are grants and merit-based opportunities for our projects to compete for Federal funds. How could we rescind a grant which, through local and State ingenuity, they have already leveraged $300 million in local, State, and private funding? That is not fiscally responsible.

I am hopeful that this was merely an oversight by the committee, and I hope that they will work with me to address this issue.

The process to leverage $10 million into $305 million takes time. Colorado was awarded the TIGER/TIFIA Challenge grant in February 2010, and Colorado and other States were challenged to think bigger and do more with less; but Colorado was the only State to accept that challenge. Many of the other funds have already been obligated under TIFIA. So when they are doing what we wanted them to do, being creative and leveraging the capital, unless we make this change they could be punished.

Colorado’s U.S. 36 application did not anticipate a TIFIA loan, but Colorado and the U.S. 36 embraced the challenge. The application is in, and the obligation is expected by September of 2011, consistent with the intention of the challenge grant in the first place. My amendment would ensure that the long process of applying for a loan guarantee at the Department of Energy—not a grant, simply a loan in this tight credit market—would not mean projects already in the queue would be thrown out. How can we tell a private company to spend time and money applying for something, have it awarded, and then turn around and take it off the table? That’s simply bad for business. Similar programs at the World Bank and IMF treat the loan authority authorized by Congress as obligated funds once they are appropriated. We owe it to our small businesses and local governments to provide predictability with regard to Federal funding streams.

As we move toward grant-based programs, it’s critical that people trust and believe that the Federal word is good. I believe that these provisions in the CR run contrary to that, and I ask my colleagues to work with me to address this issue.

I yield back the balance of my time.
amendment, though I realize the realities of the situation that we are in. In the recovery bill—and we could have a long discussion about the word ‘failure’ of the recovery bill but we won’t go into that at this time of night—the so-called shovel-ready projects that were ready to go into construction right away, those were designated with a termination date. The work had to be done by the end of 2010. And those monies that were for shovel-ready projects have already been expended completely in the process.

For the longer term investments, of which the high-speed rail program and the TIGER grant program were part, those were always intended to go farther. Never was it suggested that they could be done and the work done that would also produce the jobs necessary in less than at least 2011 and 2012 as well. So what has been proposed for the TIGER grant here, and all of the TIGER grants, puts them in quite a different category.

The gentleman’s amendment highlights an example of how the majority’s rhetoric and political posturing on the continuing resolution come at the expense of good policy. If you had presented this project that the gentleman from Colorado has put forward to a Member on the other side of the aisle, they would agree that the use of a $10 million grant to leverage over $200 million in non-Federal funds is a perfect example of the potential for public-private partnerships. But the moment you mention the project genesis within the President’s Recovery Act, their tune turns to righteous condemnation.

More broadly, there are other projects across the country that would be impacted by the rescission’s political intent. In particular, efforts to address congestion that is choking our transportation network through the creation of a 21st-century high-speed rail system would be halted in many regions. For example, $110 million to improve connections to Amtrak’s rail system would be halted in many regions. For example, $110 million to improve connections to Amtrak’s rail system would be halted in many regions. For example, $110 million to improve connections to Amtrak’s rail system would be halted in many regions. For example, $110 million to improve connections to Amtrak’s rail system would be halted in many regions.

The motion was agreed to. Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM) having assumed the chair, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

More broadly, there are other projects across the country that would be impacted by the rescission’s political intent. In particular, efforts to address congestion that is choking our transportation network through the creation of a 21st-century high-speed rail system would be halted in many regions. For example, $110 million to improve connections to Amtrak’s rail system would be halted in many regions. For example, $110 million to improve connections to Amtrak’s rail system would be halted in many regions. For example, $110 million to improve connections to Amtrak’s rail system would be halted in many regions. For example, $110 million to improve connections to Amtrak’s rail system would be halted in many regions. For example, $110 million to improve connections to Amtrak’s rail system would be halted in many regions.
transmitting the Corporation’s final rule — Joint Final Rule — Community Reinvestment Act Regulations (RIN: 3064-AE68) received January 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); to the Committee on Financial Services.

519. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Occupational Safety and Health, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Procedures for the Handling of Retaliation Complaints Under the Emoluments Provisions of Environmental Statutes and Section 211 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, as Amended [Docket No.: OSHA-2007-0028] (RIN: 1218-AC25) received February 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

520. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule — Commission Involvement In Voluntary Standards received January 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

521. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule — Interpretation of “Consultations” (Doyle No.: OSH-2010-0029) received January 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

522. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule — Substantial Product Hazard Reports received January 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

523. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(i) (Final DTV set market plan) — Television Broadcast Stations (Huntsville, Alabama) (MB Docket No.: 08-194) (RM-11488) received February 1, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

524. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule — Revision to Forms, Statements, and Reporting Requirements for Natural Gas Pipelines [Docket No.: RM07-5-003; Order No. 716-B] received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

525. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy, Energy Information Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Direct Investment Surveys: BE-11, Annual Direct Investment Position, Deregulated Product Services, U.S. Direct Investment Abroad [Docket No.: 100217100-0606-02] (RIN: 0648-AA74) received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

526. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Sculpins, Sharks, Squid, and Octopus in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 091131392-0067-02] (RIN: 0648-AX156) received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

527. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Non-American Fisheries Act Crab Vessels Harvesting Pacific Cod for Processing by the Inshore Component in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 091131392-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-AX155) received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

528. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inseason Adjustment to the 2011 Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Atka Mackerel Total Allowable Catch Amount [Docket No.: 091131392-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-AX129) received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

529. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Management Plan; Amendment 20 and 21; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Management Plan; Amendment 20 and 21; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Management Plan; Amendment 20 and 21; Northwest Carolinian Groundfish: A Realignment for the Start of the 2011 Fishery [Docket No.: 091131392-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-AX129) received January 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

530. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — Passenger Weight and Inspected Vessel Stability Requirements [Docket No.: USCFF-2007-0030] (RIN: 1625-AB20) received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

531. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Loan Guaranty Revised Loan Modification Procedures [RIN: 2900-AN7B] received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

532. A letter from the Director, Regulations Management, Office of Regulatory Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Suicide Prevention and Post-Deployment Suicide Exposure and Veterans with Covered Service in Korea [RIN: 2900-AN27] received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

533. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Certification of Factually Incorrect Information to Import Administration during Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings [Notice: [Docket No.: E102249202-1049-01] (RIN: 0625-AA66) received February 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); to the Committee on Ways and Means.


PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. ENSHO (for herself, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 733. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a Pancreatic Cancer Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BILBRAY (for himself, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. ROHRABACHER):

H.R. 734. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the medical device tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HARPER, Mr. LAMMOR, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WYVONDER, Mr. MULVANY, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOMPERT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. PITTS, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 735. A bill to provide for competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. RICHARDSON (for herself and Mr. FILNER):

H.R. 736. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the Build America Bond program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AKIN:

H.R. 737. A bill to terminate the Paul S. Sarbanes Transit in Parks Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mrs. CHRISTENSON, Mr. FALROMAVARIA, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. FERREAL, Mr. PAIH, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. HANABURA, Mr. FIERABEND, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FERRAS of Florida, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 738. A bill to authorize the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 739. A bill to provide that no Federal or State requirement to increase energy efficiency shall require a hospital, school, day care center, mental health facility, or nursing home to
install or utilize such energy efficient lighting if the lighting contains mercury; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H.R. 740. A bill to require disclosure to the Securities and Exchange Commission of certain sanctionable activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H.R. 741. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the marketing of generic drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself, Mr. PARCELL, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 742. A bill to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Giuseppe Garibaldi and to recognize the Republic of Italy on the occasion of its Unification; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. JENKINS (for herself, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. NORTON, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 743. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the work opportunity of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILSON (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Ohio, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BLUM, Mr. BUSSEY, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TITUS, Mr. AYOTTE, Mr. KEMP, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. HARRIS of South Carolina, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. PHILLY):
By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:
H.J. Res. 38.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17, giving Congress exclusive jurisdiction over the District of Columbia. That clause was cited as the authority for the government’s ability to accept the original Smithsonian donation and the creation of the Smithsonian Institution via the Act of August 10, 1846.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:
H.R. 744.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:
H.R. 745.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Because this legislation adjusts the formula the federal government uses to spend money on federal contracts, it is authorized by the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. MACK:
H.R. 746.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. SCHIFF:
H.R. 747.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Build America Bonds Extension Act is enacted pursuant to the power of Congress exclusive jurisdiction over the District of Columbia. That clause was cited as the authority for the government’s ability to accept the original Smithson donation and the creation of the Smithsonian Institution via the Act of August 10, 1846.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:
H.R. 748.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, which grants Congress its spending power.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:
H.R. 749.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The bill is constitutionally authorized under the Necessary and Proper Clause, which provides the government the power to enact legislation necessary to effectuate the authority granted in Clause 17 above.

By Mr. SCHILLING:
H.R. 750.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TIBERI:
H.R. 751.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill makes changes to existing law relating to Article 1, Section 7 which provides that all bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.

By Mr. WALBERG:
H.R. 752.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill bill makes changes to existing law relating to Article 1, Section 7 which provides that all bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.

By Mr. WALDEN:
H.J. Res. 37.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POLIS:
H.R. 423.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution ("The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes").
Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

**Routine Proceedings, pages S765–S805**

**Measures Introduced:** Fifteen bills and six resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 359–373, S.J. Res. 6, S. Res. 55–58, and S. Con. Res. 6.

**Measures Reported:**
- S. Res. 56, authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.
- S. Res. 57, authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.
- S. Res. 58, authorizing expenditures by the Committee on the Budget.
- S. 365, to make a technical amendment to the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002.

**Measures Passed:**

**National Association for the Advancement of Colored People 102nd Anniversary:** Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 6, commending the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its 102nd anniversary.

**Measures Considered:**

**FAA Air Transportation Modernization and Safety Improvement Act—Agreement:** Senate continued consideration of S. 223, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto:

- Adopted:
  - Rockefeller (for Baucus) Further Modified Amendment No. 75, of a perfecting nature.

- Pending:
  - Rockefeller (for Wyden) Amendment No. 27, to increase the number of test sites in the National Airspace System used for unmanned aerial vehicles and to require one of those test sites to include a significant portion of public lands.

- Inhofe Modified Amendment No. 7, to provide for an increase in the number of slots available at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport.

- Rockefeller (for Ensign) Amendment No. 32, to improve provisions relating to certification and flight standards for military remotely piloted aerial systems in the National Airspace System.

- McCain Amendment No. 4, to repeal the essential air service program.

- Rockefeller (for Leahy) Amendment No. 50, to amend title 1 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to include nonprofit and volunteer ground and air ambulance crew members and first responders for certain benefits, and to clarify the liability protection for volunteer pilots that fly for public benefit.

- Reid Amendment No. 54, to allow airports that receive airport improvement grants for the purchase of land to lease the land and develop the land in a manner compatible with noise buffering purposes.

- Udall (NM) Modified Amendment No. 49, to authorize Dona Ana County, New Mexico, to exchange certain land conveyed to the County for airport purposes.

- Udall (NM) Modified Amendment No. 51, to require that all advanced imaging technology used as a primary screening method for passengers be equipped with automatic target recognition software.

- Paul Amendment No. 18, to strike the provisions relating to clarifying a memorandum of understanding between the Federal Aviation Administration and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

- Hutchison Further Modified Amendment No. 93 (to Modified Amendment No. 7), of a perfecting nature.

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, February 17, 2011; that there then be 2 hours for debate prior to the cloture vote on Inhofe Modified Amendment No. 7 (listed above), with the time equally divided and controlled between the proponents and opponents,
and that the filing deadline for second-degree amendments to the bill be 10 a.m.

Appointments:

Joint Committee on Taxation: The Chair, announced on behalf of the Committee on Finance, pursuant to section 8002 of title 26, U.S. Code, the designation of the following Senators as members of the Joint Committee on Taxation: Senator Baucus, Senator Rockefeller, Senator Conrad, Senator Hatch, and Senator Grassley.

Senator Coats—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at 1:30 p.m., on Thursday, February 17, 2011, Senator Coats be recognized for up to 30 minutes.

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Timothy M. Cain, of South Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina.

Scott Wesley Skavdahl, of Wyoming, to be United States District Judge for the District of Wyoming.

2 Army nominations in the rank of general.

Routine lists in the Army and Marine Corps.

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Budget: Committee ordered favorably reported an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee.

Also, committee adopted its rules of procedure for the 112th Congress.

NATIONWIDE NETWORK FOR FIRST RESPONDERS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine safeguarding our future, focusing on building a nationwide network for first responders, after receiving testimony from Representative King (NY); Delaware Governor Jack Markell, Dover, on behalf of the National Governors Association; Raymond W. Kelly, New York City Police Commissioner, New York, New York; Al H. Gillespie, North Las Vegas Fire Department Chief, Las Vegas, Nevada, on behalf of the International Association of Fire Chiefs (IAFC); and Joseph L. Hanna, Directions, Garland, Texas.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY BUDGET

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President’s proposed budget request for fiscal year 2012 for the Department of Energy, after receiving testimony from Steven Chu, Secretary of Energy.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee ordered favorably reported an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee.

Also, committee adopted its rules of procedure for the 112th Congress and announced the following subcommittee assignments:

Subcommittee on Energy: Senators Cantwell (Chair), Wyden, Johnson (SD), Landrieu, Sanders, Udall (CO), Shaheen, Franken, Manchin, Coons, Risch, Barrasso, Lee, Paul, Coats, Portman, Hoeven, and Corker.

Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests: Senators Wyden (Chair), Johnson (SD), Landrieu, Cantwell, Udall (CO), Shaheen, Franken, Coons, Barrasso, Risch, Lee, Paul, Portman, and Hoeven.

Subcommittee on National Parks: Senators Udall (CO) (Chair), Landrieu, Sanders, Stabenow, Franken, Manchin, Coons, Burr, Barrasso, Paul, Coats, Portman, and Corker.

Subcommittee on Water and Power: Senators Shaheen (Chair), Wyden, Johnson (SD), Cantwell, Sanders, Stabenow, Manchin, Lee, Risch, Coats, Hoeven, and Corker.
Senators Bingaman and Murkowski are ex officio members of each subcommittee. 

**CALL TO ACTION ON TRANSPORTATION**

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine national leaders’ call to action on transportation, after receiving testimony from Thomas J. Donohue, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and Richard Trumka, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL–CIO), both of Washington, D.C.

**BUDGET**

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded hearings to examine the President’s proposed budget request for fiscal year 2012, after receiving testimony from Timothy F. Geithner, Secretary of the Treasury.

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Committee on Finance: Committee adopted its rules of procedure for the 112th Congress and announced the following subcommittee assignments:

* Subcommittee on Health Care: Senators Rockefeller (Chair), Bingaman, Kerry, Wyden, Stabenow, Cantwell, Menendez, Carper, Cardin, Ensign, Grassley, Kyl, Roberts, Enzi, Cornyn, and Coburn.

* Subcommittee on Taxation and IRS Oversight: Senators Conrad (Chair), Baucus, Kerry, Schumer, Wyden, Cantwell, Nelson (FL), Menendez, Carper, Cardin, Kyl, Snowe, Crapo, Roberts, Ensign, Enzi, Cornyn, and Thune.

* Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources, and Infrastructure: Senators Bingaman (Chair), Rockefeller, Conrad, Kerry, Cantwell, Nelson (FL), Carper, Cornyn, Grassley, Roberts, Enzi, and Thune.

* Subcommittee on International Trade, Customs, and Global Competitiveness: Senators Wyden (Chair), Rockefeller, Kerry, Schumer, Stabenow, Nelson (FL), Menendez, Thune, Hatch, Grassley, Crapo, and Roberts.

* Subcommittee on Social Security, Pensions, and Family Policy: Senators Stabenow (Chair), Rockefeller, Schumer, Cardin, Coburn, Hatch, and Kyl.

* Subcommittee on Fiscal Responsibility and Economic Growth: Senators Nelson (FL) (Chair), Baucus, Conrad, Bingaman, Crapo, Ensign, and Coburn.

Senators Baucus and Hatch are ex officio members of each subcommittee.

**D.C. OPPORTUNITY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM**

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine saving the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program, including S. 206, to reauthorize the DC Opportunity Scholarship Program, after receiving testimony from Mayor Vincent C. Gray, Kwame R. Brown, Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, Kevin P. Chavous, Black Alliance for Educational Options, and Virginia Walden Ford, D.C. Parents for School Choice, all of Washington, D.C.; and Patrick J. Wolf, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville.

**IMPROVING FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT**

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia concluded a hearing to examine improving Federal employment of people with disabilities, focusing on barriers to the employment of people with disabilities in the federal workforce and leading practices that could be used to overcome these barriers, after receiving testimony from Yvonne Jones, Director, Strategic Issues, Government Accountability Office; Christine Griffin, Deputy Director, Office of Personnel Management; Kathleen Martinez, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Disability Employment Policy; and Chai Feldblum, Commissioner, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee ordered favorably reported an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 112th Congress, an original bill entitled, “Technical Amendment to the Education Sciences Reform Act”, and Public Health Service nominations.

Also, committee adopted its rules of procedure for the 112th Congress.

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee.

Also, committee adopted its rules of procedure for the 112th Congress.

**WEBSITES DEDICATED TO STEALING AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY**

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine targeting websites dedicated to stealing American intellectual property, after receiving testimony from Tom Adams, Rosetta Stone Inc., and Thomas M. Dailey, Verizon Communications Inc., both of Arlington, Virginia; Scott Turow, Authors Guild, New York, New York; Christine Jones, The GoDaddy Group, Inc., Scottsdale, Arizona; and Denise Yee, Visa Inc., San Francisco, California.

**NOMINATIONS**

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Jimmie V. Reyna, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit
Judge for the Federal Circuit, who was introduced by Senators Cardin and Cornyn, John A. Kronstadt, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, who was introduced by Senator Feinstein, Vincent L. Briccetti, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, and Arenda L. Wright Allen, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Virginia, who were both introduced by Senators Webb and Warner, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

WORLDWIDE THREAT

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the worldwide threat, after receiving testimony from James R. Clapper, Director of National Intelligence; Robert S. Mueller, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice; Michael Leiter, Director, National Counterterrorism Center; Leon Panetta, Director, Central Intelligence Agency; Lieutenant General Ronald L. Burgess, Jr., Director, Defense Intelligence Agency; and Philip Goldberg, Assistant Secretary of State for Intelligence and Research.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 18 public bills, H.R. 733–750; and 6 resolutions, H.J. Res. 37–40; and H. Res. 95–96 were introduced. Pages H1069–71

Additional Cosponsors: Page H1071

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Nunnelee to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. Page H937

Recess: The House recessed at 11:25 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. Page H949

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest chaplain, Reverend Bill Shuler, Capital Life Church, Washington, DC. Page H949

Extending expiring provisions of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 93, the rule providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 514, to extend expiring provisions of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 and Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 relating to access to business records, individual terrorists as agents of foreign powers, and roving wiretaps until December 8, 2011. Pages H951–57

Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker’s appointment of the following Member of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy: Representative Shimkus. Page H957


Agreed to:

Rooney amendment (No. 2 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 15th that reduces Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy by $225,000,000 and reduces Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force by $225,000,000 and increases Defense by $450,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 233 ayes to 198 noes with 1 voting “present”, Roll No. 46); Pages H957–58

Michaud amendment (No. 153 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 15th that increases funding, by offset, for the Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration, Economic Development Assistance Programs by $80,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 305 ayes to 127 noes, Roll No. 50); Pages H960–61

Flake amendment (No. 368 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 15th that eliminates funding for the National Drug Intelligence Center (by a recorded vote of 262 ayes to 169 noes, Roll No. 51); Page H961

Weiner amendment (No. 125 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011), as modified, that was debated on February 15th that increases funding, by offset, for the Department of Justice, Community Oriented Policing Services by $298,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 228 ayes to 203 noes, Roll No. 53); Pages H962–63

Pascrell amendment (No. 223 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 15th that increases funding, by offset, for the Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Firefighter
Assistance Grants by $510,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 318 ayes to 113 noes, Roll No. 60);  

Burton (IN) amendment (No. 30 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that reduces funding for the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Management of Lands and Resources by $2,000,000;  

Pompeo amendment (No. 84 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that reduces funding for the Environmental Protection Agency, Environmental Programs and Management by $8,458,000 (by a recorded vote of 239 ayes to 185 noes, Roll No. 64);  

Reed amendment (No. 379 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that reduces funding for the Environmental Protection Agency, State and Tribal Assistance Grants by $10,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 228 ayes to 203 noes, Roll No. 65);  

Whitfield amendment (No. 108 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that reduces the funding for greening of the Capitol by $1,500,000; and  

McClintock amendment (No. 291 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that reduces funding for the Department of the Treasury, Debt Restructuring by $20,000,000.  

Rejected:  

Jones amendment (No. 95 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 15th that sought to eliminate funding for the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund (by a recorded vote of 135 ayes to 294 noes, Roll No. 47);  

Holt amendment (No. 237 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 15th that sought to eliminate funding for the Iraq Security Forces Fund (by a recorded vote of 135 ayes to 299 noes, Roll No. 48);  

DeFazio amendment (No. 97 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 15th that sought to increase funding, by offset, for the Organic Transition Program by $5,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 136 ayes to 296 noes, Roll No. 49);  

Latta amendment (No. 260 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 15th that sought to reduce funding for the Department of Commerce, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Construction of Research Facilities by $10,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 184 ayes to 247 noes, Roll No. 52);  

Duncan (SC) amendment (No. 110 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 15th that sought to reduce funding for the Legal Services Corporation by $324,400,000 (by a recorded vote of 171 ayes to 259 noes, Roll No. 54);  

Biggert amendment (No. 192 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 15th that sought to reduce funding for the Department of Energy, Energy Programs, Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy by $50,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 170 ayes to 262 noes, Roll No. 55);  

Inslee amendment (No. 395 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 15th that sought to increase funding, by offset, for the Department of Energy, Energy Programs, Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy by $20,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 159 ayes to 273 noes, Roll No. 56);  

Tonko amendment (No. 259 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 15th that sought to eliminate funding for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy by $70,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 137 ayes to 293 noes, Roll No. 58);  

DeFazio amendment (No. 98 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 15th that sought to eliminate the funding for the Selective Service System (by a recorded vote of 130 ayes to 301 noes, Roll No. 59);  

McClintock amendment (No. 295 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to reduce funding for the Department of the Interior, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Resource Management by $7,537,000;  

Lum misc (No. 197 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to reduce funding for land acquisition under Title VII—Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies by $35,055,000 (by a recorded vote of 213 ayes to 216 noes, Roll No. 60);  

Moran amendment (No. 338 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to reduce funding for the Department of Energy, Energy Programs, Advanced Research Projects Agency by $50,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 199 ayes to 230 noes, Roll No. 65); and  

Polis amendment (No. 68 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to
create an exception for TIFIA projects within ARRA reductions. Pages H1067–68

Withdrawn:

Barletta amendment (No. 111 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have increased funding, by offset, for Low Income Home Energy Assistance by $42,676,000 and

Pages H1014–20

Franks (AZ) amendment (No. 481 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have added language regarding the fulfillment of the Egypt-Israel treaty.

Pages H1060–63

Point of Order sustained against:

Pearce amendment (No. 556 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011), as modified, that sought to reduce funding for construction and land acquisition under Title VII—Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies by $239,045,000;

Pages H970–76

Lummis amendment (No. 194 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to change the date for the final rule published by the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the endangered status of wolves;

Pages H984–86

Hall amendment (No. 407 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to direct the EPA to enter into a contract with the National Academy of Sciences to perform a comprehensive review of non-mercury hazardous air pollutants emitted by electric generating units and industrial boilers;

Pages H987–88

Edwards amendment (No. 415 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to increase funding for the Environmental Protection Agency, State and Tribal Assistance Grants by $2,816,446,000;

Pages H990–92

Braley (IA) amendment (No. 521 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to add language stating that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall not be prohibited from implementing or enforcing section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act;

Pages H992–94

Markey amendment (No. 160 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to increase Low Income Home Energy Assistance by $390,328,000 and add new sections at the end of the bill;

Pages H1007–14

Chu amendment (No. 490 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to increase the funding level in the bill for Pell Grants to $4,860;

Pages H1024–25

Jackson Lee amendment (No. 239 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to increase the funding level in the bill for Pell Grants to $4,860;

Pages H1025–28

Blumenuer amendment (No. 436 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to provide funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting;

Pages H1028–31

Tonko amendment (No. 15 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to strike section 1844 which provides a limitation on Administrative Expenses for the Social Security Administration;

Pages H1032–33

Tonko amendment (No. 16 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to strike section 1846 which provides a limitation on Administrative Expenses for the Social Security Administration;

Pages H1033–36

Lee (CA) amendment (No. 221 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to add a new section regarding rules related to additional weeks of first-tier emergency unemployment compensation; and

Page H1036

Nadler amendment (No. 511 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to add back all transportation funding.

Pages H1063–64

Proceeds Postponed:

Pompeo amendment (No. 85 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that seeks to reduce funding for the Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, State and Private Forestry by $7,400,000;

Pages H999–H1001

Walberg amendment (No. 196 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that seeks to reduce funding for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, National Endowment for the Arts, Grants and Administration by $20,594,000;

Pages H1001–02

Canseco amendment (No. 249 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that seeks to reduce funding for National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs by $4,500,000;

Pages H1002–03

Reed amendment (No. 381 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that seeks to eliminate the Presidio Trust Fund;

Pages H1003–07

Bass (NH) amendment (No. 565 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that seeks to reduce funding for Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services by $98,000,000;

Page H1007

Flake amendment (No. 457 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that seeks to reduce funding for making payments under the Community Service Block Grant Act by $100,000,000;

Pages H1016–20

McMorris Rodgers amendment (No. 276 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that seeks to increase IDEA state grants to FY 2010 levels and reduce school improvement grants and teacher quality grants by necessary amounts to fully offset outlays;

Pages H1020–23

Young (AK) amendment (No. 532 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that
seeks to restore the education funding authority for Alaskan and Hawaiian Native Americans;

Price (GA) amendment (No. 410 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that seeks to eliminate funding for the National Labor Relations Board;

Weiner amendment (No. 100 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that seeks to reduce funding for the United States Institute of Peace by $42,676,000;

Canseco amendment (No. 248 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that seeks to reduce funding for the East-West Center by $10,716,000;

Heller amendment (No. 29 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that seeks to reduce funding under Title XI—State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs by $211,244,700; and

Sessions amendment (No. 43 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that seeks to reduce funding for Amtrak by $446,900,000.

H. Res. 92, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to yesterday, February 15th.

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. today.

Amendment: Amendment ordered printed pursuant to the rule appears on page H1071.


Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 3:45 a.m. on Thursday, February 17th.

Committee Meetings

REGULATORY BURDENS
Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Nutrition and Horticulture and the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure held a joint hearing to consider reducing the regulatory burdens posed by the case National Cotton Council v. EPA (6th Cir. 2009) and to review related draft legislation. Testimony was heard from Steven Bradbury, Director, Office of Pesticide Programs, EPA; and public witnesses.

NATIONAL DEFENSE FY 2012 BUDGET
Committee on Armed Services: Held a hearing on the Fiscal Year 2012 national defense authorization budget request from the Department of Defense.

Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Robert M. Gates, Secretary; and ADM Michael G. Mullen, USN, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

TREASURY FY 2012 BUDGET
Committee on the Budget: Held a hearing on the Department of the Treasury Fiscal Year 2012 Budget. Testimony was heard from Timothy F. Geithner, Secretary of the Treasury.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR POLICIES AND PRIORITIES
Committee on Education and the Workforce: Held a hearing on Policies and Priorities at the U.S. Department of Labor. Testimony was heard from Hilda L. Solis, Secretary of Labor.

NET NEUTRALITY AND INTERNET REGULATION
Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, held a hearing entitled “Network Neutrality and Internet Regulation: Warranted or More Economic Harm Than Good?” Testimony was heard from the following officials of the FCC: Julius Genachowski, Chairman; Mignon Clyburn; Michael J. Copps; Meredith Attwell Baker; and Robert M. McDowell, all Commissioners.

HEALTH CARE AND THE CENTER FOR CONSUMER INFORMATION AND INSURANCE
Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled “Health Care Issues Involving the Center for Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight.” Testimony was heard from the following officials of Department of Health and Human Services: Jay Angoff, Senior Advisor, Office of the Secretary; and Steve Larsen, Deputy Administrator and Director, Center for Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

FINANCIAL CRISIS INQUIRY COMMISSION
Committee on Financial Services: Held a hearing entitled “The Final Report of the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission.” Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission: Phil Angelides, Chairman; Bill Thomas, Vice Chairman; Douglas Holtz-Eakin, Commissioner; Brooksley Born, Commissioner; Peter Wallison, Commissioner; and Byron Georgiou, Commissioner.

HOUSING MARKET RECOVERY
Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Insurance, Housing and Community Opportunity held a hearing entitled “Are There Government Barriers to the Housing Market Recovery?” Testimony was
heard from David Stevens, Assistant Secretary, Housing and Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development; Theodore “Ted” Tozer, President, Government National Mortgage Association (Ginnie Mae); Phyllis Caldwell, Chief, Homeownership Preservation Office, Department of the Treasury; Douglas Holtz-Eakin, former Director, CBO; and public witnesses.

HEALTH CARE ACT OF 2011

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE INDIVIDUAL MANDATE
Committee on the Judiciary: Held a hearing on the Constitutionality of the Individual Mandate. Testimony was heard from Kenneth T. Cuccinelli, II, Attorney General, Virginia; and public witnesses.

FEDERAL FINANCIAL REPORTING MODEL

THE STIMULUS: TWO YEARS LATER
Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs, Stimulus Oversight and Government Spending held a hearing on the Stimulus: Two Years Later. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FAA FY 2012 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BUDGET
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics held a hearing on a review of the Federal Aviation Administration’s Research and Development Budget for Fiscal Year 2012. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Transportation: Victoria Cox, Air Traffic Organization, FAA; and Calvin Scovel, III, Inspector General; and public witnesses.

PUTTING AMERICANS BACK TO WORK
Committee on Small Business: Held a hearing entitled “Putting Americans Back to Work: The State of the Small Business Economy.” Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

The Committee also approved a Committee resolution to reduce facility costs by consolidating the National Gallery of Art and Federal Trade Commission operations in the District of Columbia.

PRESIDENT’S FY 2012 BUDGET PROPOSAL
Committee on Ways and Means: Continued hearings on the President’s Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Proposal. Testimony was heard from Kathleen Sebelius, Secretary of Health and Human Services; and Jacob J. Lew, Director, OMB.

Joint Meetings
LITHUANIA’S LEADERSHIP OF THE OSCE
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Commission concluded a hearing to examine Lithuania’s leadership of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), focusing on the challenges that the Lithuanian chairmanship faces, after receiving testimony from Audronius Azubalis, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Lithuania and OSCE Chair-in-Office for 2011, Vilnius.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2011
(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: To hold hearings to examine agriculture and growing America’s economy; to be immediately followed by an organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 112th Congress, 2:30 p.m., SR–328A.

Committee on Armed Services: To hold hearings to examine the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, subcommittee assignments, and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 112th Congress; to be immediately followed by an oversight hearing to examine the Dodd-Frank implementation, focusing on a progress report by the regulators at the half-year mark, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on the Budget: To hold hearings to examine the President’s proposed budget request for fiscal year 2012 and revenue proposals, 10 a.m., SD–608.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 112th Congress, 10 a.m., SR–253.
Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Peace Corps and Global Narcotics Affairs, to hold hearings to examine United States policy toward Latin America, 2 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: To hold hearings to examine President’s proposed budget request for fiscal year 2012 for the Department of Homeland Security, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: Organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, subcommittee membership and jurisdiction, an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 112th Congress, S. 193, to extend the sunset of certain provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act, S. 49, to amend the Federal antitrust laws to provide expanded coverage and to eliminate exemptions from such laws that are contrary to the public interest with respect to railroads, and the nominations of Sue E. Myerscough, and James E. Shadid, both to be a United States District Judge for the Central District of Illinois, Susan L. Carney, of Connecticut, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, Michael H. Simon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon, and Mae A. D’Agostino, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of New York, and Timothy J. Feighery, of New York, to be Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Rules and Administration: Organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures for the 112th Congress; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine Senate committees that have presented budgets above guidelines for the 112th Congress, 3:30 p.m., SR–301.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 112th Congress, Time to be announced, Room to be announced.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine reauthorization of the SBIR and STTR programs, 10 a.m., SR–428A.

Select Committee on Intelligence: To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Agriculture, hearing on reviewing the state of the farm economy, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Armed Services, hearing on the Fiscal Year 2012 national defense authorization budget request from the Department of the Air Force, 1 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.


Committee on Homeland Security, hearing entitled “Impact of Medical Device Regulation on Jobs and Patients,” 9:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, hearing entitled “Understanding the Federal Reserve’s Proposed Rule on Interchange Fees: Implications and Consequences of the Durbin Amendment,” 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.


Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, hearing on Waste and Abuse: The Refuse of the Federal Spending Binge, 9:30 a.m., 210–HVC.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, hearing on An Overview of the Administration’s Federal Research and Development Budget for Fiscal Year 2012, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials, hearing on Sitting on Our Assets: Rehabilitating and Improving our Nation’s Rail Infrastructure, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, hearing on Department of Veterans’ Affairs Budget Request for Fiscal Year 2012, 9:30 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, to mark up the following measures: H.R. 4, Small Business Paperwork Mandate Elimination Act of 2011; and the Comprehensive 1099 Taxpayer Protection and Repayment of Exchange Subsidy Overpayments Act of 2011.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, hearing on FY 2011 Budget Overview, 10 a.m., 304–HVC.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
9:30 a.m., Thursday, February 17

Senate Chamber
Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of S. 223, FAA Air Transportation Modernization and Safety Improvement Act, and after a period of debate, vote on the motion to invoke cloture on Inhofe Modified Amendment No. 7, at approximately 11:30 a.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
9 a.m., Thursday, February 17

House Chamber